

Journal of Contemporary European Research

Volume 13, Issue 4 (2017)

Special Section on UACES's 50th Anniversary

What's in an Anniversary? UACES and European Studies at 50

Maxine David, *University of Leiden*

Helen Drake, *Loughborough University London*

Emily Linnemann, *UACES*

Citation

David, M., Drake, H., Linnemann, E. (2017). 'What's in an Anniversary? UACES and European Studies at 50', *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 13(4): 1443-1453.

First published at: www.jcer.net

What's in an Anniversary? UACES and European Studies at 50¹

Anniversaries come in many forms. They invite us to reflect, they ask us to remember, encourage us to learn, and they allow us space to celebrate. They are definitely a moment to look to the future and to acknowledge, but not wallow, in sentiment and nostalgia. They remind us that we are each part of something bigger; here, of UACES, of the university, of the academy and beyond.

On this occasion of UACES's golden anniversary, we write here in our guise as present custodians of UACES's past.² Building on Drake and Linnemann's joint initiative back in 2013, we have overseen a two-year strategic project leading to this point: we have raised funds, co-opted partners, mobilised UACES members past and present, initiated and recorded memories, organised events, launched new financial support schemes for early career academics; deposited the UACES archive in a safe and appropriate place for the benefit of scholars of the future; and finally, in December 2017, held a 50th birthday 'party' in London;³ and finished the UACES year with a round-table in Brussels to look ahead to the 'Future of Europe'.⁴

In September 2017, notably, we recorded a series of conversations with people who have made UACES what it is today, and those who will take it into the future. All participants were willing volunteers, and were invited to participate in our project to ensure that their specific memories and observations were not lost to time past. The exchanges took the form of conversations: yes, in front of the camera, and with sight beforehand of the areas we would cover; but also friendly in tone, and between individuals connected through UACES.

First were some of the recipients of the UACES Lifetime Achievement Award (Geoffrey Edwards, Emil Kirchner and Brigid Laffan), who collectively conducted an exchange with UACES Executive Director Emily Linnemann. These are scholars who have been highly influential in the field of European Studies and recognised as such by their peers. What could they tell us about European Studies as an academic field and about its institutionalisation in the universities where they spent their careers? What else might they have to say that could help us and our successors steer UACES into the next 50 years? Unsurprisingly, this conversation covered a good deal of important ground and the participants' observations tell us much about how and why UACES and the field of European Studies look as they do today. They also direct us, even if only implicitly, to think about whether and how academics respond to criticism from peers and others, about the boundaries of relationships, especially those between academics and policymakers, and about the responsibilities of academics when seen through a longer lens. This conversation thus has salience today and much of it was picked up in the other interviews, not least with the UACES Chairs.

In the second of the conversations, the current UACES Chair Helen Drake invited two of her predecessors, former UACES Chairs Jo Shaw (2003-2006) and Richard Whitman (2009-2012), to share their recollections: both of what they did for UACES, but also what UACES did for them. In the case of UACES, others have argued that the Association exists in large part through the 'accidents of persons and places' (Milward 1975: 74). Individuals and their sense of agency clearly have been crucial to the fortunes of UACES; but our research into the UACES archives demonstrates that it is just as much the successes of the Association in consolidating its more permanent foundations (its finances; its infrastructure, for example), particularly latterly, that have brought the Association into its second half-century of service to its members. This conversation between Chairs illustrates the challenges of striking this perpetual balance but reminds us also that the structures of the

Association are themselves the product of considerable thought and generosity of effort, individual and collective.

According to Wynn Grant, an academic association is in part characterised by its operation of a journal (Grant 2010: 1-2). Alongside *JCER*, UACES is inseparably associated with the internationally-renowned journal *JCMS*, of which it is part owner with publishers Wiley. We therefore asked past and president editors of *JCMS*, Simon Bulmer and Toni Haastrup, to tell us all. With *JCMS* as its focus, this conversation offers its own fascinations, perhaps mostly for its demonstration of – here too – the centrality of *people* to the development of a journal and a field. Additionally, the health of the journal and its contents are windows onto the state of the academic field and the academy itself. The thoughts expressed by the two editors illuminate precisely these twin environments. They talk about that holy grail of interdisciplinarity and of how disciplines and sub-disciplines move in and out of fashion; and they reflect also on the influence of external factors (such as the UK's Research Excellence Framework (REF)) on academics' publishing strategies – and the consequences.

