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Information for Conference Participants

Welcome to the annual EUSA AP Conference which is being held on June 4th and 5th, 2012 in Singapore. In this booklet you will find information on accommodation, transport, etc as well as the conference programme. We hope that you arrive safely and will enjoy your stay.

If you have any concerns or problems during the conference please

- contact Yvonne Grosch, email yvonne.grosch@canterbury.ac.nz or in urgent cases mobile +64 21 1845 942
- or email Sarah Christie sarah.christie@canterbury.ac.nz

The conference registration will start at 8am on Monday, June 4th and at 8.30am on Tuesday, June 5th. The programme finishes at 5.30pm on Monday, at 5.45pm on Tuesday.

A conference dinner will be held on Monday evening at The National University of Singapore Society, Kent Ridge Guild House.

The international calling code for Singapore is +65 followed by the phone number.

Transport on Conference Days

On conference days a bus transfer to and from the venue will be offered. Buses will also return participants to the hotel each evening.

Departure Times

Monday, 04 June 2012 at 7.30am sharp
Tuesday, 05 June 2012 at 8.00am sharp

If you are not at the bus at departure time, we assume that you will use the local public transport system.

We recommend the MRT East-West line for transport to and from the conference venue if you prefer to make your own way to the venue by the MRT system.

More detailed information on public transport is in the back to this booklet.

Access for Email, Computer, Printing and Your Presentation

Internet access will be available at your hotel room free of charge. There will be limited access to computer terminals (with internet) at the conference venue on level 5. However printing will NOT be possible at the conference venue.

Please ensure that you bring your necessary print-outs with you, as we cannot ensure printer access locally. The hotel provides printing for a small number of pages. Small costs may apply.
There will be computers/laptops in the conference rooms. Please bring your presentation on a USB flash-drive. We require that every presenter saves his/her presentation onto the desktop of the computer in the room BEFORE HIS/HER just before the session begins.

Conference Rooms

Welcome and Opening for all in attendance will be in room LT301 on level 3. Please make sure that you sign the Registration form on Monday morning, collect your name badge and conference booklet between 8.00am and 8.45am in front of LT301 before the Welcome. From 9.00am on there will be two parallel sessions throughout the conference. On Monday ‘A’-sessions will be in room LT301 (level 3), ‘B’-sessions will be in SR901 on level 9. Morning and Afternoon Tea as well as lunch will be in the foyer of Level 3 on Monday.

On Tuesday both sessions will be on level 9, rooms SR901 and SR902. Morning and Afternoon Tea as well as lunch will be on level 9.

More information on the public transport system, the hotel, conference dinner, etc can be found towards the end of this booklet.

If you have any other questions please feel free to send an email to yvonne.grosch@canterbury.ac.nz
### Conference Programme

**Monday, 04 June 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.00am - 08.45am</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.45am - 09.00am</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>LT301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Martin Holland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Apirat Pechtsiri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Lay Hwee Yeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00am - 10.30am</td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>LT301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASEAN Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ass Prof Clara Portela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking Inspiration from Europe? The ASEAN Charta and Views on Integration and Sovereignty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Naila Maier-Knapp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Politico-Security Perspective on the ASEAN-EU Relationship in the 21st Century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Danielle Tan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Success and Limits of Open Regionalism: Lessons Learnt from the GMS (Greater Mekong Subregion) Programme for EU and ASEAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Boguslawa Drelich-Skulska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The premises of the EU and ASEAN regional integration process in the age of globalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am - 11.00am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am - 12.30pm</td>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>SR901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Yuriko Haga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid impact of laws in/of EU onto Asia – Through the example of EU law study in Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Tobias Hofmann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-compliance as Bargaining Failure. Strategic Interaction under Uncertainty and the Escalation of Infringement Proceedings in the European Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Jiao Zhang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Rule of Law in the EU integration: Limitations and Prospects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Sawako Oba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Influence of European Union Conditionality on the Czech Legal System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45pm - 01.15pm</td>
<td>EUSA AP President Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.30pm - 03.00pm</td>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room: LT301</td>
<td>Chair: Dr Maria Garcia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Jong-Hwan Ko</td>
<td>To What Extent Could Preferential Trade Agreements between the EU and East Asian Countries Promote Economic Growth?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Shintaro Hamanaka</td>
<td>Comparative Analysis of Services Trade Integration in Asia and Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Anna H. Jankowiak &amp; Dr Szymon Mazurek</td>
<td>Asia already in EU: How Asian Clusters and Business Networks Affect Economic Relations between EU and Asia and EU integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room: SR901</td>
<td>Chair: Dr. Sebastian Bersick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Juan Pablo Ferrero</td>
<td>Democracy beyond New Social Movements: interrogating the anarchist principle as the new standpoint to study democratisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Thomas Christiansen</td>
<td>National Parliaments in the EU after Lisbon: Towards Multilevel Democracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Pablo Jimenez</td>
<td>Now Let Us Make Europeans – Citizenship, Solidarity and Identity in an Intercultural Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Antonio Formacion</td>
<td>Right to be not ignored; EU’s “No disconnect Strategy” and the future of internet freedom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.00pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.30pm</td>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasman CRIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room: LT301</td>
<td>Chair: Dr John Leslie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Leslie</td>
<td>Going ‘Deep’ in trans-Tasman Economic Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Annmarie Elijah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Matthew Castle</td>
<td>What good is ‘actorness’ beyond the EU? Trans-Tasman integration and the foundations of CER-ASEAN interregionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Toni Grace</td>
<td>Micro-regional integration meets migrant integration: Third Country Nationals in the cross-border Öresund region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Avery Poole</td>
<td>Ambitions versus capacity: The role of institutions in ASEAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room: SR901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Prof. Rajendra Jain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Annick Masselot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the EU have a future as a gender actor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Katharine Vadura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mind the gap: exporting human rights, importing obligations, the EU and Asia”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Wenwen Shen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EU's Promotion of Human Rights in Global Information Age: the case of China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ravi Saxena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste in the Public Sphere and Indian State: A Human Rights Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ruth A. Bevan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the EU’s Soft Power Track Record in Asia?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday, 05 June 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30am</td>
<td>Registration on level 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00am</td>
<td>Session 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00am</td>
<td>International &amp; Diplomatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room: SR901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Katharine Vadura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnabas Horvath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The USA-PRC rivalry’s impact on EU-Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jelica Stefanovic-Stambuk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership diplomacy horizon: the visible junction of the European Union and Asia joint practice of knowing and acting for prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Beata Jagiello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central-West Asia region: a new factor in Asian geopolitics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Hiromasa Kubo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room: SR902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christian Fjaeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionalism I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Policy in the EU Mode of Regionalism: Implications for Asian Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Tamio Nakamura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Impact of the EU’s Dual Character Diplomacy on Asian Regionalism(s): Norms and Interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am</td>
<td>Session 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Rajendra Jain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European Union and South Asia: Indian Perceptions and Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Natalia Chaban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En’vision’ing Europe’s Crisis: A visual and textual analysis of the EU imagery in Chinese, Indian and Russian business newspapers (with Jessica Bain and Serena Kelly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr May-Britt Stumbaum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common wording, deviating vision? Comparing Chinese and European perspectives on the EU as a security actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sebastian Bersick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving Asia: The Expectation Deficit in EU-Asia Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EU & Asia

**Room:** SR902  
**Chair:** Dr. Mathew Doidge

- **Ms Ika Riswanti Putranti**  
  The Role of the GSP to Discover ASEAN - EU Trade Relationships.

- **Mr Vlad Vernygora**  
  Mirroring the EU? Functional Capacity of Integration in Asia (co-authored with Dr Natalia Chaban)

- **Ms Suet-Yi Lai**  
  Going forward, backward or going nowhere? ASEM turning sixteen and ASEM9 in Vientiane

- **Mr Gyula Toth**  
  Europe and Asia: Governance, Sociological Constructivism and Society

**12.30pm – 01.30pm**  
**Lunch & Announcements**

**12.45pm – 1.15pm**  
**NZ/Australia EU Centres & Erasmus Mundus Meeting**

### 01.30pm – 03.00pm  
**Session 7**

#### The View from Asia

**Room:** SR901  
**Chair:** Dr May-Britt Stumbaum

- **Ms Garima Mohan**  
  Natural Partners in Foreign Policy? Case of Peacekeeping and Indian Elites' Perception of the European Union

- **Mr Florian Britsch**  
  Tall in talk – short in action? Security Concepts of India and the EU and possibilities for cooperation *For the Panel - 'The View from Asia': How India and China see the European Union as a Security Actor.*

- **Mr Jizhou Zhao**  
  Europe Leads, China Follows? The European Union, China and International Peacekeeping & Export Controls: One Partnership, Different Perspectives

- **Ms Olivia Gippner**  
  “Agent China”: Multilateral negotiations and the role of the EU – discovering the patterns of interaction in negotiations on climate change and technology transfer

### Trade II

**Room:** SR902  
**Chair:** Prof. Bruce Wilson

- **Dr Maria Garcia**  
  Redefining EU-Asia Relations through Free Trade Agreements

- **Mr Karel Cada**  
  Negotiations of Economic Justice and Global Health: The Case of the FTA between EU and India

- **Dr Hitoshi Suzuki**  
  EU’s Not Unknown Partner In Asia: Japan, FTA Negotiations, And Fukushima

- **Dr SooYeon Kim**  
  Designing Commitment: The Political Economy of Dispute Settlement Design in Preferential Trade Agreements

