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Welcome to the 2021 European Union Studies Association Asia Pacific (EUSAAP) conference!

We are very pleased that you join us for this hybrid conference which is hosted by the European Studies Association Australia and New Zealand (ESAANZ) based in Melbourne, Australia and Christchurch, New Zealand. The past 18 months have been a challenging time and we are hoping to see you in person at the 2022 conference. For now, this e-booklet contains important information on the conference organisation, programme and abstracts.

Timing
The conference session times in the programme are Australian Eastern Standard Time (AEST) which is GMT+10. Please ensure that you take this into consideration when logging in. We have done our best to accommodate different time zones so your presentation is hopefully at a somewhat reasonable time.

Virtual Sessions
The conference has two parallel streams, accessible via different links, located on the top of each days’ programme (see below). The sessions will be held via Microsoft Teams and you have the option of joining via your browser or downloading and installing the Microsoft Teams App (available for Mac as well). We suggest that you give it a try before your scheduled session starts.

Please note that the sessions will not be recorded.

Online Registration
This event is co-funded with the support of the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union, and in order to comply with grant requirements we need to provide attendance/registration lists. For this purpose, can you please register on Eventbrite for the conference? We greatly appreciate your support with this.

Eventbrite: https://www.eventbrite.com/e/eusaap-conference-2021-tickets-160913898803

Conference Google Drive
Due to technical limitations with the current EUSAAP website, conference papers will be collected via the conference Google drive.

In order to prevent and minimise potential technical issues with screensharing, presentations disappearing, etc we ask to you to upload your presentation to the conference Google Drive (link below). The Google Drive organisation is laid out below.

Google Drive: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZD-c98T3X6AP-B2l-M6EssOK0TuYX8mG?usp=sharing
The conference Google Drive is organised as follows:

Please check the programme below to find your session and stream.

Then go into the Google drive and navigate to the respective session under Final Papers, and upload your final paper there.

Repeat this process with your presentation under the 'PowerPoint Presentations' folder.

**COVID-19 Precautions**

In some places conference participants may gather in groups to participate in the event. We ask that you please follow local COVID-19 precautions, official guidelines and use, where available, official contact-tracing and registration tools. Thank you very much for your cooperation.
All times in this programme local time Melbourne, VIC, Australia, that is AEST (GMT+10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Stream A</th>
<th>Stream B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0845 - 0900</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="#">Click here to join the meeting</a></td>
<td><a href="#">Click here to join the meeting</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or call in (audio only)+61 3 9067 5001,,733608435#</td>
<td>Or call in (audio only)+61 3 9067 5001,,245459778#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia, Melbourne, Phone Conference ID: 733 608 435#</td>
<td>Australia, Melbourne, Phone Conference ID: 245 459 778#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900 – 1000</td>
<td>Session 1A EU-Asia I</td>
<td>Session 1B Smart Specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 – 1015</td>
<td>Short Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015 – 1115</td>
<td>Session 2A EU-Asia II</td>
<td>Session 2B Perceptions/ Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115 – 1130</td>
<td>Short Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130 – 1230</td>
<td>Session 3A International Relations I</td>
<td>Session 3B Economics I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 – 1330</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330 – 1430</td>
<td>Session 4A International Relations II</td>
<td>Session 4B Economics II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430 – 1445</td>
<td>Short Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445 – 1545</td>
<td>Session 5A International Relations III</td>
<td>Session 5B Economics III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545 – 1600</td>
<td>Short Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 – 1700</td>
<td>Session 6A International Relations IV</td>
<td>Session 6B EUNAP – Special Panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All times in this programme local time Melbourne, VIC, Australia, that is AEST (GMT+10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, 29 June 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to join the meeting Or call in (audio only) +61 3 9067 5001,,323710546# Australia, Melbourne Phone Conference ID: 323 710 546#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to join the meeting Or call in (audio only) +61 3 90675001,,703528595# Australia, Melbourne Phone Conference ID: 703 528 595#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0900 – 1000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1000 – 1015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1015 – 1115</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1115 – 1130</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1130 – 1230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 9A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 9B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEEC I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1230 – 1330</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1330 - 1430</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-Asia III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEEC II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1430 – 1445</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1445 – 1600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 11A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 11B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1600 – 1615</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1615 – 1630</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concluding Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to join the meeting Or call in (audio only) +61 3 9067 5001,,323710546# Australia, Melbourne Phone Conference ID: 323 710 546#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New EUSAAP 2022 Presidency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monday, 28 June 2021

#### 0845 - 0900  Welcome

Prof Bruce Wilson, RMIT  
Dr Serena Kelly, UC, ESAANZ, President  
Prof Martin Holland, EUSAAP Secretary, General

[Click here to join the meeting](#)  
Or call in (audio only) +61 3 9067 5001,  
Australia, Melbourne, Phone Conference ID: 733 608 435#

#### 0900 to 1000 - Monday, 28 June 2021

| Session 1A | Theme: EU-Asia I  
Chair: Prof Martin Holland |
|-------------|----------------------|
| Prof Taehwang Kim  
Dr Junghwan Cho | **Policy Implications of Changes in Korea-EU Trade and FDI** |
| Prof Hungdah Su | **Is the Europe-Asian Connectivity Plan Really an Anti-China Strategy?** |
| Ass Prof Mor Sobol | **EU-Asia Connectivity Strategy: A European Response to China’s Belt and Road Initiative?** |

| Session 1B | Theme: Smart Specialisation  
Chair: Prof Bruno Mascitelli |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bradley Davison</td>
<td><strong>Smart Specialisation in the European Union: A comparison of S3 practices in Germany and Romania and what Australia can learn from this</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Bruce Wilson</td>
<td><strong>Promoting Social and Scientific Innovation to Deliver on the UN Global Agenda: a difficult challenge for the new EU leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1015 - 1115 - Monday, 28 June 2021

| Session 2A | Theme: EU-Asia II  
Chair: Prof Martin Holland |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Cesar De Prado</td>
<td><strong>The effects of great power competition on regionalisms: contrasting dynamics in the higher education sector in Europe and in East Asia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Yunseo Jung</td>
<td><strong>BRI and Europe-Asia Connectivity: Friends or Competition?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haonon Ji</td>
<td><strong>European strategic autonomy: Contexts, Evolution and Controversies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 2B | Theme: Perceptions / Expectations  
Chair: Prof Bruno Mascitelli |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Suet Yi Lai</td>
<td><strong>How China views the EU in the new decade</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Ashleigh Alberts</td>
<td><strong>New Zealand Perceptions of The Netherlands and Ireland – A Comparative Study</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dr Serena Kelly  
Dr Mathew Doidge | **Perceptions of Development: The EU and China in the Pacific Media** |
## 1130 - 1230 - Monday, 28 June 2021

**Session 3A**  
**Theme:** International Relations I  
**Chair:** Dr Emma Shortis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Yoichi Nakagawa</td>
<td>Germany’s contributions to CSDP and its transformation in its role and orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Muhadi Sugiono</td>
<td>EU’s Strategic Agenda for 2019-2024: Projection EU’s Global Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ludovica Marchi</td>
<td>Micro communities of practice and EU’s foreign policy: Rome, Brussels and Paris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 3B**  
**Theme:** Economics I  
**Chair:** Prof Bruce Wilson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miss Meike Guenther</td>
<td>Consumer attitudes towards food attributes: a cross-country comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Driver</td>
<td>Changing consumer use of digital media and smart technology in relation to New Zealand’s food product exports in key international markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Nina Markovic and Dr Rémy Davison</td>
<td>Who wins? Who loses? The EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1330 - 1430 - Monday, 28 June 2021

**Session 4A**  
**Theme:** International Relations II  
**Chair:** Dr Binoy Kampmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Russell Solomon</td>
<td>Australia’s post-Brexit engagement with the UK and the EU: getting beyond trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richard Vogt</td>
<td>Coping with Political Ataxia in Europe’s Borderlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Nina Markovic and Dr Alexey D. Muraviev</td>
<td>Russia’s increased influence in the EU candidate states in the Balkans during the Covid-19 pandemic? A political/strategic assessment of Russia’s role and influence in the Balkans over the past 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 4B**  
**Theme:** Economics II  
**Chair:** Assoc Prof Gosia Klatt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Tomohiro Fukuda</td>
<td>The Enhancement of Accountability in EU Budgetary Process: Still the Decade of NPM?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Hideki Sato</td>
<td>European Harmonization of Banking Supervision: European Identity or International Context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Masahiro Ishii</td>
<td>Nord Stream 2 and the complex dynamics of the European energy political economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1445 - 1545 - Monday, 28 June 2021

**Session 5A**  
**Theme: International Relations III**  
Chair: Dr Matt Harvey  
- **Prof Kumiko Haba**  
  The UK and the EU after Brexit – Development and Prosperity through Cooperation with Asia  
- **Miss Lun Li**  
  The EU’s strategies on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons  
- **Dr Yongshu Li**  
  Exploring the UK’s Arms Trade with China after Brexit, and its Impact to EU-China Relations

**Session 5B**  
**Theme: Economics II**  
Chair: Dr Mathew Doidge  
- **Prof Chun Ding**  
  Challenges for the EU’s Economy in the shadow of the COVID-19 Pandemic  
- **Mr Haonan Ji**  
  Narrow, Shallow and Blue: Water Governance and the Sustainability of Intra-EU Agricultural Trade  
- **Assoc Prof Marco Brunazzo**  
  Why not differentiated? The EU differentiated integration and the Next Generation EU

### 1600 - 1700 - Monday, 28 June 2021

**Session 6A**  
**Theme: International Relations IV**  
Chair: Dr Maren Klein  
- **Mr Manoj Babu Buraga**  
  European Union in International Politics: Perception and Action  
- **Dr Csaba Barnabas Horvath**  
  The EU’s global role after Brexit  
- **Mr Yong-Jae Yoo**  
  Predicting the number of immigrants in the EU using machine learning techniques: Suggestions for EU immigration policy

**Session 6B**  
**Theme: EUNAP Panel - Rethinking EU-Asia Pacific relationships in the (post-)Covid-19 era**  
Chair: Dr Milenko Petrovic  
- **Prof Xiaotong Zhang**  
  The EU-China Vaccine Cooperation: Opportunities and Challenges  
- **Prof Francesco Alicino**  
  New perspectives for EU-Asia Pacific security and political cooperation in the post-Trump era  
- **Prof Beatriz Perez de Las Heras**  
  The European Green Deal: policies and financial tools to build a green alliance between the EU and Asia Pacific countries

**18.30 - 20.00**  
Conference dinner

---

**Tuesday, 29 June 2021**
### Session 7A  Theme: Climate Change
Chair: Prof Bruce Wilson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker/Title</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Hitomi Kimura</td>
<td>EU’s leadership on zero emission and youth/future generation as driver to implement the Paris Agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Emma Shortis</td>
<td>Lessons from Kyoto: Australia, Europe, and Global Climate (In)Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Kunjie Wang</td>
<td>Shaping the Circular Economy within the European Union Environmental Policies and Climate Change: Experiences, Challenges and Steps Forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session 7B  Theme: Member States I
Chair: Dr Nina Markovic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker/Title</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Maren Klein, Mr Damian Privitera</td>
<td>The German election 2021: wither Germany post-Merkel and post-pandemic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Bruno Mascitelli, Miss Jessica Quirk</td>
<td>Euroscepticism in the closet? Draghi suffocates the political division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Gosia Klatt</td>
<td>Poland’s education reforms in context of the European Education Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1015 - 1115 - Tuesday, 29 June 2021

### Session 8A  Theme: Covid-19 I
Chair: Dr Emma Shortis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker/Title</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Matt Harvey</td>
<td>Shot in the Arm or Stab in the Back? Vaccine Nationalism in the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Binoy Kampmark, Assoc Prof Petar Kurecic</td>
<td>Vaccine Nationalism, Competition and Covid-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Agata Wierzbowska</td>
<td>European banking sector and bank lending amid Covid-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session 8B  Theme: Member States II
Chair: Dr Nina Markovic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker/Title</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Dionysios Stivas</td>
<td>The Response of Germany to the European Refugee Crisis. A ‘Bottom-Up’ Silent Securitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatsu Yasuda</td>
<td>Cultural Policy of the EU in the age of challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter J. Hudson</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change Policy Interactions in the EU and Japan: Exploring Common Pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session 9A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130-1230</td>
<td>Dr Heli Askola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Jaehyun Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Edward Yencken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 9B</th>
<th>Theme: CEEC I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1330-1430</td>
<td>Mr Alexander Malkov</td>
<td>Russia’s relations with the V4 countries: A Real Threat to EU Integration or Making a Mountain out of a Molehill?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Milenko Petrovic</td>
<td>If not the EU, who?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Xiwen Wang</td>
<td>Does the presence of China endanger the EU’s role in post-communist Central Europe?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 10A</th>
<th>Theme: EU-Asia III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1445-1600</td>
<td>Dr César De Prado</td>
<td>Explaining the EU+’s growing presence in the Indo-Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Martin Sebena</td>
<td>Germany’s Political Economy and the Lack of a Common European Approach to China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Marcela Peric</td>
<td>Japanese Foreign Policy in Western Balkans: Kosovo crisis, instability in Macedonia, and European integration between 1998-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 10B</th>
<th>Theme: CEEC II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Shixin Du</td>
<td>The Risks of the Belt and Road Initiative in Eastern Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Matthew Coote</td>
<td>Social Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe: A Comparative Study of Social Democratic Parties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Session 11A | Theme: Regulatory Power  
Chair: Dr Serena Kelly |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof Mike Innes</td>
<td>Regulatory and administrative power and the development and application of artificial intelligence: The European Union and the professional application of psychology as a paradigm for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Anke Kennis</td>
<td>EU’s Regulatory Cooperation through Preferential Trade Agreements: proposing a new framework applied to the EU-Japan Economic Partnership Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Alexandr Svetlicinii</td>
<td>“Three Great Mountains” for the Chinese State-Owned Investments in the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Xiyin Liu</td>
<td>Analysing the EU’s external governance effort in greening the industrial production outside its neighbouring periphery: A China case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 11B | Theme: Integration Theories  
Chair: Dr Rémy Davison |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kenji Tomita</td>
<td>Re-thinking “transnational” anti-EU populism in 2010’s: Structural Developments of the European Parliament, Euro-parties and Political Groups as its historical context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Krzysztof Sliwinski</td>
<td>Between Identity and national interest – ‘Europeanism’ as an ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Agnieszka Cianciara</td>
<td>Will Covid-19 save or kill the EU? Exogenous shocks, partial exits and legitimacy politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Sang-Chul Park</td>
<td>The Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) and Its Future Perspectives in post-Covid Environment: Can it Be a Momentum to Multilateralism instead of Protectionism?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1615-1630</th>
<th>Concluding Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Click here to join the meeting  
Or call in (audio only)  
+61 3 9067 5001,,323710546# Australia, Melbourne  
Phone Conference ID: 323 710 546# |

| 1645-1745 | EUSAAP Presidents’ Meeting/ AGM |
New Zealand Perceptions of The Netherlands and Ireland – A Comparative Study

2018 saw the opening of new Irish embassies in Dublin and Wellington and the beginning of a new ambassadorship for the Dutch embassy in New Zealand (NZ) – her Excellency Mira Woldberg. This paper presents an analysis of how Ireland (IE) and the Irish as well as the Netherlands (NL) and the Dutch are perceived in NZ society. While the EU has not historically been regarded as one of the first-tier partners of NZ, there is an increasing strive for closer cooperation. Historically NZ has had a closer tie to the United Kingdom (UK), but in a post-Brexit world new partners are needed. The NL and IE are two partners that have been recognised by NZ as important new gateways into Europe. As a small nation state, NZ is highly dependent on international trade and diversification of its trade relationships, principally through Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). The focus on Asia is natural, given the geographical location, among other things, but the European Union has been NZ’s largest trading partner (MFAT, 2019). This paper brings together two unique perspectives that highlight historical and new ties, with a focus on like-minded partners, cultural ties, FTAs, and the impact on policies. This paper is guided by theories on public diplomacy, the cascading activation model (Entman, 2003), and perception studies.

Just about to complete her Master’s degree, Ashleigh is keen to keep the research going. Ashleigh has great interest in cultural diplomacy and strengthening relationships, as well as understanding perceptions and attachments of different diaspora within New Zealand (and further).

Ashleigh Alberts
University of Canterbury
National Centre for Research on Europe
Christchurch, New Zealand
ashleigh.alberts@pg.canterbury.ac.nz

EU Citizenship and Free Movement Post-Covid: Road to Recovery or Dead End?
The mobility regime guaranteeing free movement rights to EU citizens and their family members is often considered to be one of the most important and possibly the central right of EU citizenship. However, in 2020, most EU Member States responded to the COVID-19 pandemic with drastic restrictions to cross-border mobility, re-establishing internal border controls and introducing travel restrictions (including bans) that have significantly limited free movement. The high degree of disruption to cross-border movements raises important questions about the future of free movement rights and the Schengen area, while also
demonstrating Member States’ practical reliance on migrant workers in several essential sectors.