Consequences, of course, are felt most deeply and for longest by the younger generations. Equally, no academic discipline, association or institution would have a future if it were not for the turnover of generations. It is in the relationship between established scholars and those new to the profession that UACES has arguably wrought most change. In its earliest days, UACES did not admit student members. However, by 1971 they were entitled to a limited membership, with the right to attend events but not to vote in elections and at AGMs (UACES 1971). This membership has developed over time. In 2017, the journey from limited participation to full membership rights for students is complete and we could argue that UACES sees its student members as its foremost priority. We support a parallel governance structure, the Student Forum,⁵ and since September 2017 have separate membership options for PhD students and early career academics. Our funding applications to external bodies emphasise the needs of our student members and, we note in passing, that in recent years we have extended our attention to young people who may – or may not – one day join the academic profession: sixth-formers.⁶ Our final conversation, then, was between colleagues who in the past were chairs of the Student Forum.⁷ Could they help us to understand the dip that we have encountered in recent years in student take-up of opportunities offering funding and material support? What are conditions like for doctoral students and how is the academic profession seen from those about to embark on it?

As a result of these conversations, we are privileged to have a wonderfully rich collection of oral interviews and conversations with people who have made UACES what it is today and those who will take it into the future. A number of themes emerged that were common to all or most of the conversations, and each provided valuable insights into the role UACES and its members have played over the 50 years of its lifetime as well as the types of challenges the field and the Association have faced over that time. Those themes included: the membership; interdisciplinarity; internationalisation; events-driven research; academic-policymaker relationship; contribution to social sciences; continuity and change; epistemology; and more.

Drawing on these themes, and with direct reference to the conversations themselves (also available in video format), in what follows below we have therefore given ourselves here collective licence to highlight key points that, as we see them, stitch the story of UACES into its broader contexts. In so doing, we want this tale, of course, to speak to the current UACES community; perhaps to bolster and inspire it. Crucially, we hope it will also resonate with the 'real world' out there: the highs and lows of UACES's past 50 years, it turns out, shine a light on current and urgent matters, not least the challenge of withdrawing the UK from its 44-year membership of the European Union (EU). It will fall to future UACES officers, staff, trustees and members to shape UACES's next 50 years and we offer in the remainder of this Preface, and in the Special Section as a whole, our collective efforts to curate UACES at 50.⁸

WHAT'S IN A FIELD? EUROPEAN STUDIES AT 50

Our conversations really underlined the importance of the stock-taking opportunity that an anniversary allows. Amongst other things, they revealed early scholars of European Studies to be pioneers, working in the avant-garde of higher education; pioneers also in relation to many of the structures within which academics have to work today, including (sometimes faux) departmental delineations, access to funding and the strictures of research quality assessment. As Alan Milward reflected in 1975, the nascent European Studies movement 'attracted support from a variety of educational reformers who would like to change the organization and curriculum of university and polytechnic education' (Milward 1975: 69).

Milward's article was written as what he calls the European Studies 'movement' was finding its feet within British higher-educational institutions. At the time, UACES was just 8 years old. He describes European Studies degrees at varied institutions and identifies them as a collection of different disciplinary methods, nearly all including some element of modern foreign language learning. He highlights the importance of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches to the study of Europe because 'the EEC is so complex an institution that it can not [*sic.*] adequately be studied within the framework of one traditional "subject" only' (73). The 'movement' he describes is one in which the traditional barriers to interdisciplinary study are broken down and replaced with new working methods. He recognises that this is a challenge for him and his colleagues and that in working in an interdisciplinary way they are trying to reverse a 'general trend' in British higher education towards keeping students strictly within one disciplinary field (74). He argues that European Studies is unique in encouraging its scholars to break out of 'the protective shell of their subject' because of the complexity and ever-changing nature of what they are studying. If they want to 'find out what they are talking about' he argues, they have to work with those from other university departments (74).

