Greetings, IR majors, alumni, colleagues, and friends!

I begin with a quick introduction. At the beginning of the fall semester, I began a term as chair of the International Relations Department. Over the last four years, the department thrived under the dedicated leadership of Professor Zhiqun Zhu, who ably guided us through the challenging terrain of a pandemic. I take over with deep appreciation and gratitude for all that he has done for the IR community.

It’s an honor to be working with our students, faculty, and alumni. Together, we will continue to emphasize the how important it is to have a robust understanding of the world, an understanding that is built and nurtured by exposure to the big and global questions of the day. Our goal, as always, will be to empower our students with the intellectual tools and practical skills to engage with the world as knowledgeable and effective global citizens. Our hope, as always, is that this exposure solidifies their resolve to remain engaged throughout their life and help enact the changes necessary for a brighter and sustainable future for our planet.

The fall was the third full pandemic semester for Bucknell. As we welcomed our students back to the residential and in person teaching environment that we all know and appreciate, we all continued to do our best under improving but still challenging conditions. Still, in and outside the classroom, we sought to create and maintain a sense of community that we probably took for granted before the pandemic. Although the Omicron variant continues to present difficulties, we hope that the new year will bring us closer to collectively managing the pandemic across the world. If anything, we are reminded every day of how interconnected we are and how our shared challenges require a resolve to work together towards solutions.

Despite challenges, our IR community has been resilient and active in the fall. IR students have been returning to studying abroad. We hope to feature their experiences in our next newsletter. A sense of semi-normalcy also returns to summer activities for our students, including internships. In this issue, Giuliana Ferrara ‘22 reflects on her internship at the World Affairs Council of New Jersey. Over the summer, IR major Lielt Endeshaw ‘22 spent the summer on campus and do research thanks to being selected as a recipient of an Emergent Scholar Grant. She researched whether intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations (could) incorporate insights from the literature on positive peace into their peacekeeping efforts. She presented her findings at the Susquehanna Undergraduate Research symposium.

The pandemic has also allowed some to re-chart their paths and move in new directions. Katelyn Rothney ’15 shares with us her path from IR to creative writing by way of IBM. Our alumni are accomplished and thoughtful, with a lifelong commitment to learning and reflection. In this issue, Stefan Ivanovski ’12 reflects on the perils of challenges to democracy in many places around the world and asks how we can improve democracy’s resiliency in our lives and communities. Professor Zhiqun Zhu highlights and assesses the challenges in the Taiwan Strait and reflects on the Washington-Beijing-Taipei relations.

IR faculty continued to bring their insights to the campus community. In October, Professor Jozwiak organized a panel reflecting on the German federal election of September which marked the end of the Merkel era for Germany. In this issue, he brings to us the main takeaways from that discussion. We are currently working on other events to bring timely discussions to the broader campus during the spring semester. You’ll be able to read about those events in our spring issue. As always, please stay in touch and send us your news. We’d love to include short pieces from our students, and alumni, so let us know if you are interested. My colleagues join me in wishing everyone a healthy and safe 2022!
Paradoxes in the Taiwan Strait

During an exclusive interview with ABC News' George Stephanopoulos on August 18, 2021, President Joe Biden stated, "We made a sacred commitment to Article Five that if in fact anyone were to invade or take action against our NATO allies, we would respond. Same with Japan, same with South Korea, same with—Taiwan." He appeared to be suggesting that the so-called collective security article of the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty—an armed attack against one or more of NATO members shall be considered an attack against them all — would apply to Taiwan.

This raised some confusion about America’s Taiwan policy since Washington has long followed "strategic ambiguity" on whether it would intervene militarily to protect Taiwan in the event of an attack by mainland China. The White House quickly backtracked, with a senior Biden administration official saying the following day that "US policy with regard to Taiwan has not changed."

Though Biden may have misspoken, this episode is the latest revelation of many paradoxes or contradictions regarding the Taiwan issue. If unresolved, such fundamental problems in the trilateral Washington-Beijing-Taipei relationship will exacerbate tensions in the Taiwan Strait and contribute to turning Taiwan into "the most dangerous place on earth."

1. Seeking to boost its international status, Taipei shuns Beijing that holds the key

The United Nations and other international organizations follow Beijing’s "one China" principle and do not recognize Taiwan’s independent status. Since Tsai Ing-wen took office as President of the Republic of China (ROC) in 2016, Taiwan has lost eight diplomatic allies and has not been able to attend the World Health Assembly (WHA). Tsai’s Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) government rejects the notion that the two sides of the Taiwan Strait belong to the same country. Taipei has done a remarkable job in navigating the international system, upgrading substantive relations with Washington in particular, yet it is unable to change its international status and obtain diplomatic recognition.

