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Rationale

The purpose of the workshop is to bring together two separate but overlapping research project / networks. The workshop will be the fourth in the series convened by Michelle Pace at the University of Birmingham and benefit from an established network of researchers working in this area. It will be complemented by researchers working in the area at the University of Leeds, including Jason Ralph’s project on the human rights and the war on terror during and after the Bush administration. The workshop will be the first in the series of events on the theme of Security, Development and Democracy to be hosted by the University of Leeds during the academic year 2009-2010. These events build on an established seminar series, further details of which can be found by visiting the programme’s website at http://www.polis.leeds.ac.uk/research/events/sdd-seminar-series.php This innovative series used podcasts to reach a wider audience and with the consent of the speakers we plan to record and disseminate the proceedings in a similar way. Trained staff at Leeds will provide video recording equipment, which will enable, with the consent of the speakers, to put the proceedings on LUTube (Leeds University Tube) http://lutube.leeds.ac.uk Links to the proceedings will appear on the websites of the existing projects. The planned output of the workshop will be a special issue of International Journal of Human Rights, where Jason Ralph is Assistant Editor.

Programme

9.45 Arrival and Coffee

10.00 to 10.05 Welcome: Jason Ralph, Reader in International Relations, University of Leeds.
10.05 to 11.20 Panel 1. Chair: **Clive Jones**, Professor of International Relations and Middle East Studies, Head of School, POLIS, University of Leeds.

‘Between Foreign Policy and Good Governance- evaluating EU economic rights promotion in Bosnia and Turkey’ **Charlie Dannreuther** is Lecturer in European Studies, POLIS, University of Leeds, [C.Dannreuther@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:C.Dannreuther@leeds.ac.uk)

‘Towards a "European” Route to Democratisation in Europe’s Near Abroad? The Impact of EU, OSCE and NATO Democracy Promotion in Europe's Periphery’, **Neil Winn**, Senior Lecturer in European Studies, University of Leeds, [N.Winn@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:N.Winn@leeds.ac.uk)

11.20 to 11.30 Break

11.30 to 1.00 Panel 2. Chair: **Neil Winn**. Discussant: **Paul James Cardwell** Sheffield University

‘Liberal or Social Democracy? Aspect Dawning in the EU’s Democracy Promotion Agenda in the Middle East’. **Michelle Pace**, Senior Research Fellow and RCUK Fellow, POLSIS, University of Birmingham, [m.pace@bham.ac.uk](mailto:m.pace@bham.ac.uk)

‘Hamas’s Media: Towards a New Political Discourse’. **Wael Abdelal**, Doctoral Candidate, Exeter University, [wa218@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:wa218@exeter.ac.uk)

‘Drawing lines around “Europe”. The practice of extraordinary rendition and what it tells us about Europe’s relations with its neighbours’. **Jason Ralph**, Reader in International Relations, POLIS, University of Leeds, [J.G.Ralph@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:J.G.Ralph@leeds.ac.uk)

1 to 2.00 Lunch

2.00 to 3.20 Panel Three. Chair: **John Schwarzmantel**. Discussant: **Ahmed Badawi**, SOAS

‘State-sponsored election violence in liberalised autocracies: Egypt and Morocco.’ **Hendrik Kraetzschmar** Lecturer in Comparative Politics of the. Middle East and North Africa, University of Leeds and **Francesco Cavatorta** Lecturer School of Law and Government, Dublin City University.

‘EU Democracy Promotion in Turkey: funding NGOs, funding conflict?’ **Markus Ketola**, Doctoral Candidate, Centre for Civil Society, London School of Economics, [M.Ketola@lse.ac.uk](mailto:M.Ketola@lse.ac.uk)

‘Illegal Migration in the Southern Mediterranean: one more obstacle for political reform?’ **Thomas Demmelhuber**, lecturer, Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. [thomas.demmelhuber@polwiss.phil.uni-erlangen.de](mailto:thomas.demmelhuber@polwiss.phil.uni-erlangen.de)

3.20 Closing Remarks: Michelle Pace

3.30 Workshop closes
Abstracts

Wael Abdelal, Hamas’s Media: Towards a New Political Discourse

Does Hamas have a double-discourse, one aimed at the Arab and Palestinian peoples and the other aimed at the West? What elements make up what I consider to be a new media-discourse towards the West by Hamas? How does this new discourse respond to the drive by the Obama Administration (and to a lesser extent the EU) to brokering peace between the Palestinians and Israelis? This paper is an attempt to give tentative answers to these questions. It explores the ‘development’ of the media discourse of Hamas toward the West in the context of the ongoing struggle for Palestinian statehood. Specifically, the paper focuses on the shifts in this discourse, signalling a more pragmatic or less ideological discourse vis-à-vis the West. To this end, I shall attempt to deconstruct Hamas’s emerging discourse with special reference to the latest diplomatic efforts by the Obama Administration to revive the Palestinian-Israeli peace process. I shall argue that this new discourse shows elements of ‘moderation’, ‘flexibility’, and ‘new public diplomacy’ by Hamas in its dealing with the US and the EU.