This sense of European Studies scholars as academics searching for a new way to work and a new way to define their own community is apparent in the conversations recorded for this issue of *JCER*. What is also apparent is that this community has faced challenges over the years and – as a result of the structural restrictions⁹ placed on academia by politicians, funding bodies and university management – the work of self-definition and in particular the pursuit of interdisciplinary endeavour has very much ebbed and flowed. Emil Kirchner clearly identifies this when he says that 'we started out with this great concept, do European studies because we bring in different disciplines; economists lawyers and so on' (UACES 2017a). Jo Shaw remarks that she has always found the UACES conferences a welcoming place as a lawyer and highlights her own commitment to interdisciplinary research: 'I have been able to work with both political and legal scholars and bring some of the questions that they ask into debate with each other and be genuinely interdisciplinary' (UACES 2017b). That is not to say that her appearance at UACES conferences has not sometimes been greeted with surprise. She recounts being asked at a UACES conference "'You're some sort of lawyer aren't you?'"

In the conversation with *JCMS* editors, Simon Bulmer similarly remembers the value of working across disciplinary lines with his fellow *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* editor, Andrew Scott. Scott is an economist whilst Bulmer is a political scientist. However, both he and Toni Haastrup also identify several issues that arise for a journal which is trying to publish, at the very least, a range of disciplinary research articles. Bulmer's predecessor was an economist and, as such, the journal had 'a very economics orientation'. He recalls writing an editorial in which he and Scott foregrounded their desire to rebalance the journal by increasing submissions from politics academics. However, because of the perception at the time that *JCMS* was an economics-orientated publication they 'didn't have a politics manuscript to publish until one came in and saved the day'

(UACES 2017c). This highlights how easy it is for a journal to gain a reputation for only publishing particular kinds of article from particular academic disciplines.

As UACES's flagship journal, *JCMS* arguably needs to have a broader appeal and successive editors have put in place strategies to achieve this. It is an objective that the current editors Toni Hastrup and Richard Whitman are continuing to support. However, as Hastrup explains there are always limits to this:

On the one hand [...] we do want these different disciplines and increasingly, we are actually encouraging interdisciplinarity [...] We don't get as many economics articles that have lots of econometric models because we do want people reading *JCMS*, a sociologist [for example], to get something from an economics article.

Another challenge for *JCMS* in attracting articles from economics scholars in particular is identified by Bulmer when he explains that 'the Research Excellence Framework or RAE before that in the UK, meant some tailing off of economists because they have a hierarchy of journals that they have to publish in'.

The quality-assessment of research in the UK also affected Kirchner's experience of working collaboratively with colleagues across his university. His ground-breaking efforts at the University of Essex to bring people working in 'six departments' together was scuppered by the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) which 'basically blew a big hole' through this scheme (UACES 2017a). The first RAE took place in 1986. The requirement (in Britain at least) for academic research to be quality-controlled through disciplinary sub-panels has demanded that academics align themselves more clearly with particular disciplines and departmental striations. There are signs that this is changing. The Research Excellence Framework (REF) assessment taking place in 2021 is already seeking nominations for its sub-panel members. Interdisciplinary approaches to research are being emphasised once more and steps are being taken to ensure that research which crosses disciplinary boundaries is assessed equitably with its more clearly delineated counterparts (REF 2021). Whether this approach works to accurately and fairly assess interdisciplinary research remains to be seen but what it does suggest is that within the tightly-regulated UK higher education sector attention is being paid once more to the pioneering way in which UACES members work and have continued to work over the last fifty years.

UACES's nature as an association which exists outside of the structural restrictions of higher education institutions and divorced from the linked demands of quality assessment organisations and funding bodies means that it has the potential actively to foster interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinary. Its conferences welcome political scientists, lawyers, economists and sociologists. Its journals publish work from historians alongside the work of legal scholars. But this does not mean that there is not more to be done. UACES has a commitment to continue to extend its appeal and bring together scholarship from a wide range of disciplinary backgrounds. This is not in order to create an 'ivory Tesco' (Milward 1975: 79) but rather to allow our members the space to work in new ways and to develop their ideas in conjunction with others who may bring a different perspective or methodology to the table.

