Vaccine diplomacy and the geopolitics of influence

As COVID-19 continued to rage across the world, 2021 saw the start of widespread vaccination, giving us some hope of controlling the spread of the pandemic. The supply of vaccines during the first months of the year became a major global issue among big international players, who rushed to use this in order to increase their soft power.

As Oxford’s most international college, and home to seven regional area studies centres, St Antony’s was well placed for a cross-centre discussion on the issue of vaccine diplomacy as an instrument for geopolitical influence in a world dominated by the impact of the pandemic. At SEESOX’s initiative a panel discussion entitled “Vaccine diplomacy and the geopolitics of influence” was organised on 12 May 2021, with a global audience among Antonians; it was convened by Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX) and Michael Willis (Middle East Centre). Speakers were Yasmina Abouzzohour (Moroccan Institute for Policy Analysis), Roy Allison (RESC), Audrey Kurth Cronin (American University), Ian Neary (Nissan Institute), Kalypso Nikolaidis (European University Institute, Florence), Indrajit Roy (University of York) and Steve Tsang (SOAS, London).

This panel gave a wide-ranging picture of the situation across the world. The USA had changed from a nationalist, pandemic denier to an active player, both domestically and internationally, while Europe had, after initial hiccups, begun to assert its role as a promoter of cooperative rivalry, though how successfully remained to be seen. Russia sought to use vaccine diplomacy to counter its broader loss of economic influence, while neglecting its domestic population. China had also sought to use its comparative success domestically to extend its influence to traditionally western-leaning states. India, while pursuing its traditional role as a supporter of South-South cooperation, had shown complacency domestically, failing to prevent a deadly wave. Japan, with no production, focused on multilateralism, but its own vaccination rollout was slow. Finally, the Middle East was a playground for rivalry between China, Russia and the EU.

Jonathan Scheele
Letter from the Director

Despite the full academic year in the online/lockdown mode, the SEESOX output during the 2020-21 academic year was astonishing. Throughout the year, the collection of public seminars and webinars, brainstorming meetings, research projects and publications were as dynamic as ever. It is true that nothing beats the physical meetings and exchanges, especially in the uniquely attractive environment of Oxford, but on the positive side, the online system allowed us to “bring” excellent speakers from all over the world into our panels and meetings without any administrative hazard. This was evident in our annual Hilary term seminar series on the quality of democracy in South East Europe where we organised eight excellent panels of distinguished scholars, in our online workshops in the context of our Oxford-Berlin project on Turkey’s migration diplomacy or in our Trinity term seminar series with the Migration Centre in Oxford (COMPAS) on the politics of emigration, or, finally, in our other joint activities with third partners. Last year we established partnerships with ELIAMEP in Athens as part of our SEESOX diaspora project, we organised public webinars with some of our donors, Eurobank, Eurolife, DiaNEOsis and NATO, we convened joint panels with Humboldt University, Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies at Harvard, and with the School of Transnational Governance, at the European University Institute. A major highlight was the organisation of an Antonian panel on vaccine diplomacy last June where we worked together with the other Centres at St Antony’s College. We even managed to bring in academic visitors and new associates who contributed to SEESOX’s output and became a vital part of team SEESOX. Our SEESOX Monday meetings continued to happen online every week and kept the team together and the engine full on! This newsletter, as always, contains highlights from all these moments and initiatives, a unique year that we will not forget, because, despite the distance, it brought new energy and ideas to SEESOX’s work. The year of the pandemic leaves us richer in partnerships and designs for the future which we now hope to build upon as we come back to our offices in Oxford.

Othon Anastasakis, Director of SEESOX

SEESOX news bites

Jessie Barton Hronesova has been awarded a three-year Marie Curie-Sklodowska Global Fellowship on a project that explores the role of victimhood in contemporary politics of Central and Southeast Europe. She will be based at UNC-Chapel Hill, Ca Foscari in Italy and the Czech Academy of Sciences.

Marilena Anastasopoulou (Research Associate, SEESOX; Faculty of History, University of Oxford; Onassis Foundation Scholar) has been awarded the Best Doctoral Paper Award in the Turkey/Greece section in the context of the Annual World Convention for the Association for the Study of Nationalities (ASN), Columbia University.


The Greek Military Dictatorship: Revisiting a Troubled Past 1967-1974, is edited by Othon Anastasakis and Katerina Lagos, was published by Berghahn in September 2021. (See page 15)

Othon Anastasakis and Foteini Kalantzis participated in the annual ASN Conference on 5-8 May 2021. They presented papers on ‘Crisis and change: The vote of the Greek diaspora’, and “The Greek Diaspora: Engagement and Disengagement with the Homeland in Times of Crisis”.

Dimitar Bechev’s new book, Turkey Under Erdogan: How a Country Turned from Democracy and the West will be published by Yale University Press in April 2022.

Jess Dancy, the European Studies Centre Administrator, left the College in September to take up a new position as Operations Manager for a leading UK Drama Conservatoire. Julie Adams has undertaken a partial secondment to temporarily cover the ESC Administrator post alongside her normal role as SEESOX Administrator.
“My affiliation with SEESOX as an Academic Visitor has been a great opportunity for me to connect and share my research work on the foreign media coverage of Albania and the Balkans with an excellent team of academics and international associates. I got the chance to present and discuss my research findings as well as attend other researchers’ presentations in a very engaging and supporting virtual forum. The focus of South European Studies at Oxford on the interdisciplinary study of the Western Balkans not only allowed me to relate my work to the policy relevant research this centre conducts on the region’s developments, but also to initiate lasting cooperation relationships with senior researchers and scholars like Othon, Kalypso, Jonathan, Charles and David and all the team members I was lucky to have as mentors during a challenging time of virtual attachment to the college, but nevertheless very fruitful. While Othon kindly joined the Albanian Studies Days at my home university as a guest speaker during Hilary term, I hope in future events and occasions we could further contribute to foster links between European University of Tirana and St Antony's College at Oxford. The SEESOX seminar series on Democracy, Elections and Prospects of Developments for the Western Balkans were also the most suitable setting for my new initiative, a forum of Democratic Transition Talks with former Albanian Presidents, Prime-ministers and Heads of Parliaments, a conversation that focuses on Democratisation versus Authoritarianism and Liberal Democracy in Albania. I have been so inspired by the high quality research, seminars and events organized in the Hilary and Trinity Terms, that I can’t wait to contribute and share more with all of you next term.”  

