

---

ANNALIS  
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA  
LUBLIN – POLONIA

VOL. XIX, 2

SECTIO K

2012

---

*Reviews. Reports*

---

Recenzje. Sprawozdania

**Jakub Nowak, [*Democratic Thought in the Age of Globalization*, ed. Maria Marczevska-Rytko, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2012, pp. 214]**

The book is a collection of articles that focus on various aspects of theoretical thought concerning the idea and praxis of democracy. Yet the category in the title of the book (the age of globalization) is used not in literally chronological sense, it guides the reader to this interesting, complex and therefore analytically demanding period in which highly complicated interconnected set of conditions of different kinds make the modern (or post-modern) concept of democracy such a difficult field of theoretical elaboration.

As the analyzed concept is extremely broad and multifaceted, it is difficult to set the study in a coherent theoretical framework when trying to provide the reader with a big picture. The collection entitled *Democratic Thought in the Age of Globalization* reflects the complexity and diversity of the subject – also in terms of recalled approaches and notions of the globalization and democracy. As the editor Maria Marczevska-Rytko puts it, there are two main different positions in the studies of the subject: the first referring to social and political practice and leading to definitions referring to institutions and processes and the second one that refers directly to democratic ideals and their practical implications.<sup>1</sup> And so is the book, the studies of which represent various methodological and theoretical points of view. At the same time, as it is revealed in some of the articles, these two positions are sometimes (in theoretical and empirical contexts) deeply interwoven.

The editor succeeded in gathering articles that correspond with each other in particular ways (approaches, fields of analyses) and here the lowest common theoretical denominator is of course the contextual framework of the concept of globalization. Marczevska-Rytko emphasizes in the *Introduction* pessimistic diagnoses on modern democracies when recalling Manuel Castells' seminal concept of politics of identity perceived as the outcome of multi-dimensional processes labeled as the globalization: "The crisis of democracy is a fact, (...) globalization processes reveal and at the same time heighten the contradictions, which liberal

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Marczevska-Rytko, *Introduction* [in:] *Democratic Thought in the Age of Globalization*, (ed.) M. Marczevska-Rytko, Lublin 2012, p. 8.

democracy necessarily carries with it”<sup>2</sup> The book – as the collection of different approaches and viewpoints – does not consist of only pessimistic evaluations and interpretations, though.

The book, as the editor states in the *Introduction*, was inspired by her workshop *Democratic Thought in the Age of Globalization* during the 12th International Conference of International Society for the Study of European Ideas (ISSEI) in the University of Ankara (Turkey 2010). The collection is divided into three parts concerning different fields of studies: “Conditions”, “Participation”, “Examples”.

The volume opens with a paper by Andrei Marga (*Democracy as a Form of Life*) who argues that there is an important need for a change of modern, liberal and strongly proceduralist democracies. Such transition, as Marga argues, should lie in theoretical and practical shift from understanding the concept of democracy as a technique of periodical choice of leaders to the democracy as a form of life. To defend his thesis the author uses the case of Romanian democracy but he also makes wider perspective when formulating diagnoses concerning democracies of Central and Eastern Europe. And yet the Romanian contextualization provided by Marga is very brief and general, the next part consists of more theoretical considerations: the author brings up the thought of Max Weber, and, on the other hand, Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno in order to describe conditions of modern societies. Later he focuses on the issue of the obsolete nature of modern proceduralist concepts and practices of democracies. Marga concludes with the call for important shifts on several dimensions of Central and Eastern Europe societies, including more honest news distribution and more reasonable public debate, a shift from private and group to public interest, and, last but not least, structural transformation of democracy towards democracy understood and realized as a form of life.

Nathan van Camp (*Bios or psychē? Thinking Power after Foucault*) explores the concept of technologies of domination from the Michel Foucault’s theoretical perspective, concentrating especially on the Foucaultian concept of bio-power: “the numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations”<sup>3</sup> and its theoretical heir, elaborated after Foucault’s death (especially Bernard Stiegler’s philosophy of technology). Van Camp interestingly and convincingly shows the shift concerning contemporary power technologies that no longer aim mainly at disciplining bodies or regulating life-processes, but at controlling and modulating consciousness instead. The process is strongly connected to the structural transformations occurring on the economic level: the substitution of consumer capitalism for production capitalism. As the nature of the power has changed (contemporary power mechanisms do not longer aim at disciplining the body or regulating life, but at stimulating consumption), Van Camp (after Stiegler) underlines the need to shift analytical focus “from the disciplinary and regulating technologies deployed by the programming institutions of the nation-state to the mnemotechnologies that are currently being put into service by the globalized programming industries”<sup>4</sup> Although the author hardly recalls book’s two main themes directly (democracy, globalization), his paper remains one of the most interesting contributions in the collection.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 9–10.

<sup>3</sup> M. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1, *The Will to Knowledge*, London 1978, p. 140; cited by: N. van Camp, *Bios or psychē? Thinking power after Foucault*, [in:] *Democratic Thought...*, *ibid.*, pp. 39–40.

<sup>4</sup> N. van Camp, *Bios...*, *ibid.*, pp. 50.

Dobrinka Peicheva in *Mediatization and Globalization under the Conditions of Democracy* examines the process of globalization in democratic societies on both social structural and interpersonal levels. She combines these considerations with remarks on various aspects of the modern mediatization process on several social levels and contexts (from *home* to *state*) and concludes by underlining the meaning of the *mediatization of society* which is, according to her, not only a process accompanying globalization or an argumentation concept, but its identifier, presenter and controller.