It is not only interdisciplinarity which the participants in the recordings identified as a characteristic of European Studies. Another key feature of the field is its inextricable link with its object of study, the European Union. European Studies's growth has been concurrent with the shifts and changes in the EEC/EU itself; as Brigid Laffan puts it: 'there's always been a dialectic relationship between developments between the EU and scholarship on the EU' (UACES 2017a; see also Keeler 2005). Laffan goes on to note that in the early days of EU scholarship it was possible to know a lot about what was happening in the EU in different policy areas and institutions. However, as it developed

into a 'more complex polity and economic space' academics found it increasingly challenging to know 'everything'. Instead, scholarship became more specialised and events-driven. Laffan raises the possibility that in pursuing specialisation, scholars 'forgot some of the larger issues of European integration, the big macro questions of the nature of the polity that was developing.'

This development is also noted by Simon Bulmer and Toni Haastrup. Bulmer refers to it as an 'events following' which he says 'drives the way the journal comes out, how it looks to the reader' (UACES 2017b). This events-driven research has the effect of fostering comparative perspectives and, as Haastrup notes, this kind of research is now being encouraged by the new editors of the journal. Kirchner identifies the turn back towards comparative regionalism as a positive turn in European Studies and describes it as having 'something to offer in terms of other disciplines'. As he describes it, the development has been from a more 'narrow driven integration theory per se' to a more outward-looking focus which has 'been a good thing on the whole' (UACES 2017a).

Events-driven research is clearly on display at UACES conferences and in some of the concerns of our Collaborative Research Networks.¹⁰ The UK's withdrawal from the EU is a current notable example but others could include the migration crisis, the Eurozone crisis and the renewed hold that illiberal democracy has on certain European Union member states. It seems that for many years to come 'a considerable number of the learned [will] have much to be thankful for in the uninspiring and rather sordid compromises of Brussels' (Milward 1975: 73).

Milward's somewhat tongue-in-cheek point is that European Studies scholars have always been closely linked with events affecting Europe but also with the decision-makers driving through changes. This is another striking feature of the European Studies field: its scholars' close links with policymakers. The UACES annual conference has, over the years, featured a range of influential speakers and our members can be found working in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, at the European Commission and in the European Parliament. The researchers of initiatives like the ESRC-supported UK in a Changing Europe programme comprise many UACES members and select committees in both the House of Lords and House of Commons have invited our members to attend and give their expert opinion. This demonstrates the importance of the research being undertaken by UACES members and its impact outside academia. As impact, for better or worse, becomes an increasingly utilised method of assessing the quality of research, UACES members have been able to construct 'little relevant narratives' from their engagement with policymakers (UACES 2017a). But as Geoffrey Edwards notes, this positive outcome of academic/policymaker engagement wasn't always the overriding concern. As he says, 'we really had trouble throughout our history in a sense that at the outset we are always considered to be so pro-European, we are all a suspect'. He continues, 'we've always had this close relationship with practitioners which to some of the more *recherché* international relations scholars has [...] been problematic for us'.

The link between European Studies academics and European policymakers has frequently been read by critics of the field as proof of its pro-EU stance; we return here in our conclusions. When this suspicion comes from fellow academics it can cause problems – as Edwards highlights in the recording. When the suspicion of bias comes from a member of a government it takes on a more sinister tone. This more troubling intervention was exemplified in a letter sent on House of Commons stationery on 3 October 2017 by the UK Conservative Whip and MP for Daventry, Chris Heaton-Harris, to university vice chancellors across the UK. Heaton-Harris specifically asked the VCs to 'supply' him with:

the names of Professors at your establishment who are involved in the teaching of European affairs, with particular reference to Brexit. Furthermore, if I could be provided with a copy of the syllabus and links to the online lectures which relate to this area I would be much obliged. (quoted in UACES 2017a).

This letter was greeted with consternation from academics of all disciplines and fields and denounced as 'McCarthyism' by the left-wing press and politicians (Fazackerley 2017). The letter instigated a campaign from the *Daily Mail* to discredit academics, many of whom were UACES members, and to encourage students to write to them 'exposing' pro-European bias within their universities (Martin, Witherow and Stevens 2017). UACES's response to the letter was a statement that the association 'vigorously contests any politically-motivated interference with the right of its members to research and teach' (UACES 2017a). The association takes its responsibility to protect its members seriously and its mission to promote the teaching and research of European studies for the public benefit will continue to be its first priority as we look to the future.