Belina Budini

“I joined the Department of Politics and International Relations at Oxford in July 2020 and shortly afterwards I became an Associate at SEESOX. Even though meetings, seminars and events have been taking place online, I have very much enjoyed being part of the SEESOX community. Colleagues made me feel very welcome. I have gained a deeper understanding of South East Europe, as SEESOX seminars integrate successfully comparative and interdisciplinary perspectives. I have also had the opportunity to present my research to the SEESOX team, and contribute to SEESOX seminar series. In Michaelmas Term I contributed to the seminar on 30 Years: The end of the road for ex-Communist elites in South East Europe? and together with Mihail Chiru, Milos Damnjanovic and Jonathan Scheele discussed the democratic transitions in Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro. The Hilary 2021 Seminar Series on the quality of democracy in South East Europe inspired us to reflect on the key democratic challenges in the region. I also had the opportunity to organise a seminar on Strengthening the Rule of Law in South East Europe and the European Union and together with Marko Kmezic, Carlos Closa Montero and Kalypso Nicolaidis evaluated the effectiveness of the EU rule of law instruments and policies in comparative perspective and reflected on the key lessons learnt. I am looking forward to next academic year SEESOX’s events and I hope that I will be able to meet all SEESOX colleagues in person.”  

Eli Gateva
Motivated by the recent emphasis of the EU (and the US post-Trump) on democracy and the rule of law in Europe, our 2021 Hilary term seminar series focused on the quality of democracy in the Balkans by asking how big is the problem of the so-called democratic backsliding and how credible is the renewed fight against illiberalism?

The series included eight panels which engaged with the discussion of relevant thematic and comparative country issues.

On 20 January, SEESOX hosted the opening webinar, on “Democracy in South East Europe: Backsliding or new normal?” bringing together Milada Anna Vachudova (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Damir Kapidzic (University of Sarajevo) and Dimitar Bechev (Oxford) to discuss the notions of “illiberalism” “ethnopopulism” and “autocratization” and how these reflect the state of democracy in the Western Balkans, including from a comparative perspective with countries in Central and Eastern Europe. They pointed to the current political stagnation caused by the illiberal practices of the governing elites, the limited influence of the opposition, the impact of majoritarianism and of strongmen in politics, or the offenses against the freedom of expression.

The second panel entitled “Can elections bring (real) change? Lessons learned and prospects for the Western Balkans” was coordinated by Tena Prelec (University of Oxford) and brought together Florian Bieber (Graz University), Donika Emini (Civikos Platform), Borisa Falatar (Nasa Stranka), Vujo Illic (CRTA, Serbia), and Jovana Marovic (Politikon Network, Montenegro) who offered comparative accounts of electoral practices in the different countries in the region. The panel discussed whether elections are the legitimator of the illiberal status quo and asked whether the more recent elections in Montenegro or Kosovo might have challenged the notion that elections in the region do not bring any real change. The discussion benefitted from surveys on public attitudes towards elections in the six Western Balkan countries.

The third panel, organised in cooperation with the School of Transnational Governance of the European University Institute (EUI), focused on the strengthening of the rule of law in the EU and South East Europe. It included Marko Kmezic (Graz University) on the Western Balkans, Eli Gateva (Oxford) on Bulgaria and Romania and Carlos Closa Montero (EUI) on the EU practices and was chaired by Kalypso Nicolaïdis (EUI/Oxford). The panellists engaged with the EU’s focus on the issue of the rule of law in the member states, especially in countries with weaker institutions, and the renewed emphasis of the European Commission on the pre-accession and post-accession rule of law conditionality including the linkages with the disbursement of the EU funds. It was argued that, despite an enhanced strategy and a broad mix of instruments, the deterioration of the rule of law in some member states and candidate countries was a worrying trend and revealed the inability of the EU to address this important issue, by engaging in a critical assessment of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the instruments at its disposal.
The fourth panel discussed Jessie Barton-Hronešová’s published book entitled “The struggle for redress: Victim capital in Bosnia and Herzegovina” (Palgrave 2020) and included John Alderdice (Harris Manchester College, Oxford), Jasna Dragovic-Soso (Goldsmith University) and John Gledhil (Oxford Department of International Development), all of whom highlighted the value of the book in the broader literatures of transitional justice, and South East Europe’s post-conflict politics and society. The book looks at victims’ actions to secure redress in a post-war state, and examines the role of various social actors in influencing the policies of transitional justice.

The fifth seminar on “Media in Greece: Free or dependent?” included Lamprini Rori (University of Exeter), Roman Gerodimos (University of Dartmouth) and Stathis Kalyvas (Oxford) who focused on the nature of the Greek media, a hybrid case of free speech and state dependencies by looking at the relationships between media and the political entrepreneurs, the degree of media freedom in Greece compared with other EU member states, the lack of investigative journalism as well as the increasing role of the social media in competing with traditional media.

At the sixth panel, Ivor Sokolic (LSE), Ljubica Spaskovska (Exeter University) and Milica Uvalic (Perugia University), chapter contributors to the book “The Legacy of Yugoslavia: Politics, Economics and Society in the Modern Balkans” (I.B.Tauris 2020), presented some of the continuities and discontinuities between former Yugoslavia and the successor states in the fields of civil society, non-aligned multilateralism and economic transition, respectively. Overall, the book concentrates on the impact of the Yugoslav past on the present and how the legacy of Yugoslavia continues, in some ways, to affect contemporary developments in the post-Yugoslav states of the Western Balkans.

The seventh panel focused on the diminishing role of the legislature and the judiciary vis-à-vis the executive and the strong Presidency in the context of Turkey’s ‘new constitution’. The panel, which included Bertil Emrah Oder (Koç University), Ersin Kalaycıoğlu (Sabancı University), Murat Sevinç (Author), discussed among others, the historical roots of presidentialism in Turkey, the current personalisation of power, the role of party politics and opposition to the overconcentration of power by the leader, as well as the impact of presidentialism on human rights and freedoms.

The final panel entitled “Protest in the Balkans: Do they have an Impact?” focused on popular, participatory democratic activities in the Balkans and their consequences. The speakers, Danijela Dolenec (University of Zagreb), Chiara Milan (Scuola Normale Superiore), Julia Rone (Cambridge), and Daniel Smilov (University of Sofia), shared an understanding that protests can have an important impact in several areas, namely: in politics, through, for example shifts in voting patterns and party structures; in policies and economics, where resources may be reallocated and incentives adjusted; in culture and norms, when the standards of behaviour adjust; in networking and society, as when new nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) emerge from protest movements. However, it is often very difficult to identify the contribution of protests to developments in these areas. A careful examination of cross-country experience, as presented in this seminar, is essential to distinguish what are the essential conditions for effectiveness.

Othon Anastasakis, Adis Merdzanovic, Ivor Sokolic, Milica Uvalic and Ljubica Spaskovska
During the last academic year, the “Oxford-Berlin Partnership: Migration Diplomacy and Turkey-EU Relations” project brought together experts and scholars around its research topic, and accumulated preparatory material for a larger research grant application. Three online brainstorming meetings were organized, in addition to the past two meetings. These meetings facilitated the creation of a network of scholars and triggered a fruitful discussion around the issue of migration diplomacy and Turkey-EU relations.