The last article in the first part of the book is Nikos Koutras' *Education in the Age of Globalization* in which the author seeks to examine the effects of globalization for both international and regional educational policies. He focuses on the impact of international organizations elaborating directives for educational policies on both: national and transnational levels. Koutras understands globalization in a peculiar way as the process leading to the ideal, globalized society (yet he admits globalization is "both necessary and painful"<sup>5</sup>) and the reader can assume that this is the reason why the author does not focus on more negative or ambivalent interpretations of analyzed processes (like the concept of cultural imperialism).

The second part of the book ("Participation") starts with the paper *What Democracy Do We Need? Electronic Democracy in Contemporary Discourse* by Maria Marczewska-Rytko. The author gives a wide perspective on the notion of electronic democracy in contemporary discourse (understood as "set of statements functioning in the public space and concerning a specific problem or its scope")<sup>6</sup>. Marczewska-Rytko raises the issue of terminological confusion connected to labels used to describe democracy mediated by new technologies which sometimes can be a serious normative problem therefore not only the question of simple choice of particular labels (for example, as she argues, the term virtual democracy may connote the break-up with traditional democracy<sup>7</sup>). The author also discusses several determinants of electronic democracy (including a historical point of view), providing the reader with the concepts of Lawrence K. Grossman, Benjamin Barber, John Naisbitt, Alvin Toffler and others. When discussing the internet as an instrument of electronic democracy, Marczewska-Rytko gives also a brief yet accurate review of internet's potential as a tool and resource in political process and citizen engagement.

The next article, Christ'l De Landtsheer's *Participation Friendliness of Political Websites*, can be perceived as a natural continuation of issues discussed in the former paper. The author analyzes the concept of e-politics (similar, of course, to the *electronic democracy* presented by Marczewska-Rytko) and introduces a method for assessing the quality of political websites (and, more generally, "websites in the public sphere"<sup>8</sup>) and this part of De Landtsheer's paper can be interesting especially for a researcher interested in studying online citizen/political participation. The author labels her method as "the participation-friendliness index for political websites"<sup>9</sup> and shows how it can be used as a analytical tool for making research evaluation of websites that are based upon political participation theory. The paper consists of a com-

<sup>5</sup> N. Koutras, *Education in the Age of Globalization* [in:] *Democratic Thought...*, *ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>6</sup> M. Marczewska-Rytko, *What Democracy Do We Need? Electronic Democracy in Contemporary Discourse* [in:] *Democratic Thought...*, *ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87.

<sup>8</sup> C. de Landtsheer, *Participation Friendliness of Political Websites* [in:] *Democratic Thought...*, *ibid.*, p. 100.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

prehensive description of the tool that measures *participation friendliness* – the extent to which a particular website can motivate citizens to become active participants in the political communication processes online and offline. The index seems to be an effective research tool, especially when combined with evaluation of people's actual engagement in politics.

Arkadiusz Żukowski (*Contemporary Trends in Changing Democracy: Increasing Participation of Women in Elections*) analyzes women's electoral participation as a form of political activity from a broad perspective, including also the actual implementation of passive voting rights. The author gives the exhaustive review of the issue (underlining the problem of women's actual usage of the right to be elected) as well as the discussion on parity and electoral gender quotas. Last article in the second part of the book, Aydin Topaloğlu's *Islam and Democracy in the Age of Globalization*, is a short contribution in the discussion on mutual relations between democracy, globalization and Islam. According to the author, the concepts of democracy and globalization as well as Islam are neither alternatives nor contrary in their essence. Topaloğlu understands Islam as the main sources of religion itself, and while he sets all the ideological, traditional and historical interpretations of the religion beside this definition, all the three key categories considered are "not in a conflicting position on the condition that, all of their theories or practices are categorically ethical, humanitarian, egalitarian justly and healthy".<sup>10</sup>

The third part of the collection ("Examples") consists of three studies concerning several aspects of particular democratic systems. First article is *Democracy and the Crisis of Confidence* by Max J. Skidmore in which the author examines the problems with democratic reasoning in the public debate in the United States since the 1950s. Skidmore provides the reader with a pessimist diagnosis that logic and reason have no longer been main modalities of the US political discourse and public debate, therefore people's participation in democratic process is flawed and even harmful (as citizens vote "routinely against their own interests, even when full information is available to them").<sup>11</sup>

Valentina Marinescu (*Ways of Understanding Democracy in Romania. A Necessary Dialogue between Sociology and Journalism*) gives an interesting study of interrelations between the professional fields of journalism and sociology in relation to the two political campaigns in Romania (European elections in 2007 and parliamentary elections in 2008). The author uses diachronic approach in order to highlight the evolution of the opinions about social reality and the relationships with other external professional fields of journalists and sociologists, and seeks to specify mutual relationships between these two professional groups mediated by the influence in the political field. The study, based mainly on the discourse analysis of sociologists' blogs and interviews with journalists, has shown a large degree of mutual distrust, a high level of the others' opinions and a general low degree of confidence in public products of each other's work.

The last article in the collection, Bogdan Ştefanachi's and Roxana Alexandra Costinescu's *Lisbon Agenda – the European Union and the Challenges of the New Economy*, consists of the analysis of the guidelines of the *Lisbon Strategy* EU reform on which the authors underscore the need for implementing new EU's economic policy perspective based on the modernization of social system and the investment in human capital.

---

<sup>10</sup> A. Topaloğlu, *Islam and Democracy in the Age of Globalization* [in:] *Democratic Thought...*, *ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>11</sup> M. J. Skidmore, *Democracy and the Crisis of Confidence* [in:] *Democratic Thought...*, *ibid.*, p. 158.