This paper asks what, if anything, the unprecedented closure of both internal and external borders reveals about the value of EU citizenship and free movement rights, the Union’s ability to protect these rights and Member States’ commitment to standards of legality and proportionality. It considers whether 2020 was an aberration, driven by uncoordinated emergency responses to the pandemic, or whether the crisis suggests that fundamental rights such as free movement and non-discrimination are no longer accorded the same priority in a post-pandemic world.

Dr Askola holds a doctorate in international, comparative and European law from the European University Institute in Florence, Italy. She has done consulting work for the International Organization for Migration, the European Commission and the European Parliament on areas such as trafficking in human beings, EU citizenship, children's rights, the regulation of hate speech and crime victims’ rights. Having left her native Finland in 2001, Dr Askola has since then worked for several years in Italy, the UK and is now based in Australia. Her background as an international migrant informs not only her research but her approach to teaching. Dr Heli Askola's central research theme is the study of the various legal, social and political practices through which states and international organisations, particularly the European Union, seek to manage increasing and diversifying migration flows and migrant inclusion and what these efforts mean for migrant-receiving states, their citizens and immigrants.

Assoc Prof Heli Askola
Monash University
Melbourne, Australia
heli.askola@monash.edu

BRUNAZZO, MARCO

Why not differentiated? The EU differentiated integration and the Next Generation EU

Just as homogeneous integration is not inevitable, so is differentiation. In other words, the EU is not inevitably led to integrate more and more homogeneously and it is not inevitably destined for differentiation (or even disintegration). The solutions adopted to overcome the economic crisis of 2008-2009 and those to overcome the pandemic of 2020-2021 show that in some moments prevails differentiation, in others homogeneous integration.
The aim of these pages is to explain why the 2008 economic crisis was overcome by adopting agreements not supported by all member countries (in particular the European Stability Mechanism and the Fiscal Compact) while that of COVID-19 led to the adoption of shared measures from all countries (in particular the Next Generation EU).

Marco Brunazzo is Associate Professor of Political Science at the Department of Sociology and Social Research at the University of Trento (Italy). His main areas of interest are the EU differentiated integration theory, the role of Italy in the EU, and participatory democracy. Jean Monnet Chair in European Studies, between 2011 and 2016 he directed the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence at the University of Trento. His most recent books are *La politica dell’Unione europea* (with Vincent Della Sala, Milano, 2020) and *Italy in the EU: A Rollercoaster Journey* (with Bruno Mascitelli, New York, 2020).

Assoc Prof Marco Brunazzo
University of Trento
Trento, Italy
Marko.brunazzo@unitn.it

**BURAGA, MANOJ BABU**

**European Union in International Politics: Perception and Action**

The European Union (EU) is a unique experiment in international co-operation. It is essentially organized network that involves the pooling or sharing of sovereignty. The EU is also projected as a non-traditional, unorthodox, rule-based and supposedly value-driven international actor, which plays first-of-its-kind role on the international stage. “Factor shaping the international role of the EU is not what it does or what it says, but what it is”. Despite the fact that the EU and the role it’s playing in international politics, it is quite necessary to understand and appreciate what the EU is and especially, what it is not. The EU is one of the unique forms of experiment in international politics – created to say no to war permanently – scholars believe that and it acts like that promoting herself as ‘civilian’, ‘soft’, ‘normative’ and sometimes as ‘ethical power’, ‘responsible’, ‘pragmatic’ and ‘quiet’ superpower, in international politics. And the EU offers itself as a model to others on the basis of its political and economic achievements and it has become the world’s brand-leader in peaceful political cooperation. Herman Van Rompuy, the then President of the European Council, in his first foreign policy speech at the college of Europe in February 2010, maintains: “EU need to review and strengthen its relationship with key partners, he considers India, Canada, China, Russia, Brazil, Japan and the United States are key partners. The present paper is attempts to study the
stand taken by the EU to build and play role in international politics and it will try to answer these research questions.

1. European Union known is for its values, images, and principles. Whether these values, images and principles are burden or strength to the Union.
2. Does EU have ability and capacity to become superpower in international politics? if so, what kind of role it will play in 21st century?
3. Is EU’s relations with third countries have any influence by EU Member States?

Mr. Manoj is currently Lecturer and teaching European History, at Department of Arts, Andhra Loyola College, India. He Has submitted his Doctoral thesis on ‘Indo-French relations in the Context of India-EU relations’ at the Centre for European Studies of Pondicherry University. His research is situated in the field of International Relations, with a special focus on European Integration, Indian Foreign Policy, Indo-French relations, Europe and Human Rights, India-EU relations, and Interregional and Regional Cooperation. He has received several important recognitions to his research career, including the University Grants Commission Grant and Indian Council for Social Science Research Grant from the Government of India. He has published articles in reputed journals for his credit. Also, presented numerous research papers at international conferences in India and in Abroad.

Manoj Babu Buraga
Pondicherry University
School of Social Sciences & International Studies
Pondichery, India
manojedu pu@gmail.com

CIANCIARA, AGNIESZKA

Will COVID-19 save or kill the EU? Exogenous shocks, partial exits and legitimacy politics
In 2020 the EU faced a major exogeneous shock: the COVID-19 pandemic. Recent literature on the rise and fall of international organizations (IOs) shows that IOs are usually 'killed' by major exogenous shocks that reduce the collective utility to states of adhering to existing institutions. This is thus an opportune moment to undertake in-depth scholarly reflection beyond the stalemate of European integration and into the nature of European disintegration beyond formal withdrawals such as Brexit. Scholars have already argued that subsequent full exits formally made under art. 50 TEU are unlikely, yet differential partial exits are possible. Against this background, the objective of the paper is to develop a theoretical framework to understand mechanisms of disintegration in the EU. This framework builds on Hirschman's concept of exit, voice and loyalty, emerging literature on differentiated disintegration in the EU and latest work on legitimacy and relevance of IOs. The main hypothesis is that the relationship between exogenous shocks and EU member states' partial exits is structured by
national-level legitimacy politics. The paper makes a threefold contribution to the literature. First, it provides added value to the emerging literature on IOs' decline and death that has thrived on the crisis of multilateralism and the advent of post-liberal order. Second, it makes a contribution to the burgeoning scholarship on differentiation in the EU, while offering a bridge with exit and voice literature and insights into IO's (de-)legitimization processes. Third, it critically engages with normative scholarship on the evolving nature of EU polity, increasingly subject to 'poly-crisis'.

Agnieszka Cianciara PhD is Associate Professor at the Institute of Political Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences (IPS PAS) and Head of Department of International Organizations and Global Security Studies. In 2016-2020 she was Deputy Director for Research at IPS PAS. In 2006-2011 she was member of the Faculty of the College of Europe. Her research interests include differentiated (dis)integration in the European Union, EU external action, legitimacy and legitimation of international organizations as well as European policy of Poland.

Assoc Prof Agnieszka Cianciara
Polish Academy of Sciences
Institute of Political Studies
Warsaw, Poland
agcian@isspan.waw.pl

COOTE, MATTHEW

Social Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe: A Comparative Study of Social Democratic Parties
Social democratic parties have experienced significant electoral decline throughout Europe, highlighted by recent defeats in national elections in Germany, the UK, and France. Less well known, however, is the situation in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) where social democratic and centre-left parties are also seemingly struggling to gain voter support.

This presentation examines the state of social democratic parties in contemporary CEE. A comparative study of electoral fortunes and a selection of case studies are employed to better understand the status of social democratic parties in the region. This provides the opportunity to consider local circumstances and enhance our understanding as to why social democrats are failing to present a platform that resonates with voters at large. Furthermore, social democrats and progressives in Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere, may be able to learn from what is happening in CEE.
Matthew Coote is a Research Officer at the European Union Centre of Excellence, Social and Global Studies Centre at RMIT University. In this role, Matthew is assisting with research and outreach for projects on regional policy and Smart Specialisation, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), innovation and trade while also currently researching contemporary election results in central and eastern Europe and the implications for social democracy.

Matthew Coote  
RMIT University  
European Union Centre of Excellence, Social and Global Studies Centre  
Melbourne, Australia  
matthew.coote@rmit.edu.au

**DAVISON, BRADLEY**

**Smart Specialisation in the European Union: A comparison of S3 practices in Germany and Romania and what Australia can learn from this**

The European Union through its normative power can significantly influence the policy making and research agendas of governments globally. As part of their Cohesion Policy investment from 2014-2020, regions seeking funding were required to adopt Smart Specialisation Strategies to build on each region’s strengths, support practice-based innovation and encourage stakeholder experimentation (European Commission, 2014). Smart Specialisation utilises a region’s local assets, experience, and work force, to find place-based solutions to innovation barriers that can be utilised by external economic systems (Antonelli & Cappiello, 2016). This has had varied success in the European Union, highlighted by the discrepancy between European countries such as, Germany and Romania.

Germany provides a good example from which to extrapolate what systems and mechanisms are required to successfully innovate and change whole industries. Conversely, Romania demonstrates how innovation practices can struggle. Inadequate institutional supports, governmental failings in promoting a culture of place-based innovation and research (Rodriguez-Pose & Di Cataldo, 2015), and research institutes focused on national level projects are some reasons for this (Bučar, Udovič, & Arbeiter, 2017). Utilising these two countries as examples, this paper will analyse what systems and environments are necessary to promote better innovation and foster a positive environment for Smart Specialisation and explore what implications this may have for Australian policy makers. The lessons learnt here are key examples of EU normative power, and lessons that Australia and other countries should heed. Smart Specialisation provides a method for innovation practices tailored to each
region, discovering what is required for this to be successful is not only useful for Australian policy makers and innovators, but also aids in the integration of European ideas globally.

Bradley Davison is a graduate of the Bachelor of Arts (International Studies) at RMIT University and is commencing his Honours in International Studies at the same institution. He is a research officer at the European Union Centre of RMIT and has been working closely with researchers at the Centre of Excellence in Smart Specialisation and Regional Policy and Gippsland Smart Specialisation Strategy (G-S3) projects. He is also the former president of the International Studies Association at RMIT University and is currently a committee member for the Contemporary European Studies Association of Australia.

Bradley Davison
RMIT University
European Union Centre of Excellence, Social and Global Studies Centre
Melbourne, Australia
Davison.Bradley97@gmail.com

DE PRADO, CESAR

The effects of great power competition on regionalisms: contrasting dynamics in the higher education sector in Europe and in East Asia

This presentation argues that great power confrontation negatively affects multidimensional regionalisms. The structural realist rationale is that great powers increasingly press members of regional processes to take sides. It compares developments in Europe with the efforts in East Asia since the end of the Cold War until the year 2020 in both general political alignments and in the higher education sector. In Europe, great power confrontation is largely gone despite some tensions with Russia in recent years. So, the Erasmus program of the European Union (EU) keeps growing alongside the complementary Bologna process. In contrast, the (People’s Republic of) China is rising, most noticeably in East Asia or the Indo-Pacific, where it increasingly confronts the United States and its allies and partners. Thus, a variety of interconnected networks and institutions of regional cooperation in the higher education sector involving Southeast, Northeast and South Asia remain weak and increasingly challenged by growing Sino-centric initiatives.

Explaining the EU+’s growing presence in the Indo-Pacific

The EU+, defined as the EU working in close collaboration with key countries within and around it, has in recent years been enhanced its role in Asia defined by a growing confrontation between the United States and the People’s Republic of China. This can be
seen, for instance, in the signing of deep economic agreements with countries in East and Southeast Asia. But also in military development and in the projection of capabilities in the critical conflict theater of the Indo-Pacific. Moreover, the EU+ is enhancing its strategic culture to be able to speak the language of power. How can Europe’s recent global concerns and projection often centered in Asia be characterized in terms of structural alignment? Is it aligning towards the US-camp or hedging hoping to maintain some freedom of action? How can Europe’s behaviour be explained? This contribution will argue that the main explanation resides in the growing set of flexible, network configurations of like-minded countries led by a core of countries.

Dr César de Prado is in 2020-21 a MOFA Fellow at the EU Centre in Taiwan (Department of Political Science of National Taiwan University) relaunching his academic career with several articles on Europe, China and Asia, and a book on the EU+ in great power competition. He received his PhD from the European University Institute in Florence, and accrus academic and professional experiences across Europe and East Asia, lastly as an associate professor at the Centre for European Studies in the Guangdong Institute for International Strategies, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies. He has published three books (including Global Multi-level Governance: European and East Asian Leadership, United Nations University Press), and has single-authored around 40 novel academic articles, book chapters and policy papers.

Dr César de Prado
Fellow at the Department of Political Science of National Taiwan University
cesar.deprado@pm.me

DING, CHUN
JI, HAONAN

European strategic autonomy: Contexts, Evolution and Controversies
European strategic autonomy has become one of the key most discussed concept in EU studies and it’s key to understand today’s EU. Yet its definition has caused much confusion even after major EU leaders attempt to clarify. The main-stream understanding which analyse the concept from a geopolitical perspective is somehow incomplete. This research investigates the history of the concept of “strategic autonomy” and figures out some of the similar political concepts in modern European history. Then it shows the historical and linguistic context of the current strategic autonomy concepts. Based on these contexts, the research examines the expanding application and changing meaning of the concept in EU as well as member state policies, communications and debates. By revealing the evolution of the concept, the research not only attempts to display the traditions, controversies and
dilemma within the concept but also suggests that a historical contextualism approach may be necessary for understanding the concept in different EU political expressions.

Challenges for the EU’s Economy in the shadow of the COVID-19 Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic has had severe and long-term impacts on the EU economy. It forced EU member states to lock-down measures, further worsening the economic situation in the European bloc. The pandemic not only disturbed the economic activities but also has worsened some of the EU’s economic problems. The pandemic has had a negative impact on extra and intra-EU trade. Moreover, data suggests that the economic gap between southern and northern Europe has widened. Also, European enterprises are facing rising default risk and member states governments are facing higher debt pressure. The EU’s problems have been further compounded by the sluggish global economy. In addition, EU’s economy may also face political and social challenges. Pandemic-induced GDP decline and the resulting rising unemployment have given rise to socio-political problems in the EU. And political uncertainties remain as the general elections of Germany and France is approaching. Yet the EU has created new development opportunities amid the shadow of the pandemic. With the help of SURE mechanism and Next Generation EU, the EU’s economy is recovering from the pandemic. In addition to fiscal aid, the EU has tried to help its member states transform their development model, by encouraging them to exercise more strategic independence, work out industrial policies and increase investment in the digital economy and the green industry. However, the effect of such measures largely depends on the control of the pandemic and the efficiency of implementation. The long-term consequences of the pandemic, such as public debt, may take years to counter.

Haonan JI is a student in Department of International Politics, School of International Relations and Public Affairs, Fudan University. He has served as President of Fudan Student Association for European Studies since 2018 and hold the position as an assistant of the Dr Seaker Chan Center for Comparative Political Development Studies since 2019. He was a member of the staff for the 2019 EUSA AP Conference in Fudan University. His research interests focus on China-EU Relations, EU-China People-to-People Exchange, and the intellectual history of international relations. He has published a few papers and book chapters concerning EU-China relations, Sino-EU People-to-People Exchange and European Studies in Fudan University. His recent publication is “Seventy Years of China-Europe Relations: Achievements, Challenges and Prospects” co–authored with Prof Chun DING based on the research project.

Professor Chun Ding, Dr of Economics, Jean Monnet Chair, director of Centre for European Studies/Centre for China-EU People-to-People Exchange Studies, Fudan University. He is vice President of Chinese Association of European Studies, Secretary General of Chinese Society for EU Studies, Routine Councillor of Chinese Society of World Economics, Vice President of Chinese Association of Social Security World Study Branch, Advisor Board of Chinese Journal of European Studies. He is the senior researcher in Institute of European integration studies.
Mr Haonan Ji  
Fudan University  
School of International Relations and Public Affairs  
Shanghai, China  
hnji16@fudan.edu.cn
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DRIVER, TIMOTHY

Changing consumer use of digital media and smart technology in relation to New Zealand's food product exports in key international markets

New Zealand is a geographically isolated country that relies heavily on maintaining market access for its exports of agricultural products. This export focus has shifted from traditional European markets to other international markets, particularly in Asia. This shift has highlighted the importance of understanding consumer use of digital media and smart technology in target markets for New Zealand food and beverage exports as a means of maintaining and enhancing market access via novel marketing and sales channels. This paper presents the results of consumer surveys conducted in the United Kingdom, China and Japan in 2015, 2019, 2020 and 2021, examining consumer attitudes to and the use of a range of digital media and smart technology tools for access information about and purchasing food and beverage products. This includes the use of online shopping, social media and mobile devices, as well as interactions with product barcodes, QR codes and microchip reading technology (RFID/NFC). showed growth in the use of all digital media and smart technology for this purpose over time across all markets, particularly China. The 2020 and 2021 surveys were carried out during the COVID-19 pandemic, with results showing only marginal changes in technology use during the pandemic. This research can assist New Zealand industries by informing them of possible opportunities for increasing their export returns by improving their market access via digital marketing and sales strategies.

Tim Driver is an applied economics researcher based at the Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit (AERU) at Lincoln University. His research investigates a wide range of economic, social and environmental issues with a specific focus on the New Zealand primary sector. One of Tim's key research interests is how digital media and smart technology systems can be implemented in-market to encourage and facilitate more sustainable consumption.
This includes the application of technology to all points of the value chain, particularly in communicating provenance and product information to consumers, as well as improving environmental and economic outcomes for New Zealand’s primary producers.