Charles Dannreuther, Between Foreign Policy and Good Governance- evaluating EU economic rights promotion in Bosnia and Turkey

This paper discusses some of the challenges of foreign policy evaluation from a practitioner perspective. Evaluation is central to the effective monitoring of foreign policy activities by national governments in crowded political environments but it is also a policy tool in the promotion of good governance and democratisation agendas. The project under discussion was funded by the UK Foreign Office under its Global Opportunities Fund Reuniting Europe stream which is specifically designed to accelerate transition towards the goal of accession in neighbouring states of the EU. Both projects were designed to raise awareness of the EU’s Lisbon Agenda, a broad range of economic governance issues designed to promote transparent policy making in the pursuit of competitiveness under assumptions of globalisation, and both were managed by a small UK based NGO called EPIC that was “spun out” from the LSE in 1997. One project was based in Turkey and none in Bosnia and Herzegovina and both proposed a similar “training the trainers” methodology but with dramatically different outcomes. Three issues are discussed in order to evaluate the outcomes of each programme: first the project awards framework, in the production of expectations, second the matching of capacities to project aspirations and finally the relevance of standard management norms in practical contexts. The conclusion explores the role of member state foreign policy intervention in relation to EU goals, the ability of evaluative mechanisms to negotiate the importance of local context in foreign policy administration and the importance of foreign policy evaluation in the literature on “foreign policy evaluation”.

Thomas Demmelhuber, Illegal Migration in the Southern Mediterranean: one more obstacle for political reform?
Starting with the European Security Strategy (ESS) in 2003 and later on with the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) the European Union reiterated that security, stability, and good governance in its near neighbourhood are key policy priorities. In consideration of new kinds of security threats, such as illegal migration and various forms of terrorist acts in the Southern Mediterranean, we are witnessing an on-going externalisation of security cooperation in the field of Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) with the Mediterranean Partner Countries (MPC). With regards to illegal migration FRONTEX (established 2004 by Council Regulation 2007) acts as the main instrument in EU’s so called »integrated border management strategy«. This border control agency aims at curbing illegal migration in cooperation with the MPCs. In other words FRONTEX is a tool to establish an exterritorial border, that is to say illegal migrants are to be intercepted prior to even reaching EU territory. However, many questions remain whether it is a further step in easing or deepening the incoherence of EU foreign policy: By externalising security cooperation, the EU contradicts its policies in the fields of democracy promotion, rule of law, and human rights which are based on the EU’s self-perception as a normative power. For the last few years the EU has been increasing development aid to the partner countries in exchange for their generous cooperation in joint return missions. Libya, Morocco, and Mauritania are the most recent examples in which the EU has forgotten about its normative agenda vis-à-vis the transit countries of illegal migration in North Africa. For the sake of repatriation of illegal migrants from EU territory or intercepted migrants from various border patrol missions the EU has intensified its bilateral political and financial support. Therefore the EU bears responsibility for increasing the legitimacy and stability of authoritarianism in the region which the EU wanted to fight in the first place. The paper is based on fieldwork carried out in the Mediterranean (i.e. the MENA region). It is further supplemented by the state of the art in the EU cooperation in JHA, research on migration routes from the African continent (countries of origin and transit countries) and on recent political shifts and dynamics in the affected countries.

Markus Ketola, ‘EU Democracy Promotion in Turkey: funding NGOs, funding conflict?’

Can EU funding for NGOs induce democratization in Turkey? By focusing on the experience of the women’s movement, this paper will attempt an assessment of this question. First, by outlining the rationale for EU funding communicated through policy documents, it is shown that NGO funding is largely justified on the bases of the contribution made towards strengthening democracy. Second, by drawing on interviews with representatives of women’s advocacy NGOs, the efficacy of this strategy is investigated. Whilst the contribution of women’s groups to a series of legal reforms is taken as evidence of NGOs inducing democratization, the relations among women’s NGOs and the rules of inclusion/exclusion within the movement do not seem to reflect this commitment to democratic ideals. These fault lines are most visible between the secular and Islamic women’s NGOs, where the conflict has crystallized around the issue of the headscarf. Given the experience of the women’s movement, does the EU funding framework for democratization via NGOs remain relevant given the dynamics of civil society activism of Turkey?