As presented above, the collection hardly analyzes the concept of democracy from strictly normative point of view. Actually, Andrei Marga is the only author that recalls a normative perspective when formulating the thesis consisting of the list of goals to be achieved in order to improve the analyzed system. Much more attention is given to the praxis and the notion of democracy as a system of widely understood participation (which is revealed also by the collection's structure – the second part of the book focuses directly on the issue). Interestingly, both theoretical explorations and practical contexts provided by the authors suggest that democratic participation today is more and more strongly connected to technology perceived as one of the most important factors that shape conditions of late modern democracies. War technologies, ICT (information and communication technologies) or, on more general level, van Camp's (Foucaultian) power technologies – they all determine praxis of democracies in globalized world's environments.

Therefore, it is not surprising that one of the key categories in the book is *media* – perceived in many ways, e.g. subject of politics, resource, agent of power, sphere of public debate. Marga recalls the issue of (also mediated) public debate, van Camp focuses on *mnemotechnologies* of cinema and television, Peicheva seeks to give a wide picture and explores the subject of media as a constituent resource and the key ingredient of contemporary globalization process. Both Marczewska-Rytko and de Landtsheer strongly focus on new (digital) media technologies as a tool and resource for political and citizen participation (and also as a communication sphere in which political and citizen agents can meet to address their claims and communicate their decisions). Last but not least, media are central category in Marinescu's study – also because of empirical perspective set by the researcher: her analysis of mutual relations between sociologists and journalists focuses on their opinions and attitudes towards mediated results of their work available in the public sphere of traditional (mainstream) media and new media (mainly blogosphere).

The concept of globalization is inseparably connected to the sphere of economy, thus it is present in a few articles in the volume. Some remarks are made by Marga but they are not the primary focus of his paper. Economy (as the key factor of modern and postmodern systemic state transformations) is essential to van Camp's considerations: the author makes his point based on the diagnosis of the shift from nation-state to globalized (programming) industries. Most of attention to the issue is given in the Ștefanachi's and Costinescu's article. They focus on the economical aspects of globalization within the context of the European Union policies' reform and claim that the correlation between dimensions of economy perceived as the core of the globalization process and the politics (therefore also democracies today) is essential: "globalization and liberalism (neo-liberalism) are at least interdependent if not entirely congruent, or as Andrew Gamble argues »one of the most important tendencies of the last 30 years take the shape of revitalizing the economical liberalism both as political economy and political ideology«".<sup>12</sup>

*Democratic Thought in the Age of Globalization*, taken as a whole, is an interesting collection of articles recalling the notions of democracy, globalization, and also in many contexts – after all not surprisingly – media (and technology in general). The collection is diverse in several levels (proportions between theory and praxis, theoretical contexts taken

---

<sup>12</sup> A. Gamble, *Neo-liberalism*, "Capital and Class", 2001, no. 75, p. 127, cited by: Ștefanachi and Costinescu, *Lisbon Agenda – the European Union and the Challenges of the New Economy* [in:] *Democratic Thought...*, *ibid.*, p. 194.

from various disciplines, evaluations of the globalization process, methodological approaches, and even national contexts sometimes brought up by the authors) and this diversity, even if making the book slightly incoherent in terms of how its subject matter is elaborated, provides the reader with a valuable insight to the scholarly thought on the notion of democracy in the 21st century. From this point of view, different approaches, questions raised and conclusions made by the volume's authors sum up into a valuable contribution to the thought on the issue that remains a crucial challenge for humanities and social sciences of today.

### **IPSA's Research Committee 21 on Political Socialization and Education**

The International Political Science Association (IPSA) has recognized over 50 Research Committees (RCs). Between World Congresses, the research committees – largely as a result of the rapid growth in both their numbers and in the size of individual memberships – contribute more than any other body to the activity and achievements of IPSA. This move may be regarded as a timely recognition of the need but also the opportunity for political scientists working in particular sub-fields of the discipline to associate with colleagues from their own and from other continents in the pursuit of their research.

One of the most active RCs is RC21 on Political Socialization and Education. RC21 started already in 1976 as a study group in 1976, but granted the research committee status in 1979. The RC's topics of interest are located within the broad area of socialization and education in or regarding politics. Processes of political socialization and education deal with topics such as the development of political attitudes and behavior, participation, knowledge, decision-making and (democratic) citizenship among both young and adult citizens. Studies in these issues are mainly addressed to the research domains of the political psychology, culture, communication and leadership.

The broadness of the topics of interest and the direct link with the domain of the political psychology made it possible and very welcome that RC21 started up the cooperation with RC29, that deals with the field of Psycho-Politics. We are very proud of this long-lasting mutual friendship between these two RCs.

#### AIMS AND PRACTICES

The main goal of RC21 is to create a professional network which brings together political scientists (and political psychologists or political educationalists) from all over the world. It aims to advance the study of political socialization and education by encouraging research, especially cross national studies; to disseminate relevant information at international meetings, workshops and conferences; to publish scholarly research; and to provide a framework for co-operation between individuals and organizations concerned with teaching and research on political socialization and political education and citizenship rights and responsibilities.

In actual practice this includes for example a very active attendance (e.g. several panels sessions) at the general IPSA conferences every four years, and the offer of an almost yearly RC21 conference meeting, organized by the members of the RC itself. In the recent past these ‘expert meetings’ were held in Antwerp (Belgium), Aalborg (Denmark), Cracow (Poland) and Moscow (Russia), and more meetings in the upcoming years are already in prospect.

THE JOURNAL “POLITICS, CULTURE AND SOCIALIZATION”

Additionally, RC21 initiated the publishing of a new scientific journal: “Politics, Culture and Socialization”. In the early zero’s we acknowledged the fact that the topics of political socialization and education has become part of the main research domains in social and political science, but that there was still need of an academic journal dedicated to the topics of our area’s interest. After a couple of experimental issues, in 2010 the first volume of our journal “Politics, Culture and Socialization” was published.