Conceptual and historical perspectives
The second online brainstorming meeting of the project, entitled ‘Migration Diplomacy: Conceptual and Historical Perspectives’ was held on 5 November 2020. This gathering followed the kick-off meeting at the Humboldt University, and the first brainstorming meeting that focused on the domestic drivers of Turkey’s migration diplomacy. The aim of the second online meeting was to explore the concept of migration diplomacy and how migration management fits into interstate bargaining. The Zoom meeting was organized under the Chatham House rule and involved around 50 scholars. The speakers and participants were asked the following questions:

- How do you conceptualize migration diplomacy?
- How is migration diplomacy linked with foreign policy making? (Please explain by making references to current and historical examples.)
- What are the linkages between migration diplomacy and geopolitical considerations?
- Where do you think there is need for more research in this field? Where do you think there is a gap in the literature on migration diplomacy and its history?

EU migration policies vis-à-vis Turkey
On 11 February 2021 the third online meeting was held, concentrating on ‘EU migration policies vis-à-vis Turkey’. We have seen the consistent participation of our previous attendees. There were three broad categories that the speakers were asked to focus on: 1) The current state of affairs with regard to the EU-Turkey deal, 2) The complexity and diversity of interests, 3) The multiplicity of actors that determine the policies in various levels. Accordingly, these following questions and points were addressed:

- What is the current state of the EU-Turkey Deal?
- Sustainability of the status quo
- EU’s externalization of its migration management policies and concerns of securitization
- Which actors within the EU play a determinative role in the formulation of EU policy vis-à-vis Turkey on migration?
- To what extent EU migration priorities are informed by other considerations i.e. economic, geopolitical?
- Mezzo and micro-level of engagement and implementation of projects
- What do we know of the relevant EU Commission departments and staff and their perception of Turkey and the matters at stake?

The geopolitical context
The fourth and final brainstorming meeting was called ‘Migration Diplomacy: Turkey’s Foreign Policy in the Regional and Geopolitical Context’ and was held on 8 April 2021. The meeting addressed the following questions:

- What are the implications of the regional geopolitical conflicts for forced migration?
- What are the implications of forced migration for geopolitical conflicts?
- To what extent other external important actors use migration diplomacy for geopolitical aims?

Detailed reports of all of the meetings were prepared. Shorter versions of the meeting reports are posted on our project website.

Aslı Töre

Click here to access the project webpages:
Migration Diplomacy and Turkish-EU relations | St Antony's College (ox.ac.uk)
SEESOX held three webinars on Turkey and the Eastern Mediterranean in the first three weeks of Michaelmas Term 2020. On 14 October 2020, the first webinar - “The Eastern Mediterranean: a new hotspot for Europe” - focused on the geopolitical state of play in the region following the summer of 2020 and the crisis between Greece and Turkey. As the region has increasingly become an area of insecurity, with high stakes and numerous stakeholders, the webinar looked at the key challenges, the main drivers behind the competing interests, and high risks for the future. The speakers were Constantinos Filis (Institute of International Relations, Athens), Fiona Mullen (Sapienta Economics, Nicosia) and Sinan Ülgen (Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies, Istanbul); it was co-chaired by Othon Anastasakis and Mehmet Karlı, both of St Antony’s College. After looking at different players’ interests, the speakers focused on scenarios that might create a win-win solution in the region. It was agreed that this could be possible through a grand “gas plus” common energy deal for the Eastern Mediterranean, achieved by looking beyond gas alone, which might already be a declining commercial resource, and stitching together gas, renewables, electricity interconnectors, green hydrogen, communications technology, and defence.

The second webinar, held on 28 October 2020 and chaired by Mehmet Karlı (St Antony’s College), focused on Turkey’s disinformation ecosystem. It brought together two speakers - Akin Ünver (Oxford Internet Institute; Department of International Relations, Kadir Has University) and Afşin Yurdakul (Habertürk News Network) - with Ezgi Başaran (St Antony’s College, Oxford) as discussant. Turkey ranks among the most active countries in using social media for political communication purposes, yet it is also one of the most vulnerable countries to disinformation, bot usage and cyber-attacks. While independent social institutions/NGOs had been set up to carry out fact checking, the polarisation of society and the media meant that these rarely had a significant impact except where the news was obviously fake. Within the climate of political polarisation and constant electioneering since the early 2000s, press freedom has been shrinking and journalists found themselves forced to focus more on navigating difficult political terrain than on their classic job of checking facts. This was exacerbated by the accelerating speed of the information cycle generated by social media, compounded by the difficult financial situation of traditional media. All this had led to lower trust in media and an increasing tendency to choose media outlets in line with one’s views - the phenomenon of ‘opposing echo chambers’. This weak information environment makes Turkey vulnerable to external influence.

The third webinar was on 11 November 2020 and it focused on the economic and geopolitical implications of Turkey’s largest-ever natural gas find in the Black Sea in August 2020. Chaired by Othon Anastasakis and Okan Yardimci (both St Antony’s College), it brought together Dimitar Bechev (DPIR, Oxford; Russia Institute, King’s College London), Jonathan Lamb (Wood and Co., London), and Anna Mikulska (Baker Institute, Houston, Kleinman Center, University of Pennsylvania) as speakers. After the gas find, a change in the mix of the region’s energy use and the following transformation of Turkey’s relations with traditional energy suppliers were anticipated. Considering Turkey’s significant current account deficit and its large energy import bill, a switch to domestically produced gas was expected to generate important savings and additional earnings. It would also give Turkey extra bargaining power for contract renewals and change its relations with neighbours. Turning to the geopolitics of natural gas in the region, it was commented that a diversification away from the significant Russian power in the region is already happening. If Turkey sets itself up as a middleman for gas to Europe, there might be a shift toward a system of dual dominance (Turkey and Russia), which could strengthen the energy security of the region.

Aslı Töre
SEESOX Diaspora: The Greek Diaspora Project

Survey on Greeks in the UK and the impact of the pandemic

SEESOX, in partnership with diaNEOsis Research and Policy Institute, under the coordination of Manolis Pratsinakis, carried out a large nationwide representative survey to assess and analyze the profile of the Greek communities in the UK. The report was finalized in January 2020 and was subsequently translated in Greek but the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic made for a radically new context, which necessitated a follow-up research to assess the new circumstances brought by the pandemic. The new research was carried out since the beginning of the reporting period and was finalized in December 2020. Both surveys were published in March 2021 and were disseminated widely through various means of communication, informing the public and policy makers about the actual condition of the Greek communities abroad through the prism of the UK case. Click here to read the report

Diaspora entrepreneurs and the Greek start-up ecosystem

SEESOX has engaged in a partnership with the Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy, ELIAMEP in order to prepare a joint proposal for research on the interaction between diaspora entrepreneurs and the Greek start-up ecosystem. Start-up creation, particularly in the high-tech sector, is an important pillar in the development of a Greek economic model that is not dominated by a rent-seeking business community, is internationally competitive and thus able to employ highly educated Greeks from the diaspora. Although the Greek start-up community is increasingly mapped out by academics, venture capitalists and the government, there has not yet been research produced that relates Greece’s start-up creation with the Greek diaspora. In our research we will map diaspora actors already engaged with Greece’s start-up scene and identify practices that promote diaspora and homeland engagement in start-up creation and growth.