Timothy Driver  
Lincoln University  
Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit (AERU)  
Timothy.Driver@lincoln.ac.nz

DU, SHIXIN

The Risks of the Belt and Road Initiative in the Eastern Europe
Since Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) was initiated from 2013, the area of Eastern Europe has been one of the focused spots of the policies, and both positive views and risk recognitions have been discussed in the governmental levels and among researchers.

One of the concerning questions, about how far, the BRI can achieve the ‘New Type of International Relations’, also known as ‘Win-Win Cooperation’ proposed by China, has remained arguable, and lack of mutual understanding of the intention of BRI, could be conceived as a risk of the policy implement of BRI, especially in the area of Eastern Europe. In this paper, I will explore the risks are in the BRI projects, from an Eastern European perspective.

The methodology of this study includes case study of several projects of BRI, including the Serbia-Hungarian high speed train project. While Chinese government introduces the progress of this project in recent years, scholars especially in Eastern Europe remains critical thinking of the justice of the project. The source of the study is from the document published both on paper and online from 16+1 mechanism, Hungary, Serbia, and China, including statistics, political announcements and information of the projects and cooperation.

The argument of this study is as following: the frustration and the concern of the inequality in BRI could be a risk regarding to the BRI policies in the Eastern Europe. The perspectives and the roles of the Eastern European countries should be well considered by China, and the East European countries involved into the BRI.

Shixin DU has received the Ph, D. degree in Political Science from Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo in March, 2019. He also received the B. A. degree (Japanese Studies) from Xi’an International Studies University, China, and received the M. A. degree in Political Science from Aoyama Gakuin University. He is currently a research fellow in the Institute of International Communication, Japan Traditional Bureau, Mie, Japan, which also has research cooperation
with Aoyama Gakuin University. His research interest is Europe-Asia Relations, International History, Chinese Foreign Policy.

Dr Shixin Du  
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Mie, Japan  
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FUKUDA, TOMOHIRO

The Enhancement of Accountability in EU Budgetary Process: Still the Decade of NPM?  
This paper clarifies the contribution of the EU institutional improvement toward accountability and legitimacy in the European governance. The research especially focuses on the budgetary process, whereby different subcategories of accountability intertwine.

The new set of legislative procedures was consolidated after Treaty of Lisbon (ToL), and the allocation of the right to control the budget also modified, whereby the European Parliament can activate the budget-making competence regardless of subcategories of expenditure. Furthermore, Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF), which initially aimed at soft governance and circumvented the control by the European Parliament (EP), became a hard law that is subject to the control also by the EP. These innovations are sometimes positively evaluated in the context of New Public Management (NPM), the purpose of which is efficiency, even after ToL. However, in a general sense, NPM reform has been criticized for its excessive orientations for delegation and open competition, and some of the nation states started to reconsider the termination of NPM. Moreover, especially in Common Agricultural Policy, some preceding studies point out that the interinstitutional relations among the EU main institutions has been degraded after ToL, which could undermine the democratic accountability in the EU.

This paper shows that a series of incremental innovation and discussion on budgetary process after ToL has been pursuing the equilibrium between democratic accountability and administrative or managerial accountability, and by so doing enhancing process-oriented or ‘through-put legitimacy’, which was defined by Vivien Schmidt, in the EU. The first section discusses the relation between a set of subcategories of accountability and good governance or legitimacy in the EU. The second section explains a series of improvement of the budgetary process, especially about the operation of MFF, and clarifies its contribution toward EU managerial accountability. The final section analyses the interinstitutional discussion on budgetary process after ToL, and concludes that the EU has been trying to compensate for
what has not been enhanced in line with NPM, democratic accountability, and thus trying to legitimize the European governance.

Tomohiro FUKUDA is a PhD student in Graduate School of Political Science, Waseda University in Tokyo. He got a BA in Political Science (2018) and an MA in Political Science (2019) from Waseda University. His research interest is on the International Administration in the European Union. He is now working on the case studies on administrative resource management by the European Commission, and has published an article in Japanese – An Analysis on the Procedures for Implementing Measures of the International Public Policies in the EU: Competence Governance by the European Commission (The Study of Global Governance, 2021).

Mr Tomohiro Fukuda
Waseda University
Graduate School of Political Science
Tokyo, Japan
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GUENTHER, MEIKE

Consumer attitudes towards food attributes: a cross-country comparison
Understanding international consumer preferences and attitudes towards credence attributes in food products is important for countries like New Zealand that relies heavily on its agricultural exports. Over the last few decades, New Zealand’s export focus has shifted from traditional European markets to other international markets, particularly in Asia. It is therefore important to consider and understand the different cultures and preferences in these markets and how these preferences might have changed over time. This paper will present results from consumer surveys in the United Kingdom, China and Japan in 2015, 2019, 2020 and 2021. The surveys focus on how consumers in different markets respond to different attributes in food products; and the importance of factors affecting the key attributes of environmental quality, animal welfare, human health, social responsibility, traditional cultures and food safety and the relationship between them. Study results showed preferences for food attributes differ between countries but they did not change much between the years. The 2020 and 2021 surveys were undertaken during the global Covid19 pandemic; and results showed that consumers still considered credence attributes as very important in food during the pandemic.

This paper has been co-authored with C. Saunders, T. Driver, P. Dalziel, P. Tait and P. Rutherford.
Meike Guenther is a Research Officer at the Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit (AERU) at Lincoln University. She is currently working on a large government-funded project that assesses consumers’ understanding of the distinctive qualities of the physical, credence and cultural attributes of agri-food products that are “Made in New Zealand”. Her other research focus is on agricultural trade modelling and on regional economic development. Meike holds a New Zealand Masters in Applied Science and a German Postgraduate Degree in Economics and Social Science (Diplom-Ôkonomin).

Meike Guenther
Lincoln University
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New Zealand
meike.guenther@lincoln.ac.nz

HABA, Kumiko

The UK and the EU after Brexit —Development and Prosperity through Cooperation with Asia

There is still a lot of controversy about Brexit. In this paper, the author explores the roots of the problem and future directions from the relationship among EU, UK, Central Eastern Europe (CEE) and Relation with China. The decision that Britain has left EU is irrational. Is there a future for Brexit, which the locals and the aged people agree with and the young people disagree with?

Although in 2021, UK appeared to have a temporary advantage in developing a vaccine against Covid-19, it is unlikely that Britain will survive in Brexit. In the contemporary situation UK cannot operate economy well in one country. Furthermore, in UK, the expulsion of immigrants created a labour shortage, the state showed a vulnerability for the covid-19, and difficulties in economic recovery. On the other hand, where EU will go without Britain? Germany and France’s leadership are at stake, and the United States strongly opposes EU-China cooperation. It also shows vulnerability of EU. Meanwhile, CEE's internal rebellion against EU and its approach to China appear to divide EU into east and west, or south and north. Even within EU, there is a conflict between the elite and low-wage workers, and the division has not been easily resolved. How to evaluate the cooperation between “illiberal democracy” and China/Russia. China's "16(17) + 1" attempts submitted by Orban Victor in Hungary will be evaluated in the future EU. Will it be a crucial issue for the long-term integration and development? Although China's assistance to CEE has been successful to some extent, China itself is by no means stable against the Hong Kong or Taiwan issues. Does EU can maintain integration? EU is shaken between integration and division, especially the
relations among UK, EU itself, CEE and Asia. What kind of policy is required? Look for breakthroughs from various governance.

Kumiko Haba is Professor at Kanagawa University, President of International Studies Association Asia Pacific (2021-24), former President of the EUSA Asia Pacific 2017. Vice President of ISA (2016-17), Vice President of ISA Asia Pacific (2018-21). She is the Director of Institute for Global International Relations (IGIR) (2016-), Jean Monnet Chair of the European Union (2005-), Former Member of Science Council of Japan (2012-18), now Associate Member of SCJ (2018-24). She is a Visiting Scholar at Harvard University, USA (2011-12), European University Institute, Italy (2008), University of Paris, France (2004), University of London, UK (1996-97), and Hungarian Academy of Science, Hungary (1995-96, 2002). Her specialty is International Relations, International Politics, Comparative Politics between EU and Asia, Immigrants/Refugee/Minority questions, Human Trafficking, and Disparity -Poverty Questions under Neo-Liberal Global World. She wrote 70 books (including 16 English books & Proceedings, Editor, and Co-writer), and 218 articles.

Prof Kumiko Haba
Kanagawa University
Tokyo, Japan
kumihaba@sipeb.aoyama.ac.jp

HARVEY, MATT

Shot in the Arm or Stab in the Back? Vaccine Nationalism in the EU
The COVID pandemic has swept the world. The EU has been badly affected, though not as badly as the USA, Brazil and its former MS the UK. With amazing haste, researchers around the world have developed vaccines. These must then receive accreditation from national authorities before they can be administered to the people. There are debates about which vaccine is most effective, what the priorities for immunization should be, but also whether there should be export controls or “vaccine hoarding”. This is also related to whether the richer countries should ensure sufficient supply to the poor countries, especially those most at risk.

The EU struck an agreement with Pfizer, a German-based corporation and BioNTech, another German company, in November, 2020, for the delivery of 200 million doses, with the option for the EU to order 100 million more. This option was exercised in late December, 2020. The vaccine was to be produced at a plant in Belgium.

When it appeared that Pfizer could not deliver these on time, the EU began to talk of export controls, or at least notification of any plans to export before its own order had been delivered. This raised the spectre of “vaccine nationalism”. Italy has subsequently blocked shipments of the AstraZeneca vaccine to Australia.
Countries such as the UK and India have already made significant progress in vaccination. It will be interesting to observe the situation by the end of June, 2021 but meanwhile, these issues are worth exploring in the Asia-Pacific where Western vaccines will vie with Chinese and others for official favour and where national interest and global justice may conflict. Already, France has started vaccination in its Pacific territories.

Dr Matt Harvey obtained his PhD from Monash University on the constitutional development of the European Union. He is the co-author of “European Union Law: An Australian View” (LexisNexis 2008) and “Australian Constitutional Law & Government” (LexisNexis 2021). His major research interest is constitutional development in Australia and the EU.

Dr Matt Harvey
Victoria University
College of Law and Justice
Melbourne, Australia
Matt.harvey@vu.edu.au

HORVATH, CSABA BARNABAS

The EU’s global role after Brexit
With the results of the 2019 UK election, Brexit by 31st January 2020 virtually became a fait accompli. Besides the economy of the UK itself, a so far much less discussed, but no less important impact of it will be the one on the global role of the EU. With Brexit, the EU loses its’ strongest bluewater navy, one of its’ two permanent seats at the UN security council, and the most committed and powerful US ally among its’ ranks. Another consequence, also impacting the international role of the EU is that with Brexit the Franco-German tandem loses its’ most significant counterbalance within the block. Besides the internal dynamics of the EU, this may also change its’ foreign relations including relations with Asia. Post-Brexit EU will likely be somewhat weaker, and less US-oriented.

Csaba Barnabas Horvath obtained his university degree in History at Eötvös Loránd University in 2010, and his PhD degree at the International Relations Doctoral Program of the Corvinus University of Budapest in 2014. He participated in visiting research programs in Australia, China, Malaysia, Singapore and Taiwan. He is right now a researcher at the Silk Road Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, where his main research focus is geopolitics.

Dr Csaba Barnabas Horvath
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Silk Road Research Group
Energy and Climate Change Policy Interactions in the EU and Japan: Exploring Common Pathways

The EU is in the forefront leading the rest of the world, in terms of agenda setting with its pathbreaking policies in energy and climate action. The European Commission’s “European Green Deal”, to de-couple economic growth from resource use and to run its economy on net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, being the latest. The EU had earlier formulated the “2030 Climate and Energy Framework”, which set in the targets for the EU climate and energy policies in the 2020-2030 period, again a policy which was a runner towards agenda setting for the 2015 UNFCCC` Paris Agreement.

On the other hand, Japan though it had made strides in climate action in the late 1990s, had withdrawn from affirming its earlier commitments until recently. This was evident when it refused to ratify its Kyoto Protocol second commitment period targets. Though later on it had signed the 2015 UNFCCC` Paris Agreement, increasing fossil fuels share in its energy mix had made a dent on its climate action prospects. This dilemma in the Japanese policy circles, where evident in its two Strategic Energy Plans released, post 3.11. Yet the October 2020, commitment by PM Suga towards a long-term vision of reducing GHG emissions to zero, has aligned Japanese energy and climate policies to that of the EU, as envisioned in the “European Green Deal”, to a large extent. The EU and Japan has been engaged in exploring “cooperative mechanisms” and “energy dialogues” in the last couple of decades. This is also evident from its increased exchanges in the energy sector viz. renewables and nuclear, cooperation and technology exchanges in fuel cells, hydrogen systems and so on. The paper intends to look at the commonalities in the EU and Japan`s energy and climate policy interactions and will trace the path traversed until now and will look at the avenues and prospects for future cooperation as well.

Peter J. Hudson is a Researcher affiliated to the Institute of Global International Relations, Aoyama Gakuin University. He is a PhD candidate at the Dept. of East Asian Studies, University of Delhi, India; working on the political economy of the Japanese energy sector. He was a recipient of the PhD Research Fellowship grant from the Japan Foundation in 2017. Previously he was a Research Associate, at the Institute of Chinese Studies (ICS), Delhi, India, 2011-2015. He has an M. Phil. degree in East Asian Studies, from the Dept. of East Asian Studies, University of Delhi. He received his Master’s degree in International Management (MIM), from Pondicherry University, India. His research interests include, historical development of the Japanese Energy sector, political economy of the Japanese nuclear energy sector, the

Peter J. Hudson
Visiting Researcher, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo
PhD Candidate, Department of East Asian Studies, University of Delhi, India
joy.peterhudson@gmail.com

INNES, MICHAEL

Regulatory and administrative power and the development and application of artificial intelligence: The European Union and the professional application of psychology as a paradigm for the future

The digitization of work and significant future changes in the nature of the workforce affects thinking across the globe with respect to who will work, what work will entail and how governments will be able to control change. The development of artificial intelligence is recognized as a significant threat to work as well as a facilitator of change. The European Union has taken a lead in the development of regulatory power in the area. We examine what those regulations are and how they may affect the future development of AI and working conditions. We take psychology as an example of work that may be impacted by developments in AI. Psychology is a profession that is almost universally conceived to be relatively immune from the predations of automation due to the high level cognitive and emotional skills that are believed to underlie professional competence. We demonstrate that psychology may not be as immune as is generally thought and the development of administrative and regulatory practices for the training of psychologists and their subsequent employment may increasingly put psychology under threat as a “safe” profession. Europe has regulated and commodified the practices of psychology and psychological training and hence has magnified the threat of replacement of those practices by AI. Regulation may hasten the processes of takeover of work and the subsequent damage to the viability of the profession as well as facilitate those processes and governments need to be mindful of these consequences.

This paper is co-authored with Callum K. Innes.

Callum Innes is a graduate in politics and economics from the University of Bristol and is currently a corporate government analyst with the Investment Association in England.

Mike Innes has a PhD in social psychology. He has been a professor of psychology in public and private higher education institutions in the US, UK and Australia and a Dean of Arts at the
JUNG, YUNSEO

BRI and Europe-Asia Connectivity: Friends or Competitors?
Regional integration has been one of the most prominent issues around the globe. Although in modern days many countries pursue economic integration and cooperation with their respective partners, there are still many obstacles regarding political integration. This research tries to search for opportunities of potential political integration through the leadership of a dominant power, by focusing on the European Union’s Europe-Asia Connectivity Strategy and the Chinese Belt-and-Road Initiative (BRI).

The research delves into the commonalities and differences of the Europe-Asia Connectivity Strategy and the BRI by cross-analyzing the two in accordance with a theoretical reference point. The main commonalities that we identified were on the general aims and project plans; which include the creation of hard and soft infrastructure and increasing human connections. Nevertheless, there are striking differences that stem from the economic and political differences between the two regions, and their methods of project management. This can be best described as the European way of project “cooperation” and the Chinese way of project “coordination”. While the largest distinction between Europe-Asia Connectivity and BRI is their way of project management, we also identified other differences such as each projects’ geographic scope, and their main underlying political drive.

Based on the analysis of the commonalities and differences, we move on to examine the implications and prospective sustainability of each project. Moreover, the EU’s temptations and hesitations regarding engagement with China are examined. They include the certain merits that are derived from being more engaged with their 2nd largest trading partner, and the hesitations that come from China’s biased attitude and lack of transparency. We conclude by asserting that the Europe-Asia Connectivity Strategy and the BRI are only compatible when they start favoring cooperation over competition. Rivalry and coercion should be refrained in order to establish a win-win situation, and both strategies must be directed towards a more feasible and sustainable direction.
Yunseo Jung is a senior at Korea University where she is majoring in International Studies and double majoring in Business Administration. Her study abroad experience at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill strengthened her interest in the field of development cooperation, not limited to political but also economic cooperation. She hopes to pursue a career in business consulting in developing countries, to help public and private organizations with operations, financial projections, and business planning. To further her experiences, she interned with Smilegate Inc. in the development strategy department and has worked with LG International as well as SK Telecomm on new venture development. In her spare time, she enjoys performing with her collegiate acappella group.