Taipei is fully aware that the short cut to expanding its international space is via Beijing, but the DPP government has opted for an anti-Beijing approach. Indeed, it has eagerly joined hawks in Washington to counter China, inducing Beijing to amp up military and diplomatic pressures. Without improving relations with Beijing first, Taipei faces an uphill battle to be a normal member in the international community.

2. Rejecting “one China,” Taipei imposes a precondition for cross-Strait talks

Tsai has expressed interest in a “meaningful dialogue” with Beijing, it sounds promising, but her government claims that “one China” has been unilaterally imposed on Taiwan by Beijing as an unacceptable precondition. The truth is the ROC Constitution which Tsai pledged to abide by follows “one China,” and Tsai’s predecessor Ma Ying-jeou was able to maintain friendly cross-Strait ties based on the one-China “1992 Consensus.”

The Ma administration used “Chinese mainland” to refer to the other side of the Taiwan Strait while the Tsai administration routinely uses “China” instead to intentionally disassociate Taiwan from the mainland. The DPP government appears to be paying lip service to the ROC Constitution. By asserting that Taiwan and China are two separate countries, Taipei imposes a precondition that Beijing cannot accept.

The United States

1. Attempting to maintain the status quo, Washington upsets the cross-Strait order

It’s a long-standing US policy to oppose unilateral change of the status quo across the Taiwan Strait. Clearly Washington has not done much to encourage peaceful dialogue between Beijing and Taipei lately. It has focused on Beijing’s aggressive behavior without opposing Taipei’s troublesome policies. After taking office in 2016, Tsai ditched the “1992 Consensus,” the foundation of cross-Strait exchanges since official contacts were initiated in the early 1990s. This was unmistakably a most serious unilateral change of the status quo, and yet Washington turned a blind eye to it.

Furthermore, Washington has itself changed the status quo. In recent years US Congress has passed a series of bills to support Taiwan and the
State Department has revised the provisions governing unofficial contacts between Washington and Taipei, significantly upgrading bilateral relations. Washington has arguably broken its commitment to maintaining the status quo across the Taiwan Strait, shifting the vaguely-defined guardrails of “one China.”

2. Following its “one China” policy, Washington may be helping create “one China one Taiwan”

US officials like to distinguish America’s “one China policy” from Beijing’s “one China principle.” The letter and spirit of “one-China” are contained in the three Sino-US joint communiqués. The 1972 Shanghai Communiqué states that the United States “acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China. The United States government does not challenge that position.” The 1979 and the 1982 Joint Communiqués contain similar expressions.

The Taiwan Relations Act passed by US Congress in 1979 essentially treats Taiwan as an independent state, contradicting the concept of “one China” that Washington did not fully endorse but tacitly agreed with Beijing. Besides the three communiqués, Washington has added the Taiwan Relations Act and Six Assurances as the basis of America’s “one China policy.” However, Washington has been elusive about Taiwan’s legal status under its “one China policy,” creating a gray area for implementing a de facto “one China, one Taiwan” policy.

creating a gray area for implementing a de facto “one China, one Taiwan” policy.

China

1. Treating Taiwan like Hong Kong and Macau widens, not narrows, the cross-Strait gap

The “one country, two systems” model has been unpopular in Taiwan. What happened in Hong Kong in the past couple of years has further reduced support for it.

The status of Taiwan is different from that of Hong Kong and Macao. The ROC government was defeated by the Communist Party in the Chinese Civil War and retreated to Taiwan in 1949, but it did not perish. Instead, the ROC has prospered in Taiwan. Beijing is unwilling to face the reality of the ROC’s continued existence. When Hong Kong and Macao were returned to China, the people there had no input. To reunify with a democratic Taiwan, Beijing will need to respect the wishes of the Taiwanese people.

Beijing has stated that under “one China” anything can be discussed. Shouldn’t Beijing offer a better option to Taipei and invite proposals from Taipei about future cross-Strait relations?

2. Punishing Taiwan independence strengthens the push for separation

President Xi Jinping has noted that cross-Strait unification is not just the integration of territory but also the synchronization of hearts and minds of the people. Beijing strongly opposes Taiwan independence and will castigate those pursuing the independence cause. But how can Beijing distinguish the desire of ordinary Taiwanese to be the masters of their own future from the attempt of those who promote Taiwan independence? What is Beijing’s strategy to attract, not coerce, the Taiwanese?