**03.00pm – 03.30pm**  
**Afternoon Tea**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03.30pm</td>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>Mr Nicholas Smith</td>
<td>Closing the ‘expectations-capabilities’ gap post-Lisbon? External media portrayals of the EU’s reaction to the Arab Spring in the BRIC countries *written in conjunction with Dr Serena Kelly (University of Canterbury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Shreya Pandey</td>
<td>The Indian Gaze upon the EU: An Analysis through the Prism of Newspapers and the Views of the Indian Elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ass. Prof Reuben Wong</td>
<td>Identity in the EU’s relations with China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Lucie Macku</td>
<td>Freedom of Media – Perceptions in EU and Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Eijiro Fukui</td>
<td>Images of the EU in the Japanese Television News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.30pm</td>
<td>Regionalism II</td>
<td>Prof. Martin Holland</td>
<td>Chair: Prof. Martin Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room: SR901</td>
<td>Reassessing socio-cultural cooperation in the ASEM process: the role and contribution of ASEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Anna Rudakowska</td>
<td>China, India and Japan: the EU's strategic partners through the eyes of the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Mathew Doidge</td>
<td>Patterns of Engagement: Europe–Asia Relations and Comparative Interregionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Sandra Marco Colino</td>
<td>Methods of European Integration and their 'Exportability' into Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.30pm</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRIP Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.15pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr John Leslie</td>
<td>V Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.15pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday, 04 June 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>1A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>ASEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>LT301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assistant Professor Dr Clara Portela
Singapore Management University, Singapore

Taking Inspiration from Europe? The ASEAN Charta and Views on Integration and Sovereignty

It is often posited that divergences prevail between the Western and Asian understanding of the concepts of state sovereignty and international intervention. The present paper looks at the extent to which the EU and ASEAN diverge in their understanding of these notions as reflected in their approaches to selected questions of central importance to the notions of interference and state sovereignty: regional integration and human rights protection. In particular, the paper examines the extent to which the parties share an understanding on the means to achieve regional integration and protect human rights in view of the reforms introduced by the ASEAN Charta. The investigation is based on the analysis of speeches and declarations by members of the political elites of ASEAN countries, in an attempt to capture the precise configuration of the explored notions. The paper intends to improve our knowledge of the notions of sovereignty and human rights in Southeast Asian, illuminating our understanding of the nature and magnitude of dissent on these central notions in the scarcely explored context of Europe-Asian relations.

Dr Clara Portela is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Singapore Management University (Singapore). She holds a PhD from the European University Institute in Florence and an MA from the Free University of Berlin. She is the author of the monograph European Union Sanctions and Foreign Policy (Routledge 2010) and of several articles on the foreign and security policy of the EU. Together with Dr Daniel Novotny, she has edited the volume EU-ASEAN Relations in the XXIst Century, forthcoming with Palgrave in 2012. She has held visiting positions with the Institute for Security Studies of the EU (France), Carleton University (Canada), the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (Germany) and the Australian National University (Australia).

Dr Naila Maier-Knapp
Griffith Asia Institute

A Politico-Security Perspective on the ASEAN-EU Relationship in the 21st Century

This paper seeks to give an overview of the current interaction between the EU and Southeast Asia from a politico-security
perspective. During the Cold War the superpower overlay determined the central security issues. After the Cold War, the broadening of the interregional security and political agenda were complemented by a deepening of the dialogue. Cooperation was substantiated by various mechanisms (e.g.: Trans-Regional EU-ASEAN Trade Initiative (TREATI), Regional EU-ASEAN Dialogue Instrument (READI) etc.) and concerns related to human security were incorporated. Today, there are four main characteristics of the current state of the ASEAN-EU politico-security dialogue and cooperation. First, the agenda and initiatives suggest that Southeast Asia is the primary region of concern and the basis for developing activities, although there are instances which refer to the global agenda. Second, the nation-state as a whole is considered to be the security referent in a differentiated manner. Third, both sides promote cooperation on transnational concerns that envision multi-levelled and cross-sectoral activities in niche areas. Fourth, the activities in the field of political and security cooperation indicate the ambition to develop the ASEAN-EU Ministerial Meeting and the ASEAN Regional Forum to meaningful dialogue fora with tangible outcomes that eventually stimulate further cooperation and joint positions on the global level. In this context, particularly, so-called non-traditional security issues are offering an opportunity to advance the relationship. These threats have promoted global efforts and emphasised issue-specific cooperation. They have stimulated a momentum that converges threat perceptions and identities. Against this backdrop, the paper explores how two regions – who attach relatively little salience to each other – use the post-Cold War securitisation trend to increase the opportunity of threat othering as well as threat commonalisation creating space for greater interaction and normative influence.

Naila Maier-Knapp is a PhD graduate from the National Centre for Research on Europe at the University of Canterbury in New Zealand. Currently, she is a Research Associate at the Griffith Asia Institute. Her research interests are the European Union (EU) as a global actor, regionalism and interregionalism in the European and East Asian context, international security and Thai politics. She has published various journal articles and also has forthcoming three book chapters in edited volumes by Palgrave Macmillan, Nomos and PIE Lang.

Dr Danielle Tan
Australia National University

The Success and Limits of Open Regionalism: Lessons Learnt from the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) Programme for EU and ASEAN

Southeast Asia shares many similarities with Europe, among others, deep economic, historic and cultural ties, as well as the trauma of wars, which led to the desire of turning battlefields into marketplaces. However, in Southeast Asia, regional economic integration has preceded institutional integration, reversing the order of European integration. Despite drawing on different models of integration, programmes favouring the setting up of cross-border and transnational areas have burgeoned both within European Union and ASEAN. The Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) development programme, supported by the Asian Development Bank since the early 1990’s, is currently one of the most dynamic economic integration processes occurring in mainland Southeast Asia. Gathering six countries bordering the
Mekong River – Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, Myanmar and the People’s Republic of China (specifically Yunnan province, and later on, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region), the GMS seeks to foster economic cooperation by easing cross-border movement of goods and people. Among the flagship initiatives of the programme are three economic corridors that have revived the old caravan route network, which crisscrossed the peninsula in pre-colonial times. My presentation aims to highlight the specificities of open regionalism behind the GMS program through examining the so-called “corridor approach”. The main argument is that European Union, as well as ASEAN, can learn from the success and the limits of this form of regionalism. In less than two decades, former enemies have become interdependent economic partners. The lessons on how these countries went through the 1997 Asian financial crisis could provide food for thought for those who are analysing the current European crisis. Likewise, the success of the GMS could soon become ASEAN’s Achilles’ heel, as the “subregion” has moved steadily towards becoming a “region” being increasingly drawn into China’s orbit, thus producing growing divisions between mainland and maritime Southeast Asia.

Danielle TAN is a French postdoctoral research fellow, currently based at the ANU Centre for European Studies and the College of Asia and Pacific in Canberra, Australia. She is part of the EUOSSIC Erasmus Mundus Exchange Project funded by the European Union. Her main research interests include comparative politics and political economy of Southeast Asia with an emphasis on the rise of China in the context of regional integration in the Greater Mekong Subregion. She earned her PhD in Political Science from Sciences Po Paris (France) in December 2011. Her dissertation was entitled “From Communism to Neoliberalism: the Part Played by Chinese Networks in the Transformation of the State in Laos”. E-mail: <Danielle.Tan@anu.edu.au>

Professor Boguslawa Drelich-Skulska
Wroclaw University, Poland

The premises of the EU and ASEAN regional integration process in the age of globalization

Globalization and regionalization processes intertwine in all the areas of modern international relations, prompting researchers not only to seek for reasons, magnitude and force of this reciprocal interaction, but also to look for the underlying explanation for such broad extent of determinants for shaping regional processes in various parts of the world. Models of cooperation in the European Union and ASEAN are constructs that differ in quality, premises, mechanisms and aims of the undertaken cooperation. The author of this abstract resolved to discuss the premises of this process, as they determine opportunities of cooperation and directions of its development, as well as forming a common platform of knowledge for particular nations thanks to which they can better understand integration processes occurring in the international environment. They also help find an answer to the question if a universal model is possible to establish in modern international relations. The comparative analysis is a challenge for international relations theoreticians, who find it increasingly more difficult to automatically apply the theories of classical schools to the comprehension of the contemporary world. Hence, so many new currents of thinking which
emphasize civilization differences, diversity of regional systems, economic and political institutions, as well as basic social considerations. Therefore, comparative studies play such a significant role in investigating regionalism today.

Bogusława Drelich-Skulska is Professor in the Department of International Economic Relations, Wroclaw University of Economics. She is also Head of Asia Pacific Research Center at the same University. Her research focuses on international integration processes and foreign economic policy, particularly in East Asia. Prof. Drelich-Skulska has published extensively in Polish and in English on various aspects of this field of research, as well as on aspects of foreign trade in Poland and other East European countries and issues of business and security in the Asia-Pacific region. Her most recent book is *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe w regionie Azji i Pacyfiku. Wybrane zagadnienia* [International Security in Asia and Pacific Region: Selected Problems] (2010). She has been visiting professor at the University of Neuchatel (Switzerland), in the International School of Management in Riga (Latvia) and in the Center for Asian and Pacific Studies (CAPS), Seikei Univeristy in Tokyo (Japan).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>1B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>EURO CRISIS &amp; FINANCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>SR901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professor Changkyu Choi**  
Myongji University, Korea  
*The Euro Bias of Banklending of the financial institutions in the euro zone*

The integration of euro-area financial markets since the launch of the euro in 1999 has been the center of attention in the policy debate and academic literature. This paper complements this much-explored line of research by examining a subject that has attracted much less attention - namely, the effects of the euro on the banklending. We analyze the banklending of the financial institutions in the euro zone banks. We ask the question of whether the financial institutions in the euro zone are more likely to lend to the financial institutions in the euro zone. Our main findings are that the financial institutions of the euro-zone countries tend to lend in each other substantially more after the introduction of the euro.