Miss Yunseo Jung
Korea University
Seoul, Korea
yunseojung11@gmail.com

ISHII, MASAHIRO

Nord Stream 2 and the complex dynamics of the European energy political economy
The current situation surrounding the Nord Stream 2 is a dimension of complex dynamics of the European energy political economy. Many scholars and practitioners have shed light on this and relevant subjects for years from many approaches. One of these approaches is put of importance to the geo-political and strategic point of view. This so-called realist approach is much linked with how states regards supplier countries in terms of security concerns. On the other hands, another approach focuses on the function of market mechanism. This liberal-market approach is considering that more functioning energy market physically and regulatory is a key to achieve more resilient energy security conditions for Europeans. Recent scholars have shared that this dualistic understanding has many bottlenecks and has indicated the necessity to bridge these gaps. In addition to this, current European energy market is time of transformation, such as the pressure of decarbonization, the increased production in the United States, more competitive LNG supply to Europe, and so forth. Such reality is well observed from the political economy of the Nord Stream 2. Therefore, this case study follows the political process around the project and try to show the logics and motivations of actors, such as European Union (Commission, Council, Parliament), Member States of the EU, Russia, Ukraine, United States, and industry and relevant sector players.

Masahiro Ishii is a Ph.D. Candidate in International Relations program and Collaborative Program on EU Studies at Graduate School of Law at Hitotsubashi University. He was a Visiting Scholar at University of Leuven (2014, 2015), a Research Intern at the Leuven Centre for
Global Governance Studies (2015), and a Teaching Assistant at School of International and Public Policy and an academic Tutor at Hitotsubashi University (2014 - 2019). He has a BA (Laws) from Chuo University in Tokyo (2014) and a MA (Laws) from the Law and International Relations program and collaborate program on EU Studies at Graduate School of Law, Hitotsubashi University (2016). He was Caucus Chair of the Graduate Students Study Groups of the Japan Association of International Relations (2017-2019). His research interests focuses on Global Energy Governance, International Political Economy, EU policies, energy infrastructure, stakeholders in energy sector.

Masahiro Ishii
Hitotsubashi University
International Relations and EU Studies at Graduate School of Law
Japan
masahiro.ishii@outlook.com

JACKSON-JIN, JAI

Narrow, Shallow and Blue: Water Governance and the Sustainability of Intra-EU Agricultural Trade

Faced with growing populations and a changing climate, national governments confront increasing demands for, and variability of, water supplies. In the EU, water resource management is grounded in the principle of subsidiarity, placing river basin responsibilities in the hands of governments. This further complexifies regional water governance in the EU. As a key factor input for agricultural production, water is virtually embedded in agri-food products which manifest as international agricultural trade flows. The EU is the world’s largest exporter and second-largest importer of agri-food products, with the value of imports from other EU member states more than two and a half times that of imports from non-EU countries.

Examining water management from an international politico-economic perspective, this paper aims to determine the extent to which the current structure of EU water governance supports the sustainability of agricultural trade between member states. The paper conducts a two-level analysis, examining the relationship between agriculture and water management in six case-study EU member countries. It then examines the impact of the broader structure of EU water governance in intra-EU agricultural trade. Having identified the tensions between sustainability and profitability in the management of agricultural water as an economic good in case-study countries, the results showed that the current structure of water governance fails to support the sustainability of agricultural trade between member states. In addressing the relationship between agriculture, water and trade at the EU-level, this paper develops an
analysis of ‘virtual water’ flows between member states to gain an improved understanding of the impacts of agriculture and water management beyond the river basin.

Jai Jackson-Jin is a Teaching Associate in the School of Social Sciences at Monash university, where she was awarded First-Class Honours in Politics and International Relations in 2020. Her research is focussed on the area of global water governance, examining the impacts of growing water insecurity on the political and economic sustainability of international agricultural trade in the EU. In 2020, she won the Rufus Davis Memorial Prize for the best Honours thesis in Politics and International Relations at Monash.

Ms Jai Jackson-Jin
Monash University
Melbourne
jai.jackson-jin@monash.edu

KAMPMARK, BINOY
KURECIC, PETAR

Vaccine Nationalism, Competition and COVID-19
This paper concerns itself with the topic of vaccine nationalism. While the COVID-19 pandemic has been said to be an institutionally transformative one in terms of realigning policies and priorities in what is claimed to be a grand “reset”, the arguments presented here challenge the proposition. Rather than pooling global resources and overcoming the disadvantages faced by indigent and developing countries, wealthier countries have sought to invest and accumulate viral doses far in excess of what is required. The COVAX global allocation plan, run by the Gavi alliance, was intended as a global, cooperative effort to distribute vaccines cheaply to member states. Gavi vaccine alliance CEO, Seth Berkley, called the collaboration unique, with 170 countries comprising 70 percent of the globe’s population. It “has the world’s largest and most diverse portfolio of COVID-19 vaccines, and as such represents the world’s best hope of bringing the acute phase of this pandemic to a swift end.”

This vision has been optimistic. The European Union has embraced the idea that “no one is safe till everyone is safe.” Equitable and fair access to vaccines is encouraged. EU Member states have pledged 850 million euros for the purchase, securing and delivering of vaccines to low and middle-income countries through the COVAX facility. Despite this, instances of vaccine nationalism abound. The EU, for instance, invoked Northern Ireland Brexit emergency powers in a confrontation with the UK over vaccines, threatening to impose export controls on vaccines that might threaten supply to Britain.
The COVAX has also not done away with the problems of vaccine bilateralism. Paul Hudson, CEO of Sanofi, sees the US “right to the largest pre-order” of the first vaccine as manifest destiny. Adar Poonawalla, chief executive of the Serum Institute of India, which by volume is the largest maker of vaccines, is also clear that “the vaccine, at least initially, would have to go to our countrymen before it goes abroad.” Countries who have the cash and the means are looking out for their own.

With the Trump administration, initial interest being shown in discovering, developing and distributing vaccines only for US citizens. The choice also facing certain countries has varied depending on geopolitical considerations. China’s Sinopharm and Russia’s Sputnik V are being distributed with self-interest in mind. Sinopharm has been interpreted as an act of vaccine diplomacy and saving face for Beijing’s perceived role in inadequately combating the virus. In some countries, vaccine options are limited through political preferences and economic limitations. To that end, it looks likely that traditional political and power considerations will prevail in efforts of countries to vaccinate their populations, marring efforts at cooperation and collaboration.

Dr Binoy Kampmark is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Global, Urban and Social Studies at RMIT University. He is a former Commonwealth Scholar at Selwyn College, Cambridge and contributing editor to CounterPunch. Email: bkampmark@gmail.com

Dr Petar Kurečić is Assc. Prof of Political Science at the University North, Croatia and recipient of several mobility grants (ERASMUS+, CEEPUS, DAAD) coordinates the Small States in the Multi-Polar World international research group.

Dr Binoy Kampmark
RMIT University
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Melbourne, Australia
bkampmark@gmail.com

Assoc Prof Petar Kurečić
University North
Political Sciences
Croatia
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KELLY, SERENA
DOIDGE, MATHEW

Perceptions of Development: The EU and China in Pacific Media

The EU’s High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy recently announced that “The EU needs a strategic approach for the Indo-Pacific.” The statement acknowledged the increasing importance of the Indo-Pacific region and the need to “keep the regional order open and rules-based” as well as the importance of trade, investment and security links.
Curiously, little mention is made of the region representing the countries in the Pacific Islands Forum. Yet, the countries that make up the South Pacific have found themselves increasingly courted by third countries, such as the EU and China who wish to influence the region economically, politically and socially. This paper firstly outlines the different approaches of the EU and China as development actors in the Pacific, before going on to measure the visibility and portrayal of China and the European Union in the Pacific media. Initial findings show that the EU is more associated with other actors in the region and is more transparent about where development aid is directed. Finally, we find that there has been very little critical analysis of both actors’ engagement with the Pacific Islands, indicating that governments there are very reliant on the aid provided and feel unable to criticise the aid providers.

Dr Serena Kelly is a senior lecturer in The Politics of the European Union and deputy director of the National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury. Serena also chairs the Christchurch branch of the New Zealand Institute of International Affairs and is Vice-President of the European Studies Association of Australia and New Zealand (ESAANZ). Serena has been a project leader of, and contributor to, a number of external EU perceptions research projects, including on perceptions of the EU in the Asia-Pacific. These projects examine Elite, Media and public opinion perceptions of the EU. Her current research includes an examination of EU’s visibility in, and impact on, the implementation of the SDGs in the Pacific. Serena’s findings have been widely published and she is a regular contributor to local NZ media outlets on EU issues. Her research interests include: European diplomacy, international political communication and Europe’s relations, presence, impact in and, with the Asia Pacific.

Dr Mathew Doidge is a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Canterbury’s National Centre for Research on Europe (New Zealand). His research interests include EU external relations, regionalism and interregionalism, development, the development policy of the EU, and Europe–Asia relations. He is currently participating in a range of EU-related research networks, including Jean Monnet networks on European Union-Asia Pacific Dialogue: Promoting European Integration and Mutual Knowledge Across Continents (EUNAP) led by the University of Deusto, and on Social and Scientific Innovation to Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals led by RMIT. He is also leading a Jean Monnet Project: HUI-EU. His research has appeared in a range of journals, including the Journal of European Integration, the European Journal of Development Research, and the European Higher Education Review. He is the author of two books: The European Union and Interregionalism: Patterns of Engagement (Ashgate, 2011); and (with Martin Holland) Development Policy of the European Union (Palgrave, 2012).
KENNIS, ANKE

EU’s Regulatory Cooperation through Preferential Trade Agreements: proposing a new framework applied to the EU-Japan Economic Partnership Agreement

Ever since the stagnation of the Doha Round the WTO multilateral trading system has been lacking progress. It is therefore no surprise that preferential trade agreements (PTAs) are being negotiated with actors eager to further liberalise their market. An important aspect of that liberalisation is the elimination of non-tariff barriers (NTBs) through regulatory cooperation (RC). Despite RC in PTAs becoming more prevalent, there is no framework yet to measure the level of RC present in PTAs. The OECD has defined 11 levels of RC but PTAs are only part of the list and not studied as a mechanism in se. In this paper I propose a new framework that can gauge the level of RC in several recent PTAs such as CETA, EU-Japan EPA, EU-South Korea free trade agreement and the EU-Singapore free trade agreement. The framework ranges from weak RC like ‘de facto/informal cooperation’ to ‘mutual standard-setting’. As a case-study we take a closer look at the EU-Japan EPA and how far-reaching the RC has been developed and why such level was possible.

Anke Kennis is originally from Belgium. She has studied law at the Catholic University of Leuven. After her bachelor she completed her Masters of International Cooperation Policy at Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University in Beppu, Japan. Afterwards, she worked as a consultant in Tokyo for several years before joining the doctoral programme at the graduate school of political science at Waseda University, Tokyo.

Anke Kennis
Waseda University
Graduate School of Political Sciences
Tokyo, Japan
kennisanke@fuji.waseda.jp

KIM, TAEHWANG

CHO, JUNGHWAN

Policy Implications of Changes in Korea-EU Trade and FDI

Due to spread of the Trumpean trade protectionism, Korea-EU trade has been facing to the non tariff barriers as well as protection tariff. Since the Korea-EU FTA in 2012, the bilateral
trade has been developed but it is necessary to extend not only the quantity but the quality of the overall trade, especially in improving the trade remedy investigation and measures system. Korea and EU need to promote more actively the FTA and its implementation procedures. The two countries need to utilize a synergy effect in activating the bilateral FDI related to the trade. In order to turn down the Trumpian trade protectionism, we have to reinforce the multilateral free trade movement as well as the bilateral trade. EU has to play an important role against global protectionism trends issued by the Trump administration. The paper aims to analyse recent trends of the Korea-EU trade and FDI and to suggest the policy implications to recover the global trade as well as the Korea-EU economic cooperation.

Prof. Taehwang Kim, former President of EUSA Korea, is teaching and researching at Myongji University, Dept. Of International Trade and Business. He is interested in the researches of trade policy and development cooperation issues as well as European economic integration.

Dr Junghwan Cho, former Research Professor, the Institute for Future Growth, Korea University is researching at Econovisor Co., Ltd. He is interested in the research fields of trade policy, foreign direct investment, exchange rate movement as well as the economic effect of 4th Industrial revolution.

Prof. Taehwang Kim
Myongji University
Dept. Of International Trade and Business
ecothk@mju.ac.kr

KIMURA, HITOMI

EU’s leadership on zero emission and youth/future generation as driver to implement the Paris Agreement?
The COP25 in Madrid, Spain, could not unfortunately reach an agreement on the remaining rules to fully implement the Paris Agreement from 2020, but only to end up with loose COP decision. Zero emission target with the upgrade of nationally determined contribution (NDC) and the role of the youth will be highlighted at the historical COP26 rescheduled in 2021 due to the global outbreak of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, in Glasgow, UK, preceded by the 16th Annual Conference of Youth (“COY16”). In addition, the “Youth for the Climate” event or the Youth Summit will take place, prior to a Pre-COP meeting in Milan, Italy. Could EU take leadership for the next steps?

As the global and regional climate risks are visible, the youth started to walk on the streets in the world, insisting climate justice to cope with the current climate crisis and avoid the future possible risks, which affect younger generations more seriously than adults, and the world also started to hear the voices of the youth. This youth action led to the breakthrough of the
Green Party in the 2019 European Parliament election and those of member states and accelerated their decisions to upgrade the long-term emission reduction targets to zero emission/carbon neutral by 2050.

The direct action by the youth revealed that the current democratic system represented by adults or traditional norm of intergenerational equity needs reconsideration theoretically and practically to challenge the global climate risks. Climate litigations by the youth also touches upon the issue of intergenerational equity or climate justice, however, intergenerational equity is currently limited as moral, but not yet has been developed as legally effective norm.

The paper focuses on EU’s leadership on zero emission and youth/future generation as driver to implement the Paris Agreement.

Hitomi Kimura is an Associate Professor in international and domestic environmental law at Otsuma Women’s University, Tokyo. Her research covers the implementation of international/EU environmental laws in member states and Japan. She also worked in IGES as a researcher/fellow, taught at Graduate School of the University of Tokyo, as part-time Lecturer, stayed at Aix-Marseille University, as short Visiting and Institute of Comparative Law of Waseda University, as Adjunct Researcher. She currently serves as Chair of Outreach Committee of the Japan Chapter of the Asian Society of International Law and the Secretary of Kanto Subcommittee of the European Union Studies Association-Japan.

Assoc Prof Hitomi Kimura
Otsuma Women’s University
Tokyo, Japan
kimura@otsuma.ac.jp

KLATT, GOSIA

Poland’s education reforms in context of the European Education Area

In September 2020, the European Commission published a strategic document: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on achieving the European Education Area by 2025 (European Commission, 2020). It included six policy dimensions representing specific set of values and assumptions for education policies of members states. While the Commission President argued that European Education Area “aims to bring to the education and training communities the support they need to fulfil their fundamental mission” (ibid. p.1) it seems the objectives and goals of some national education systems in Europe have been increasingly de-Europeanised and may be impossible to integrate into the EU common vision of education policy.
Since 2004 accession to the EU, Poland, like many other post-communist countries, have gone through a significant process of Europeanization (Radaelli 2004). In this process, the European values, policies and institutions have been an important reference point for the legitimacy of major national system reforms. In education, Poland adjusted its higher education structures according to the Bologna Process, introduced European-focused studies, modernised its governance structures and committed to European benchmarks in early childhood, youth and lifelong learning. Nevertheless, the ideas of nationalism and populist politics have been increasingly present in Poland and other European member states. In Poland, since 2015 the populist right-wing government has undertaken wide-spread reforms across variety of sectors including re-nationalisation of industry, judicial reform and education. Political narrative arguing for these reforms refers to the importance of shaping national values and beliefs through education.

This paper is interested in the process of de-Europeanization of national education policy through the analysis of Polish national reforms of education, policy re-alignment and the new discourses legitimising these policies. De-Europeanization is understood broadly as “the loss or weakening of the EU/Europe as a normative/political context and as a reference point in domestic settings and national public debates” (Aydin-Düzgit & Kaliber 2016, 5). In such a process, legitimacy to carry out reforms is no longer sought through reference to the EU and the policy discourse and policy agenda deliberately refrain from referring to the EU documents and policies. The paper will focus on the agenda-setting and agenda-framing (Princen, 2018) of education in Poland to unpack education ‘problems’, policy objectives and policy solutions, identified by the national governments since 2011, to understand the process of Europeanising and de-Europeanising of education policy in Poland. It will attempt to understand the dynamics of the process of European integration in the area of education and the reality of integrating national policies within the common European Education Area.