Beijing continues to stifle Taiwan’s international space, such as blocking its participation in the WHA as a way to penalize the DPP government. It has alienated many Taiwanese, who have grown resentful of Beijing’s intimidation. Beijing not only gives the DPP ammunition to attack it but also helps consolidate the DPP’s support base in Taiwan.

Taipei, Washington, and Beijing all have a huge stake in peace and prosperity of the Taiwan Strait, but they have conflicting interests and goals and are advancing inherently contradictory policies.

The three parties must take actions simultaneously to lower tensions and avert potential war in the Taiwan Strait. They should all demilitarize the Taiwan Strait, with a shared understanding that the final solution of the Taiwan issue should not be by military means.”

Prof. Zhiqun Zhu

A Different Path: From IR to AI, Screenwriting, and Fiction

As one of Bucknell University’s most popular majors, taking courses in international relations at some point is almost inevitable. Its courses overlap with those of the Political Science Department, the Economics Department, and the School of Management, and they often fulfill liberal arts requirements. At Bucknell, I prided myself on taking these courses--I consider these insights valuable to all students. When I was attending Bucknell, I was aware that the major had a strong alumni network that could lead to opportunities post-graduation. It never occurred to me that my career choices after leaving Bucknell would diverge from those that I had imagined myself pursuing: government, nonprofits, and entry-level positions at other policy-related organizations.

Following Bucknell, I began working for IBM Watson in both the AI and marketing departments. In addition to working for IBM, I have also produced a documentary while attending night classes for screenwriting, and I have begun writing my own fiction since the pandemic began. My passion for human rights and interest in rolled events has never wavered and I have leveraged everything I learned after my undergraduate degree into my career and creative endeavors. I joined IBM initially with the hopes of working in an AI strategic group that was focused on delivering software solutions to combat human trafficking, terrorism and identity theft. After a few months at IBM, however, I realized that if I immersed myself fully in the development and maturity of the technology, rather than focusing on one type of industry application, I would eventually be able to use the technology to accomplish missions in any area.

Over the course of my time at IBM I eventually joined the marketing department as a product manager, working alongside researchers and engineers to create new AI capabilities. By focusing on delivering software solutions to combat human trafficking, terrorism and identity theft. After a few months at IBM, however, I realized that if I immersed myself fully in the development and maturity of the technology, rather than focusing on one type of industry application, I would eventually be able to use the technology to accomplish missions in any area.

Working at AI has met the intellectual desires I had while studying international relations at Bucknell, allowing me to explore new possibilities to address real world problems across industries and organizations. However, a few years after college, I still wanted to find a medium to advocate for human rights in my adult life.

Throughout my time at Bucknell and before, I was always seeking creative outlets. I spent my four years in college acting on stage and directing productions. In 2017, two years after I graduated, drained and feeling disconnected from my creative self, I realized I needed to find an outlet. While I didn’t particularly like my chances of landing stage time as an actress in NYC up against such amazing talent, I still needed to find a creative outlet. So, I did something different. I began taking night courses in screenwriting at The New School. Based on a true story, I began writing a feature screenplay about sexual assault and its impact on mental health and well-being of a young woman. In addition to feeling reconnected to my creative self, I also felt reconnected to the part of myself, my inner IR major, that wanted to use my voice for good.

My investment in creativity and activism led me to become a member of a small group of filmmakers who were making a documentary about child sexual assault and its impact on a survivor. It was an honor to work on this project as an Associate Producer. Our documentary, A Girl Named C, premiered at the 2018 Austin International Film Festival and has since been screened at film festivals across North America.

I have continued to write screenplays, finishing two features and countless shorts most of which champion the same themes: intersectional feminism, mental health, environmentalism, and coping with trauma. In order to grow as a writer, I invested in my part-time education and built a community. These experiences eventually led to me writing fiction. Today, I am truly enjoying writing my first novel, which focuses on a young character and merges speculative elements (think fantasy and science fiction) with ecofeminism.
A Different Path, Cont’d

All of this is to say that any student studying international relations, declaring or having declared international relations as a major should reflect on the content they learn about our world, its people and how we treat and interact with one another. These learnings can help you to decide what sort of contribution you wish to make to the world. It is up to you to explore your interests and use your brainpower and energy in whatever field you decide to enter after graduating from Bucknell. Your path might be traditional for an international relations major, and that is wonderful. Or perhaps it won't be. That's fine too! It might be unorthodox like mine -- going from IR to AI, and screenwriting to fiction.