The aim of the journal “Politics, Culture and Socialization” (PC&S) is to publish new and significant work in all areas of political socialization and civic education, political culture, psychology, and communications in order to achieve a better scientific understanding of the origins of political behaviors and orientations of individuals and groups.

The focus of attention is on political socialization processes – including political education, information, persuasion, marketing, or propaganda and their underlying and accompanying motivations – and political socialization structures – including the family, school, mass media, peer groups, social networks, and politics. PC&S publishes new and significant works that report on current scientific research, discuss theory and methodology, or review relevant literature in the book review section.

GOVERNING BOARD OF RC21

*President of RC21:*

Prof. dr hab. (Ph.D.) Maria Marczewska-Rytko  
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (Lublin, Poland)

*First past and Vice-President:*

Prof. Christ’l De Landtsheer  
University of Antwerp (Antwerp, Belgium)

*Second past and Vice-president:*

Prof. Daniel B. German  
Appalachian State University (Boone, NC, USA)

*Third past and Vice-President:*

Prof. Russell F. Farnen  
University of Connecticut (West Hartford, USA)

*General Secretary and Webmaster:*

Lieuwe Kalkhoven, MSc.  
University of Antwerp (Antwerp, Belgium)

*First past General Secretary:*

Prof. Trond Solhaug

Norwegian University for Science and Technology, NTNU (Trondheim, Norway)

*Second past General Secretary:*

Prof. Heinz Sünker

Wuppertal University (Wuppertal, Germany)

*Third past General Secretary:*

Prof. Henk Dekker

Leiden University (Leiden, The Netherlands)

*Treasurer:*

Dr. Philippe De Vries

University of Antwerp (Antwerp, Belgium)

Lieuwe Kalkhoven

(University of Antwerp)

## **The Fourth European Communication Conference of ECREA**

The Fourth European Communication Conference organised by ECREA (European Communication Research and Education Association) was held between 24–27 October in Istanbul. More than one thousand participants took part in panel sessions, discussions and work-groups. The main theme was “Social Media and Global Voices”. The researchers from all over the world exchanged their opinions on new media, peace and conflict journalism, network society, convergence culture, cultural spaces of human interaction, social media use and access, as well as political and economic consequences of media actions.

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University was represented by Dr. Grażyna Stachyra from the Department of Social Communication at the Faculty of Political Science who presented a paper based on her own research upon perception of radio at work, entitled *Radio in a Workplace – Between Hard Work and Leisure*. The presentation aimed to look at the radio in regard with cultural aspects of converging areas of free time and work in modern societies.

Apart from that, during the conference the new managing team of ECREA Radio Research Section was elected and Dr. Grażyna Stachyra entered the new board as its Vice-Chair. The board consists also of Prof. Guy Starkey from the University of Sunderland (Chair) and Prof. Madalena Oliveira from the University of Minho (Vice-Chair). Both of them had visited our University as the guests of II International Conference “Radio and Society 2” organized in June 2012 by the Department of Social Communication at the Faculty of Political Science. We are very pleased to state that Lublin became a well-recognized centre of radio research.

*Grażyna Stachyra (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin)*



## **International Scientific Conference “EU–Russia Common Spaces: Current Challenges and Ways of Tackling”, Veliky Novgorod, 25–26 May 2012**

On May 25–26, 2012 in Veliky Novgorod (Russia) there was held an international scientific conference “EU–Russia Common Spaces: Current Challenges and Ways of Tackling”. The conference was organized in cooperation with the EU Centre at the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, the Yaroslav-the-Wise Novgorod State University, Association of European Studies and Baltic Regional Branch of the Russian Political Science Association. In the conference participated representatives of the Institute of Political Science of the University of Warmia and Mazuria in Olsztyn: Dr. Marcin Chełminiak, Dr. Wojciech Kotowicz, and Dr. Krzysztof Żęgota.

On the first day of the conference, held at the Veliky Novgorod City Hall, guests were greeted by representatives of the organizers and local authorities: Rector of the Yaroslav-the-Wise Novgorod State University, Prof. Anatoly Leonovich Gavrikov, director of the EU Centre at the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Dr. Anna Vladimirovna Barsukova, representatives of the Veliky Novgorod local authorities, representatives of the Veliky Novgorod oblast and guests from Moscow State Institute of International Relations – Prof. Oleg Nikolaevich Barabanov and Dr. Mariusz Sielski. The speakers emphasized the importance of the relationship between the Russian Federation and the European Union and discussed the prospects of cooperation with the EU and other actors of international relations.

Subsequently took the floor participants of the first conference session “Challenges of Building Regular Base for Russia–EU Cooperation”. Within the framework of this session the speakers presented the main problems in developing the legal basis of cooperation between Russia and the European Union. Dr. Cedric Ryngaert from the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium) discussed the differences in the Russian and EU legislation, in particular the mechanisms of democracy and civil society. Next, Dr. Eugenio Zaniboni from the University of Foggia (Italy) presented the key issues relating to human rights in the common area of the EU and Russia. Harassment issues and respect for workers’ rights in Serbia were presented in speech of Prof. Goran Obradovic from the University of Nis (Serbia).

Within the framework of the second session “Political Dimension of Common Space Building” participants of the conference presented various initiatives aimed at deepening cooperation between the EU and Russia, as well as discussed alternative solutions for enhanced integration in the Eurasian space. Dr. Ria Laenen from the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium) presented the issue of the involvement of Russia in the Eurasian integration projects. Dr. Mikhail Vladimirovich Berendeev from the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University in Kaliningrad (Russia) discussed the main challenges and threats of cooperation between the EU and Russia in the post-Soviet area. An important voice in the discussion was the speech of Oleg Korneev from the European University Institute in Florence (Italy) about the possibilities of cooperation between Russia and the European Union with regard to a common migration policy. Representing the University of Warmia and Mazuria in Olsztyn (Poland) Dr. Marcin Chełminiak and Dr. Wojciech Kotowicz discussed the importance of the Kaliningrad oblast in Polish foreign policy and the place of the Kaliningrad question in the Polish political parties programs. The issues of business opportunities for cooperation at the external borders of the European Union were presented by Prof. Milena Jovanovic-Zattila from the University of Nis (Serbia). The participants of the session emphasized the significant

opportunities and potential in the field of EU–Russia cooperation, as well as recognized the important political barriers to the construction of the European-Russian common area.