Gosia Klatt is an Associate Professor at the Centre for Vocational and Educational Policy at the University of Melbourne. She has political science background but her current academic and practical interest lie in the field of education policy in Australia and Europe. She has recently completed a project where she was a Chief Investigator of the Australian component of the Horizon 2020 research project developed with a consortium of nine European universities led by the University of Nottingham titled Encouraging Lifelong Learning for an Inclusive & Vibrant Europe (ENLIVEN). Her latest book with M. Milana and S. Vatrella published in 2020 by Palgrave Macmillan is titled: Europe’s Lifelong Learning Markets, Governance and Policy. Using an Instruments Approach. She is currently leading a Jean Monnet Module “Education Policy in Practice (EPP) - European education policy and national systems” co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union (2020-2023).

Assoc Prof Gosia Klatt,
University of Melbourne
KLEIN, MAREN

PRIVITERA, DAMIAN

The German election 2021: wither Germany post-Merkel and post-pandemic?

On 26 September 2021 Germany, the EU’s largest economy, will elect a new federal government. With Angela Merkel stepping down after 16 years as Chancellor, no clear successor in sight, an economic downturn due to COVID-19, socio-economic impacts of the pandemic still unfolding, and six state elections preceding the federal election uncertainties abound, both domestically but also more broadly for Europe and the EU.

While Merkel’s Christian Democratic Union (CDU) with its Bavarian sister party, the Christian-Social Union (CSU) is expected to win the largest share of votes, the economic fallout from a lockdown extended numerous times might not only seriously damage voters’ trust in the CDU/CSU, it might also drive some potential voters to the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) with its nativist narrative.

Even if the CDU/CSU retains its lead, with Merkel retiring and the new party leader only elected in January, it is far from clear what the party’s new direction will be. Moreover, it is highly likely that the party will need to forge a coalition with one or more other parties in the parliament. This may influence policy post but also pre-election in areas such as climate, migration, foreign policy and others, thus impacting not only on Germany but on Europe and the EU more broadly. This presentation will explore parties, candidates, possible coalitions and their impact on Germany’s policies.

*This paper is co-authored with Mr Damian Privitera, RMIT*

Maren Klein is a researcher at the EU Centre of Excellence at RMIT University in Melbourne. Originally trained as a secondary teacher in Germany, she has worked as a teacher and lecturer, in curriculum and education policy development, and a in higher education regulation. Her PhD explored mobility between Australia and Germany. Her current research interests include international relations, the European Union, the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals, governance, and transnational education.

Damian Privitera is currently studying International Studies at RMIT University. His interests include European diplomacy, international relations, climate change, renewable
energy and cross-cultural engagement, with a particular focus on German politics and language.

Dr Maren Klein  
RMIT University  
EU Centre of Excellence  
Melbourne, Australia  
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RMIT University  
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KURECIC, PETAR

The Overview of the Impact of the EU Membership on Croatia with Lessons that could be used by the Western Balkans States in the Post-COVID-19 Era

The former communist states of Central and South-Eastern Europe at present are mostly NATO/EU member states. The Western Balkans states have a declared European perspective. However, the economic situation in the Western Balkans is not optimistic, with bleak prospects for rapid economic development. It is not probable that the investment boom and GDP growth experienced in the “New Central Europe” in the pre-accession period will be repeated. The emigration from the Western Balkans states will most likely increase due to the gradual opening of the labour market in the EU member states. The EU Strategy for the Western Balkans was revealed in February 2018. The Bulgarian and Romanian presidencies of the EU have put the Western Balkans high on their priorities list. What could be the major implications of the accession to the EU for these states? Poor economic results and their negative demographic impacts, which have mostly annulled the positive effects of the EU membership for Croatia, are presented here, with predictions what might occur in the Western Balkans, if socio-economic development is not comprehensively encouraged and financed by the EU. In the first half of the 2020, from the Croatian presidency is expected, considering the geographic proximity, as well as historical experience and contemporary ties of Croatia to the region, to continue putting the issue high on the EU’s agenda. What could then be done in half a year, considering the facts that Croatia has not been particularly successful in leadership initiatives oriented towards the region, has several unsolved issues with Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina (not serious, albeit persistent), and has been the least successful EU member state economically? Can Croatia do something significant during the short period of its EU presidency that could inject optimism to (currently) gloomy prospects for the EU future of the Western Balkans?

Dr Petar Kurecic is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University North, Croatia. Dr Kurecic is author of one academic book and numerous papers (20 in CC/WoS/Scopus indexed journals). His research interests are primarily geo-economics, small states and small economies, and the challenges to European integration. Dr Kurecic has received several
international academic mobility grants (ERASMUS+, CEEPUS Freemover, DAAD Research Stays). He is currently (2018-2021) coordinating a Jean Monnet Module “Internal Market and Migration as Catalysts for Regional Integration in SEE”, as well as the activities of the international research group “Small States in the Multi-Polar World”.

Assoc Prof Petar Kurecic
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**LAI, SUET YI**

**How China views the EU in the new decade?**

2020 has arrived, starting a new decade, while EU-China relationship is entering a new phase. The two are celebrating the 45th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relation. Meanwhile, their relationship is also developing into a new form -- the growing compound co-existence of partnership, competition and rivalry. In this new context, how the perception and expectation of China on the EU has changed is explored in this research.

Dr Lai Suetyi is Associate Professor of Centre for European Studies, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies. Her research interests include EU politics, Asia-Europe relations and China-Europe relations. She has published over thirty journal articles and book chapters on these topics.

Dr Lai finished her doctoral studies in National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury, in 2012. Her Ph.D. thesis focused on the contribution of the ASEM process on Asia-Europe relations, regionalism and inter-regionalism. After graduate, she took post-doctoral fellowships in Monash University (Australia), Peking University (China), and Tsinghua University (China).

Assoc Prof Suet Yi (Cher) Lai
Guangdong University of Foreign Studies
Guangzhou, China
laisuetyi@gdufs.edu.cn

**LI, LUN**

**The EU’s strategies on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons**
Since the first successful test of nuclear weapons (Trinity, 1945) and the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (August, 1945) in the Second World War, the term “nuclear security” has been discussed widely by states how to react. In order to predominate more voices in the international stage, nuclear proliferation occurred more than once after the end of the Cold War. However, as the meaningful “Peace Era” begins after the closure of “Iron Curtain”, many states have gradually abandoned the necessary consideration of nuclear weapons in line with the signature of Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In other words, nuclear non-proliferation should be founded on a common vision to establish and maintain the nuclear world regime. In fact, there are 63 non-nuclear weapons states in total with one or more nuclear-armed neighbours in the world nowadays (Rublee, 2009). Therefore, besides terrorism attacks and climate changes, nuclear weapons remain one of the tremendous threats in the world for human beings, both in traditional and non-traditional security areas.

Since 2003 the EU made a forward-step by adopting a cooperative approach in arms control matters (Portela, 2003), it has been engaged in a role of leading international negotiations on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. For example, the EU played crucial part to avoid military conflicts in Iran, in 2005 the EU had worked to convince the, United States, United Kingdom, France, Russia, China and Germany to sit down at the negotiation table with Iran, by applying diplomatic and political solutions. Regarding the EU’s strategies on the nuclear weapons, EU had prioritised a commitment to multilateral treaties and bodies, based on the United Nations, to support the non-proliferation regimes. Lately, the EU also conducted the use of economic sanctions to show its position clearly and pursue its strategic goals.

However, Taylan (2013) argues that there are two different types of studies on EU’s foreign actions: the “nation-state” centric EU; distinctive and unique characteristic of the European Union. In fact, “normative power Europe” belongs to the latter case. And my research will focus on EU’s normative role in non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, along with distinctive and unique characteristics and analysis of the NPE as policy framework in internal and external dimension to find out whether the EU is concerned about defending the non-proliferation regime and finding a political solution to the nuclear issue in order to assess how EU acts as normative power in the security areas.

Lun Li is a PhD candidate at National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury, New Zealand. She holds Master’s degree in European Studies from University of Macau and a B.A degree in Spanish language and literature from Beijing International Studies University. Her current academic interest is focused on EU foreign policy, IR theory and Sino-European relations.

Miss Lun Li
University of Canterbury
National Centre for Research on Europe
Exploring the UK's Arms Trade with China after the Brexit, and its Impact to EU-China Relations

Including the UK, the EC member states banned the overall arms trade with China after 1989 Tiananmen Incident; however, when the EU published its own arms control regime in 1998, the UK immediately left the arms control responsibility to the EU, and restarted arms trade with China. How will the current arms trade policy of the UK change once the UK exits the EU? How will it influence the UK and the EU’s arms trade with China? It requires a thorough comparative study of the history of UK’s arms trade policy.

The EU's arms embargo on China has been haunting the tie between the EU and China for almost 30 years. Economies in the EU, such as France, Spain, Poland etc., either benefit from favouring lifting the embargo, or suffer from disfavouring lifting the embargo. The UK was no exception. During the period from 2003 to 2005, the UK was the most vital swing member states in the discussion to lift the EU's arms embargo on China. The rationale behind the UK's swinging attitude is also interesting in the sense of how to interpret the UK's arms trade policy. 1998 was the year the EU and China announced their Comprehensive Partnership; the year before that, 1997, was the sovereignty return of Hongkong from the UK to China. How did these key events influence the UK’s decision on restarting arms sales to China? This paper proposes a case-study into the UK's arms trade policy on China, and clarifies the influential factors and actors in the view of the Brexit.

Dr Yongshu Li graduated from the Ocean University of China with a B.A. in English in 2007. Immediately after graduation, he was enrolled into the East Asian Studies Program in the Centre for East Asian Studies at the University of Bristol. Upon receiving his M.Sc. in 2009, he entered the Political Science Program at the Meiji University Graduate School of Political Science and Economics, and pursued studies mainly on the theme of arms trade between the European Union (EU) and China. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science in 2013, and has since been conducting research in areas including EU policy on high-tech export, lobbying activities in the EU, military cooperation between Ukraine and China, and Brexit. After serving as Research Associate and Lecturer at the Meiji University School of Political Science and Economics, he assumed his current position in 2018 as the Assistant Professor.

Ass Prof Yongshu Li
LIU, XIYIN

Analysing the EU’s external governance effort in greening the industrial production outside its neighbouring periphery: A China case

Sixty years since the Treaty of Rome, the then new-born European Economic Community's Common Market has evolved into a Union's Single Market, based on where the EU's global influence has relied for existence. In addition to a solid foundation of a sizable, integrated market, the EU has also benefited from an exclusive competence in commercial policy-making and a robust societal interest in trade liberalization. Based on these three characteristics, by externalizing market-related policies and regulatory measures in defending human rights, public goods, or good governance, the EU has the capacity and will to transcend beyond its role of an influential trader and morphed into a market/regulatory power. One might ask: now we know that the EU is well-equipped and capable, but it takes two to do the things right, so where is the other missing piece of the jigsaw in the EU's global governance dynamic - the foreign regulation adopters or the norm takers? The research will revolve around one query in order to contribute to a better understanding of the EU's role and actorness in its external or global governance: whether the EU internal market-related policies and regulatory measures in economic and social dimensions have brought about structural change in the industrial sector and shift in policymaking and priority setting in a third country.

To narrow down the research focus, the research will delve into the EU's regulatory influence and its actorness in China. There are examples of compliance and even signs of green industrial revolution as well as shifts in governmental priority in economic and social development spotted in China under the EU's impact. On one hand, it seems that both polities have a pragmatic but also reserved attitude towards regulatory cooperation. It is thereof necessary to know how far the EU market-related law can reach China and how do they function in a faraway land. On the other hand, a clearer definition of the role China plays in this dynamic is needed: is it a passive, involuntary rules/norms taker or an active, voluntary coordinator?

Xiyin Liu is a PhD candidate at the National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury. After obtaining an MA in International Relations at Freie Universität Berlin, she worked in the Shanghai art industry as a curatorial intern and a media coordinator during 2015 and 2016.
Miss Xiinyin Liu  
University of Canterbury  
National Centre for Research on Europe  
Christchurch, New Zealand  
xiinyin.liu@pg.canterbury.ac.nz

MALKOV, ALEXANDER

Russia’s relations with the V4 countries: A Real Threat to EU Integration or Making a Mountain out of a Molehill?

Since the 5th enlargement when the Visegrad Group of states (V4) - along with Malta, Cyprus and the three Baltic states - joined the European project, the EU has witnessed a series of crises, namely the financial crisis of 2007-2008, the Eurozone crisis, the migration crisis, armed conflicts in its neighbourhood and, relatively new, the rise of populism and nationalism. It may be argued that the EU’s current integration problems, partially caused by these crises, open the door to Russia’s bilateral interaction with the V4 countries, increasing its influence in the region, undermining the EU’s real and perceived superiority in its own geo-strategic ‘home’ and threatening the European project’s future. The paper argues that the participating in the European project remains the V4 states’ priority. However, some of the region’s countries, particularly Hungary and Slovakia, seek for the alternatives in political, economic or socio-cultural dimensions, which Russia is happy to offer, using individual approach and exercising different sort of power in its quest for regional leadership. This paper provides an analysis of the current state, as well as the last decade dynamic, of the EU’s relations with a number of its Post-communist member states, namely the V4 countries, the extent and dynamics of the Russia-V4 bilateral interactions, including the reasons for such interplays’ (de)intensification.

Mr Alexander Malkov is a PhD student at the National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury. Back in 2005, Alexander was awarded the qualification of Physical Training Teacher. Dramatically switching the academic field, he graduated Cum Laude from Tallinn University of Technology in 2015, obtained MA degree in International Relations and European-Asian Studies. His current research analyses the impact of Russia’s bilateral inclinations towards V4 on the EU, and EU’s response to this. His research interests include: international relations theory, EU-Russia and in particular Russia-CEEC relations, foreign policy decision-making, cooperation between Europe and Asia.

Mr Alexander Malkov  
University of Canterbury
MARCHI, LUDOVICA

Micro communities of practice and EU’s foreign policy: Rome, Brussels, and Paris

Although the practice approach and the community of practice have generally been studied, the relationship between communities of practice has mostly escaped the attention of EU foreign policy scholars. This empirical investigation contributes to that less explored area. Its central question enquires whether, and how the practice approach makes sense of the actions of micro communities of practice focused on European foreign policy when practices involve actions at the local, national and European/supranational levels. It motivates an interest in the practice mechanism since this perspective allows the identification of otherwise unexplored experiences that are critical to the functioning of European foreign policy. In fact it argues that a practice approach helps us to distinguish different understandings of the EU that are crucial for the performance of European foreign policy. Methodologically it combines a discourse analysis with content analysis, and shows that the use of the practice perspective has led to demonstrate acceptance of the EU, resistance to it, and suggestions on improving EU’s foreign policy. The analysis of results focuses on theory and policy. Regarding theory, the findings prove that the practice approach makes sense of actions of communities of practice operating at a local, European/supranational and national levels. Regarding policy, the findings give evidence that the practices examined here contributed suggestions in the direction of new substance to European foreign policy. The investigation applies the practice approach to a case study which is structured with three micro communities of practice: in Rome, Brussels and Paris all of which focus on ‘European foreign policy and/or China’s Belt and Road initiative’. It employs sources derived from the author’s conversation at the citizens’ level in Rome in the context of China and the EU; it draws from the European institutions’ official documents to enquire the policy making in Brussels on China; and uses diplomatic strategy to investigate Europe that speaks with one voice, in Paris.

Ludovica Marchi (pen name of Ludovica Marchi Balossi-Restelli) (PhD) is a political scientist with main interests in European external relations, the Common Security and Defence Policy and Southeast Asian studies. She authored a monograph, coedited a book and edited two others, the last being ‘The European Union and Myanmar: Interactions via ASEAN’. She published her research in several peer-reviewed journals. She has been teaching assistant at the University of Cambridge (UK), and organised workshops there and at the London School of Economics and Political Sciences, London.
Russia’s increased influence in the EU candidate states in the Balkans during the Covid-19 pandemic? A political/strategic assessment of Russia’s role and influence in the Balkans over the past 15 years

This paper will examine Russia’s foreign and strategic/defence policy towards the EU candidate states in the Balkans over the past fifteen years. Modern Russia has had deep cultural, political and economic ties to the Balkans since the 19th century, when the Ottoman Principality of Serbia established diplomatic relations with the Russian Empire (then under Nicholas I emperor of the House of Romanov) in 1836. More than 180 years later, Russia’s influence in this part of Europe has been anything but on the wane. Its preference for bilateral relations in dealing with European states generally has been displayed also during the Covid-19 pandemic in the Balkans, with Serbia becoming the first European state to officially enlist Russian-made Sputnik V vaccines for national use in early 2021. This set the example for EU members, especially Germany, to engage in a political dialogue with Russia on this front.

For the EU and its principal geopolitical ally, the US, Russia is a strategic challenge to the Western liberal international order and a systemic threat for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members. The EU’s and NATO’s expansion in the Balkans in the 2000s has put the spotlight for Russia on this region, which has launched its own diplomatic, political and strategic initiatives to woo impoverished Balkan states closer into its geopolitical orbit through economic incentives (such as trade agreements on favourable terms) and investment into strategic assets. Cultural diplomacy and soft power have also become essential tools in Russia’s diplomatic arsenal towards the Balkans, as have informal linkages through civil society, media and academia. Furthermore, Russia’s ‘vaccine diplomacy’ during the Covid-19 pandemic has elevated stakes in the EU-Russian relations, which have suffered from EU-imposed sanctions against Russia due to the ongoing conflict with Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea. We will argue that the Balkan region offers an insightful case study of Russia’s foreign, defence and security policy outside its traditional Near Abroad circle of influence. This paper will also, albeit more marginally, analyse Russia’s foreign interference, energy diplomacy and strategic investments in the Balkans as a counter-narrative to the EU/NATO influence in the region. We will offer some cautionary predictions regarding future trends in Russia’s engagement with this part of Europe, where five current EU membership candidates and two potential ones are located – many of them with a long-history of engagement, rather than conflict, with Russia.