Dr. Changkyu Choi is Professor of Economics at Myongji University. He holds Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Texas at Austin, and BA degree in Economics from the Seoul National University. He served as president of the EUSA-KOREA in 2011. He worked for the Bank of Korea from 1980 to 2000. He has served as an advisor to monetary policy at the Bank of Korea since 2007 and as an outsider director of National Research of Foundation in Korea since 2011. He also served as an outside director of Korea Housing Finance Corporation from 2009 to 2011. He has published many articles in Applied Economics, *Applied Economics Letters, Economics Letters, Journal of Policy Modeling, etc.*
The sovereign debt crisis inflicting the Eurozone member states has both international economic and European integration significance. Rarely has a regional economic crisis had such clear and immediate effects on even distant nations such as Australia and South Korea. This crisis is a sovereign debt crisis in which some Eurozone governments are facing unsustainable bond market rates of repayment for having high public debt and low level measures to resolve these debts. Moreover these states are inflicted by low or no economic growth and a no exit solution given they are members of a single currency scenario in which monetary policy is a combined approach and not specific to member states. Countries such as Australia and South Korea will ultimately feel this decline in lower levels of investment, lower levels of exports and potentially decline in the GDP. The aim of this paper is to ascertain in what ways they will feel the effects of the crisis. These are two different economic realities which theoretically should respond differently to this sovereign debt crisis. The paper also seeks to understand the similarities and the differences in the way these two nations will defend themselves from this economic tsunami and what factors will explain this economic defence.

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 in economics in Sep. 2004 in Sweden. He is currently Full Professor at Graduate School of Knowledge based Technology and Energy, Korea Polytechnic University and Adjunct Professor at Center for Science-based Entrepreneurship, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), South Korea. He is also a Private Dozent at Justus Liebig University in Giessen, Germany and Visiting 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. 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 is 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).
Asian Currency reserves as an instrument of macroeconomic policy. Implications for international business

Sebastian Bobowski, Ph. D., Lecturer, Faculty of Economic Sciences, International Economic Relations Department, Wroclaw University of Economics, Poland; co-founder and member of the Asia-Pacific Research Centre at Wroclaw University of Economics; author and co-author of 36 articles and 6 books in Polish and English concerning the issues of the Asian regionalism, financial integration, cluster structures, cohesion policy of the European Union (UE), global governance and innovativeness; departmental coordinator of the UE programme of international exchange of students “LLP Erasmus”; visiting professor at University of Applied Sciences in Schmalkalden, Germany; co-creator and contractor of international research project “Clusters as an innovation carrier of enterprises and regions. Verification and implementation of Asian models in terms of the Polish economy”, funded by National Science Centre, Poland.

Marcin Haberla, Ph. D., Lecturer, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Marketing Research Department, Wroclaw University of Economics, Poland; member of the Asia-Pacific Research Centre at Wroclaw University of Economics; author and co-author of 16 scientific papers in Polish and English concerning the issues of the Asian regionalism, academic entrepreneurship, innovativeness; visiting professor at Turku School of Economics, Turku, Finland; author of the training manuals and coach in training and educational projects co-funded by UE; co-creator and contractor of international research project “Clusters as an innovation carrier of enterprises and regions. Verification and implementation of Asian models in terms of the Polish economy”, funded by National Science Centre, Poland; research director in research company, responsible for planning and organizing of research process.
Legal studies in Japan have long used European countries as base models. To establish a “modernized” system, Japan sent delegations to Europe and invited European intellectuals to Japan to learn the system in Europe. For the civil laws, legislators referred specifically to Germany and France. Standing on this historical basis, Japanese legal studies were (or even are) quite often focused research on the law and regulations of a particular European country on specific area, such as German civil procedural law or French succession law. Recently, however, there is a new trend: There is a growing focus on EU law itself because of its development and expansion. EU law-making is, in other words, getting more influential in Japan. Therefore, events surrounding EU law are closely followed by Japanese legislators as well as scholars. This does not mean that the object of comparative study has been completely shifted from each national law to the EU law. EU legislation still does not cover all matters of law and has to refer many issues to the laws of each country. Therefore, studies must be conducted on both EU law and individual national laws when there is no existing rule at the EU law level. This study will take the private international law (PIL) issue on defamation as an example (Rome II Regulation). For this matter, Japanese PIL receives many inspirations not only from the Regulation itself but also from the discussions during its drafting, and even national laws or jurisprudence of member States. Through analysis of the example, this study will examine the impact of EU laws in Japanese legal studies, which will give some inspirations to answer for the question of whether/how Asian laws have a reverse influence on European laws.

Dr Yuriko Haga
KYUSHU UNIVERSITY, JAPAN

*Hybrid impact of laws in/of EU onto Asia – Through the example of EU law study in Japan*

Legal studies in Japan have long used European countries as base models. To establish a “modernized” system, Japan sent delegations to Europe and invited European intellectuals to Japan to learn the system in Europe. For the civil laws, legislators referred specifically to Germany and France. Standing on this historical basis, Japanese legal studies were (or even are) quite often focused research on the law and regulations of a particular European country on specific area, such as German civil procedural law or French succession law. Recently, however, there is a new trend: There is a growing focus on EU law itself because of its development and expansion. EU law-making is, in other words, getting more influential in Japan. Therefore, events surrounding EU law are closely followed by Japanese legislators as well as scholars. This does not mean that the object of comparative study has been completely shifted from each national law to the EU law. EU legislation still does not cover all matters of law and has to refer many issues to the laws of each country. Therefore, studies must be conducted on both EU law and individual national laws when there is no existing rule at the EU law level. This study will take the private international law (PIL) issue on defamation as an example (Rome II Regulation). For this matter, Japanese PIL receives many inspirations not only from the Regulation itself but also from the discussions during its drafting, and even national laws or jurisprudence of member States. Through analysis of the example, this study will examine the impact of EU laws in Japanese legal studies, which will give some inspirations to answer for the question of whether/how Asian laws have a reverse influence on European laws.

Doctor of Laws, Kyushu University (Japan), majoring in private international law; Research Fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. Most recently, she won the grand prize in the 8th essay contest of the Copyright Research and Information Center (essay on law applicable to moral right in France) and was also selected as one of the 3 winners of the Intellectual Property Junior Researchers’ Essay Contest 2011 of Hokkaido University Research Institute for Information Law & Policy (article on parody and author’s right in France). She has an experience of 1 year’s study in Master course of University of Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne in the Cycle Major Programme of the Renault Foundation.
Dr Elisabetta Nadalutti
Australia National University, Australia

*Is cross-border cooperation a ‘feasible’ form of governance which boosts integration?*

The paper analyzes governance in cross-border-regions following the implementation of EU cross-border-cooperation programmes and Regulation 1082/2006 (i.e. European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation). It focuses on cross-border-governance between Eastern and Western European states, particularly Italy, Slovenia and Croatia. First, it offers a brief theoretical background on the meaning of ‘integration’ (Social? Urban? Economic? Security?) and ‘cross-border-governance’ within the EU. Second, it investigates whether a type of transnational governance is emerging in cross-border-regions, in which cross-border activities are empowering the regional-local level (sub-national level) and permitting it to circumvent/supersede the national level. Thirdly, it will investigate the role of civil society in promoting integration. The paper does not seek to understand the causes that lead to integration. Rather it investigates, whether civil society in cross-border-regions can promote integration in Europe, and whether effective integration can be achieved without engagement of civil society in the integration process. It will be shown that EU cross-border-cooperation programmes are transforming the operation of power across the various levels of governance on a local/national/ supranational level. Additionally, it demonstrates the significance and role of civil society in cross-border areas in fostering relations, mutual understanding and integration across different borders. This will be my starting point in order to analyse whether cross-border cooperation can be a feasible form of governance which, in creating more integration on the ‘border’, can spread and boost integration to the ‘centre’. Furthermore, can this kind of ‘governance’ be promoted outside Europe? Can it have an effective influence on regionalism in Asia? Do Asia regions have a ‘cross-border dimension’? Is there a civil society mobilization? What is the role played by the state in promoting integration in these territories? Whether and how do states acts tactically to resist or facilitate regional integration?

Dr Elisabetta Nadalutti is an Erasmus Mundus post-doctoral researcher in European and Asia-Pacific studies at ANU Centre for European Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra. She holds a PhD and a MSc (Hons) degree from the University of Bath and BSc (Hons) degree from the University of Udine (Italy). Her research interests are focused primarily on issues of governance, citizenship and identity in cross-border areas. She has conducted research on the impact of the European integration process in relation to civil-society mobilization and identity construction. She has presented at numerous international conferences and has published over 4 academic articles in a range of social and interdisciplinary journals.
Dr Tobias Hofmann  
National University of Singapore, Singapore  
*Non-compliance as Bargaining-Failure. Strategic Interaction under Uncertainty and the Escalation of Infringement Proceedings in the European Union*

The domestic politics of compliance literature pays almost exclusive attention to variation in political institutions and the influence of special interest groups. In this paper, I focus on political parties and voters. I analyze the effects of electoral competition on compliance. Having developed distinct theoretical models of how the electoral calculations of political elites and the policy preferences of voters affect compliance with the legally binding provisions of international agreements, I empirically test these models using original European Union data for the years 1978-2007.

Tobias Hofmann is a Visiting Instructor in the Department of Political Science at the National University of Singapore. Before joining NUS, he worked at the College of William & Mary, Princeton University, and Harvard University. His research focuses on the political economy of regional integration.

Ms Zhang Jiao  
University of Macao, China  
*The Rule of Law in the EU integration: Limitations and Prospects*

Ever since the appearance of the proposal on “integration through law”, the Rule of Law has been regarded not only as an objective of the EU integration but also as an instrument for the EU integration. The EU identifies itself as a Union created by law and operating based on the Rule of Law. And the Rule of Law has been required throughout the enlargement of the EU. Yet, the “integration through law” proposal was appeared under the background that there was no sufficient media and political consensus to support the EU integration. Besides, no substantive concept on the EU Rule of Law has been developed until now. It seems that the Rule of Law remains as a purely formalistic slogan presented in EU activities internally and externally. Thus, what are the precise contributions of the Rule of Law to the EU integration? Is there any limitation on the Rule of Law to function in the EU context? Is it still appropriate to call the EU integration as “integration through law” or “integration through the Rule of Law”? Hence comes out the title of this paper. What I seek to show in this paper is to observe the status and the potential of the Rule of Law in the EU integration through analysing on the EU integration theory, exploring supposed functions of the Rule of Law, and observing the Rule of Law in the EU context. The present purpose is to give some considerations to the role of the Rule of Law in the regional integration and some evaluations on the limitations and prospects of the Rule of Law in the future EU integration.