The third session “Russia and EU in Baltic Sea Regional Studies” was dedicated to the issues of cooperation at the external borders of the European Union, based on examples of solutions in the Baltic Sea region. Dr. Ivan Sergeevich Gumenyuk from the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University in Kaliningrad (Russia) in his speech about problems and prospects of development of maritime transport in the EU–Russia cooperation emphasized large and still untapped potential of the Baltic Sea ports in the development of economic cooperation in the European-Russian common area. Next, Dr. Juris Gromovs from the University of Latvia in Riga (Latvia) discussed the role of migration legislation in Latvia in shaping state policy of foreign investment. Problems in mutual understanding of Russia and its western neighbors presented in his speech Dr. Sergey Vyacheslavovich Khomutinkin from Tambov State University (Russia). The most important conclusion from the discussion at the end of the session was the statement that EU–Russia cooperation in the Baltic Sea region has a thorough institutional ground and tradition, and in the future may become a permanent basis for building a European-Russian common political and economic space.

On the second day of the conference participants took part in the round table discussion “Burning Issues of Local Border Traffic Legislation at the Russia-EU Level”. Representing the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University in Kaliningrad (Russia), Dr. Vladimir Valentinovich Voinikov discussed the most important issues in implementation of the regulations of local border traffic at the Polish-Russian border. Dr. Tomasz Dubowski from the University of Białystok (Poland) presented the latest achievements of implementation mechanisms of the local border traffic from the Polish and Russian point of view. Next, Dr. Krzysztof Żęgota from the University of Warmia and Mazuria in Olsztyn (Poland) described the importance of the Polish-Russian agreement on local border traffic in the context of EU–Russia relations. The debaters recognised the importance of local border traffic as an effective mechanism to break the barriers at the external borders of the European Union. Participants of the conference also expressed the hope that the agreement on local border traffic will be announcement of visa-free regime between the European Union and Russia.

At the end of the conference, representing the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University in Kaliningrad (Russia) Anna Valerevna Belova presented the experience of the Kaliningrad University in the implementation of international research projects with the involvement of institutions from the European Union. Representatives of the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University invited other participants to take part in joint activities aimed at integration of the European and Russian scientific society and implementation of joint research initiatives. Noteworthy is particularly the experience of Kaliningrad University in research collaboration with the Polish scientific community, in particular with the University of Warmia and Mazuria in Olsztyn. This Polish-Russian scientific experience was emphasized by all participants of the conference. Discussants noted that current scientific cooperation between Kaliningrad and Olsztyn can be a positive example of breaking down barriers and building a network of cooperation between the European Union and Russia.

During the conference were discussed issues related to current challenges in Russian-European relations. In discussing the current situation in these relations, both from a legal and political point of view, the participants of the conference paid special attention to the legal basis for cooperation between Russia and the European Union (legal norms, human

rights, cooperation in the area of migrations). As part of the round table was discussed the question of local border traffic, with the participation of Russian and Polish scientists.

Special contribution to the organization of the conference brought representatives of the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University: Dr. Vladimir Valentinovich Voinikov, Dr. Anna Vladimirovna Barsukova and Anna Valerevna Belova, representatives of Veliky Novgorod local authorities and participants from the Yaroslav-the-Wise Novgorod State University: Dr. Valentina Vladimirovna Grokhotova, Dr. Anatoly Viktorovich Gusev and other representatives of the Faculty of Law of the Novgorod university.

*Krzysztof Żęgota (University of Warmia and Mazuria in Olsztyn)*

### **International Polar Year 2012 Conference: “From Knowledge to Action” – Report**

Under the auspices of the International Polar Year, co-sponsored by the International Council for Science and the World Meteorological Organization, more than 3,000 participants came together to Montreal, Canada, during the International Polar Year 2012 “From Knowledge to Action” Conference (22–27 April 2012). Participants included Arctic and Antarctic researchers from all over the world and various fields of expertise such as policy and decision making, law, academia, industry and environment, representatives of non-governmental and non-profit organizations and circumpolar communities, including indigenous peoples from Russia and Northern Canada.

The Conference was the final event of International Polar Year 2007–2008, the largest international program of interdisciplinary polar research ever undertaken<sup>13</sup>. The conference

---

<sup>13</sup> International Polar Year (IPY) was initiated as international cooperation and for the first time was introduced in 1882–1883. Its main objective was and still is, to provide scientific information about the fundamentals of meteorology and geophysics as well as to enhance all people’s knowledge and awareness about Polar Regions and associated, ongoing changes in both, opposite poles. Many of the earth’s unique phenomena, such as circulatory systems for air and water and the Earth’s magnetic field lines reach the surface in the polar areas. In addition, thick glaciers have trapped air and water from ancient times, which makes it easiest to observe these phenomena near the poles. The initial idea of international cooperative polar research came from an Austro–Hungarian explorer and naval officer Lt. Karl Weyprecht who was a scientist and co-commander of the Austro-Hungarian Polar Expedition of 1872–1874. Weyprecht, realized that a comprehensive polar research could not be a task of one nation only, but should involve a coordinated international effort. He recognized that a time of mere geographical discovery had passed and a series of coordinated expeditions dedicated to scientific research should be undertaken to further people’s understanding of fundamentals of meteorology and geophysics. Unfortunately, he died before the international research became a reality, but his inspiration led to an establishment of the largest coordinated series of scientific expeditions ever undertaken in the Arctic during the 19th century, or to what is now known as the First International Polar Year. The first IPY was announced between the years of 1881–1883, when eleven nations came together to establish fourteen principal research stations across the Polar Regions. The Second IPY, which took place in 1932–1933, was both proposed and promoted by the International Meteorological Committee. The main objective