Dr Nina Markovic Khaze holds PhD in Political Science from the Australian National University. She is a sessional lecturer at the Department of Security Studies and Criminology, Macquarie
University in Sydney. Prior to academic life, she was working for government and parliamentary departments in Canberra, including her longest tenure as Senior Europe and Middle East specialist. Her research interests include diplomatic history, Sino-European relations, post-Communist Europe and Australian foreign policy. She is a published poet and fluent in four European languages.

Dr Alexey D. Muraviev is Associate Professor of National Security and Strategic Studies at Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia. He is the founder and Director of the Strategic Flashlight forum on national security and strategy at Curtin. He was also a non-residential fellow at Sea Power Centre Australia, Royal Australian Navy, and inaugural scholar-in-residence, The Australian Strategic Policy Institute. Alexey has published widely in the field of national security, strategic and defence studies. His research interests include problems of modern maritime power, contemporary defence and strategic policy, Russia as a Pacific power, transnational terrorism and Australian national security.

He is a member of the Australian Member Committee, Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region (AU-CSCAP); member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, London; member of the executive advisory board, CIVSEC international congress and exposition; member of the Advisory Board, Australia Public Network, and other organisations and think tanks. Alexey is regularly interviewed by national and international media, among them ABC TV and Radio, the Australian, Sydney Morning Herald, BBC World News and BBC Radio, Bloomberg, CNN, Fox News, The New York Times, and the Financial Times.
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Macquarie University  
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Sydney, Australia  
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MARKOVIC, NINA

DAVISON, REMY

Who wins? Who loses? The EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment

The EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment (CAI) was reached in-principle on 30 December 2020 after seven years of negotiations in the shadow of a serious downturn in US-China relations. It has been described as the ‘most comprehensive investment agreement’ that the EU has ever concluded with a third country, granting EU firms increased market access to lucrative Chinese consumer and industry sectors and a more level playing field. Once ratified, EU investors will be able to establish companies in China without the restriction of 49% ownership with a joint-venture partner. However, there are still many unresolved
issues in the CAI and several aspects that may hinder or delay the agreement’s ratification by all parties and subsequent entry into force.

Our paper will address both economic and political/strategic aspects of the CAI for the EU. On the political side of implications, this paper will specifically examine the impact on sustainable development; then the 17+1 arrangement between China and Eastern European countries; and the interests of key EU members which have advocated for the conclusion of CAI late last year (Germany and France in particular). Regarding economic implications, we will discuss the over-arching impact on trade/investment flows, regulatory frameworks (including in-principle agreement on ISDS and the end of forced technology transfers for EU companies) and level playing field aspects of the reached agreement. One question addressed in this paper is how CAI could affect US-China ‘post-Phase 1’ economic relations.


Dr Nina Markovic Khaze (Ph.D., Pol. Sc. ANU, MA/MDip ANU, BA/Hons UWA) has been teaching in the Department of Security Studies and Criminology, Macquarie University since 2018. Previously, she was a sessional course convenor and lecturer at the University of New South Wales. Before joining academia, Nina was working in public and parliamentary service as a senior researcher for Europe and Middle East. Her research interests include Australian foreign policy, EU trade and security policy, Russia, China and the Balkans. Since 2013, she has been an analyst for SBS radio with a regular segment every Thursday.

Dr Nina Markovic
Macquarie University
Department of Security Studies and Criminology
Sydney, Australia
nina.markovic@mq.edu.au
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NAKAGAWA, YOICHI

Germany’s contributions to CSDP and its transformation in its role and orientation

In recent years, the German problem has focused on whether the country will embrace hegemony or classical power politics in the future. Although previous researches discussed
Germany’s power, role, and leadership, a series of such discussions concentrated on “Leitbild,” which is a goal that functions as cognitive map.

Previous researches suffer from the following problems. 1) Although previous works discussed whether Germany is either a “normal great power” or a “civilian power,” this ‘either-or’ assumption does not reflect the reality. 2) Unlike work that supports continuity in Germany’s security policy, it has not only changed at the policy level but also at the idea level. 3) Previous researchers failed to clearly analyse the fine distinctions between a “normal great power” and a “civilian power.” Using discourse analysis, this author overcame problems 2 and 3. By analysing Germany’s party system, the author explains the transformation of German security policy more completely than previous researches. To overcome the above research problems, the author analyses policy decision processes using process-tracing and parliamentary debates using discourse analysis, especially using a qualitative content analysis based on soft-constructivism. Discourse analysis describes shared ideas and material interests, action, and their changes in a society. Additionally, it enables us to analyse the above-mentioned subtle differences between the theses of Leitbild models to clarify the intersubjectivity between agency and structure and to analyse the reciprocal changes between policy and ideas on an idea level.

In the policy analysis, the author clarifies the development of CSDP and German military dispatch cases within it. In the discourse analysis, the author analyses parliamentary debates. Germany has followed a hybrid-type Leitbild that combines both the constituent ideas of a “civilian power” and a “normal great power.” This change in Germany’s Leitbild can be explained by the transformation of its party system into a “fluid five-party system.”

Yoichi Nakagawa acquired a Ph. D. at Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt am Main in 2012. He worked as the Research Attache at the Division of Policy Affairs, Embassy of Japan in Germany, Berlin, from 2009 to 2011. Since 2012, he has engaged as a lecturer at many universities including Ritsumeikan University. His research achievements are as follows. As a coauthored book, 50 chapters to know Luxembourg (Akashi Shoten, 2018) (edited by Norihiro Tahara and Saori Kido). As Articles, e.g., "Changes in German climate and energy policy governance during the energy transition (Energiewende)," Ritsumeikan International Area Study No. 47, March 2018, pp. 61-81; "Transformation of the view of the security of the Green Party and leading to its German foreign security policy Meaning " German study, No. 51, March 2017, pp. 91-108; "Ideas matter, change policy, but how?" Journal of the Japan Association for Global Governance, vol. 4. 2018, pp. 110-122.

Dr Nakagawa Yôichi
Part-time lecturer
ic513wetterstein@hotmail.com
The Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) and Its Future Perspectives in post-COVID Environment: Can it Be a Momentum to Multilateralism instead of Protectionism?

It is no doubt that global trade has contributed to rapid economic growth in the world last 5 decades. However, the trade growth has slowed down in the global economy since the global financial crisis that started to recover several years later, but return to decline because the trade conflict between the U.S. and China as well as other major trade partners such as the EU, Japan, and South Korea since 2017. The Trump Administration has regarded the WTO as an improper entity for the U.S. national economic interest and tried to limit its arbitration function from trade negotiations and conflicts between nations to between corporations. Despite the U.S. attempt to weaken the WTO’s functions, the rest of the world has tried to restore the WTO’s roles in free trade and multilateralism. In order to overcome the U.S. unilateralism, many major economies have established the mega FTAs such as EU-Japan FTA, the CPTPP, and the RCEP. The 15 member nations in the RCEP agreed to complete it in 2020 and finally signed on it without Indian participation which is third largest economy in Asia although the 16 member nations have negotiated since 2011. Despite the absence of India in the agreement, the RCEP will be the largest mega FTA in the world covering over 30 percent of the global GDP and contributes to strengthening regional economic integration and growth. The paper argues whether the RCEP could function properly with the absence of India or not. Furthermore, it investigates and analyses how the RCEP will develop without the Indian participation. Last, but not least, it also discusses how to set the relationship as a competitor with the CPTPP overlapping the membership among the member nations.

Sang-Chul Park has received PhD degrees in political science in Aug. 1993 in Germany and economics in Feb. 1997 in Sweden. His dissertations discussed Technopolises in Japan. He also passed a habilitation examination (full professorship) in political science in Nov. 2002 in Germany as well as a docent evaluation (Swedish habilitation) in economics in Sep. 2004 in Sweden. He is currently a Full Professor at Graduate School of Knowledge based Technology and Energy, Korea Polytechnic University. He was an Adjunct Professor at Center for Science-based Entrepreneurship, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), and a Visiting Professor at Seoul National University, South Korea. He was also a Private Dozent at Justus Liebig University in Giessen, Germany and Visiting Full Professor at Gothenburg University, Sweden. He served as Associate Professor at Gothenburg University, Sweden from 2001 to 2003 and as Associate Professor at Okayama University, Japan from 2003 to 2006. He also stayed as Visiting Professor at Fudan University, China in Sep. 2014 and as Visiting Scholar at Asian Development Bank Institute, Japan in Oct. 2014. Since 2016, he has also served as a visiting professor at Maria Curie Skłodowska University, Poland. His research interests concern
industrial policy and regional development and studies on innovation systems and on science parks and innovative clusters in particular. Currently his research areas are expanded toward energy policy, sustainable development strategy, high technology ventures and international business and trade.

In addition, he was a member of editorial advisory board for Korea Observer (SSCI Journal) as well as a member of editorial review board for Journal of Small Business Management (JSBM) (SSCI Journal). In 2013, he became the editor of Asia Pacific Journal of EU Studies (APJEUS) that is the official journal of European Union Studies Association Asia Pacific (EUSA). In 2014 he also became a member of editorial board in International Journal of Innovation and Regional Development (IJIRD). In 2016 he serves as associate editor for International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development (IMED) (SCOPUS Journal) and a member of Managing Editorial Board in Australian & New Zealand Journal of European Studies.

In practice, he has served as a member of many government committees in Seoul Metropolitan government and the national government. Currently, he is an advisory member of Presidential Committee on New Southern Policy since Sep. 2018. He wrote five text books and numerous articles and reports to the government, national research institutes, and public and private companies. The representative academic works are as follows.

Prof Sang-Chul Park
Korea Polytechnic University
Graduate School of Knowledge based Technology and Energy
scpark@kpu.ac.kr

PETROVIC, MILENKO

If not the EU, who?
This paper addresses the crucial role that EU technical advice and expertise and financial assistance has had for the success of post-communist political and economic transition in the countries of the former communist bloc, particularly in those post-communist states who were able to anchor their post-communist reforms to the process of meeting the EU accession conditions (and receiving EU assistance). While these states - foremost those of East Central Europe and the Baltics who were first to open accession negotiations with the EU in the late 1990s and join it in 2004 - have so far consolidated their democratic and socio-economic institutions to a level that granted them EU membership, their ex-communist counterparts whom the EU accession opportunity was later offered (in the Western Balkans) or has not been offered at all (in non-Baltic post-Soviet Europe) have continued to struggle with post-communist transition. The level of corruption, respect for the rule of law, freedom of the
media as well as the standard of living in general in these states are still significantly behind those achieved in the post-communist states which joined the EU in 2004, 2007 and 2013. The more extensive relations with authoritarian China and/or Russia that some of the ‘left off the EU’s radar screen’ post-communist European states have developed over the last several years may bring them some short term economic benefits, but can hardly help them to overcome the listed gaps in their post-communist democratization or make up for the role of the EU in this regard.

Dr Milenko Petrovic, is Senior Lecturer Above the Bar and Jean Monnet Chair at the National Centre for Research on Europe and at the Department of Global, Cultural and Language Studies, University of Canterbury, New Zealand. He is the author of The Democratic Transition of Post-Communist Europe (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013) and the co-editor of A Quarter Century of Post-Communism Assessed (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017). He has authored or (co)edited several other volumes and numerous journal articles and shorter contributions on comparative politics, post-communist transition, European integration and EU enlargement.

Dr Milenko Petrovic
University of Canterbury
National Centre for Research on Europe
Christchurch, New Zealand
milenko.petrovic@canterbury.ac.nz

OH, JAEHYUN

Impact of Covid-19 on the Right to Asylum in the EU

Enshrined in major international human rights conventions, the right to asylum ensures protection from political, religious, and racial persecutions. However, the ongoing pandemic allowed several member states to derogate from this international responsibility for public health and security. As the states shut their borders, numerous irregular immigrants seeking entry to EU inevitably faced restrictions in their right to asylum. To restore this right, it is imperative to reassess the current EU asylum system and border measures in the initial stages of covid-19. This research reviews state emergency border restrictions in response to covid-19 from a legal perspective and question their compatibility with the non-refoulement principle. Based on the analysis, this study offers suggestions to empower refugees’ right to asylum and rekindle EU solidarity in asylum policies.

The right to asylum derives from the Geneva Convention in 1951 and is embedded in EU laws. This paper studies the legal basis of the right to asylum in both EU and international laws. Since 1999, EU has developed a common asylum system and its supplementary directives. They stipulate asylum procedures and reception conditions to help refugees settle in EU member states. The significance and functions of the CEAS will be covered in this research. And yet, as the coronavirus loomed in 2020, the asylum system nearly came to a halt. Several EU member states suspended accepting refugees and closed their borders. These measures
are against the principle of non-refoulment and have exacerbated asylum-seekers’ vulnerability to the virus. Notwithstanding the pandemic, refugee reception should continue.

To this end, EU should adjust its asylum system to resume the reception process while maintaining effective disease control. Most importantly, EU should balance the concern over public health and asylum-seekers’ immediate need for shelter. By reviewing the current state-level responses to the pandemic, this paper outlines possible directions to reshape EU asylum policies in the post-covid world.

Jaehyun is a senior at Korea University where she is studying international studies. Versed in diverse fields, she is an avid learner who seeks to build her expertise in international law. Her interest primarily lies in immigration and refugee laws, and racial studies. Her interest in EU studies began with her career as a project assistant at KU Jean Monnet EU Centre in 2019. Not only her passion for learning but also her amiable personality often impresses her colleagues.

Ms Jaehyun Oh
Korea University
jaehyunee42@gmail.com

PERIC, MARCELA

Japanese Foreign Policy in Western Balkans: Kosovo Crisis, instability in Macedonia, and European Integration between 1998-2013
This study analyses Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs policies during the Kosovo crisis (1998), instability in Macedonia (2001), and Croatia’s accession to the EU (2013). The human security concept enhances Japanese government’s indirect approach through international organisations and expands its non-military capabilities of involvement in humanitarian crises and conflict prevention. During the ethnic conflict in Kosovo, non-belligerent promotion of human security expressed Japan’s neutrality. The Kosovo crisis provided a new opportunity for Japan to advance political relations with the EU through the trilateral US-Japan-EU framework. Japan’s contributions through human security and aid served as foundations for post-conflict reconstruction and development. International aid became the basis for transition towards a stable political system capable of building on its aspirations to become a member of the Western community of nations. By supporting EU enlargement in the Western Balkans, Japan fostered EU-Japan political relations, cross-regional cooperation, and peace in former Yugoslavia.

Marcela Peric is Ph.D. candidate at the Graduate School of Law, Keio University, Tokyo, Japan. She has been Suntory foundation fellow since 2019. Her research focuses on the political
relationship between the EC/EU, Croatia and Western Balkan with Japan in the post-Cold War era.

Marcela Peric
Keio University
Doctoral student at the Graduate School of Law and Politics
marcela.peric01@gmail.com

QUIRK, JESSICA

MASCITELLI, BRUNO

Euroscepticism in the closet? Draghi suffocates the political division

Italy has seen a rising tide of Euroscepticism since the mid-1990s that has grown in momentum over the last decade. The emergence and electoral success of anti-EU and anti-establishment parties such as Lega and M5S (The Five Star Movement) have demonstrated the levels of discontent and disenchantment of the EU within the Italian public. The COVID-19 pandemic has had widespread health and economic impacts across Europe with Italy being one of the hardest hit nations. The pandemic has compounded and accelerated the existing trends, frustrations and economic woes making the leadership of Italy during the recovery all the more important. The breakdown of the Democratic Party (PD)/Five Star (M5S) coalition in January 2021 saw “Super” Mario Draghi rise to lead the technocratic government responsible in this critical moment. Draghi, former President of the European Central Bank brings with him the respect of politicians in both Brussels and Rome and a reputation as a skilled leader who saved the Euro during its time of crisis. With all major political parties across Italy’s much fragmented political spectrum giving the new Draghi government its support, even the Eurosceptics have temporarily ducked. Will this mean that we see a reduction in Euroscepticism both politically and publicly or will the Eurosceptics continue to fester behind closed doors?

Jessica Quirk is a graduate of the Bachelor of Business at Swinburne University of Technology and is an Honours student in International Studies at RMIT. She is Secretary of European Studies Association of Australia and New Zealand (ESAANZ) and her current interests lie in the fields of European Studies, Political Economy and Italian populism

Bruno is an Adjunct professor from Swinburne University of Technology. His teaching and research covers European Political economy and especially Italian political economy. He was a Jean Monnet Chair (2016-2019) and is the President of the European Studies Association Australia and New Zealand (ESAANZ).
European Harmonization of Banking Supervision: European Identity or International Context?