Zhang Jiao is a PhD Student at the University of Macau currently, majoring in European Union Law, specifically, in the field of external relations law of the European Union and its impacts on China. In 2008, she got dual bachelor degrees of international economic law and English language at East China University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai, China. In 2010, she got her master of law degree under the programme of Master of EU Law,
International Law and Comparative Law in English Language, University of Macau. Since 2009, her research is focusing on the ongoing EU-China Partnership and Cooperation Agreement.
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**Ass Prof Daniela Sicurelli**  
University of Trento, Italy

**Ass Prof Marco Brunazzo**  
University of Trento, Italy

---

*Chinese and European approaches to regional security. The test of the Darfur conflict*

This paper tests the impact of the models of conflict management promoted by the European Union (EU) and China on the African Union (AU)’s security policy. To this purpose, it compares the European and Chinese approaches to the regional conflict of Darfur, and investigates the way the AU and key African states reacted to external intervention. While China has tried to promote an approach based on diplomacy and on the principle of the host state consent, the EU has sponsored a more intrusive role of regional organizations and of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in implementing the principle of the responsibility to protect. The Chinese model had greater resonance among AU leaders, who welcomed it due to its respect for the African ownership of the peace process. On the contrary, the European approach to conflict management, which had inspired the building of the AU security architecture, has increasingly lost legitimacy in the eyes of African governments and regional leaders. These leaders criticised European intervention for its lack of appropriateness to the local context and its abuse of the principle of universal jurisdiction. The Darfur case shows that Africa has become an arena of competition between China and the EU not only in the fields of trade and development, but also in the field of security building. It shows that the Asian model of “Eastphalia” – or gentle Westphalia- promoted by China (Ginsburg 2009) has become a key challenge to the attempt of the EU to promote a post-Westphalian security policy in its international relations.

Daniela Sicurelli is assistant professor of International Relations at the University of Trento. She has recently published the volume European Union’s Africa Policies. Norms, Interests and Impact (Ashgate, 2010) and articles on EU’s external relations and development cooperation in several journals, including Journal of Common Market Studies, Journal of European Public Policies, Journal of European Integration, International Politics, International Spectator and Regional and Federal Studies.
Marco Brunazzo is assistant professor in European Politics and Director of the Jean Monnet European Centre of Excellence at the University of Trento. His main research interests include European Union politics, with a focus on negotiations, policy-making and multilevel governance. He has published two books and articles for several journals, including Journal of Modern Italian Studies, Modern Italy, Regional and Federal Studies and World Political Science Review.

**Associate Professor Naohisa Murakami**
Nagaoka University of Technology, Japan

*How Fukushima has impacted the EU countries’ nuclear power policies and what Japan can learn from Europe on nuclear safety?: Seeking a new paradigm of energy security*

The March 11 earthquake, tsunami and ensuing nuclear disaster in Fukushima has prompted rethink of ways to secure nuclear safety as well as energy security. There have been repercussions not just in Japan but in other parts of the world, including Europe where divergent nuclear power policies have emerged. Germany and Italy are weaning themselves away from dependence on nuclear power, while Paris and London seem to be sticking to pro-nuclear power policies. This presentation aims at elucidating how Fukushima impacted European countries' atomic power policies and how they intend to go about energy security amid the general public's deep-seated concerns about nuclear safety and in response to global warming. This presentation will attempt to shed light on the circumstances leading up to the relevant decisions in Germany and Italy as well as the ongoing arguments in France on whether to scale down the nuclear power industry or not. The findings, if any, may provide some food for thought for Japan which has been trying to come up with a revised energy strategy as early as this year. Moreover, Europeans might be curious to know what is actually going on in Japan in terms of preventing the spread of radioactivity and its strenuous decontamination efforts. This will be included in the presentation. The presentation will also focus on what Japan can learn from Europe on nuclear safety as well as the ongoing cooperation between Tokyo and Brussels in this respect. Energy security will be another key watchword. Efforts to expand the shares of renewable in Japan and Europe will be also highlighted.

Naohisa MURAKAMI (Mr.) is a Japanese journalist-turned-academic. He has been teaching international studies, centering on European integration, as associate professor, at the Department of Management and Information Systems Science of the state-run Nagaoka University of Technology in Niigata Prefecture, Japan, since 2007. His interest now focuses on regionalism in East Asia and the metamorphosis of the Japanese society in the aftermath of the March 11, 2011, Fukushima nuclear power plant disaster as well as European integration, mainly the repercussions of the Euro crisis. He was visiting scholar at the University of Southern California's Annenberg School of Communication and Journalism between December 2009 and March 2010. Before starting the academic career, he worked as a journalist for the Japanese news agency Jiji Press for 26 years during which he served as the news organization's Brussels correspondent 1989-1994. He was born in Yamaguchi, Japan, in 1949.
Lessons from Europe: Is the European model of integration applicable to Asia, Latin America and the Middle East?

Prior to the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, there was little discussion in regards to the question: what does “European” mean? Europeans were defined by their geographical position near the Iron Curtain. While British and French citizens were perceived as “Western Europeans,” Polish and Serbian citizens were perceived as “Eastern Europeans.” These epithets in conjunction with nationalistic references served as the traditional means by which Europeans identified themselves as well as each other. Since the USSR’s downfall, however, Europe has undergone a significant degree of regional integration that now challenges the utility of established epithets and recognizes the multiplicity of identities. Qualitative analysis regarding this transformation is conflicting. Whereas some scholars argue the European model of integration can serve as a pathway for other regions to follow, other scholars suggest the European model is an exclusive phenomenon and consequently cannot be applied to regions such as Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. Though the European model of integration is applicable, I contend that it is not a viable option for nationally divided or ethnically fragmented regions, and that it should not be pursued without substantial modification. Examining literature on the development of European integration, I find evidence of a sophisticated model where the transference of state powers from the national to the supranational level of governance is determined on the basis of crisis resolution. I also find that the European model of integration is predicated on three key factors – sustained economic prosperity, institutional feasibility, and philosophical consensus – which produce roadblocks that disrupt the overall process of integration in the long run. I conclude this article by proposing a series of questions and offering remedies that may address deficiencies within the European model of integration, and thereby produce a more suitable model for other regions to adopt.

Randall Denison is a graduate student at the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, where he is pursuing a Master of Arts in Political Science. He holds a BA in Political Theory and Constitutional Democracy from Michigan State University. He traveled abroad in Turkey, after which he wrote a comprehensive examination on the development of authoritarianism and constitutional liberalism. Presently, he is focusing on foreign affairs, membership enlargement and cultural integration with regards to the European Union. After a year of study at UNC-CH, he will study abroad in Bremen, Germany where he will complete his master’s thesis.

A shifting scale: EU-Asia energy competition

In recent years, the scale of competition for the world’s energy resources has intensified. The rapid economic growth of the Asian
continent, particularly China and India has led to vast appetites for coal, oil and gas. Indeed, the International Energy Agency has forecast an increase of 75% in China’s total demand between 2009 and 2035. This is set to have a huge impact on international markets as prices rise on the back of such demands and China’s capacity and willingness to pay these costs. As such, Europe faces large challenges in securing its own access to these resources. It also faces not only economically but also politically, competing with rising powers to establish/maintain close relationships with key suppliers and regions. Therefore, what this paper seeks to analyse is the efficacy of EU engagement with key suppliers in Central Asia. Central Asia is an important region for both China and the EU given its relative proximity to both and their attempts to secure access to the resources found in the region. The paper argues that although the EU is making some attempts in this area, it needs to make more substantive effort in order to maximise its gains. In presenting this point, the article proceeds by firstly providing some background on the changing world energy dynamics and the place of Central Asia therein, particularly resource-rich Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. It then goes on to contrast the EU and Chinese approaches to the region. The article highlights that Beijing’s approach is more geopolitical and lacks a basis on normative issues, unlike the EU, and argues that this is limiting the efficacy of EU efforts.

Evan Thompson earned a B.A with a Diploma of Languages (Chinese-Mandarin) from Monash University in 2008, majoring in International Studies and Politics with a Minor in French. He immediately went on to earn a Masters in International Relations with Monash University) with a research thesis examining the history of Chinese aid to Africa and how this had affected relations between African countries and the People’s Republic of China. His PhD research focuses on the role Russia plays as a major exporter to Europe of gas and oil and the political influence this gives to a resurgent Russian state, with particular emphasis on Moscow’s goals to secure unexplored oil and gas reserves in the Arctic, potentially at the expense of the other four littoral states (including EU member state Denmark).

He has presented at international conferences in Australia as well as in Russia, China and Sweden and the UK on a range of issues concerning Arctic geopolitics and international relations and energy politics. He has been published in the Australian and New Zealand Journal of European Studies and has several book chapters and journal articles being published in 2012.

Evan has lectured in Eastern European politics and Central Asia as well as European integration and taught classes on conducting business in Europe.
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Professor Jong-Hwan Ko
Pukyong National University, Japan
To what extent could preferential Trade Agreements between the EU and East Asian Countries Promote Economic Growth?

The European Union has concluded free trade agreements with South Korea and Papua New Guinea in East Asia, is currently negotiating
preferential trade agreements with India, Malaysia and Singapore, and is considering opening preferential negotiations with Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. This paper deals with what economic effects the EU and its partners are to gain by quantifying potential economic effects of the preferential trade agreements the EU has concluded, is currently negotiating and is considering negotiating using a computable general equilibrium (CGE) model. A CGE model can be defined as a system of non-linear simultaneous equations describing the constrained optimization of behaviors of economic agents, such as producers, consumers, exporters, importers, savers, investors, and the government. Simulation results of the preferential trade agreements are described in terms of real GDP, equivalent variation as a proxy for welfare, total exports, total imports, trade balance, terms of trade, employment and demand for capital at the macroeconomic level. At the microeconomic level, exports and imports by commodity, trade balance by commodity, domestic production by sector, demand for labor and capital by sector are examined. This paper is organized as follows. Section II provides a description of characteristics of economic relations between the EU and its partners. Section III describes the model used in this study. Section IV examines baseline and policy scenarios of the preferential trade agreements, and Section V discusses their simulation results. Section VI concludes with some remarks.