Publications

SEESOX and ELIAMEP collaborate in the study of the Greek diaspora-homeland nexus

This paper sets the framework for the joint collaboration of SEESOX with ELIAMEP which aims at catalyzing comparative and multidisciplinary research undertaken in Greece and abroad, on the diaspora and homeland relationship.

Homeland crisis, party politics and the Greek diaspora vote

The working paper looks at the micropolitics leading to the 2019 adoption of the Greek law on the facilitation of the diasporic vote and argues that the Greek crisis acted as a catalyst in the redefinition of homeland diaspora political engagement. The paper is written by Othon Anastasakis and Foteini Kalantzis.

The Greek diaspora and the homeland in the time of the pandemic

The edited volume is a selection of interdisciplinary opinion pieces on the homeland-diaspora nexus in the time of the pandemic. It covers the reactions of Greek diasporans to the outbreak of the pandemic as well as the initial responses of the Greek government. The volume is edited by Antonis Kamaras.

Upcoming book on Homeland-Diaspora Engagement

The proposal of our upcoming book ‘Homeland-Diaspora Engagement in times of Severe Economic Crisis: The case of Greece’ was accepted in March 2021 for publication in the Migration, Diaspora and Citizenship series of Palgrave Macmillan. The book is the product of original research conducted by the Greek Diaspora Project since 2016 on issues including the study of Greek diasporic philanthropic giving, the understanding of the Greek diaspora in the UK whose numbers tripled during the years of the economic crisis, the diasporic-homeland political engagement including the diasporic vote and the significance of brain drain caused by the increase in outward migration. All these issues are included as eight chapters in our book as original material based on rigorous scientific research. In addition, the book is enriched by insights from our network of collaborating scholars working on the Greek diaspora and further includes a section which offers a comparative perspective by looking at similar contemporary cases of homeland-diaspora engagements in countries hit by similar economic crises like Ireland and Portugal, or in countries hit by political crises like Ukraine. As such the book covers holistically the topic of diaspora engagement in times of economic crisis and makes a significant contribution to the scholarly literature on diaspora studies and comprises a state-of-the-art publication on Greek contemporary homeland-diaspora relations and a key reference and source both for policy makers in Greece and scholars working in the field.
In Trinity Term SEESOX co-organised with the Oxford’s Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS) a Seminar Series entitled ‘The Politics of Emigration: Representations and contestations’. From the nation state perspective emigration has an inherently contested character: on the one hand it indicates and symbolises a certain failure of the state and on the other it often goes together with the production of negative representations for the emigrants who are seen to be betraying the nation by exiting it.

However, recently diaspora literature has suggested that a shift has taken place with governments changing their narratives from denouncing emigrants as deserters, to celebrating them as an extension of the nation outside the state. To what extent can this be said to be true? What variations can we identify between states? What are the different actors shaping discourses on emigration in origin countries and how do these feed in on policies that aim to regulate exit and govern citizens abroad? How do emigrants respond to such representations?

Four presenters offered insightful answers to these questions through different case studies.

On 6 May Dace Dzenovska (University of Oxford) focused on Latvia, a country that lost one third of its population to emigration, an event that intensified pre-existing existential fears about the continuity of the state and the nation. In this context, the Latvian diaspora has emerged as a transnational actor asserting or aspiring for sovereignty to ensure the continuity of the national community, while the state retains its importance as a territorial unit for that very same matter.

Elena Genova (University of Nottingham) spoke about the politics of emigration in Bulgaria, which like Latvia has also experienced significant demographic decline to a large extent due to outward migration. Genova spoke about a rift between migrants and non-migrants associated with the ways in which migration is conceptualised and perceived with reference to the Communist past, when emigration was as an act of treason. Such conceptualisations resurge in critical moments of political unrest.

Manolis Pratsinalis chaired the session.

On 27 May Ivan Krastev, (Centre for Liberal Strategies) explored the links between migration and illiberalism. Focusing on Central and Eastern Europe, he described how strong nationalism rhetoric is unsuccessfully employed in these countries to stop the exodus of people. At the same time illiberal governments, are not closing their countries to foreigners but rather welcome them as guest workers without political rights, thus divorcing labour markets from politics and the nation.

Maria Koinova and Othon Anastasakis acted as discussants, and Jessie Barton Hronesova chaired.

Finally, on 3 June 2021 Alexandra Délano Alonso (The New School) focused on Mexico to outline the role of origin countries in designing policies aiding the integration of diasporas abroad, an area most often determined by countries of destination. She explained how these policies challenge traditional conceptions of sovereignty, citizenship and social protection and can be a space for accountability across borders.

Robin Cohen was discussant and Manolis Pratsinakis chaired.

Manolis Pratsinakis
Joint events

The US after Trump: The prospective Biden presidency, Trumpism and partisan crisis

On 26 November 2020, at the conclusion of the annual meeting of SEESOX’s Hellenic Advisory Board (separate item), there was an online discussion on this issue. The speaker was Professor Desmond King of Oxford University, and the discussant was Despina Afentouli of NATO’s Public Diplomacy Division.

Professor King looked closely at the electoral statistics and their consequences. At home, Joe Biden’s priorities would be the economy and management of the pandemic.

Abroad, the election of Biden would give a new impetus to Washington-Brussels relations: at a time of tectonic changes, in which the challenges following the Covid-19 pandemic would go beyond the Euro-Atlantic context and require an international response.

US relations with Europe would change, but would not be entirely straight-forward, given the need to try and find a common approach to Russia, and also agree trade deals.

The defeat of Trump had not solved or ended the partisan split in the US; only 21% of Trump supporters believed that the election had been fair, and this would bedevil US politics for the coming period.

Describing relief among European leaders at Biden’s election, Despina Afentouli explained that at the institutional level both sides were awaiting a return to normal practices which had preceded the election of Trump. She spoke of an impending US turn towards Asia, requiring the Europeans to take on more of the joint burden on defence and security.

David Madden

30 years on: The end of the road for ex-communist elites in SE Europe?