WHAT'S - OR WHO'S - IN AN ACADEMY? UK HE AT 50

Notably, the statement highlights that UACES is a 'community and a home to scholars at all stages of their careers' and offers support to all its members, whether they are based in the UK or further afield. This recognition of UACES as an international organisation which welcomes students and early-career researchers alongside more established academics may seem unremarkable to our current members. Over 50 per cent of UACES membership is based outside the UK and around 25 per cent are students (UACES 2017e: 4). However, this broad membership base was not always the norm within UACES. Indeed, when the association first started it was very much focused on providing support to UK-based scholars who had, at the very least, completed their PhD. The internationalising and broadening of UACES's scope has contributed to the growth of the association and has also led to a redefinition of what the academy is and who it is for.

From UACES's earliest days the question of who could and should be a member of UACES has occupied the executive committee. We have discussed elsewhere in this preface the changing status of student members. Our conversation with the UACES Student Forum chairs reveals how the establishment of an autonomous yet closely-linked governance structure within UACES has helped many graduate students develop confidence and key skills (UACES 2017f). It has given them a sense of place within the UACES community and encouraged them to get involved with conference-organising, publishing and increasingly has emphasised the opportunities of social media and online platforms for disseminating research. UACES Student members now have full voting rights during committee elections and at the AGM and this reflects the acceptance of PhD students as full members of the academic profession.

More contentious than the entrance of students into the UACES community in the early 70s was the admittance of non-UK-based members. Recorded in the minutes of a committee meeting which took place on 13 April 1972 is a query from Adrian Poole about whether some 'foreign i.e. Dutch' academics could join UACES (UACES 1972). In the discussion that followed some members of the committee expressed the view that the Dutch should start their own association rather than joining the UK one. However, this sentiment was evidently overruled as the final decision was that 'in principle' there was no reason why they should not be able to join. This decision has had an enormous impact on UACES's membership. As has been already acknowledged, over the half of UACES's members are based outside the UK (UACES 2017e, 4). Our conferences are international in scope (often welcoming delegates from every continent) and as Jo Shaw notes, during her tenure it was written into the UACES constitution that there must be at least one member from outside the UK on the Executive Committee (UACES 2017b). UACES would not be the thriving and vibrant association it is today without the valuable contribution of our members from outside the UK. This drive towards internationalisation emerges in several of the recorded conversations and is always pointed to by the participants as a valuable and important part of UACES's development as an association.

One of the roles played by professional associations is therefore, whether willingly or not, to determine who belongs to the academy and who belongs to the association's field. Membership has been spoken about above through the lens of professional status but there is the question too of research focus. For UACES, the possible scope is gratifyingly wide. Academics from a wide range of fields are welcome with current members representing the Humanities as well as the Social Sciences. Still, trends are evident and the conversation with Simon Bulmer particularly, highlights both the fact and the reason for change. *JCMS's* early focus on economics has been replaced by a focus on politics, occasioned, as Simon says, partly because of the agency of different editors but also by the publishing environment pushing Economists to publish in a narrower range of journals, recognised by their research assessment panels. As a result, *JCMS* was successful in ensuring that it broadened its appeal beyond Economics, such that Politics and IR and Law are well represented. Today, Politics and International Relations dominates in the UACES membership. While this covers an extensive range, the Executive Committee of UACES regularly discusses the need to reach out to members, potential and existing, to ensure a more comprehensive range in which voice is given to scholars working outside Politics, International Relations, Economics and Law. Thus, questions of belonging lie at the heart of much that UACES does. There are various reasons for this preoccupation. The first is occasioned by ruminations on the nature of European Studies itself and the need to preserve its eclectic, yet focused, nature. Policy outcomes impact more than the political or legal life of citizens, understanding the effects of policy on culture, for instance, is significant and UACES takes seriously its need to do so.

Global events also have their part to play in driving the UACES agenda, as the Lifetime Achievers and Chairs have said. Whether looking at the EU Referendum, what Cas Mudde (2017) characterises as a return to nativism, Trump's election to the US presidency, Russia's historical revisionism, the enshrining of Xi Jinping's thought into the Chinese Communist Party's Constitution, we are given a multitude of reasons to remember our history. UACES's archival project has been one attempt in this direction but the association is aware that historians can do more to illuminate our current political circumstances and is reflecting on ways to ensure the longer perspective can be incorporated into analysis of contemporary events.