Katelyn Rothney ’15

Why We Need More Democracy

Democracy is in decline.

The people do not govern the world. Minorities govern the world. Even in ‘democratic countries,’ small groups effectively exercise power and control over key areas of our lives. In today’s world, democracy as we know it is under attack from many directions—from dictatorships to corporations to social media algorithms. But our own actions or inactions can also undermine it—like when we do not vote or take part in public life. Yet, there is more to democracy than just casting a vote in a ballot box.

For many, it may be difficult to imagine that there is more to democracy than just representative or political democracy. Most leading authorities and experts on democracy are students of the various Political Science departments from universities across the world. When discussing the merits or failures of democracy, they focus mostly on the political aspects of democracy. For example, The Economist’s Democracy Index or Freedom House’s Freedom in the World reports are considered the benchmarks (at least in the Western world) in assessing how democratic a particular country is. Both reports evaluate how effective are the mechanisms of representative democracies in each country. They put numbers on qualitative aspects such as how “free” and “fair” the elections are, or the degree of civil liberties.

Even if we focus on measuring democracy by the political parameters used in The Economist’s Democracy Index such as the electoral process and pluralism, the functioning of government, political participation, political culture and civil liberties, democracy around the world has been on a steady decline.

The Economist’s Democracy Index uses a four-scale rating: Full Democracy (8.01–10), Flawed Democracy (6.01–8.00), Hybrid Regimes (4.01–6.00), and Authoritarian Regimes (0.00–4.00) to measure the state of democracy in a country.

In 2015, The Economist ranked the world as a Hybrid Regime, giving it a 5.55 score. By 2020, the state of democracy globally declined to 5.37 points. Although the decline in this five-year period is relatively small, the last decade and a half also marks a steady decline of democracy. For instance, in 2006, the global score on the state of democracy was 5.52 points.

In its Freedom in the World 2021 report, Freedom House, one of the most authoritative think tanks on democracy globally, noted that democracy has marked the 15th consecutive year of overall decline around the world.¹ Last year, 2020, marked the highest gap (45) between the number of countries that deteriorated in the democracy and freedom rankings (73) vs. those that improved (28). The report further stated that “Nearly 75 percent of the world’s population lived in a country that faced deterioration last year [in 2020].”

We have a long way to go to reach democracy, even in those countries that consider themselves democratic.

The 2020 Dalia Research results show that 78% of those surveyed around the world believe democracy is important. However, in most of the surveyed countries, 1/3 people believe there is a lack of democracy in their country. Yet, most of the surveyed people focus on the level of political democracy. Democracy needs to be part of our daily life, otherwise, people will continue to be disillusioned with democracy.

There are many people who believe that if the citizens of a particular country vote once every four years (or whatever the election cycle in the country is) in free and fair elections, that they live in a democracy.

People vote (or not) for their political representatives who focus on the macro-level issues, such as the overall growth of the economy, trade agreements
If we want to build a resilient democracy and reverse its declining trend, we need to have an expanded understanding of it and practice it every day... [w]e need to have democracy in all key areas of life that affect our important day-to-day activities in our lives. This means that we need to learn to democratize our lifestyles.” 

Stefan Ivanovski ‘12

Yet, the things that concern people most are of more ‘mundane’ nature, such as bills, interest on loans and mortgages they need to pay off every month, quality of healthcare and infrastructure, and access to high-speed internet. It is no surprise that people become politically apathetic and/or disillusioned with democracy. People confuse the absence of democracy with the lack of democracy. They see the absence of democracy as a failure of (political or representative) democracy. Democracy is increasingly becoming absent in our political life. However, democracy was never present in the areas that matter a lot, such as our jobs, our schools, the digital space, infrastructure and so forth.

It is not only politics that frustrates people, but also their work. In 2019, Gallup surveyed over 112,000 business units in the United States and found that only 35% of workers were engaged at work. This leaves the remaining 65% of the surveyed disengaged at work. When thinking about democracy, we need to think beyond just political participation. We also need to think about practicing democracy in the places where we spend most of our lives, such as at work, at home, and at school.

If we want to build a resilient democracy and reverse its declining trend, we need to have an expanded understanding of it and practice it every day. What does it mean? That means we need to have democracy in all key areas of life that affect our important day-to-day activities in our lives. This means that we need to learn to democratize our lifestyles.