On 27 November 2020, SEESOX organised an event entitled “30 years on: the end of the road for ex-communist elites in SE Europe?” Chaired by Jonathan Scheele (SEESOX), it brought together two Oxford-based speakers, Eli Gateva (DPIR) and Mihail Chiru (School of Global and Area Studies) and Milos Damjanovic, a freelance political analyst, based in Serbia. The panellists looked at Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro and prospects for real political change, as parties formed in the 1990s from ex-communist elites faced challenges from new parties and people.

The verdict was mixed: the situation in Bulgaria is uncertain and volatile; the new parties in Romania face challenges in establishing solid organisations, while largely unreformed ex-communist elite parties can rely on a more or less captive vote; Serbia, with a greying leadership, contrasts with Montenegro’s youth, but the opposition there has so far failed to capitalise on its electoral success, while in Serbia, once elected, it simply succumbed to the temptations of power. Overall, the answer seemed fairly negative, even if the challenges for newly formed parties differ from those reshaping old ones.

Jonathan Scheele
On 13 May 2021, SEESOX hosted this webinar, jointly with the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies at Harvard. Speakers were Thomas Countryman (former US Deputy Assistant Secretary of State), Valerie Hopkins (former South East Europe Correspondent for the Financial Times), and Ivan Vejvoda (Head of Europe’s Futures Programme, Institute for Human Sciences, Vienna). Othon Anastasakis and Elaine Papoulas co-chaired.

Countryman underlined that the aims of US policy had remained unchanged across different administrations since Dayton: to support the aspirations of West Balkan countries to integrate into the Euro-Atlantic structures and prevent any recurrence of conflict. The new administration would seek to restore US credibility with its allies and in its alliances. He pointed out that, even under Trump, the US and EU had in fact worked well together and achieved results – the North Macedonia name issue, Montenegro accession to NATO, and Albania’s progress towards EU accession. However, the EU accession perspective had lost credibility. Common action could include:

- Continued public opposition to suggestions for border changes;
- Support for a continued Kosovo-Serbia dialogue, with the clear goal of mutual recognition,
- A credible EU accession perspective.

Hopkins warned against excessive expectations about US engagement and EU accession. At the same time, South East Europe represented an opportunity to repair the EU-US relationship; the EU should take it, as the US continued to be seen, in the SEE region, as a more honest broker. The Kosovo-Serbia dialogue was also another area for US-EU joint action, but EU needed to address Kosovar frustrations.

Vejvoda noted that post-Dayton unfinished business remained unchanged. Members of the new administration, from Biden downwards, were well versed in the Western Balkans; there was need for engagement, both geopolitical and geo-economic. Bulgaria’s position regarding North Macedonia’s accession was untenable, and extremely detrimental to EU credibility in the region. The Kosovo visa regime was also a troubling issue – even Moldova and Ukraine had passed this milestone.

On 17 June 2021, SEESOX, in cooperation with the School of Transnational Governance at the European University Institute in Florence, organised a book launch discussion on the recently-published Citizen’s Guide to the Rule of Law, authored by Kalypso Nicolaidis (EUI, Florence) and Adis Merdzanovic (Zurich University of Applied Sciences). Speakers were Sarah Nouwen and Marta Pardavi (EUI, Florence) and Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX); it was chaired by Alexander Stubb (EUI, Florence).

The book seeks to engage citizens and raise awareness of shared responsibility. It urges the EU to be both more ambitious in promoting the rule of law, and, in some areas, humbler. It underlines the difference between rule of law as a political concept and the adoption of the acquis communautaire; NGO activism sometimes confuses the two.

The EU is rightly criticised as being too focused on means and instruments, but others share responsibility for failures of rule of law – political elites and citizens’ complacency play their role. The EU has learned lessons, and is now more citizen-focused, but media also play a key role in monitoring the situation. International efforts can only succeed if combined with internal pressure from empowered citizens. Finally, discussion on rule of law has lessons not only for the EU and SE Europe, but more globally.

Jonathan Scheele
Opinion pieces: Climate challenges for SEESOX countries

Greece on fire! The harsh reality of climate change

2021 has been the year of COVID-19. People, countries, governments, societies, learning establishments, health systems and charities round the world have been deeply affected: and are understandably apprehensive about the next pandemic.

But it is also the year of climate change. The extreme weather affecting so many parts of the world (searing heat, catastrophic fires, torrential rain and devastating floods) have borne out all the prophecies and warnings issued by experts over the years. The IPCC sums it all up:

2021 has been the year of COVID-19. People, countries, governments, societies, learning establishments, health systems and charities round the world have been deeply affected: and are understandably apprehensive about the next pandemic.

But it is also the year of climate change. The extreme weather affecting so many parts of the world (searing heat, catastrophic fires, torrential rain and devastating floods) have borne out all the prophecies and warnings issued by experts over the years. The IPCC sums it all up:

— climate change is real and already with us; and it is caused by human agency. The human race has thoughtlessly and recklessly breached planetary boundaries in many ways: carbon footprint, invasion of the wild, misuse of nature, failure to look after the soils and insects on which we all rely; and, sometimes overlooked in the past, industrial agriculture (because of factory farming, the livestock sector is responsible for more greenhouse gases than all the world’s planes, trains and cars).

The fires in Greece stand as a stark reminder which best exemplifies the predicament facing the planet as the result of human actions over the years. Greece is famous for its climate, its beauty, its pellicund seas and noble mountains, its contribution to human civilisation. Yet the pictures we have all seen tell the current story: the images of destruction, of loss, the suffering of humans and of animals (domestic, farmed and wild). Sadly, neighbouring Turkey has also been afflicted by devastating fires.

And what do pandemic and climate change have in common? They are caused by human beings, who have produced a situation which is dire but not irrecoverable: provided we act fast, decisively and NOW. We need to change our ways dramatically. In the case of agriculture, the cause of so much harm, we need to follow three guiding principles: Regeneration of the countryside through the adoption of nature-friendly farming; Rethinking protein to embrace alternatives such as plant-based and cell-based (instead of just mindlessly churning out ever more meat and dairy); and Rewilding (not least of the soil).

David Madden

The European Green Deal presents opportunities for South East Europe

The brutal wildfires in Southeast Europe—not only in Greece and Turkey but also in Albania, Croatia, Montenegro, and North Macedonia—underscore the urgency of action to rein in climate change. The region is also suffering crop damage from extreme temperatures and more frequent floods. Besides their direct economic costs, these disasters are worsening political fragility by eroding confidence in governments. Hence, SEESOX has been collaborating with EuPEP’s programme on the political economy of European climate action, with the goal of raising awareness and identifying reform priorities for the region.

The programme was designed as an agenda of key political-economy climate issues relevant to COP26, the November 2021 climate summit in Glasgow. It opened with a conference (Jan 22, 2021) that discussed the European Green Deal and the COP agenda, as well as the roles for governments and the financial sector in financing climate action, and the contribution of non-state political activists to a successful green transition. Follow-up seminars continued through Trinity Term, covering Europe’s approach to carbon pricing (including the EU’s controversial carbon border adjustment mechanism), the case for regenerative agriculture and CAP reform, the scope for financing climate action via a new SDR issue from the IMF and via green bonds, and possibilities for strengthening the international climate architecture. (See EuPEP’s website for blogs and podcasts of all the sessions.)