Jong-Hwan Ko is Professor of Economics (with a chair in European Studies) with the Division of International and Area Studies, Pukyong National University (PKNU) in Korea. He serves as Director of Institute for International and Area Studies and Director of Center for EU Relations at PKNU. He also serves on the editorial board of International Area Studies Review, and Journal of Economics and Management by Korean-German Academy of Economics and Management. Before transferring to PKNU in early 1996, he served as Chief Economist of Busan Development Institute, a think tank of Busan Metropolitan City government. He received his Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Frankfurt in Germany in 1992.

As visiting professor, Jong-Hwan Ko taught at Columbia University (as Fulbright Fellow) in New York, at the University of Frankfurt, the University of Giessen, the University of Hohenheim, and the University of Duisburg-Essen in Germany, and the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia. His teaching fields include: International Economics, Economics of the EU, European Economic Integration, EU Trade Policy, Statistics, and Computable General Equilibrium Modeling. His research interests include: impact of analysis of economic integration broadly defined, e.g. impact analysis of free trade agreements; the multilateral trading system; trade in services; open economy growth and development; trade and environment; CO2 emission and green growth; CO2 trading system; computational partial and general equilibrium modeling; and estimation and inference with global VAR model. He has published 10 Books, 50 refereed scientific publications and more than 60 other publications.
Our understanding of trade integration in Asia and elsewhere is significantly dominated by our knowledge on goods trade, with research on services trade lagging behind. It is quite possible that we need to revise what is commonly understood about trade integration, if services are added in our trade analysis. The main empirical findings of this paper are: (1) in absolute term, regional bias of services trade in Asia is as high as or higher than that in Europe and North America; (2) regional bias of services trade is higher than that of goods trade in Asia, which is in sharp contrast to Europe and North America where regional bias of goods trade is higher than that of service trade; (3) while Asia’s regional bias in goods trade has a declining trend, that of services trade maintained a high-level, though its future decline is expected. Asia’s relatively high-level of regional bias of services trade can be explained by the following factors: (1) a relatively high-level of shared language (Chinese), which is essential to services trade, but not to goods trade; and (2) the geographical condition that many Asian countries are separated by sea, which is a critical unfavorable condition for goods trade, but not for services trade. In order to further integrate Asia’s services trade, two policies seem to be necessary based on the experience in Europe. First, effective regional services agreements are critical to further increase intraregional services trade. Second, policies to increase the trade of “crisis-resilient services” such as professional services as oppose to “crisis-vulnerable services” such as transport and travel is necessary.

Shintaro Hamanaka is currently Economist at the Office of Regional Economic Integration of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Honorary Research Fellow at White Rose East Asia Centre in the UK. Before joining ADB, he worked as a service negotiator of Doha Round at the Japanese Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO). Prior to this, he was a central bank economist at the Bank of Japan. His research interests include political economy of regionalism, regional economic architecture in Asia, and free trade agreements, particularly regional services agreements. He authors several books and numerous academic journal articles in the field of political science, economics and international law.

Dr Anna H. Jankowiak
Wroclaw University, Poland

Dr Szymon Mazurek
Wroclaw University, Poland

Asia already in EU: How Asian Clusters and Business Networks Affect Economic Relations between EU and Asia and EU integration

Asian clusters and business networks operating in the EU are the result of dredging economic relations between regions. Their impact on the markets of certain goods is explicitly visible. Models of the Asian companies attracted in the EU are quite different and
the consequences for trade relations between the EU and Asia are various. An example of an open network business model is the presence of Toyota in the EU while the example of a closed model is LG’s Poland cluster. Toyota’s business network is to pursue a strategy of emancipation of the individual production units in Europe from the sources of supply in Asia which does not affect the increase in trade. On the other hand there is a positive influence on deepening the integration of European markets. LG Corporation uses a different strategy. Their business model is closed LG’s cluster in Poland which is an almost complex chain of production. Companies inside cluster do not enter into relationships with other entities. Polish cluster depends on the supply of components from the Asian market, which affects the deepening of exchanges between Asia and Europe.

The article presents the differences between the two concepts and their implications for trade between the EU and Asian countries.

Asian presence in Europe is already visible through foreign direct investment which was made by the Asian corporations in the European market. This is why we can not underestimate the impact of Asia in the EU.

Anna H. Jankowiak, Ph. D., Lecturer, Faculty of Economic Sciences, International Economic Relations Department, Wrocław University of Economics, Poland; founder and coordinator of the Asia-Pacific Research Centre and the main coordinator of Asian Conference at Wroclaw University of Economics; author and co-author of 32 articles and 6 books in Polish and English concerning the issues of the Asian regionalism, Asian economies, transnational corporation, international business and clusters in global economy; co-creator and contractor of international research project “Clusters as an innovation carrier of enterprises and regions. Verification and implementation of Asian models in terms of the Polish economy”, funded by National Science Centre, Poland.

Dr Szymon Mazurek is a lecturer in the Department of the International Economic Relations of the Wrocław University of Economics. A member of the research team managed by Ms Bogusława Skulska, Professor of Wrocław University of Economics, conducting research on the economic and social processes as well as issues of international safety in the Asia-Pacific region.

Co-authored several monographs regarding the Asia-Pacific region:

Author of several articles on integration processes, financial markets (with particular attention given to the phenomenon of contagion of financial crises) and the energy security in the region.
Ms Sawako Oba  
Kobe University, Japan  

The Influence of European Union Conditionality on the Czech Legal System

First, legal history and system in the Czech Republic will be introduced, as it might not be well-known. Then, what is the European Union Conditionality for legal field and judiciary will be discussed. Finally, how the Conditionality worked in the Czech Republic will be overviewed. During the discussion, the focus is the Judicial Independence.

After graduated from Kyoto University, Japan, worked as an attorney at law. Changed to be a researcher, took the LL.M. at Kobe University, Japan in March 2012. Going to study at Charles University in Prague, the Czech Republic from September 2012.

---
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Mr Juan Pablo Ferrero  
University of Bath, UK  

Democracy beyond New Social Movements: interrogating the anarchist principle as the new standpoint to study democracy

The aim of this paper is to critically engage with an increasing body of literature discussing the epistemological standpoints to study democratisation. I look at the contribution of New Social Movement literature as well as theories of Radical Democracy. To what extend do we need to elaborate on the anarchist principles in order to understand democratisation as expansion of equality in contemporary society? I argue that engagement with anarchist principles to the study of democratisation is critical. It sheds light to understand ongoing democratic deliberation outside institutional deliberative bodies and equally raises questions regarding the effects of the increasing gap between the former and the latter.

I am a PhD student at the University of Bath (UK). My PhD focuses on social movements, the state and democracy. I aim to understand the formation of collective action behind empirical practices of democratisation in order to elaborate on the theoretical implications to the theory of democracy. I have recently submitted my doctoral dissertation and will have the viva in July/August 2012. I am currently based at the Victoria University of Wellington (NZ) for nine months participating of the Erasmus Mundus Exchange Program (Europe-Oceania).
Much of the discussion of the Lisbon Treaty has been about the potential for increasing politicisation and parliamentarisation of EU politics, in the wake of developments such as the expansion of EP powers, the introduction of the European Citizens Initiative and the new scrutiny powers granted to national parliaments. With respect to the latter, however, while the impact of these changes will take time to make an impact on EU-level decision-making, a more immediate change can be expected at the domestic level, as national parliaments adapt to the requirements of making effective use of these new powers. This paper develops a framework for the analysis of the Europeanisation of national parliaments which challenges the ‘politicisation thesis’ by including a focus on the role of bureaucratic networks. First, it identifies the relevant explanatory factors that lead to various degrees of Europeanisation among national parliaments in the EU. Second, it argues that the effective use of the new Lisbon powers, coming on top of existing secular trends, requires national parliaments to cooperate systematically with one another and to develop a high level of technical expertise in order to deal with the technical and procedural demands of EU legislation. Based on the bureaucratisation and transnationalisation of their work, we develop a typology of national parliaments based on the assumption that the more Europeanised parliaments will tend to invest more into their administrative resources and will therefore be able to actively engage to a greater extent with other national parliaments as well as with EU-level actors. This claim – still to be tested empirically - implies that the active monitoring of EU legislation by national parliaments not only enhances the power of elected members, but above all leads to the empowerment of bureaucratic networks – something of a normatively questionable outcome of a treaty reform that was meant to enhance the democratic foundations of European governance.

Thomas Christiansen is Jean Monnet Professor of European Institutional Politics at Maastricht University where he teaches predominantly on the Research Masters in European Studies and the MA in European Public Affairs. He joined the Department of Political Science in 2010, after several years at the European institute of Public Administration (EIPA). He is Co-Director of the Maastricht Centre for European Governance, Executive Editor of the Journal of European Integration, Academic Coordinator of the Observatory of Parliaments after Lisbon (OPAL, www.opal-europe.org) and member of the steering committee of the Standing Group of the European Union of the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR). He has published widely on different aspects of the institutional politics of the EU. The European Union After the Lisbon Treaty, co-authored with E.Best and W.Wessels, is forthcoming with Oxford University Press.
Mr Pablo Jimenez  
Australian National University, Australia  
Now Let us Make Europeans – Citizenship, Solidarity and Identity in an Intercultural Europe  
The euro crisis has hit “Europe” (the European Union or EU) economically, socially and politically. In addition to structural economic deficiencies; a very modest political leadership on the part of those who could make a difference; and a lack of democratic participation; there is the absence of a pan-European sense of belonging among citizens, a common political identity thanks to which European citizens may regard each other as equals—at least up to a certain extent—and therefore as deserving not only respect, but also trust and solidarity. The paper looks into the European understanding of human rights, in a context of intercultural dialogue and coexistence, under an analogical hermeneutics perspective, as a possible source of common political identity and solidarity between European citizens. A few remarks are dedicated in the conclusive part to the possible integration of the Asia Pacific Region in the future, setting out from the interesting case of Singapore.  
Pablo has degrees in humanities, economics, family studies, and philosophy. In the past decade he occupied public relations positions in the field of international education, and has lectured in philosophy, politics, and history. His research deals with topics like the human person, language, love, education, literature, and political identity, from a philosophical perspective. His publications touch on issues concerning citizenship, identity, human rights, solidarity, culture, secularism and religion in Europe.