Currently the world is facing a tremendous issue: how to cope with the coronavirus pandemic via governmental responses. Regarding central banking strategy, it would seem unequivocal that prudential policies are crucial to maintain a stable and robust financial system. Even though monetary policy is the most indispensable application for central banking, micro- and macro-prudential instruments are essential toolkits with respect to crisis management. This paper aims to clarify the dichotomy between European and international methodologies of banking supervision. European identity, represented by the European Banking Union (EBU), is based on a jurisprudential approach; while the international approach implemented by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) mirrors a soft-law methodology. The study explores issues of prudential regulation in the relation between European internal harmonization and international cooperation. The analysis proposes future coordination of banking supervision with effective mixture of hard- and soft-law implementation to prepare for crisis management.

Hideki Sato is an Associate Professor of International Finance at Faculty of Economics and Management, Kanazawa University. He received BA, MA and Ph.D. in economics from Yokohama National University (YNU). Prior to the current position, he engaged in practical research and policy planning at the Financial Services Agency (FSA) of Japanese Government. His fields are banking supervision and regulations including prudential policies of the ECB, Banque de France and Bank of England through current and historical approaches.

Ass Prof Hideki Sato
Kanazawa University
Kanazawa, Japan
h-sato@staff.kanazawa-u.ac.jp
Germany’s Political Economy and the Lack of a Common European Approach Towards China

Germany’s primary macroeconomic policy of basing the country’s economic success on industrial exports created an outsized dependence on two key export markets: The United States (US) and China. Since in the case of China the performance of the German economy depends both on Chinese economic output as well as Chinese policies towards the country, German politicians tend to embrace engagement and avoid confrontation in their attitudes and policies towards China.

On the other hand, due to China’s gradual reversal towards authoritarianism during president Xi Jinping’s tenure, the politicians as well as public in a number of European Union (EU) member states have adopted a more critical stance towards the country. This has created rifts both within Germany and between Germany and other EU countries on several issues.

This paper aims to investigate the developments and dynamics of these divisions. The analysis will start with scrutinizing the 17+1 platform, which brings together Central and Eastern European countries and China, as the participating EU countries were often criticized for pursuing independent policies towards China. It was predominantly Germany calling on these countries to abandon such approach and opt for a unified European approach.

Germany’s position changed rapidly in the recent years due to the change in relations with the United States after Donald Trump was elected a US president and due to the slowing pace of Chinese economic growth, which has already had impact on Germany. This resulted in Germany’s more recent negative or ambiguous attitudes toward attempts to create an EU common policy towards China in areas such as investment screening or cybersecurity.

These case studies will demonstrate that Germany’s goal of maintaining a stable macroeconomic position forces it to abandon a common European approach and to predominantly and primarily consider its own national interests.

Martin Sebena is a PhD candidate in European Studies at The University of Hong Kong. He holds an MA degree in Political Science and Sinology from the Charles University in Prague, Czechia, and MFin degree from the Curtin University in Perth, Australia. Prior to pursuing his PhD degree, he has worked for 8 years in the financial services industry in Switzerland, Australia, and Hong Kong.
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The University of Hong Kong
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Lessons from Kyoto: Australia, Europe, and Global Climate (In)Action

As the 2021 United Nations Climate Change Conference approaches, it has become clear that despite the significant momentum developing around global climate action, Australia will continue its tradition of recalcitrance. This paper argues that the Morrison government expects it will be able to continue to refuse to act substantively on climate based on key historical lessons learned at the Kyoto Protocol negotiations in 1997. At those negotiations, the Howard government gained significant concessions for Australia—undermining the whole agreement—by threatening to torpedo negotiations at the last minute. The tolerance of that behaviour by the major parties, including the European Union, encouraged rather than dissuaded future governments. Subsequent developments also encouraged the conviction, particularly on the conservative side of Australian politics, that any effort at action on the part of the United States and the EU can simply be waited out, with no significant consequence for Australia or its international relationships. In Australia, furthermore, a single-minded focus on the United States has meant that significant and globally consequential developments elsewhere, particularly in the European Union, have gone almost completely unnoticed. That wilful blindness has significant implications for both Australia and the COP26 negotiations in Glasgow, and, more importantly, the world's ability to address climate change.

Emma Shortis joined the EU Centre at RMIT University in June 2018. A historian by training, Emma’s research interests include global environmental governance, environmental history and diplomacy, and the relationship between history and climate change adaptation. In 2017-18, Emma was a Fox-Zucker International Fellow at Yale University. She recently completed her PhD in History at the University of Melbourne. Emma is often asked to provide media commentary on historical connections to current events in the United States and Europe, tailored for an Australian audience. Emma holds a Master’s Degree in International and European Studies from Monash University, and a Bachelor of Arts from The University of Melbourne.

Emma Shortis
RMIT University
Melbourne, Australia
emma.shortis@rmit.edu.au
European integration as a project is comparatively juvenile. Commenced in 1950 (by the Schuman Declaration) it was initially based as we know on pragmatic, mostly economic agenda albeit with crucial political foundations and consequently – political ramifications. After 69 years it has grown substantially to involve political, institutional and ideological elements.

This paper looks at European integration and specifically at its institutional form – the European Union from an ideological perspective. The author claims that ‘Europeanism’ has, in fact, become a new ideology, shared among intellectual, political, judicatory, societal, and even major economic elites that influence or shape European Union as an institution and its major policies.

As an ideology ‘Europeanism’ is a somewhat exotic mixture of various seemingly incoherent trends that give current European Union its intriguing characteristics. On the one hand, economically one can easily identify numerous elements of neoliberalism, especially regarding the financial aspects of European integration. Likewise arguments used by the major proponents of the European integration vis-à-vis USA, China or Japan are of neoliberal character. At the same time, with reference to international trade in agricultural products, intellectual property or internal (single market) competition (freedom of labour) one rather easily spots distinct elements of protectionism and overregulation. Finally, in terms of philosophical outlook and especially moral issues ‘Europeanism’ seems to be mostly focusing on progressive agenda.

This rather incomprehensible amalgamate is based on a three-fold premise that seems to hold unquestionable value for the so-called ‘Euro-enthusiasts’. Firstly, most if not everything that is EU/European related is of positive value. Secondly and consequently, most if not everything that is EU/European related is positive for all parties involved. Thirdly, most if not everything that is EU/European related brings an added value to the whole world.

SOBOL, MOR

EU-Asia Connectivity Strategy: A European Response to China’s Belt and Road Initiative?
In 2013, President Xi Jinping introduced China’s flagship foreign policy endeavour, that is, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). Five years later, in September 2018, the European Union’s (EU) High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Federica Mogherini, introduced the EU-Asia Connectivity Strategy. Following the introduction of the new European initiative, both the EU and China have officially stated that EU’s Connectivity Strategy should not be viewed as a competing or alternative policy to China’s BRI. Yet, it appears that there is a wide agreement among scholars and policy analysts that the Connectivity Strategy is indeed a balancing (or counter) strategy vis-à-vis China in general and the BRI in particular. Against this background, this paper aspires to examine the decision-making process that has led the EU to launch its new initiative. In so doing, it aims to engage with questions such as: Why did it take so much time for the EU to react to the challenges posed by China’s BRI? What does the EU aim to achieve with the Connectivity Strategy? And to what extent could the Connectivity Strategy be considered as an adequate response? Thus, the paper does not only aim to contribute to the growing literature on EU-China relations in the context of the BRI but also wishes to offer an analysis of the under-researched area of EU’s Connectivity Strategy.

Mor Sobol is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Diplomacy and International Relations at Tamkang University, as well as an Affiliated Research Fellow at the European Union Centre in Taiwan (EUTW). He received his PhD in Politics from the University of Edinburgh and worked as a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Institute of European & American Studies at Academia Sinica. In addition, he also held the position of Adjunct Assistant Professor at Yuan Ze and Ming Chuan Universities. His main research interests centre on European and Chinese foreign policy, Mediterranean politics, Taiwan/China-Israel relations, and institutionalist theories.

Ass Prof Mor Sobol
Tamkang University
Department of Diplomacy and International Relations
Affiliated Research Fellow at the European Union Centre in Taiwan (EUTW)
155876@mail.tku.edu.tw
Australia’s post-Brexit engagement with the UK and the EU: getting beyond trade

Brexit has been variously referred to as providing both opportunities as well as challenges for the United Kingdom in terms of its future engagement with the rest of the world. For the Brexeters in the UK government, a number of countries including Australia have been signalled as offering various trade and other options that could be taken up by the UK as it charts its future directions. The UK’s historically important relationship with Australia is partly due to having inherited its political institutions but also a result of their shared security and foreign policy approaches. Australia’s relations with the EU, though devoid of such legacies, have been constantly improving due to the EU’s recent engagement with Asia, its recognition of a global role and a lessening of Australia’s Euroscepticism.

The debate as to how Australia should engage has been largely about the avoidance of any nostalgia when dealing with the UK and having a clear-minded focus on what is in Australia’s material interests when it comes to the EU. In each case it is a matter of balancing ideational values and material interests with commercial imperatives undeniably dominant. The Trade and Cooperation Agreement (TCA) between the UK and the EU, as thin as it is, reveals a level of asymmetrical interdependence between the two recently separated entities and, together with the path dependence created by the EU’s legal embeddedness in UK law, should alert Australia to the complexity of negotiating future agreements with the UK. As this paper will argue, this recognition is not just about particular shared material interests but also about those shared ideational values found across legal, political and social dimensions. A broad and multi-dimensional approach to its future relations with the UK not only enhances Australia’s future engagement beyond trade agreement making but likewise improve its links with the EU.

Dr Russell Solomon teaches law in the Global, Urban and Social Studies School at RMIT University, Melbourne. His current research interests include the impact of Brexit, particularly in relation to EU juridification and rights in the UK and the EU, as well as their post-Brexit relations with Australia. He also researches on economic and social rights in Australia and globally

Dr Russell Solomon
RMIT University
School of Global, Urban and Social Studies
Russell.solomon@rmit.edu.au
The Response of Germany to the European Refugee Crisis. A ‘Bottom-Up’ Silent Securitization

The response of the EU Member States to the 2015 refugee crisis was inconsistent. Some countries represented the refugees/immigrants as security threats and dealt with them as such. Some other countries viewed the refugee crisis from a humanitarian perspective and refrained from adopting any immigration-restrictive measures. Germany, the main destination-EU-country for the refugees/immigrants, while appeared to be sceptical towards refugees at first, welcomed hundreds of thousands of refugees at the peak of the crisis and adopted some mild immigration-restrictive measures later on. This paper applies the Copenhagen School’s securitization theorem as complemented with the novel Comprehensive Securitization Empirical Framework to the case study of Germany and utilizes critical discourse and content analysis to support its findings. It claims that in Germany, between 2015 and 2018, it is observed a ‘bottom-up’ silent securitization. ‘Bottom-up’ because the response of the German government ran in parallel to the feelings of the German public about immigration. ‘Silent’ because despite the fact that the German politicians did not represent the refugees, or the crisis, as a security threat, they adopted certain immigration-restrictive measures to address the concerns of the German society.

Currently, a part-time lecturer at the Hong Kong Baptist University, Dionysios Stivas holds Ph.D. in Government and International Studies from Hong Kong Baptist University, an M.A. in European Union International Relations and Diplomacy from the College of Europe and an LL.M. in European Law from Maastricht University. Before commencing his Ph.D. studies he worked as a legal consultant for the OECD in Paris and offered his services to the Media and Communications Department of the Court of Justice of the European Union. His research interests focus on the European Union and include security, securitization, migration, and European integration.

Dr Dionysios Stivas
Lecturer at the Hong Kong Baptist University
stivasd@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Is the Europe-Asian Connectivity Plan Really an Anti-China Strategy?

In September 2018, the European Commission presented its new Asian strategy entitled “Connecting Europe and Asia - Building blocks for an EU Strategy”, aimed at constructing the
new EU-Asian relationship based upon sustainable, comprehensive and rule-base connectivity. One year later, on 27 September 2019, the first Europe-Asia Connectivity Forum was inaugurated solemnly in Brussels with presence of Juncker, Abe and two other prime ministers. A lot of analyses concluded that this new Europe-Asia connecting strategy, combined with the EU’s regulation establishing a new mechanism to examine the inflow capital, is implicitly an anti-China plot. A majority of European leaders denied this interpretation. This paper, therefore, aims to evaluate if this strategy is anti-China and, if yes, how was that formulated, with help of an analysis of those related discourses of EU’s official documents, its leaders’ speeches and talks, the interpretations of national leaders, key officials and heavily-weighted think tanks. The focal period is between June 2016, when the EU released its Global Strategy, and October 2019, one month after the first Europe-Asia Connectivity Forum was held.

Dr Hungdah Su holds Doctorate of University Paris-Sorbonne and is Professor and Jean Monnet Chair at National Taiwan University. He is also Director General of EU Centre in Taiwan since March 2011 and President of ECSA Taiwan since January 2015.

Prof Hungdah Su
National Taiwan University
EU Centre in Taiwan
Taiwan
hungdah.su@gmail.com

SUGIONO, MUHADI

EU’s Strategic Agenda for 2019-2024: Projecting EU’s Global Role
The European Union has increasingly been projected as a global power. There has been internal drives and external demands for the EU to play a greater and more active role in addressing global challenges and crises. However, with serious challenges facing the EU in the forms of internal fragmentation and distrust, among the EU member states and between the EU and the member states, on the one hand, and increasingly challenging international environment as signified by Russian resurgence, more isolationist US, major power shift and growing Sino-American competition, on the other hand, the ‘capability - expectation gap’ is undoubtedly growing. The EU has to redefine its global role. The redefinition of its global role is taking place while the EU is preparing for the EU27.

This paper will look at how the EU’s institutional leadership deals with these challenges through the EU’s Strategic Agenda 2019-2024 and how the EU’s Strategic Agenda 2019-2024
will affect the EU’s global role. It is argued that the EU’s Strategic Agenda 2019-2024 has contradiction which makes it difficult for the EU to effectively redefine its global role.

Mr Muhadi Sugiono is a lecturer at the Department of International Relations, Universitas Gadjah Mada, in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Currently completing his PhD at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands on Humanitarianism in the European Union Foreign Policy. His major area of interests includes international political theory, peace and security studies and European Studies / comparative regionalism. Mr Sugiono is the coordinator of the European Studies at Gadjah Mada University. He is also serving as the chairman of the Indonesian Community of European Studies (ICES), the association of European studies in Indonesia, formally established in 2019. He recently published an article on Brexit and its implication on Southeast Asian regionalism. He is the editor of The EU’s Institution, Politics and Policies (forthcoming).

Mr Muhadi Sugiono
Universitas Gadjah Mada
Department of International Relations
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
msugiono@ugm.ac.id

SVETLICINII, ALEXANDR

Three Great Mountains” for the Chinese State-Owned Investments in the European Union

After labelling China “an economic competitor in the pursuit of technological leadership, and a systemic rival promoting alternative models of governance” in its 2019 policy paper “EU-China – A strategic outlook”, the European Union (EU) has been solidifying its regulatory frameworks in order to “level the playing field” for the European companies and their Chinese competitors on the European and global markets. The first regulatory framework already encountered by the Chinese state-owned enterprises (SOEs) is the EU merger control. Their investments in the form of acquisitions of control over enterprises with substantial presence in the internal market have to be notified to the Commission under the EU Merger Regulation (EUMR). The second regulatory framework for defending the strategic interests of the EU and its Member States – the EU FDI Screening Regulation – entered into force in April 2019 and became fully operational from 11 October 2020. Finally, the Commission’s White Paper on foreign subsidies, published in June 2020, laid the foundation for the third regulatory framework for the foreign investments, which is expected to take the form of a legislative proposal in 2021. The present chapter is discussing the features of this three-prong regulatory framework and its likely effects on the Chinese state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and their investments in the EU.
Alexandr Svetlicinii is an associate professor at the University of Macau, Faculty of Law, where he also serves as Programme Coordinator of the Master of International Business Law in English Language. Prior to joining the University of Macau, Dr Svetlicinii was a senior researcher at the Jean Monnet Chair of European Law at the Tallinn Law School, Tallinn University of Technology in Estonia. In addition to his academic work, Dr Svetlicinii served as the Non-Governmental Advisor to the International Competition Network (working group Mergers) and acted as a consultant in a number of research projects of the European Commission.

Assoc Prof Alexandr Svetlicinii
University of Macau
Faculty of Law
Macau, SAR
alexandrs@um.edu.mo

TOMITA, KENJI

Re-thinking “transnational” anti-EU populism in 2010s: Structural Developments of the European Parliament, Euro-parties and Political Groups as its historical context

Since the beginning of the 2010s, radical left/right populism have experienced significant rise in the political arena in many parts of the world, by trying to depict themselves as defenders of spotless people, against “corrupt political establishments”. In European context, according to Shoji (2018), they attack “unelected” elites, EU leaders and officials. 2014’s European election and intra-party interactions within the following 8th European Parliament (2014-2019), including the formation of nationalist ENF group, showed that those populist “transnational” networks were no longer something to be ignored. However, despite of European or global level context of its rise, most of previous researches on European populism have not been free from “domestic politics” perspective, often end up with case-study based analysis or comparative studies, very little attentions to their “pan-European” networks and European political platform, especially, the European Parliament. In this presentation, I will review historical developments of EU, especially structural and constitutional changes, from its beginning as the ECSC to the Lisbon Treaty, as well as the European Parliament’s “evolution” from an inter-parliament consultative body into joint legislative body with directly-elected MEPs from citizens of EU member states, and how these changes have enabled a formation of “pan-European” political arena. Secondly, I will analyse how these changes, as well as privileges for Euro-parties and political groups, have opened way for radicalist parties to get into the European Parliament, shaped trans-national “pan-European” anti-EU populism. Finally, I will provide some implications for ongoing 9th
European Parliament (2019-2024), post-Brexit referendum interactions and their possible effects on EU’s decision-making itself.