The European Green Deal presents opportunities for South East Europe (including pre-accession countries), but also special challenges. South East Europe is more carbon-intensive (exceptionally dependent on coal), has lower energy efficiency and a weaker regulatory structure, and is poorer than Western Europe (see Catuti et al, CEPS 2020). Hence, the region starts with a disadvantage in reducing greenhouse gas emissions in line with Green Deal commitments. The Just Transition fund, which partly finances the Green Deal, is intended to help South East European EU members address these problems. Moreover, since climate change does not respect borders, the EU will also support reforms in pre-accession countries and the near neighbourhood: IPA III (pre-accession finance 2021-27) will emphasize environmental projects and strengthening infrastructure and the NDICI (neighbourhood development support) will target energy efficiency and the green economy. The Green Deal includes a specific Green Agenda for the Western Balkans, financed by a €9 billion economic investment plan for the region. Almost all countries in the region have updated their national climate action plans (NDCs) in preparation for COP26 and to clarify their priorities for international financial support. For instance, the development of renewable energy in the Black Sea is considered exceptionally promising. Recent good news is that Turkey has finally ratified the Paris Agreement, after several years as the only G-20 country outside—because it wished to be treated as a developing country for climate financing purposes. The ratification is expected to give Turkey access to some of the EU resource package. More broadly, it will give SEE an opportunity to craft a coherent and comprehensive regional transition strategy to a greener Europe.

Adrienne Cheasty
My book “Europe beyond the Euro—Enhancing Protection for the Peoples of Europe in the Time of Risks” is scheduled to be published in August 2021. “Beyond the Euro” can be taken in three separate ways: first, “Europe beyond the Euro” is geographical, looking at Europe as a whole, not just the Euro area member states of the EU that are frequently the focus of analysis of European integration; second, because while questions along the lines of “will the Euro survive?” were the bread and butter of commentators for the first decade or so of the Euro’s existence, such questions looks archaic now; and thirdly, because the future of the common currency is no longer the greatest issue when we have entered the age of risks: financial risks, health risks, climate risks, and risks to democracy.

The book looks at some of the developments in European integration (and dis-integration) over the past decades. It observes an increasing pattern of differential integration—that initiatives in Europe are rarely co-determinate with the boundaries of the EU. Some cover a smaller area (such as the single currency) and some areEU plus (for instance the Erasmus programme of student exchanges). Especially where the interrelationships across the perimeter of the EU are intense (for instance in issues of health) there is a strong case for inclusivity, with European agencies covering not just the member states of the EU but also the “near abroad” and maybe beyond.

The book looks also at the EU’s institutional innovations since the global financial crisis. Much has been achieved to strengthen Europe’s resilience to financial crisis, but this is still a work in progress. The book looks in detail at the European Systemic Risk Board (ESRB), the EU institution tasked with promoting financial stability, whose existence well below any radar screen means that it has not been politicised and can act in line with “the science”.

Over the past decade since its founding the ESRB has established its credibility; it has done good work in protecting EU countries from financial crisis. Importantly, it has already gone beyond the EU membership, including also EEA countries in everything but voting. Yet the ESRB remains heavily constrained, particularly as it shares its leadership and its premises with the European Central Bank, and has to rely on soft power (“comply or explain”) if it seeks action from its member states. It barely features in international fora.

The book argues that in the time of risk the ESRB should become an apex institution, moving away from the ECB—and maybe out of Frankfurt. It should have responsibility to assess the economic impact from crises other than financial and be given some hard powers in its core areas of responsibility. It should appear in its own right in relevant international fora. Critically, it should examine the possibility of external differentiation—having as members not only the EU, but also the UK and the countries of the western Balkans and possibly others too.

If this comes to pass, the countries of South East Europe would be at the table in discussions concerning the myriad existential threats that the region, and indeed the world, is facing. This would help protect their own economies; it would also help protect the member states of the EU since the risks of contagion can flow in either direction. It would provide an appropriate introduction to the workings of an operational European institution for those countries outside the EU that are seeking to enter, as well as for the recently-departed country an opportunity to continue to share its expertise and insights in areas at the very core of Europe’s future. For South East Europe, therefore, the possible enhancement in the powers and geographic reach of the ESRB could help strengthen their economies and societies when all are struggling with crises past and present, known and yet unknown.

Charles Enoch

---

**From the ashes of Moria refugee camp to a new migration system?**

On 18 November 2020, SEESOX held the webinar ‘From the ashes of Moria refugee camp to a new migration system?’ with the aim of problematising the EU’s migration governance system and critically discussing the prospects for the new migration pact announced in late September 2020 in the aftermath of the Moria catastrophe. The seminar was chaired by Foteini Kalantzis and brought together Angeliki Dimitriadi (ELIAMEP), Franck Düvell, (Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies (IMIS), Osnabruck University) and Elzbieta Gozdzik, (Centre for Migration Studies (CeBaM), Adam Mickiewicz University). Dimitriadi focused on the circumstances and structural causes that made the Moria camp such a dangerous and inhume place and led to its eventual destruction by fire. Düvell argued that flows during the crisis accounted for only 0.2% of the total population of Europe, yet they brought about a massive reaction and humanitarian issues in Greece, the Balkans and other countries along the route. Finally, in her presentation Gozdzik focused on the Visegrad Four (V4) countries and their views on the new pact on migration and asylum, having opposed refugee relocation most strongly.

Foteini Kalantzis
Michaelmas 2020 (October-December)

The East Med: A new hotspot for Europe?
Constantinos Filis (Institute of International Relations, Athens); Fiona Mullen (Sapienza Economics); Sinan Ulgen (Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies, Istanbul)
Chairs: Othon Anastasakis and Mehmet Karli (SEESOX)

Exploring Turkey’s disinformation ecosystem
Afsin Yurdakul (Haberturk News Network); Akin Unver (Department of International Relations, Kadir Has University)
Discussant: Ezgi Basaran (St Antony’s College, Oxford)
Chair: Mehmet Karli (SEESOX)

Black Sea gas: Economic and geopolitical implications
Dimitar Bechev (DPIR, Oxford; Russia Institute, King’s College); Jonathan Lamb (Wood & Company, London); Anna Mikulskia (Baker Institute, Houston; Kleinman Center, UPenn)
Chairs: Othon Anastasakis; and Okan Yardimci (SEESOX)

From the ashes of the Moria camp to a new migration system?
Angeliki Dimitriadi (Department of International Relations, Kadir Has University); Franck Düvell (Osnabrück University); Elizbieta Gozdziak (Adam Mickiewicz University)
Chair: Fotini Kalantzis (SEESOX)