Assistant Professor Antonio Formacion  
Kuyshu University, Japan  
Right to be not ignored; EU’s “No disconnect Strategy” and the future of internet freedom.  
In the expanding world of online networks, to be disconnected is to be marginalized. Never was there another time in history when access to information is literally within the tips of our fingers. Moreover, the idea of connectedness, regardless of proximity or geopolitical boundaries, through online networks is having a transformative effect in our lives. Connectivity and access to information has clearly empowered citizens, both as individuals and as part of a collective society. This has been quite evident in the Arab spring of 2011 when information technology brought images to the rest of the world on the abuses of repressive regimes, and help galvanized peaceful protests with assistance of social-media tools. Information technology’s importance was eloquently summed up by Neelie Kroes, Vice-President of the European Commission during her December 2012 press conference on EU’s “No Disconnect” strategy, declaring that “Connectivity is everything” in planning peaceful protests to effect positive socio-political changes. This paper will focus on the “No disconnect” strategy of the EU, taking into account the UN Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression that addressed the question of universal access to the internet. The “No disconnect” strategy calls for technical support and advice to be provided by the EU, support that ranges from deployments of “internet survival packs” to activists in
order to bypass national censorship controls, to hosting assistance on prohibited content intended for external and internal dissemination. While it is tempting as a legal scholar to only dwell on the legality of a strategy that calls for a pro-active support to activities of human rights activists in a sovereign non-EU country, I would like to take a broader technical approach in analyzing the technological limitations and possible implementation pitfalls of this EU initiative.

Antonio Formacion is an Assistant professor of the Graduate School of Law, Kyushu University and a committee member on Outreach of EU Institute in Japan – Kyushu. His interest is in the area of Law & Technology, specifically internet and privacy issues. Currently, he is doing research on e-learning as a driver for sustainable development. Mr. Formacion did his legal education as an undergraduate in Japan – Kanazawa University, LL.B. in the Philippines - San Agustin University, and LL.M. in Japan – Kyushu University. He was also connected with the Japanese Embassy in the Philippines as a Special Assistant for Culture and Education.
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Dr John Leslie  
Victoria University  
Wellington, New Zealand

Dr Annmarie Elijah  
Australia National University  
Australia

Going ‘Deep’ in trans-Tasman Economic Integration

This paper compares trans-Tasman economic integration between Australia and New Zealand to the emergence of a Single European Market. This comparison helps us understand forces behind ‘deep’ economic integration by providing a case against which to project explanations for ‘deepening’ developed from and for other contexts, particularly Europe. It reveals that Australia and New Zealand reached an endpoint similar to the Single European Market, but did so by following a developmental path that was both similar to and different from the path of European integration. Specifically, Australian and New Zealand policy makers employed supra-national institutions to manage uncertainties accompanying ‘deep’ economic integration, but these institutions, unlike their European counterparts, are specific to functional issue areas and are all-but-invisible to the public. The trans-Tasman relationship provides a useful comparator that helps to bridge the conceptual divide separating the seemingly singular experience of regional economic integration in Europe and other regions.
Dr John Leslie is currently a visiting scholar at ANU Centre for European Studies and UC Berkeley Institute of European Studies. He lectures in Political Science and International Relations Programme at Victoria University of Wellington (VUW). He chairs the European Studies Programme at VUW and has been a member of the New Zealand European Union Centres Network Executive Board since 2006. His current research compares economic integration in Europe and other regions around the world, especially between Australia and New Zealand.

Annmarie Elijah has a PhD in politics from the University of Melbourne and has spent almost five years as a policy officer in the Australian Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. She has taught politics at the University of Melbourne, Victoria University of Wellington and the Australian National University and is a visiting fellow at the ANU Centre for European Studies. With Dr John Leslie (VUW) she is working on a long term research project on Australia, New Zealand and comparative regionalism. Other research interests include Australian and New Zealand foreign policy, European integration and Australian federalism.

**Mr Matthew Castle**  
Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand  
*What good is ‘actorness’ beyond the EU? Trans-Tasman integration and the foundations of CER-ASEAN interregionalism*

Observers of interregionalism generally suggest that the ability of regions to engage in relations with one another depends on a set of general, over-arching regional qualities understood collectively as a region’s ‘actorness’. This term derives from scholarship on the European Union’s (EU) external relations, although regions beyond the EU also engage in interregionalism. How can we understand the foundations of interregionalism outside of the EU? Is ‘actorness’, as it is currently understood, a useful concept beyond the EU? This paper will add to growing scholarship on interregionalism by analysing relations between CER (the Australia-New Zealand Closer Economic Relations agreement) and ASEAN (the Association of South East Asian Nations). Spanning more than a decade from the mid-1990s, this relationship culminated, in 2010, in the ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Agreement (AANZFTA). Such close Australia-New Zealand cooperation with a third party has not, however, eventuated in other cases. This paper asks, why did Australia and New Zealand jointly engage with ASEAN, but not in other cases? It suggests that the issue-specific institutions produced during trans-Tasman integration provided Australian and New Zealand policy makers with a ready-made framework for cooperation in some, but not all, issue-areas. In the trans-Tasman case, ‘actorness’ may therefore be issue-specific, rather than general. The paper will bring the insights from a new empirical case to a nascent field of inquiry. It will contribute to our understanding of the foundations of interregionalism by asking to what extent, outside of the EU, ‘actorness’ may be an apt descriptor for the ability of regions to ‘act’ in international relations.

Matthew Castle completed his Master’s thesis in International Relations at Victoria University of Wellington in February 2012. This research examined the trans-Tasman institutional and decision-making environment that enabled Australia and New Zealand to
agree to joint negotiations on the ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Agreement (AANZFTA), effective since 2010. His research interests include trans-Tasman integration and the history of trans-Tasman relations; comparative regionalism; and inter-regionalism, including EU-ASEAN relations, CER-ASEAN relations and the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) process.

Ms Toni Grace
Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand

*Micro-regional integration meets migrant integration: Third Country Nationals in the cross-border Öresund region*

Border regions are no longer the ‘peripheries’ they once were. They increasingly represent promising locations for the creation of functional, prosperous micro-regions, transforming the concept of the ‘border’ from one of division to one of dynamic transnational cooperation. Yet despite multi-level efforts to enhance economic and political integration, the dominance of national borders in certain policy areas continues to hamper many cross-border integration efforts. This paper examines the cross-border Öresund region of Denmark and Sweden and the regional issues that have arisen over divergent migrant integration regimes. The construction of the Öresund Bridge and the flexible types of mobility that it promotes has led to a major shift in immigration dynamics in the region, allowing people to think and live across national borders though simultaneously rousing nationalist sentiment around the free movement of foreigners. This paper seeks to analyse the politics of national belonging and exclusion as they find political expression in policy and discourse on migrant integration in Denmark and Sweden, and how these in turn affect regional efforts to foster common belonging and participation in the cross-border Öresund region. This paper argues that prospects for sustained cross-border social and political integration in the Öresund region will depend on the ability of national and local governments to agree on the definition, method and purpose of immigrant integration. The experiences of European border regions like the Öresund could provide important lessons for future regional integration in Europe and other continents, such as the emerging Asian micro-regions of the Greater Tumen Region and Greater Mekong Sub-region.

Toni Grace has recently completed her M.A. thesis in Political Science as a recipient of a Victoria University Master’s Scholarship. Last year she was part of the IRSES KEEENZ project of exchanges between New Zealand and Europe, spending 5 weeks at Lund University in Southern Sweden. During this time she was able to engage in field research for her Master’s thesis on the relationship between regional integration and migration politics in the cross-border Öresund region of Denmark and Sweden. Toni maintains an on-going interest in comparative migration politics and currently works at the British High Commission in Wellington.
In recent years, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has set out plans to become more institutionalised. The ASEAN Charter, which came into force in December 2008, purportedly establishes a ‘legal and institutional framework’ for ASEAN. It contains several apparent ‘institutional innovations’, including the strengthening of the ASEAN Secretariat, more frequent ASEAN Summits, and a new ASEAN Coordinating Council. Why are these ambitions not matched by institutional capacity? There are certainly grounds for scepticism about ASEAN’s approach to regional integration, although scholars should not be overly dismissive; some member state representatives have a genuine desire for a more formalised and institutionalised Association. However, such change is contingent upon traditional interpretations of ASEAN norms – particularly sovereignty, non-interference and the ‘ASEAN Way’ of consensus decision-making. This paper will review the institutional innovations made by the ASEAN Charter – in particular, the supposed ‘strengthening’ of the Secretariat (which is based in Jakarta), and other changes to its institutional structure – three years after the Charter came into force. It will argue that the pursuit of ambitious goals is constrained by limitations given ASEAN’s ‘cognitive priors’. There are tensions among ASEAN norms, as some member states attempt to introduce new institutions which challenge the Association’s traditional normative understandings. The paper will then discuss some implications for comparative regional analysis. While some observers have heralded the Charter as a signal that ASEAN is moving towards ‘EU-style’ regionalism – and there is certainly some evidence of active ‘learning’ from the EU – ASEAN’s brand of regional integration continue to reflect the importance of local norms. Moreover, this paper raises the broader question of whether regional organisations must have a certain degree of institutionalisation, legalisation and supranationalism to be considered credible and/or effective. This, of course, relates to debates about whether the EU is a ‘model’ to which other regions could or should aspire.