Hendrik Kraetzschmar and Francesco Cavatorta, ‘State-sponsored election violence in liberalised autocracies: Egypt and Morocco.’
This paper is concerned with state-sponsored election violence in liberalised autocracies. Building on existing research in the field, the first section puts forward a number of propositions that may help explain the decision-making rationale of authoritarian incumbents to deploy force against strong electoral challengers. The second section of this article then examines these propositions in Egypt and Morocco. Drawing on recent parliamentary elections in the two countries, the study questions why - despite facing similar challenges from Islamist groups - the two regimes differed so markedly in their willingness to manipulate the polls by recourse to violence. Whilst the Egyptian authorities decided to abrogate all pretence of peaceful elections in favour of violent repression against the Muslim Brotherhood and its sympathisers, no such tactics were deployed by the Makhzen in Morocco. We suggest that three principal factors influenced the regimes’ calculation of how to run the elections: (i) the centrality of the elected institution to authoritarian survival, (ii) the availability of alternative electioneering tools and (iii) the anticipated response of the international community. The article concludes by suggesting that in order to better understand when and how states deploy violence in election, we need to focus on a more complex set of factors rather than simply on the electoral potency of key opposition challenger or the authoritarian nature of the state.

Michelle Pace, Liberal or Social Democracy? Aspect Dawning in the EU’s Democracy Promotion Agenda in the Middle East

This paper questions how liberal democracy has come to symbolize an ideal, or a universal set of values ready to be exported elsewhere in the world. It critically assesses the EU’s almost messianic mission to promote its successful project of liberal democracy, and the ways in which the EU seeks to teach others about its meaning while refusing to aspect learn about alternative forms of political organization in different contexts. It discusses the implications of such a narrow framing of EU conceptions of liberal democracy, drawing on extensive fieldwork carried out in Palestine and Egypt in September 2007 and March 2008, respectively. The paper argues for a new framing of political transformation in the Middle East and North Africa. It concludes by employing Aletta Norval’s notion of Aversive Democracy to highlight the need for recognition of crucial aspects of political change that stem from what is emerging in the Middle East.

Jason Ralph, ‘Drawing lines around “Europe”. The practice of extraordinary rendition and what it tells us about Europe’s relations with its neighbours.’

The term “extraordinary rendition” has been used widely in recent years to describe the transfer of suspected terrorists by the US to foreign states in circumstances that make it more likely than not that the individual will be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment. The discussion on this subject tends therefore to be linked to the question of whether torture can be justified as a means of combating terrorism. The practice of extraordinary rendition however does involve additional considerations. Any analysis of the practice must be concerned not merely with the act of torture itself, it must also take into account the ideological character of the states involved; for the normative assumption behind the act is that illiberal states can do what liberal states would prefer not to do. This is important because it highlights how liberal states view legal and moral boundaries in the post 9/11 world, and how they view their responsibilities as citizens of international society. This
paper focuses on Europe’s place in the geography of the extraordinary rendition programme. It is noted that terrorist suspects were moved, for example, from Sweden and Italy to Egypt, from the UK to Morocco; and while European governments may not have been complicit in all these transfers it is argued that the programme consolidates lines that separate the ‘liberal’ from the ‘illiberal’ world. By drawing lines around liberal zones of ‘civilisation’, and by exporting the ‘dirty work’ of counter-terrorism, European governments are in this respect working against any broader objective of democratisation.

Neil Winn, ‘Towards a "European" Route to Democratisation in Europe's Near Abroad? The Impact of EU, OSCE and NATO Democracy Promotion in Europe's Periphery’

This paper analyses the role and impact of the European Union (EU), the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in promoting democracy, human rights and good governance in Europe’s Near Abroad. In this context the Near Abroad comprises illustrative cases from North Africa and the former Soviet Union. The paper begins by analysing democracy, human rights and good governance in the context of assessing the role and impact in the political and security fields of the above international organisations (IO’s) in Europe’s Near Abroad. The paper then goes onto evaluate whether or not the above IO’s reinforce democracy, human rights and good governance in the Europe’s Near Abroad. It is the argument of the paper that regional IO’s engaged in democracy promotion often vie for policy space to the detriment of effective international co-operation and that this attenuates the impact of European democracy promotion programmes.