What do you think is needed to improve the state of our democracy? Join the discussion at Lifestyle Democracy.

Stefan Ivanovski ‘12

Stefan Ivanovski, Class of 2012 and a Phi Beta Kappa, is currently a project manager at CIVITTA, the largest management consulting firm originating in Eastern Europe. He is also the founder and lead contributor of the Lifestyle Democracy blog, where he writes about the role of democracy in our society.

Kann auch ein Mann Bundeskanzlerin werden?

The German Federal Legislative Election was important and noteworthy in many ways, but perhaps exceptional in the fact that for the first time in decades Angela Merkel was not running for re-election to the office.

Professor Joseph Jozwiak

The German Federal Legislative Election was important and noteworthy in many ways, but perhaps exceptional in the fact that for the first time in decades Angela Merkel was not running for re-election to the office. This led to, for lack of a better term, memes like the one above (Can men be Chancellors?) that widely circulated through social and traditional media.

After all, it had been roughly twenty years since a man had been a chancellor.

On October 21st the Bucknell Institute for Public Policy sponsored a panel entitled “Reflections on the German 2021 Bundestagswahl and the Merkel Era” which included members of the Bucknell faculty (Professors Jozwiak, Wilson, and Xydias)
as well as Dr. Sven Berger, from the German Federal government. Dr. Berger’s expertise is experiential as well as academic. He has spent over twenty-five years working in the Interior Ministry (Innenministerium) with various portfolios related to crime and criminality as well as border controls and immigration. He currently heads the aviation security division. He also spent a portion of his career working for the Social Democratic party engaged in policy research. He holds a PhD in political science as well as a degree in law.

The panel began with each presenter discussing one aspect of the election. Prof. Xydias began with an exploration of the structure of German elections. She emphasized the importance of the party vote, which determines the appointment of the chancellor, as well as discussing the various orientations of the parties involved. Moving along the political spectrum from right to left (very broadly speaking) is the Alternative for Germany (AfD), the Christian Democrats/Socialists (CDU/CSU), the Free Democratic Party (FDP), the Social Democrats (SPD), the Greens (Die Grünen) and the Left Party (Die Linke). Prof. Jozwiak’s considered the dynamics of the race through a presentation of public opinion polling over the preceding eighteen months, which largely traced the rise (and fall) of leading candidates. One noteworthy point about this election was that while party identification and platforms remained important, the rise of the personality politics was noteworthy, personal character took an added dimension of importance. The dynamic of the race was marked by the fall of the CDU candidate, Armin Laschet, who began the race with exceedingly high poll numbers (inherited from Merkel’s positively perceived handling of the pandemic) but which fell over time. His, and his party’s, numbers cratered in the summer of 2021 after a particularly damaging public appearance following the devastating floods in the states of Rhineland-Palatinate and North Rhine-Westphalia. The Green candidate, Annalena Baerbock, enjoyed a brief time at the top of the polls, but questions about her ability and background dogged her. Eventually, the SPD candidate, Olaf Scholz, consolidated support and solidified his lead through cautious actions and considered choices, reaffirming his nickname as the “Scholzomat.” In the end, the SPD ended with 25.7% of the vote, the CDU/CSU with 24.1%, the Greens with 14.8%, the FDP with 11.5%, the AfD with 10.3%, and the Left with 4.9%. With the election results in mind, Dr. Berger presented some thoughts on likely coalition partners, suggesting the likely winners forming a coalition “stop light” government (“Die Ampel”) which follows from the colors association with the parties—red for the SPD, yellow for the FPD, and green for Die Grünen) as well as pointing out some areas where cooperation was likely (spending more money on infrastructure, encouraging the digitization of society, and protecting the environment).

Looking ahead, all the panel participants agreed on this probability, as inter-party discussions and agreements were well underway. All also noted the uniqueness of the arrangement, too, as this was the first time in post-WWII history that three parties agreed to govern. Prof. Wilson’s presentation also considered the future by posing several possible directions for German foreign policy which began to assess the role of German without an internationally recognized figure leading its actions inside, as well as outside, of Europe. He discussed the challenges inside the EU and the implications for French-German collaboration, especially in light of Brexit. Prof. Wilson also raised the prospect of a potentially more independent German foreign policy vis-à-vis the United States, especially given the nearly universal distaste for the Trump administration in Berlin.