These two reasons alone suggest that European citizens are, if not members of the academy, the subject of the academy's work. This is hardly controversial, a government focus on understanding the impact of academic work is not confined to the UK, although it may be seen there most clearly. But it does raise questions again of what this means for academics in relation to neutrality and activism and for how they define their responsibilities.

WHAT'S IN THE FUTURE? EUROPEAN STUDIES AND UACES AT 100

With 50 years behind us and the British exit looming, our collective minds have inevitably turned to what lies before us, for European Studies is a discipline that grows and changes as the context studied changes (Milward 1975). We think that we have given reason to believe here, in the face of the numerous challenges facing the EU, its member states and peoples, that UACES's pioneering spirit will stand it in good stead. Future Chairs will have to decide whether the times call for a steady hand at the tiller or whether a more adventurous, risk-taking response is called for. Looking back over its long history gives the UACES Executive much reason to be confident about its ability to adapt. That confidence is rooted in the knowledge that its membership has ever been vigilant, reflective and, when required, ready with radical solutions.

At the same time, we must acknowledge that there have also been missed opportunities and learn from them. To give one example, as Ben Rosamond, for instance, has argued, much time has been

spent on theorising about integration but very little on disintegration (2016). One of the challenges for UACES will be to think about what it can and should do by way of anticipatory measures more generally. Should it, for instance, encourage its journal editors to commission works when scholarship seems to be falling behind event? This would be consistent with past times, witness Simon Bulmer's account of his time as *JCMS* Editor. Is this a necessary part of building, shaping and developing the field or in the current times, does it cross a line and amount to a narrowly-wrought engineering of the profession? Questions also remain to be answered about the place of European Studies in relation to other disciplines. Declining student numbers have had impacts in the form of departmental closures and the rebranding of programmes. As a result, European Studies is often "hidden" within Politics, International Relations, History, Sociology and other departments. Some railing against this pattern may be called for but is it more useful to ask about opportunities afforded - does this offer greater scope for interdisciplinarity and synthesis? Scholarship on Europe continues to make significant contributions to knowledge but is there more to be done to connect this to wider trends and other disciplines?

Perhaps, by way of example, during the next 50 years UACES will be part of a pendulum swing back to the inclusion of the humanities (including foreign language learning) into European Studies? At the outset, 'Europe' was studied in pioneering universities and departments through a combination of humanities and social science. To take the case of Loughborough University alone:

European Studies emerged in the 1968/9 academic year when, in the School of Human and Environmental Studies, a Bachelor of Science was offered in the Institutions and Languages of Modern Europe. The new degree responded to a perceived need: '... for a course which combines languages with a knowledge of the Social Sciences, particularly Economics and Politics. This degree was originally conceived of as a "European Studies" degree. It is vocational in character, though not exclusively so, in that the course aims to produce graduates with a linguistic capability in two European languages, and a knowledge of Economics and the Political and Economic Institutions of major Common Market countries (Loughborough University of Technology, 1968/9: 75 cited in Drake and Linnemann 2018).

Michael Kelly and colleagues have recently reflected on the likely prospects for such a return to the future, once 'Brexit' is upon us, and the findings are instructive (Kelly 2017).

These types of questions are, one might say, the bread and butter of professional organisations. Others speak to deeper, more divisive issues. The UK's referendum on EU membership has been the source of various disagreements and controversies, not least among academics. Perhaps nowhere was this more heartfelt than in the debate on the British exit among those who saw a responsibility for remaining above the political fray as paramount, while others felt that their understanding of the negative societal effects of a British exit outweighed a concern for academic neutrality and placed them under an obligation to adopt a stance and defend it publicly. The impact of funding on freedom of speech was often the sub-text but rarely discussed openly. On a connected but somewhat separate matter, it would be remiss not to reflect in the days ahead on the effect on political and public perceptions of close relations between academics and policymakers; when academics act holistically – here, in their guise as citizens – what dilemmas are posed? UACES responded this year by putting this and other related questions to the membership through the academic activist panel at the UACES Annual Conference and it will continue to provide a forum for debating these tensions. Dealing with controversy brings risks and UACES will need to continue to connect firmly with its membership to understand the range of opinions and possible responses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful for the co-funding of the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union. The views expressed are those of the authors and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

We would also like to offer our thanks to Helena Cicmil for facilitating this special section, and especially for the time spent recording the conversations and producing the videos.