and provided an opportunity to apply and disseminate the knowledge and scientific results from IPY from around the world<sup>14</sup> and focus on the next steps. Focus was on ongoing challenges of globalization and climate change plus environmental, social and economical issues in the polar areas. And the title of the conference “From Knowledge to Action”, captured a desire for research to lead to concrete action. Participants were encouraged to consider ways to translate those new understandings into policy that will guide activities in and enhance stewardship of the polar regions.

This approach was especially evident in a case of the session I had a pleasure to co-organize (since June 2011) and co-chaired (as the APECS convener) together with Prof. Suzanne Lalonde (Canada), Prof. Lassi Heininen (Finland), and Dr. Geny Cobra (Brazil/Finland). Its title was: “Polar governance, policy, and management in the face of the change”. This session focused on syntheses and overviews that addressed governance, policy and management issues in polar regions at different scales. Comparative studies contrasting governance models, and strategies and policies, to deal with polar issues among countries and regions were above all invited. Regional, international or bi-polar syntheses of policies that identify best approaches and practices were particularly welcome. Finally we gathered more than 50 papers and posters from all over the world and chose only the best 25. The session was divided into three panels. At one of them I presented my paper on *Arctic Regionality According to Strategies and Policies. Comparative Analysis*. The aim of this presentation was to offer for the debate some conclusions from the comparative study of the strategies and policies in terms of the demonstrated understandings of the notion ‘the Arctic region’. In order to make this comparison more operational the concept of *regionness* by Hettne, Söderbaum was used. It should be stressed that the cooperation set up among the chairs of the session during the preparation process has already brought some new ideas and scientific initiatives, e.g Prof. Lalonde agreed to come to Poland for the conference about geopolitics in the Arctic region, which is co-organized by the International Relations Department of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in autumn 2012.

Every day of the conference began with a keynote session and the plenary panel discussion. Issues generally touched on current environmental and political changes and challenges in the polar regions. They were addressed and discussed by experienced polar officials mainly from eight Arctic states and led to promotion of science based decision making process as well as cooperation and partnership with international industries, particularly focused on oil and gas exploitation. In addition, many sessions succeeded on bringing indigenous matters to the public awareness with the main focus on environmental, health and social problems.

---

of the second research initiative was to investigate the global implications of the newly discovered “Jet Stream” and to conduct magnetic, aurora and meteorological observations at a network of research stations in the Arctic and Antarctic. It gathered researchers from more than forty different countries and came out as a great success in terms of scientific contribution. The third IPY was dedicated to the research on technology and science in the upper atmosphere and it was finally renamed to become the International Geophysical Year (IGY). The fourth IPY took place in 2007–2008 and happened to become the gigantic international scientific project with close to 10,000 scientists and 50,000 other participants from over 60 countries. The aim was to significantly increase the scientific knowledge and understanding of the polar areas and to conduct research projects beyond the resources of individual countries.. See more: *The History of the International Polar Years (IPYs)*, S. Barr, C. Lüdecke, (eds.), Springer 2010.

<sup>14</sup> About 40 people were from Poland.

The combining of scientific research with the indigenous knowledge was the important aspect of this IPY Montreal 2012 Conference. Representatives of the communities from Russia and Northern Canada shared the wide-ranging and sometimes personal knowledge about the Arctic ecosystems in which they have lived for centuries.

The IPY 2012 invited participants for indigenous knowledge exchange panels as well as offered a space for action forums which brought up interactive discussions on current issues facing the polar regions. Discussions covered the perspectives and knowledge from various disciplines and sectors including industry, policy, civil society, academics and indigenous representatives. Verity of workshops was open for all participants, concentrating on introducing science to policy makers and vice versa. Association of Polar Early Career Scientists held the workshop on career development during the first two days of IPY 2012. Conference delegates had a chance to balance their active participation in the sessions with a number of different tours, including technical and cultural tours, which were being offered through the whole week and were organized by local, polar-related facilities. Participants could visit the old port in Montreal, where CCGS “Amundsen” research icebreaker is currently based and opened for public visitors. The IPY 2012 “From Knowledge to Action” was definitely one of these years’ most important scientific gatherings for polar science and governance, climate change impacts and adaptation.

Additionally to participation in the IPY Conference I had a pleasure to give an invited lecture at the Marine & Environmental Law Institute (MELAW) at the Schulich School of Law, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada. The title of this presentation was: “Poland’s approach towards the Arctic region: an insignificant dream or a meaningful contribution?”. The lecture was attended mainly by a group of the researchers from the five Halifax universities. It was followed by a long and interesting discussion, also about prospects of the Polish and Canadian political and scientific cooperation in the Arctic. One of main outcomes of this study visit in Halifax is an article coming next year in the Ocean Yearbook which is one of the leading reference works of the Brill Publishing House edited by Prof. Aldo Chircop, Director of the MELAW.

I would like to express my acknowledgement to the Deans of the Faculty of Political Science of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin and the Chair of the International Relations Department for supporting my participation in the presented events.