Thirty years on: The end of the road for ex-communist elites?
Mihail Chiru (Oxford School of Global and Area Studies); Miloš Damnjanovic (BIRN Consultancy); Eli Gateva (DPIR; St Antony’s College, Oxford)
Chair: Jonathan Scheele (SEESOX)

Hilary 2021 (January-March)

Democracy in South East Europe: Backsliding or new normal?
Damir Kapidzic (University of Sarajevo); Milada Vachudova (North Carolina at Chapel Hill)
Discussant: Dimitar Bechev (Institute for Human Sciences, Vienna)
Chair: Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX)

Can elections bring (real) change? Lessons learned and prospects for the Western Balkans
Florian Bieber (Graz University); Donika Emini (Civikos Platform); Borisa Falatar (Nasa Stranka); Vujo Ilic (CRTA, Serbia); Jovana Marovic (Politikon Network, Montenegro)
Chair: Tena Prelec (Department of Politics and IR, Oxford)

Strengthening the Rule of Law in South East Europe and the EU: Instruments, challenges and lessons learned
Carlos Closa (European University Institute); Eli Gateva (Department of Politics and IR, Oxford); Marko Kmezic (University of Graz)
Chair: Kalypso Nicolaides (European University Institute; St Antony’s College, Oxford)

IN COOPERATION WITH THE SCHOOL OF TRANSNATIONAL GOVERNANCE, EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

The struggle for redress: Victim Capital in Bosnia and Herzegovina
Jessie Hronesova (Oxford Department of International Development & author of the book)
Discussants: John Alderdice (Harris Manchester College, Oxford); Jasna Dragovic-Soso (Goldsmith University)
Chair: John Gledhill (Oxford Department of International Development)

Media in Greece: Free or dependent?
Roman Gerodimos (Bournemouth University); Lamprini Rori (University of Exeter)
Discussant: Stathis Kalivas (All Souls College, Oxford; DPIR, Oxford)
Chair: Tim Vladas (St Antony’s College, Oxford)

Legacies of Yugoslavia on the region’s post-communist transition
Ivor Sokolic (LSE); Ljubica Spaskovska (University of Exeter); Milica Uvalic (University of Perugia)
Chairs: Othon Anastasakis (St Antony’s College, Oxford); Adis Merdzanovic (Zurich University of Applied Sciences)


Turkey’s new constitution: The President’s monopoly over state power and the shrinking role of the parliament and judiciary
Bertil Erat Oder (Koc University); Ersin Mahmut Kalaycioğlu (Sabanci University); Murat Sevinc (Bogazici University)
Chair: Mehmet Karli (St Antony’s College, Oxford)

Protests in the Balkans: Do they have an impact?
Danimjela Dolenc (University of Zagreb); Chiara Milan (Scuola Normale Superiore (Italy)); Julia Rone (Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (CRASSH), University of Cambridge); Daniel Smilov (University of Sofia)
Chairs: Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX); Jessie Hronesova (Oxford Department of International Development)

Trinity 2021 (April-June)

Emigration states, existential sovereignty, and migrant responses
Dace Dzenovska (School of Anthropology & Museum Ethnography, University of Oxford); Elena Genova (University of Nottingham)
Chair: Manolis Pratsinakis (SEESOX/COMPAS)

IN COOPERATION WITH COMPAS

Vaccine diplomacy and the geopolitics of influence
Yasmina Aboubouzah (Brookings and European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR); Roy Allison (Oxford School of Global and Area Studies (OSGA)); Audrey Kurth Cronin (American University); Ian Neary (Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies and St Antony’s College, Oxford); Kalypso Nicolaides (European University Institute; St Antony’s College, Oxford); Indrajit Roy (University of York); Steve Tsang (SOAS China Institute at the School of Oriental and African Studies; St Antony’s College, Oxford)
Chairs: Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX); Michael Willis (Middle East Centre, St Antony’s College, Oxford)

IN COOPERATION WITH ST ANTONY’S COLLEGE, OXFORD

Challenges and opportunities for the Biden Administration in South East Europe
Thomas Countryman (Former Deputy Assistant Secretary for European Affairs); Valerie Hopkins (South East Europe Correspondent, Financial Times); Ivan Vejvoda (Head of Europe’s Futures Program, Institute for Human Sciences)
Chair: Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX) and Elaine Papoulia (Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, Harvard University)

IN COOPERATION WITH THE MINDA DE GUNZBURG CENTER FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Is emigration a blow to liberal democracy?
Ivan Krastev (Centre for Liberal Strategies, Sofia)
Discussants: Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX) and Maria Koinova (University of Warwick)
Chair: Jessie Barton Hronesová (Oxford Department for International Development)

IN COOPERATION WITH COMPAS
Emigrants and emigration states: A contested relationship?
Alexandra Délano Alonso (The New School, New York City)
Discussant: Robin Cohen (Kellogg College, Oxford)
Chair: Manolis Pratsinakis (SEESOX/COMPAS)
IN COOPERATION WITH COMPAS
Book discussion: A Citizen’s Guide to the Rule of Law
Adis Merdzanovic (School of Management and Law, Zurich University of Applied Sciences); Kalypso Nicolaidis (School of Transnational Governance, European University Institute)
Discussants: Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX, St Antony’s College, Oxford); Sarah Nouwen (School of Transnational Governance, European University Institute); Marta Pardavi (School of Transnational Governance, European University Institute)
Chair: Alexander Stubb (School of Transnational Governance, European University Institute)
IN COOPERATION WITH SCHOOL OF TRANSNATIONAL GOVERNANCE, EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE ON THE OCCASION OF THE PUBLICATION OF THE BOOK A CITIZEN’S GUIDE TO THE RULE OF LAW (IBIDEM PRESS 2021)

Other events
WORKSHOPS
UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE OXFORD-BERLIN PARTNERSHIP IN COOPERATION WITH HUMBOLDT UNIVERSITY
November 2020
Conceptual and historical perspectives
March 2021
EU migration policies vis-à-vis Turkey

NEW BOOK
The Greek Military Dictatorship
Revisiting a Troubled Past 1967-1974

Greece as the so-called birthplace of democracy appeared an international oddity in the eyes of many Westerners when in 1967 a group of Greek colonels overthrew the civilian government. The 1967 coup d’état brought about the longest dictatorship in the history of modern Greece. Looking back further, it was not the only military intervention in modern Greece’s past; yet what was unique about the Colonels’ regime—unlike previous cases in Greece or contemporary cases in the Southern Europe or Latin America—was that the 1967 coup d’état took place at a time of strong economic growth in Greece, with the country firmly in the Western capitalist bloc, including a very promising association agreement with the democratic European Economic Community (EEC).