Avery Poole is a Lecturer in International Relations in the School of Social and Political Sciences at The University of Melbourne. She was educated at The University of Melbourne and The University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada. Her doctoral dissertation explores institutional change in regional organisations, focusing on the case study of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). In particular, it examines the references to democracy and a new human rights body in the ASEAN Charter. Avery current research interests include comparative regional analysis, particularly in the areas of institutional design and regional human rights mechanisms.
Ms Annick Masselot
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

*Does the EU have a future as a gender actor?*

This paper aims to determine whether and how EU gender law communicates a sense of EU identity, and to what degree EU citizens identify with this. Our paper considers the ideological motivations underlying EU gender equality law and the role that relevant policies play in articulating and legitimising the political identity of the Union. Consideration is given to the origins and evolution of EU gender equality law and the role that the ECJ played in communicating and furthering institutional ideology. The paper examines the importance afforded gender equality law by the European public through a series of data on perceptions of gender equality. By considering the political and ideological roots of gender equality law within the EU as well as providing an analytical snapshot of the public’s perception of that legal field, the paper proposes to evaluate its position within and contribution towards the EU’s processes of self-identification and legitimisation. At a time when the foundations of the project are being shaken and governments argue for the need to concentrate resources of higher political priorities, it is important to evaluate the role of the EU in supporting the European equality agenda and to seek the EU’s ability to be an International gender actor.

Annick Masselot is a senior lecturer in law at the University of Canterbury (Department of Accounting and Information Systems). Her research interests focus upon EU law, gender equality and equal treatment, social law, reconciliation between work and family life, pregnancy and maternity rights. She is the author of *Reconciling Work and Family Life in EU Law and Policy*, (2010) London: Palgrave Macmillan (with E. Caracciolo di Torella).

Dr Katharine Vadura
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

*Mind the Gap: exporting human rights, importing obligations, the EU & Asia*

In an era of growing challenges and shifting agendas the relationship between Europe and Asia in the area of human rights risks becoming an ever widening gap. The changing nature of global order sees the European Union potentially becoming more isolated and struggling to maintain its position as a global normative actor in a world with new emerging ‘international values’. This paper undertakes a conceptual analysis of human rights in the context of the EU as ‘global citizen’; understanding Europe as a sender of norms and as a receiver of obligations, and presenting an analysis of the how this translates into global responsibility. Central to EU norms and values is the concept of human rights. However, it is in pursuing this agenda that the
opportunity for divergent perspectives and understandings of values becomes apparent. Emerging out of economic crisis can the EU still make a claim to be a global normative actor, how is ‘conditionality’ understood in this new environment, and what is the impact on its international obligations of human rights ‘slippage’ within Europe. This paper examines the relationship between Europe and Asia from the perspective of the ‘silver thread’ of human rights running through EU external policies. In looking at EU diplomacy in human rights in Asia, it is possible to start to envisage bridges over the human rights gap through civil society, global governance and the notion of the EU as ‘global citizen’.

Dr Vadura is currently adjunct senior fellow at the National Centre for Research on Europe (NCRE) at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch New Zealand. She has an extensive teaching record at both undergraduate and postgraduate level in European Studies and International Studies. She has particular expertise in experiential learning in the area of human rights, as well as using virtual technologies to deliver courses. Her research interests focus on human rights dimensions associated with forced migration and transnational security issues; human security and global governance related to children’s rights, and human rights aspects of humanitarian action in a European and Asia Pacific context. She has authored a number of articles, presented at international conferences and supervises research degree students in these areas.

Dr Wenwen Shen
EU-Asia Centre Brussels, Belgium

The EU’s Promotion of Human Rights in Global Information Age: the case of China

This paper analyses the extent to which the EU influences national and international political debates on human rights situation in China, with a particular reference to the role of the internet which facilitates and provides new platforms for such debates. In doing so, I propose a normative power perspective which helps us understand how human rights norms are diffused through a discursive form of power. Central to this paper is the assumption that human rights norms are better diffused through normative means in the global information age, such as knowledge-based cooperation and living by virtuous example. To verify this assumption, I look at two analogous issues of the death penalty and Tibet, and seek to understand the ways in which the EU shapes the international and Chinese discourses on these two cases, against the backdrop of the liberating impact of internet and social media in particular in recent years. Regarding the death penalty, I argue that EU cooperation projects in recent years, which pragmatically focused on enhancing the knowledge and capability of legal professionals and lobbying through academic research, are more effective than direct lobbying in the Chinese context. In case of Tibet, although European governments had resorted to public criticism as a less costly way to sustain the international visibility of the Tibetan cause, the process of ‘shaming’ has yet to alter the Chinese citizens’ almost universal acceptance of the official view on Tibet, largely due to the ideological divide, and China’s successful propaganda on the domestic front.

Wenwen Shen had just received her PhD degree from University of Bath, UK. She was born and raised in China, and used to work for the Xinhua News Agency in Sichuan province. Her
Dr Ravi Saxena
Nirma University, India
*Caste in the Public Sphere and Indian State: A Human Rights Perspective*

This Research Paper has two central objectives. First, to critique the institution of caste in the Indian public realm from the human rights perspective. To check its various nuances and its reflections, mostly inhumane and creating spaces for power politics in Indian society. How the culture in India (though not a homogenous entity, yet if compared internationally, Indian cultural identity can be located) been affected by the most influential variable of Indian society, i.e., caste. Social theories justifying caste like varna-vyavastha were not seen being practised in the public Indian realm in a very mundane and humane perspective. Indian historiography has no clues as to when Indian society was based on the varna-vyavastha. Experiential history starts when caste as a social category of stratification was much abused, rather than justifying the claims of division-of-labour paradigm (as suggested in the varna-vyavastha). The second objective of this research paper is to dig into the debate if is it possible to have a single and unified perspective for the study of various societies of the world. In lieu of that, where is the rational solace, to evolve with a thematic perspective of human rights, relating and responding to the Indian socio-political realities, mostly affected by the caste. As the theme of the seminar suggests, International perspective; national challenges, an attempt is being made to analyse if caste can be justified from the human rights perspective in contemporary India, an India duly affected by the process of globalisation, though negatively and positively both (creating marginality). Considering the Indian social realities, caste has always been a the most visible and vibrant violator of human rights. The relation between caste and Indian constitution is also found “uneasy” if we read the constitutional success in eradicating caste as a mark of social discrimination in India.

Professor Ruth A Bevan-Dunner
Yeshiva University, New York City, USA
*What is the EU’s Soft Power Track Record in Asia?*

What does the European Union have to offer Asia? This is the central question raised in the proposed paper. The model of European integration does not fully jibe with Asian regional aspirations. The Euro crisis makes the EU an unlikely security partner for Asia. What, then, can Europe offer Asia? The EU presents itself as a soft power which values multilateralism. It seeks to create a more level global playing field economically and to mold conditions promoting global peace. The EU thinks of itself as a soft power pioneer in these regards. Asia, with its complexity of ethnicities, regime-types and histories, has its own aspirations
for economic growth, political change and social advancement. With a major portion of the world's population, Asia is also home to the world's greatest number of poor. Asia suffers environmental degradation. Democratization in many parts of Asia is still in its infancy. Emphasizing China and the ASEAN member states, this paper "confronts" Asian expectations with European performance. What have the soft power Europeans done in terms of environmentalism, economic development and human rights in Asia? Is European foreign policy toward Asia uniform or differential? How do the Asians assess European efforts to create a more equitable and just world order? How do Europeans assess themselves in regard to Asia?

Ruth A. Bevan is David W. Petegorsky Professor of Political Science and Director of the Schneier Program for International Affairs at Yeshiva University in New York City, USA. She specializes in European Union politics with special emphasis on European Foreign Policy as well as contemporary European political theory. Currently she is working on a research project detailing EU-USA relations that outlines a new framework for a European-American partnership in world affairs. She has received various grants == Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdient, National Endowment for the Humanities, Fulbright, and the U.S. Dept. of State (IREX). Her most recently published article, "The New Globalism: Reflections on the EU and USA in Asia," appeared in the 2011 (Vol.3) issue of the Australian and New Zealand Journal of European Studies.
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**Mr Barnabas Horvath**  
Corvinus University Budapest, Hungary  
*The USA-PRC Rivalry’s Impact on EU-Russia Relations*

During the last two years, we witnessed an increasing rivalry between the USA and China in the Asia-Pacific region. It is becoming a commonplace that interdependence is becoming increasingly dominant on our world, but at first sight it still may seem unlikely, that such a geographically distant phenomenon could have significant effect on the EU’s geostrategic situation regarding its immediate neighbors. Some tendencies however show that it does. During the period of the Bush administration (2001-2009) the group of the “Shanghai Five” evolved to become the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. This experience showed that an American foreign policy alienating China and Russia the same time will cause these two countries to move closer to each other. In the scope of this experience, perhaps it is more than a mere coincidence, that while the Obama administration drove a confrontative policy towards China, it softened the former administration’s tone on Russia, and issues such as the NATO membership of Georgia and Ukraine were taken off the agenda and the USA decreased its
presence in Europe. This way, the recent USA-China rivalry seems to have a side effect that enables Russia to extend its influence in Europe. Another point where emerge of China is likely to influence EU-Russia relations is energy trade. Crude oil and natural gas trade has led to political disputes and even security concerns between Russia and EU member states several times in the past. By diversifying its export markets through increasing oil and gas export to China, Russia is also enabled to achieve more advantageous positions in its energy trade with the EU. These tendencies lead us to a conclusion, that the recent USA-China rivalry is indirectly improving the positions of Russia, and disproving the positions of the EU in EU-Russia relations.

My name is Csaba Horvath. I am a PhD student in International Relations at the Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary. Before starting the PhD, I have graduated from History and Political Science at the Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest. My interests towards Asia started after I spent one year in Japan as a Rotary exchange student when I was 16, in 1998-1999. Since then, I have also visited South Korea, China, India, Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore. My planned dissertation topic is power balance in Asia.