Final thanks must go to the participants in the interviews for offering their thoughts and sharing their memories, having already been more than generous with their time over the years.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Emily Linnemann, UACES, Woburn House, 20 Tavistock Square, London, WC1H 9HQ [elinnemann@uaces.org].

REFERENCES

- Drake, H. and Linnemann, E. (2018) 'What's in a subject association? UACES and European Studies in the United Kingdom, 1967-2017' in F. Larat, M. Mangenot and S. Schirmann (eds), *Les études européennes. Genèse et institutionnalisation*. Paris: l'Harmattan: Chapter 6.
- Fazackerley, A. (2017) 'Universities deplore "McCarthyism" as MP demands list of tutors lecturing on Brexit', *Guardian*, 24 October 2017. Available online: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/oct/24/no-10-disowns-tory-whip-accused-of-mccarthyite-behaviour-universities-brexit> [last accessed 1 December 2017].
- Grant, W. (2010) *The Development of a Discipline. The History of the Political Studies Association*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Keeler, J. T. S. (2005) 'Mapping EU Studies: The Evolution from Boutique to Boom' *JCMS*, 43 (3): 551-82.
- Kelly, M. (ed.) (2018) *Languages After Brexit: How the UK Speaks to the World*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, D., Witherow, T. and Stevens, J. (2017) 'How Open-Minded are our Universities?' *Daily Mail*, 25 October 2017. Available online: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-5018251/Remainer-universities-Anti-Brexit-bias-laid-bare.html> [last accessed 11 December 2017].
- Milward, A.S. (1975) 'The European Studies Movement: What's in a Name?'. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 14(1): 69-80.
- Mudde, C. (2017) 'Why nativism, not populism, should be declared word of the year'. *the guardian*. Thursday 07 December 2017. Available online: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/dec/07/cambridge-dictionary-nativism-populism-word-year> [last accessed 7 December 2017].
- REF 2021 (2017) *Interdisciplinary Research*. Available online: <http://www.ref.ac.uk/about/ir/> [last accessed 1 December 2017].
- Rosamond, B. (2016) 'Brexit and the Problem of Disintegration'. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 12(4): 864-871.
- UACES (1971) *Committee Minutes*, 12 February 1971.
- UACES (1972) *Committee Minutes*, 13 April 1972.
- UACES (2017a) 'In Conversation with UACES Lifetime Achievement Award Winners'. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 13 (4).

UACES (2017b) 'In Conversation with UACES Chairs'. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 13 (4).

UACES (2017c) 'In Conversation with JCMS Editors Past and Present'. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 13 (4).

UACES (2017d) *A Statement on Academic Freedom*. Available online: <https://www.uaces.org/academicfreedom/> [last accessed 1 December 2017]

UACES (2017e) *Annual Report*. Available online: https://www.uaces.org/documents/about/agm_2017.pdf [last accessed 1 December 2017]

UACES (2017f) 'In Conversation with UACES Student Forum Chairs'. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 13 (4).

ENDNOTES

¹ The title refers to the chapter title of Drake and Linnemann (2018), which itself was inspired by Alan Milward's seminal article on European Studies as an academic discipline in the UK (Milward 1975).

² Maxine David, current Editor-in-Chief of *JCER*; Helen Drake, current UACES Chair; Emily Linnemann, UACES Executive Director.

³ <https://www.uaces.org/events/uaces50/> [last accessed 11 December 2017].

⁴ <https://uaces.org/events/futureofeuropa/> [last accessed 11 December 2017].

⁵ To be renamed 'Graduate Forum' in the course of 2018.

⁶ Through engagement with schools in the form of simulated EU negotiations on the freedom of movement in 2016 and 2017, UACES has in fact revived a dimension of one of its earliest objectives, namely to inform and educate, full stop, about continental European nation states and in particular their adventures in European integration.

⁷ Participants were Viviane Gravey, Liz Monaghan, Miguel Otero-Iglesias, Simon Usherwood and Anna Wambach. Simon Usherwood acted as facilitator for the conversation.

⁸ Full details of the UACES@50 project can be found here: <https://www.uaces.org/fifty/>

⁹ We acknowledge too that structural changes can be interpreted as opportunity rather than restrictions, an idea we return to in the concluding remarks.

¹⁰ <http://www.uaces.org/networks> [last accessed 11 December 2017].