The book, The Greek military dictatorship; revisiting a troubled past (1967-1974) (Berghahn 2021) co-edited by Othon Anastasakis and Katerina Lagos discusses this paradox and looks at the complexity of the military rule in Greece through a selection of contributions that examine the origins, nature, ideology, policies, and foreign politics of the regime. A collection of scholars who are experts in the field—most of them historians, as well as others from political science, international relations, political economy, religious studies, and literature—approach the military regime from internal and external relations perspectives. The book analyzes the military regime not simply as a unique period in modern Greek history, with a start date and an ending, but also through the prism of evolving domestic and international environments. The themes of continuity and rupture vis-à-vis the previous status quo are discussed throughout the book, whereby each contributor presents what was unique in the regime and what represented a continuity with past ideas, practices, and policies. While the book underscores the dictatorial, reactionary and often convoluted nature of the regime, it looks at what the Colonels did in order to remain in power, as well as their policies as governors responding to the exigencies of a country operating within the camp of modernizing Western liberal economies and societies.

April 2021
Turkey’s foreign policy in the regional and geopolitical context

OUTREACH
April 2021
The New Greek Diaspora
Alexis Patelis (Head of the Finance Office of the Greek Prime Minister; Othon Anastasakis (SEESOX); Manolis Pratsinakis (SEESOX); Members of the new Greek diaspora as well as returnees will also presented their experiences
Chair: Thodoris Georgakopoulos (diaNEOsis)
IN COOPERATION WITH DIAEONISO
June 2021
Diaspora and the Greek start-up ecosystem: A power couple?
Marina Hatsopoulos (Levitronix Technologies; Z Corporation)
Vassilis Papakonstantinou (MITEF Greece and Hellenic Innovation Network); Ioanna Sapfo Pepelasis (Athens University of Economics and Business); Katerina Pramatari (Department of Management Science and Technology; Athens Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation; University of Economics and Business)
Chair: Odin Linardatou (ELIAMEP)
IN COOPERATION WITH THE HELLENIC FOUNDATION FOR EUROPEAN AND FOREIGN POLICY (ELIAMEP); ATHENS CENTER FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION; AND ATHENS UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS
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Greece as the so-called birthplace of democracy appeared an international oddity in the eyes of many Westerners when in 1967 a group of Greek colonels overthrew the civilian government. The 1967 coup d’état brought about the longest dictatorship in the history of modern Greece. Looking back further, it was not the only military intervention in modern Greece’s past; yet what was unique about the Colonels’ regime—unlike previous cases in Greece or contemporary cases in the Southern Europe or Latin America—was that the 1967 coup d’état took place at a time of strong economic growth in Greece, with the country firmly in the Western capitalist bloc, including a very promising association agreement with the democratic European Economic Community (EEC).

The book, The Greek military dictatorship; revisiting a troubled past (1967-1974) (Berghahn 2021) co-edited by Othon Anastasakis and Katerina Lagos discusses this paradox and looks at the complexity of the military rule in Greece through a selection of contributions that examine the origins, nature, ideology, policies, and foreign politics of the regime. A collection of scholars who are experts in the field—most of them historians, as well as others from political science, international relations, political economy, religious studies, and literature—approach the military regime from internal and external relations perspectives. The book analyzes the military regime not simply as a unique period in modern Greek history, with a start date and an ending, but also through the prism of evolving domestic and international environments. The themes of continuity and rupture vis-à-vis the previous status quo are discussed throughout the book, whereby each contributor presents what was unique in the regime and what represented a continuity with past ideas, practices, and policies. While the book underscores the dictatorial, reactionary and often convoluted nature of the regime, it looks at what the Colonels did in order to remain in power, as well as their policies as governors responding to the exigencies of a country operating within the camp of modernizing Western liberal economies and societies.
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NEW BOOK
The Greek Military Dictatorship
Revisiting a Troubled Past 1967-1974

Greece as the so-called birthplace of democracy appeared an international oddity in the eyes of many Westerners when in 1967 a group of Greek colonels overthrew the civilian government. The 1967 coup d’état brought about the longest dictatorship in the history of modern Greece. Looking back further, it was not the only military intervention in modern Greece’s past; yet what was unique about the Colonels’ regime—unlike previous cases in Greece or contemporary cases in the Southern Europe or Latin America—was that the 1967 coup d’état took place at a time of strong economic growth in Greece, with the country firmly in the Western capitalist bloc, including a very promising association agreement with the democratic European Economic Community (EEC).

The book, The Greek military dictatorship; revisiting a troubled past (1967-1974) (Berghahn 2021) co-edited by Othon Anastasakis and Katerina Lagos discusses this paradox and looks at the complexity of the military rule in Greece through a selection of contributions that examine the origins, nature, ideology, policies, and foreign politics of the regime. A collection of scholars who are experts in the field—most of them historians, as well as others from political science, international relations, political economy, religious studies, and literature—approach the military regime from internal and external relations perspectives. The book analyzes the military regime not simply as a unique period in modern Greek history, with a start date and an ending, but also through the prism of evolving domestic and international environments. The themes of continuity and rupture vis-à-vis the previous status quo are discussed throughout the book, whereby each contributor presents what was unique in the regime and what represented a continuity with past ideas, practices, and policies. While the book underscores the dictatorial, reactionary and often convoluted nature of the regime, it looks at what the Colonels did in order to remain in power, as well as their policies as governors responding to the exigencies of a country operating within the camp of modernizing Western liberal economies and societies.
SEESOX aspires...

In 2022, SEESOX turns 20! Seems like yesterday when our initial small group took its first steps, full of energy and ideas, believing in the region’s rapprochement and its European integration, the two original and long-lasting pillars of our scholarly mission. Since then our mission has expanded, our projects have diversified and our network of past and present associates has grown; so much so that we have now reached the age of combined experience and creativity. We look to the past for inspiration and to the future for aspiration. Next year we will be organising a series of celebratory events. Stay tuned for these, as well as for the new projects in the subsequent years to follow!

Fourth SEESOX Hellenic Advisory Board Meeting

The Fourth SEESOX/Hellenic Advisory Board took place on November 26 in zoom mode and was attended online by members, generous donors to SEESOX and its programme on modern Greece, including the Greek Diaspora Project. During this closed meeting, the SEESOX team presented the overall progress of SEESOX’s activities, research output and publications and invited the members to offer their views and ideas for future work and innovative output. The closed meeting was followed by a public lecture entitled “The US after Trump” organised jointly with Eurolife and its CEO and chairman of the Board Alexandros Sarrigeorgiou.

Join our mailing list to receive news of events and publications. Visit our website: https://www.sant.ox.ac.uk/research-centres/south-east-european-studies-oxford and click on SEESOX Mailing List

SEESOX
European Studies Centre
St Antony’s College
University of Oxford
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Tel. 01865 274537