The panel then opened the discussion for questions from the attendees where two broad areas dominated. The first was the handling of the Syrian refugee “crisis” of 2015. Dr. Berger answered for the panel and considered the some of the thinking behind Merkel’s “Wir Schaffen Das” (We can do it!) statement, largely considering this in light of German history and responsibility, but also noting the relative success of the policy, even if there have been serious challenges. For instance, it was noted in the discussion that refugees were largely absent as an issue in the election. The second, unsurprisingly, was the German handling of the pandemic. Here it was noted by several panelists that there were significant differences between the US and Germany in how to manage testing, masking, verification of immunization status, as well as attitudes towards lock downs. Unlike the US, at-home tests were widely available and relatively inexpensive, masking on public transport and in shops, stores and businesses was common, the “Green Pass” was available for QR code verification of immunization to allow access to bars, clubs and sporting events. Like the mixed reactions in the US, lock downs were not liked, but unlike the US also recognized as being important, and protests against them were uncommon, at either the individual or group level.

Professor Joseph Jozwiak
Working for the World Affairs Council: Internship Reflections

This past summer I interned with the World Affairs Council of New Jersey (WACNJ), a public educational nonprofit. Though a satellite council of the World Affairs Councils of America network, WACNJ is relatively new, only founded in 2019. As a result, I had the ability to work directly with the president and founder of WACNJ as well as the Board of Trustees and one other intern. The mission of this nonprofit organization is to provide independent and engaging programming on global affairs to inform New Jersey citizens. While I discovered this opportunity through independent internship searches, this experience would not have been possible without the support of the Center for Career Advancement's Bucknell Public Interest Program (BPIP).

In this small office setting I had the opportunity to work on many of the organization's operations. For example, I helped to expand WACNJ's social media presence, doubled its social media engagement on Instagram and Facebook, and researched current events across the globe to feature on the organization's social media platforms. Furthermore, I was tasked with researching statistics on New Jersey's global connections and interests abroad. I used this information to design informative pamphlets on WACNJ's mission and significance. I also had the opportunity to launch WACNJ's first membership campaign and grow its membership base. This involved corresponding with past event attendees, community partners, and school teachers. In a similar manner, I was tasked with researching and contacting local venues as well as potential community partners for future events.

In addition, I researched topics that could serve as future event themes as well as potential speakers and interested partners who might want to be involved. As an international relations major, researching relevant topics and speakers was fascinating, especially given the shifting landscape of global affairs. I became further acquainted and familiar with significant topic areas in the field, including COP26, changing leadership in Germany, and refugee resettlement in New Jersey. Once we had a set idea for the fall and winter programming, I was tasked with writing the event descriptions, which was a valuable experience to improve my writing skills. My training as an IR major prepared me well for these tasks as many of our courses are writing intensive and emphasize the significance of independent research and the range of challenges facing the international community.

This experience has not only better acquainted me with the impacts of an interconnected globe on my home state, but it has also improved my interpersonal communication skills, a necessary ability for anyone hoping to embark upon a career path in a diverse and multifaceted field. Given the ever-changing landscape of global affairs and the uncertainty of the ongoing pandemic, we had to constantly stay on our toes to ensure that future programming was relevant, engaging, and safe and that the organization itself was able to grow. In essence, my experience this summer at WACNJ served as an invaluable opportunity for flexibility and professional growth.

Giuliana Ferrara '22
IR Faculty News

Over the summer, Professor Uçarer worked with Lielt Endeshaw ’22, who was the successful recipient of an Emergent Scholar Grant in summer 2021. Lielt worked on assessing whether Intergovernmental Organizations such as the United Nations can incorporate principles of positive peace into their peacekeeping work. During the fall, Professor Uçarer completed a chapter on the European Union’s Area of Freedom, Security, and Justice and is now working on a manuscript on waning solidarity practices in the European Union.


Alumni News

In this section, we highlight news from our alumni. Let us know what you are doing by sending us an email to international-relations@bucknell.edu. We would also welcome short submissions on projects or perspectives.

Jeanne Hey ’85. After three decades in academic positions at Miami University (faculty in political science & international studies; program director, interim dean) and University of New England (dean of arts and sciences, professor of political science & global studies, associate provost), I am leaving the comfort of a steady paycheck and a tenured position to launch my own business, Hey University, as a leadership development specialist in the higher-ed space. My experience teaches me that far too few department chairs, program directors, and even academic deans have the training and support required to be effective and visionary leaders in our industry. I have been developing this work over a number of years and am excited about this new chapter in my professional life.