*Michał Luszczuk (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin)*

### **International Scientific Conference “Public Administration East and West: Twenty Years of Development”**

On 23–25 May 2012 I took part in the International Scientific Conference: “Public Administration East and West: Twenty Years of Development”. The purpose of the conference was to raise knowledge and expertise and exchange of experience in the operation of public administration issues, a variety of political and administration systems, and to establish cooperation with foreign universities and scientific institutions. The specific objectives:

- to provide a public stage where academics, professionals, and students can present their research at the international level,
- to facilitate an exchange of knowledge and academic/research experiences,
- to encourage development in academic research with the purpose of supporting more effective learning and teaching processes, as well as striving for economic, social, and political administration development at both national and regional levels.

The conference was held on 23–25 May 2012 in Ohrid, Macedonia. It was organized by The Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe (NISPA) in co-operation with the University St. Kliment Ohridski – Bitola, the Republic of Macedonia (FYR Macedonia).

The 20th NISPAcee Annual Conference held in Ohrid, Macedonia gathered academics and practitioners in various fields of public administration, not only from central and eastern European countries, but from all over the world. The conference began with welcoming and opening speeches given by representatives of: NISPAcee (Gyorgy Jenei, NISPAcee President), University St. Kliment Ohridski – Bitola, the Republic of Macedonia (Prof. Violeta Panovska-Boskoska, Dean of the Faculty of Administration and Information Systems Management), ASPA (Stephen E. Condrey, ASPA President-Elect), NASPAA (Nadia Rubaii, NASPAA President), Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Poland (Barbara Kudrycka, Minister). The conference programme consisted of working sessions on the main conference theme, general sessions, meetings of research working groups, EAPAA sessions, several Panel Sessions and Forums, and Panels of new projects, which enriched the programme of the conference with new information, and a presentation of new initiatives and opportunities for collaboration with external organisations, as well as within NISPAcee.

The papers presented provided a detailed overview of the forms and motivations of East-West cooperation and highlighted its contribution:

- to the development of new public administration, public policy and public management programmes at universities in the region, learning from various models of western institutions,
- to the creation of curricula and teaching materials,
- to fostering cooperative research programmes, resulting in joint conference papers, articles, edited volumes, and research grants.

The papers provided valuable comparative analyses of institutions, models and practices in the framework of a series of selected country case studies dealing with Poland, Estonia, Slovenia, Romania, and Slovakia.

During the conference I presented the paper *The Evolution of the Revenues and Expenditures of Local Government in Poland after 1990. Legal and Financial Aspects*.

The Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe originated from the genuine effort of people and institutions from the region to share the knowledge and skills and unite the effort to cope with present and future challenges in the field.

NISPAcee is an arena for East–West collaboration through assisting, mediating and facilitating joint research, educational and training programmes and discussions between instructors, civil servants, trainers, public sector managers and politicians. This will promote both human capacity building and institutional development in public administration through mutual learning and bring about considerable synergetic effects to all member institutions.

The core of the NISPAcee activities is to promote the development of public administration disciplines and training programmes in post-Communist countries. This means increasing the quality of instruction and research and assisting in school/institute development on the international, regional and national levels.

Part of the mission is also to foster the development of civil service human resources by spreading the practices of good professional public management, public policy and governance and assisting in the overall political and economic transition through effective public service. Most important is the creating of conditions for increased professionalism of the civil service especially through the facilitation of contact between government representatives responsible for public service and representatives and consultants from member institutions.

*Mariusz W. Sienkiewicz (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin)*

### **International Conference: “Governance and Poverty Reduction in Developing Countries”, 6–8 March 2012**

The conference was held on 6–8 March 2012 in Bangkok, Thailand. It was organized by the National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA).

The International Conference on Advancement of Development Administration 2011 (ICADA 2011), hosted by the National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) lasted two days (20–21 February 2012). The theme of ICADA 2011 was “Governance and Poverty Reduction in Developing Countries” including academically related issues. The aims of this conference were (1) to bring together international academics, professionals, and undergraduate/graduate students with the general public by providing a stage for the latest research in development administration and related fields to be presented and discussed and (2) to provide a forum for professionals with practical experience of the social and economic development of developing countries to exchange their views and share their knowledge with leading countries.

During the conference there were established contacts with representatives of science from the National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) and other countries participating in the project (Japan, Indonesia, Philippines, India, Malaysia, Nigeria, Germany, France, United Kingdom).

The National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) was established following His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej’s vision of advancing Thailand’s development through the establishment of an advanced educational institution to prepare people to become agents of change for the national development.

NIDA was originally established to support the national development in Thailand; this objective has now been expanded to encompass the regional development in countries outside of Thailand, with the aim of producing advanced degree graduates who can serve in the public, business, and nonprofit sectors. At present, NIDA is a state-supported graduate

institution with university status, and it is one of very few higher education institutions in Thailand that offer exclusively graduate degree programs.

NIDA is a dynamic, unique, service-oriented graduate institution which seeks to meet many of Thailand's and the region's critical needs in development administration. Recognizing the increasing interdependence of nations across the globe and responding to the priorities of Thailand's Plan for Higher Education, NIDA seeks to meet the new challenges of international cooperation, understanding, and service.

Through teaching, training, research, and consulting, NIDA provides its students with the necessary knowledge, analytical ability, and other skills to be applied at the community, national, and international levels. NIDA's several schools, centers, and supporting services are constantly evolving as they adopt the latest technology and methodology. NIDA is recognized as a leading quality institution.

Faculty members' task performance greatly contributes to NIDA's education excellence. Eighty-five percent of the faculty members hold doctoral degrees or equivalent. NIDA's present and former faculty members play important roles and serve many vital positions in helping regulate national policies and direct national development and administration.

NIDA is well-known as a unique higher education institute in Thailand which provides men and women at the graduate level with a variety of skills necessary for public policy planning, decision making, and management in the public and private sectors. Generally, NIDA's graduates are currently serving in key positions in both public and private sectors in Thailand.