Kenji TOMITA is a 26 years old doctoral student in Integrated Sciences for Global Society (Interdisciplinary Studies) with specialisation of International Relations and European studies at the Graduate School of Integrated Sciences for Global Society, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan. He received his master degree in Arts (Master of Arts), with a master thesis on Nigel Farage’s UKIP’s “Democracy in One Country” nature and its potential transnational connections. His main research interest is “Pan-European” networks among anti-EU populists as well as their relations and ideological similarities with anti-liberal movements around the world (ex. Alt-Rights in North America) and authoritarian regimes.

Mr Kenji Tomita
Kyushu University
Graduate School of Integrated Sciences for Global Society
Fukuoka, Japan
tomita.kenji.380@s.kyushu-u.ac.jp

VOGT, RICHARD

Coping with Political Ataxia in Europe’s Borderlands
The first issue raised by the European Commission in its future action focus for 2019-2024 is that of protection. This focus on the protection of Europe and not the lives of migrants has been on display repeatedly since the escalation in irregular arrivals in 2015. In March 2019, the Commission declared the European migration crisis officially over. However, through the outsourcing of responsibility and the externalisation of its borders, the Union’s hypocrisy is evidence of an ataxia-like approach to border policies. The problems persist, despite the data showing that Mediterranean crossings have been falling. This measure of success is well championed by Brussels elites, ignoring questions over how this has been achieved. This has largely been through moral prevarication between militaristic forms of border confirming and transcending, between the wish of Schengen and the reality of mass displacement in neighbouring regions. With ongoing temporary closures at multiple European internal borders, initially due to mass irregular migration and subsequently as a result of attempts to contain the covid-19 pandemic, will the current political schisms between states over ensuring the universal human rights of dignity and respect to all migrants likely to define the identity of the European Union over the coming decades?

Richard Vogt just completed his PhD at Macquarie University (under review) and has been a sessional academic at Australia National University since 2018. His thesis, A Steady Diet of Images, explores the ongoing migrant situation for Europe and EU border policies. He has
previously completed an MRes related to American narratives of North Korea, and an MA on oceanic borders in low-lying Pacific Island states. His research interests include violence to/of bodies, hypocrisies of power, necropolitics, and engagement with critical and cultural theories. He is also a fan of metaphor and post-it notes. @richardvogt2019

Dr Richard Vogt
Australia National University
Canberra, Australia
richard.vogt@anu.edu.au

WANG, KUNJIE

Shaping the Circular Economy within the European Union Environmental Policies and Climate Change: Experiences, Challenges and Steps Forward

The circular economy is an irreversible global goal, which is needed to scale up action at EU level and globally, especially in the context of the environmental policy on climate change. It is a major concern and action area of the new proposed European Green Deal adopted in December 2019.

In December 2015, the European Commission adopted the first Circular Economy Action Plan, which contains a host of initiatives to reduce waste and to increase the longevity of products and materials, in order to stimulate Europe’s transition towards a circular economy. Three years after, the first Circular Economy Action Plan was fully implemented. As an important pillar supporting the European Green Deal, thereafter the European Commission published a new Circular Economy Action Plan on 11 March 2020 to update the original 2015 Plan, which aims to lay out a “future-oriented agenda for achieving a cleaner and more competitive Europe”. It is therefore time to review the implementation of these Plans and summarize the experiences of the European Union on shaping the circular economy, in order to make Europe “a world leader in circular economy and clean technologies”.

This paper intends to do such assessment, firstly by summarizing the evolution of the environmental policy of the European Union in the context of the efforts undertaken to shape the circular economy and climate change. It includes a review of the implementation of the first Circular Economy Action Plan, analysing the challenges facing the implementation of this Plan including the different parties’ interests from both policy-making level and practice level. Finally, it proposes the steps ahead particularly in view of the second Action Plan, in order to achieve the climate-neutrality goal.

Kunjie Wang is a PhD Candidate in European Union Law at the Faculty of Law of the University of Macau, engaged in the research programme related to European Union Environmental Policies. She was previously an Exchange Scholar at University of Coimbra, and was selected as an intern at the Committee on International Trade of European Parliament. She completed
a Master of Laws in European Union Law from University of Macau and also a Master of Laws in Comparative Law, Economics and Finance from both University of Turin and International University College of Turin.

Miss Kunjie Wang  
University of Macau  
Macau, SAR  
wjkkyra@gmail.com

**WANG, XIWEN**

**Does the presence of China endanger the EU’s role in Post-communist Central Europe?**

The ‘17+1’ cooperation framework and the Belt and Road Initiative bring forth frequent communication and cooperation between China and Europe in these years. The ‘17+1’ aims to increase political, economic and cultural cooperation between China and 17 Central and Eastern European countries (CEE). The 17 countries are all former communist countries (except for Greece) which include the Baltic States, the Visegrad group countries and the Balkan states. Some of them have achieved “EUropeanization” and now hold membership of the Europe Union (EU), while some are still striving for membership. On the one hand, China has extensive economic collaboration with major Western European countries, such as Germany, France and the EU as a whole. In addition, China established comprehensive strategic partnership with the EU. On the other hand, these major Western European countries and the EU are also the main political and economic partners of the CEE countries.

Under this background, this essay aims to examine China’s ever increasing presence and penetration in the CEE region to seek how the ‘17+1’ has affected China’s relations with CEE countries, in particular with those in central Europe over the past several years. Moreover, it attempts to reveal how it may affect their relationships with the EU or whether external forces exercised by China endanger the EU’s anchor role in the region. The research will make an original contribution to the investigation of EU-China relations and fill the gap in the literature on EU-China relations in the context of the ‘17+1’ cooperation framework.

Xiwen Wang is a PhD candidate at the National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury, New Zealand. Her thesis focuses on EU-China relations in the context of the 16+1 cooperation framework. For the presentation of her initial findings at the European Union Studies Association Asia Pacific (EUSAAP) conference held in Taiwan on 28-29 June 2018 she was awarded a “Student Best Paper Presentation” award.

Miss Xiwen Wang  
University of Canterbury
The Juncker Commission was a firm advocate for the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals by the United Nations’ General Assembly in September 2015. The Commission’s representatives were involved actively in the earlier preparation of the 17 Goals and their targets, and played a crucial role in the adoption of new commitments on climate action in Paris in December, 2015. Subsequent to the adoption of the Global Agenda, the European Commission actively fostered work to promote the Goals by requiring each Directorate-General to frame their strategic thinking and work programs with the Goals in mind.

More recently, the Commission’s Joint Research Centre (JRC) has drawn on the work of its Smart Specialisation Platform to focus specifically on how the EU’s Smart Specialisation approach can assist regions to develop Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) Roadmaps to accelerate implementation of the Agenda. However, this approach has been slow to develop in peripheral regions where the early learning has suggested that socio-ecological learning is at least as important. Given the relative predominance of peripheral regions throughout the world, there is a considerable challenge in understanding the relationship between socio-ecological innovation and STI roadmaps.

If the EU is to continue to exercise leadership in the implementation of the UN’s Global Agenda, it will need to articulate how these approaches to innovation can be reconciled. Ultimately, this is a challenge not only for the JRC but for the new Commission more generally. This paper will explore these issues and consider how the socio-ecological and STI approaches to innovation might be understood as interrelated dimensions of change.

Bruce Wilson is Director of the European Union Centre at RMIT. In this role, he provides insights to and leads research and debate on EU-Australian relations, and supports partnerships between Australian universities and organisations and their European counterparts. He leads several Jean Monnet projects at RMIT.

Prof Bruce Wilson
EU Centre of Excellence at RMIT University
European banking sector and bank lending amid Covid-19

The Covid-19 pandemic has in short time extended large influence on the way of living and the economy. Many countries in Europe have introduced various social distancing measures and lockdowns, which have hit hard the economic activity. This situation has also negative impact on banks. On the one hand, lockdowns might mean lower demand for banking loans as fall in economic activity discourages companies from investments and households limit consumption among uncertain economic and employment situation. For the same reasons, banks might also be less willing to extend loans, which are now accompanied by higher risk.

At the same time, however, credit crunch might mean both deeper economic slowdown now and lower bank profitability that might, in turn, have negative impact on banks’ ability to finance the post-pandemic economic recovery. It is especially the case in Europe where banks play paramount role as the main source of external finance for private sector. Thus, many governments have introduced loan guarantees systems that aim at supporting both banks themselves and through their lending also the real economy.

This paper carries out the comparative data analysis in order to present the changes in bank lending in the euro area countries during the Covid-19 pandemic and describe bank lending supply and demand and their main determinants. It shows also how banks profitability and financial condition were influenced due to the pandemic. Further, the analysis of the impacts of each country banks and banking sector characteristics, a country macroeconomic situation, lockdown measures, and other government policies on the bank lending is carried out. The analysis thus presents the latest situation of the banks and bank lending in the euro area countries and provides implications for future recovery and ability of banks to finance it.

Agata Wierzbowska is Associate Professor at Graduate School of Economics, Kobe University, Japan. She received M.A. in Finance and Accounting from Warsaw School of Economics in 2011 and Ph.D. in Economics from Kobe University in 2015. Her research has mainly focused on empirical studies on monetary policy, mostly in the euro area, its effectiveness, differences in effects across the countries, transmission mechanism, and a problem of financial integration. Further, she carries out studies on the situation in the banking sector, bank performance, bank efficiency, and their determinants. Other research interests include problems of international finance and macroeconomic empirical analysis.

Assoc Prof Agata Wierzbowska
YASUDA, CHINATSU

Cultural policy of the EU in the age of challenge
The Maastricht Treaty signed in 1992 was the first treaty which included provisions on culture at the European level, and it gave a certain position to “culture” in the EU. After 1992, various kinds of cultural policies were implemented in addition to economic and political measures which were main subject in the integration process of the EU since its beginning. In recent years, the situation over the EU is in complex crises and very challenging. At the referendum in the United Kingdom in June 2016, the group which supported to leave the EU won. BREXIT may influence the EU in many of its aspects.

This paper analyses cultural policies of the EU focusing mainly on “European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 (EYCH 2018)” held in member states in 2018. Does BREXIT impact contemporary cultural policies when they are implemented in the member states? This paper compares EYCH 2018 held in the United Kingdom, Ireland and France.

Chinatsu Yasuda is graduated from graduation school of University of Tokyo (Master’s degree). The current research focuses on cultural policy of the EU.

Chinatsu Yasuda
Graduated from graduation school of University of Tokyo (Master’s degree)
chinasu.yasuda22@gmail.com

YENCKEN, EDWARD

Discovering New Commonalities: Australia-EU relations in a post-COVID-19 context
Prior to the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic relations between Australia and the EU were already predicated on substantive cooperation. In particular, a treaty level Framework Agreement was signed in 2017 with negotiations for a free trade agreement commencing in 2018. These developments were of particular significance given past tensions in the relationship predicated on trade disputes largely associated with the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy. In 2020, however, Australia and the EU saw a new avenue for cooperation based on their coordinated campaign for an international inquiry into the origins of COVID-19 via the World Health Organisation (WHO). This came in the context of strong criticism from
Edward Yencken is a Research Associate within the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education. He was a co-author of a recently published report on transnational education for the Australian Department of Education. He was awarded his PhD in the School of Social and Political Sciences at The University of Melbourne, Australia in 2018. During his PhD research, he spent time as Visiting Scholar at Universität Trier, Germany and at Freie Universität Berlin, Germany as part of the Nachwuchsforschergruppe (NFG) Research Project “Asian Perceptions of the EU: External views on the EU as a Civilian Power.

Dr Edward Yencken
The University of Melbourne
Melbourne, Australia
yenckene@unimel.edu.au

YOON, YONG-JAE

Predicting the number of immigrants in the EU using machine learning techniques: Suggestion for EU immigration policy

With the surge in the number of immigrants, the European Union (EU) is now preparing for a new era. As of 2019, 2.7 million immigrants entered the EU from non-EU countries, and 4.6% of the citizens living in EU member countries were non-EU citizens. Though the fact that the EU is an economic and political union, each member state had a different stance on immigrants. Different political situations and economic conditions have led to different stances on immigration, and this difference made some problems for years.

For a reliable and comprehensive European migration system, the European Commission proposed a New Pact on Migration and Asylum in September 2020. Various approaches have been proposed by the European Commission - including fair solidarity and responsibility, efficient immigration procedures, and changes in the paradigm of cooperation with non-EU members. However, there is a fundamental problem with past approaches to immigrant issues: We had to design immigration policies without knowing the number of future immigrants.
To solve this problem, this study attempts predictions on the number of future immigrants entering the EU, using machine learning. Predictions based on machine learning techniques have recently emerged for their outstanding performance in various fields such as climate, health care, and finance. By applying machine learning techniques, this study will propose the model to predict the number of future immigrants and evaluate the performance of that model. Based on the predictions, this study will draw policy implications on how the EU should respond to immigration issues.

Yong-jae Yoo is a graduate student in the Department of Industrial Engineering at Seoul National University. He received his Bachelor’s Degree in Mathematics and Electrical-Computer Engineering at Seoul National University. His research interests include machine learning, data mining, and natural language processing. He has a deep interest in multidisciplinary research using machine learning, and he participated in several multidisciplinary research projects these days.

Mr Yong-jae Yoo
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
challenger@snu.ac.kr

SPECIAL EUNAP PANEL

Rethinking EU-Asia Pacific relationships in the (post)Covid-19 era
Covid-19, Brexit and the international political instability significantly hit the European Union (EU) in 2020, while tensions among its own Member States increased. Jean Monnet, visionary and founding father of the European political project, said, “Europe will be forged in crises”. With the pandemic under control if global vaccination is successful throughout 2021, with no fraught talks with United Kingdom or an anti-EU American president like Donald Trump, will Europe emerge stronger and more united from the current systemic crisis?

The Covid-19 crisis, in particular, has highlighted more than ever the need for greater international cooperation and a multilateral rules-based system. Building on what they have already been working together, what can the EU and the Asia Pacific countries, including regional organizations like the ASEAN, do to rebuild trust, uphold multilateralism and contribute to a rapid global recovery? What will be the impact of Brexit and Covid-19 on the connectivity agenda between Asia and Europe? Will the health pandemic become a game-changer in the interregional dialogue by reinforcing joint action on health and other policy areas, such as climate change and sustainable development, digital and technological issues, strategic communication and economic security?
This panel will address some of these current challenges and assess their impact on EU-Asia Pacific cooperative relations:

- *The EU-China Vaccine Cooperation: Opportunities and Challenges*, by Prof Xiaotong Zhang (Wuhan/Fudan University).

- *New perspectives for EU-Asia Pacific security and political cooperation in the post-Trump era*, by Francesco Alicino (LUM Giuseppe Degennaro University).

- *The European Green Deal: policies and financial tools to build a green alliance between the EU and Asia Pacific countries*, by Beatriz Pérez de las Heras (University of Deusto).

Dr Zhang Xiaotong is Professor of the School of Political Science and Public Administration, Wuhan University, a Member of Advisory Committee for Economic and Trade Policy (Economic Diplomacy Subcommittee) of the Chinese Ministry of Commerce and Executive Director of Wuhan University Centre for Economic Diplomacy and. He used to work at the U.S. Desk of Chinese Ministry of Commerce, and serve as Trade Attaché at the Chinese Mission to the European Union in Brussels between 2004 and 2010. He obtained a Ph.D. degree on political science at Université Libre de Bruxelles. His major research interests include economic diplomacy, geopolitics, and European studies.

Francesco Alicino is Full Professor in Public Law and Religion and Constitutional Law. He is the Director of the School of Law and Vice Rector for teachings activities (LUM University). He is a member at the Italian Council for the relationship with Muslim communities at the Italian Minister of the Interior. He is Professor at the MISLAM of the School of Government (LUISS, Rome) and a member of the Institute of S. Pio V. (Rome). He has been involved in several international research projects. He is the author of several books and articles in English, Italian and French.

Beatriz Pérez de las Heras is Professor of European Union Law and Jean Monnet Chair on European Integration at the University of Deusto (UD). She is also currently Editor-in-Chief of *Deusto Journal of European Studies*. She has been a visiting scholar at the Universities of Oregon, Georgetown, Fordham, Boston College and Florida International University. She is author of several articles and books on European legal issues, As of September 2019, she is the Coordinator of the Jean Monnet Network “European Union-Asia Pacific Dialogue: promoting European Integration and mutual Knowledge across Continents” (EUNAP).