NIDA's faculty members and curriculums, as well as programs and services are enriched through various exchange programs and national and international relationships. These are key paths to achieving the goals of an international institution of higher education.

*Mariusz W. Sienkiewicz (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin)*

### **International Scientific Conference “Global Accounting, Finance and Economics Conference” in Melbourne on 20–21 February 2012**

On 20–21 February 2012 I took part in the international scientific conference: “Global Accounting, Finance and Economics Conference”, the Author's paper: *Public Finance in Poland in the Process of European Union Integration*. The purpose of the trip was to raise knowledge and expertise and exchange of experience in the operation of public finance in a variety of political systems. The aim was also to establish cooperation with foreign universities and scientific institutions.

The conference was held on 20–21 February 2012 in Melbourne, Australia. Conference was organized by the Australian Research Centre for Accounting, Finance and Economics (ARCAFE), World Business Institute and Melbourne University.

The conference lasted two days (20–21 February 2012). Was held in Melbourne, Australia. The conference focused on issues of finance, economics, business and banking. During the conference, I presented the paper: *Public Finance in Poland in the Process of European Union*



*Integration.* The presentation was part of a panel on finance, including public finances. The presentation was met with great interest of participants in the panel. Most of the participants were from non-European countries, and therefore the issue of the functioning of the public finances of the Member State EU integration processes was interesting for the participants. The presentation also alluded to the global economic crisis and the condition of the Polish and the European economy. The paper presented at the conference was published in the international scientific journal "World Journal of Social Science".

The World Business Institute (WBI) is a multi-disciplinary research, training and publishing institute. Though founded in 2000 as the Business and Computing Institute of Australia, it was reconstituted as the WBI in 2004. The mission of WBI is to serve academic, student, research and business communities as well as to provide and create facilities for improving academic and business performances, standards, and excellence ([www.wbiworld.org](http://www.wbiworld.org)).

*Mariusz W. Sienkiewicz (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin)*

## **The Report on the research conducted in Serbia and Kosovo in 2011–2012**

Thanks to financial support of the Committee of Deans of the UMCS Faculty of Political Science, I visited Serbia and Kosovo three times within the last year. Although each visit had different aims, all were directly related to my research interests concerning the post-conflict peace-building in the Western Balkans, my didactic work at the Political Science Faculty as well as the preparation of my postdoctoral thesis devoted to the issue of the controversial statehood of Kosovo.

The first visit to the Balkans resulted from my participation in the international conference entitled "Belgrade Security Forum: The Balkans and Global Security: What Do We Have in Common, What Sets Us Apart?", which took place in Belgrade in September 2011. The organisers of the conference were: Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence, Belgrade Centre for Security Study and European Movement in Serbia. Belgrade Security Forum is a periodic conference which gathers state officials and international relations practitioners. Many ministers, diplomatic representatives and the representatives of international organisations were present at the BSF 2011. During the conference the President of Serbia, H. E. Boris Tadić gave a speech on foreign policy and domestic problems of the Republic of Serbia. The voice of the Ambassador of the Russian Federation in Serbia, H. E. Aleksandr Konuzin, controversial and widely discussed in the Serbian media, is also worth mentioning. According to the formula established by the organisers, the experts and the analysts from the think-tanks and universities also participated in the conference. During one of the panels I gave a speech entitled *From Initial Peace-Building to 'Unexpected' State-Building: Dilemmas and Results of the International Involvement in Kosovo* devoted to the evolution of the international engagement in Kosovo since 1999, as well as the situation in Serbia and Kosovo before and after the declaration of independence.

In November 2011 I went to Kosovo. The aim of this visit was my research inquiry at the library of the American University in Kosovo (AUK, Pristina) as well as the establishment of

the cooperation with the AUK staff. During the visit I met the authorities of the University and got familiar with the courses and the University's infrastructure. In my opinion, the education model presented at the AUK, *de facto* based on US learning standards, is of the highest quality and could be hardly beaten at the educational market in Kosovo. Observing the functioning of the AUK, a modern University which offers a valuable knowledge to the students, also led me to the general conclusion about the importance of a proper education for Kosovo's society, with the average age slightly over 26 years of age and unemployment rate of 45%. I participated in passionate talks with AUK lecturers and students and had a great opportunity for a direct observation of the situation in Kosovo, which is still uneasy.

In July 2012 I headed to Kosovo once again. That time I did a broad scientific field research related to the statehood of Kosovo, a very controversial issue, discussed by the doctrine of political science and international law. According to planned complex evaluation of the ongoing statehood process, its characteristics, specificity, conditioning and problems, I focused my research on the institutions of the Republic of Kosovo, including its administrative, judiciary and legislative bodies, international civilian and military presence in Kosovo, as well as on the functioning of different ethnic groups and religious institutions. In order to cover a possibly broad perspective, I conducted my research in the Central and South Kosovo, as well as in the North, where situation is still very tense and unstable.

During my visit in Kosovo I did several interviews with the officials of the Republic of Kosovo, the representatives of the international society from the International Civilian Office (ICO) and European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX Kosovo), local politicians, analysts and experts from the Kosovo's think-tanks and non-governmental organisations and ordinary citizens, mainly Albanians and Serbs. The specific situation in Kosovo makes it hard to conduct proper interviews though. Unfortunately, it was not always possible to find appropriate people and arrange interviews with them.

To sum up, I would like to stress that during the visits to Serbia and Kosovo I have conducted a thorough and empirical research and have broadened my knowledge, which has definitely influenced the evaluation and final conclusions for my future postdoctoral dissertation. I have also met many interesting people, established professional contacts and promoted the UMCS Faculty of Political Science abroad.

*Konrad Pawłowski (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin)*