Prof Jelica Stefanovic-Stambuk
University of Belgrade, Serbia

Partnership Diplomacy Horizon: the Visible Junction of the European Union and Asia Joint Practice of Knowing and Acting for Prosperity

The EU by frequency of addressing different Others as partners and doggedness in differentiating relations framed as partnerships through used adjectives for qualifying their distinctiveness do not stand alone in globalized world. There is a likewise conduct of Asian actors in naming and qualifying Others as they partners. Mutual viewing of the EU and Asia as partners and they usually ordered and labeled partnerships in diverse relational formats and configurations (e.g. the ARF, the ASEM process) are adding up to the widespread construction of partners’ identities and constitution of partnership relations based on aid/trade, defense/security, amity/peace, structuring,strategizing. The very visibility of partners’ perceptions and audible pervasiveness of partnership relations, in particular those undertaken for sustainable joint provision of mutually beneficial global social goods of the highest order, draw attention to the possibility that the new mode of diplomacy, i.e. partnership diplomacy, is under construction. In order to empirically corroborate indicated possibility the research question whether in they relations the EU and Asia practice partnership diplomacy is chosen. The main finding from comparatively analyzed plurality of assessed partnerships of these two regions is that they practice partnership diplomacy. That mode of partnership diplomacy is based on mutual respect and driven by mutual benefit of jointly provided sustainable prosperity. Both mutual respect and mutually beneficial prosperity are socially constructed, in ordering narrative on the Self and Other(s) of two regions, as in-house social goods of the highest rank. Consequently, over time it is likely to expect that thus practiced knowing of and acting on this inter-regional partnership diplomacy might enable the consensual upgrading of attained socation to seamless 'ASianSEuropeanS Socioscape (ASSESS) on the intersection of sustained mutual respect for diverse identities framed within range of partners perceptions and experienced sustainable mutual prosperity.
Professor (full) of International and Diplomatic Studies and the head of the Doctoral Programme in International and European Studies at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Political Sciences. As an Executive Director of the TEMPUS Joint European Project "European Studies in Politics" (JEP No. 2725-91) she has introduced the postgraduate teaching of the European Studies at the University of Belgrade. Professor Stefanovic-Stambuk has authored numerous articles and books in Serbian language. The most recent are Diplomacy in International Relations (2008), Diplomacy without the State: The European Union Diplomatic System (2012) and Partnership Diplomacy (forthcoming). Her research is now focused on multilateral partnership practices and diplomatic power of the EU and Asian regional integrations.

Dr Beata Jagiello
Warsaw School of Economics, Poland
Central-West Asia Region: A New Factor in Asian Geopolitics

The article is going to show some parallel processes in international relations and geopolitics: emergence of a new region, i.e. Central-West Asia (1), the role of regional countries in the process of integration (2), position of other big Asian states towards that process (3), role and interests of the European Union in Asia, especially in the Central and West part of the continent (4). We may observe emerging “middle powers” and new energy centres. New political initiatives have given rise to some international organizations and programmes as CICA, RECCA, ECO, ENVSEC, BSEC. Political and economic perspectives connected with the new regional organizations and initiatives as well as a new energy resources in regional states (Turkmenistan, Afghanistan), new energy projects (TAPI pipeline, buy/sell of electricity) have shown the growing role and ambition of some regional powers. Some of them have got special relations with the EU, some with perspective for membership in the EU (like Turkey). New geopolitics have been changing the regional, Asian and global scene and the new role for countries and organizations. In that context the present and future foreign policy and external relations of the EU meets a great challenge.

Beata Jagiello, Ph.D., researcher and lecturer, was affiliated to Polish Institute of International Affairs, Yale University (Postdoctoral Fellow), Warsaw University, Warsaw School of Economics: Polish-French European Master Programme (WSH-ScPo) and International Security Department. Currently head of two postgraduate studies at WSE and lecturer at Radom Economic School. Award – winning author of over 100 papers and articles, three books and co-author of many others. Contributed to the EU 6th Framework Programme (Go-EuroMed). Last publication (2011) on Afghanistan as a future energy centre. Current work focuses on International Cultural Relations, Dialogue of Civilizations, Geopolitics of Islam, EU’s Foreign Policies and External Relations.
Regional Policy continues to be a central part of the overall framework of the European Union’s (EU) approach to developing a supranational political and economic entity. It accounts for more than one third of the EU’s expenditure and involves complex challenges of redistributing resources from subnational regions in some nations to poorer regions in other nation states. Increasingly, Regional Policy is directed towards achieving the strategic objectives of Europe 2020. As such, it can be seen to constitute a significant part of the EU ‘mode of regionalism’. What can be learned from this experience by nations in other parts of the world that are engaged in pursuit of greater integration? The first challenge is to develop greater understanding in itself of the underlying intent, and of the effectiveness of Regional Policy in achieving its objectives. Secondly, the question arises about the extent to which those understandings are relevant to nations in other parts of the world, however they define themselves and their potential supranational integration.

This paper will provide a review of both these questions, with specific attention to the Asian context. It will consider some examples of the interest in subnational regional policy within specific Asian countries, with a view to exploring the potential interest in redistribution from richer to poorer regions in Asia. It asks whether this could be contemplated on a transnational basis. Some reference will be made to regional development policy in the Australian context, as a counterpoint to both the European experience and the Asian potential.

This paper will discuss the features and possible drawbacks of the EU’s new “strategic partnership” diplomacy. The paper first reviews briefly how the EU has changed its diplomatic strategy in economic and political policy fields since the beginning of the 2000s. The relevant documents to be focused upon include the European Security Strategy (2003) for the political dimension and the Global Europe strategy (2006) for the economic dimension. The discussion is followed by the institutional reforms introduced by the Lisbon Treaty and the subsequent specific decisions regarding the establishment of the European External Action Service (EEAS). Then the paper moves on to
analyze some examples of the EU’s new “strategic partnership” with Asian countries including South Korea, China and India, which, in the author’s view, epitomize the EU’s new directions in both political and economic diplomacy. In this section, the paper will emphasize the dual character of EU diplomacy of “strategic partnership”, i.e., normative and interests-based partnership. The last section of the paper will discuss not only the tension that the dual character diplomacy has so far entailed in practice, but also the possible tension that may arise in relation to East Asian regionalism(s) including ASEAN community building.

Tamio Nakamura is currently a Professor of Law at the School of Law, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan. Previously he was a Professor of Law at the Institute of Social Science, the University of Tokyo from 1999 to 2010. His research interests cover constitutional and administrative law of the European Union and the United Kingdom and comparative study of regionalism. Among his recent English publications include East Asian Regionalism from a legal perspective: Current features and a vision for the future (Tamio Nakamura ed.; Routledge, 2009); “The EU as a Plural Constitutional Order: An approach to the Constitutional Treaty” (Nihon EU Gakkai Nempo [Annual Review of EU Studies Association of Japan] 25: 22-54, 2005). His Japanese publications include Leading Cases on the Law of the European Union (co-ed. with Takao Suami. Nihon Hyoronsha, 2nd ed. 2010) and New Horizon of EU Studies: new approaches to the polity sui generis. (Minerva Publishing, 2005). His contact address is tamio@waseda.jp and/or School of Law, Waseda University, Nishi-Waseda 1-6-1, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, 169-8050, Japan.

Dr Christian Fjäder
Independent Scholar, Finland
Regionalism in Asia and Europe in a Theoretical Perspective: ‘Rationalist’ and ‘Ideational’ Explanations

Whilst regionalism has advanced across the globe, two “mega regions” have caught most of the attention: Asia and Europe. Out of the two, Europe has been generally considered a model for regional integration elsewhere and consequently, observers have in many occasions focused on pointing out what Asia could or should learn from the EU, much less often what the two could learn from each other. Yet the opportunities for this are immense. Indeed the two regions apply distinctive models of regionalism; regionalism in Europe is characterised by the institutionalised nature of the European Union in a legalistic framework based on binding treaties backed up by a massive bureaucracy. Asian regionalism on the other hand, is primarily a form of economic regionalism and driven by trade. It is also consensus driven instead of institutional bureaucracies and binding agreements. From regionalism theory point of view the study of European Regionalism has been dominated by Neo-Functionalism and its variants. Social Constructivism on the other hand has gained major momentum in the study Asian “soft and normative” form of regionalism. What I am proposing is a more eclectic analysis of the differences and commonalities by examining region formation and enlargement in order to discover what the two regions are “made of”. Moreover, I would argue that paradigmatic approaches do not offer satisfactory explanations, as they are hampered by a dichotomy between what I title as “Rationalist” and “Ideational”
approaches. The “Rationalist” approach focuses on material interdependency as the main driving force behind integration. Thus, Regionalism is seen as a consequence of rational calculations and bargains by rational agents. In contrast, the “Ideational”, or Social Constructivist approach, emphasizes shared regional identity and culture as driving forces that produce levels of “cognitive interdependence”. This paper aims to establish how both regions nonetheless encompass both elements.

Christian completed his PhD in the University of Sydney in 2010. His thesis was titled as *The Problem of the ‘Borderline States’ in Regionalism: ‘Rationalist’ and ‘Ideational’ Approaches* and dealt with regionalism theory from material and ideational (identity, culture, values) points of view by comparing Australia’s position in East Asian and Turkey’s in European regional integration. He is a keen student of Asian and European regional integration and has completed research projects funded and commissioned by e.g. the European Commission and the Danish Foreign Ministry. Christian is currently an independent scholar working on publications and seeking academic opportunities.
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**Professor Rajendra Jain**  
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India  
*The European Union and South Asia: Indian Perceptions and Perspectives*

Despite a long and deep experience of social, cultural, commercial and political interaction with Europe, South Asia has never been a region of frontline policy for the European Union. Over time, the European Union and its Member States have emerged as the largest trading partner of most South Asian economies, a major contributor of developmental aid, and home to a large and influential Indian diaspora, mostly in the United Kingdom. After providing a brief overview of the historical relationship of the EU with South Asia, the paper will highlight how India and the Union perceive each other. It will discuss the growing engagement of the European Union with South Asia and its attempts to evolve a strategy towards the region. The paper will go on to examine Indian perceptions of the EU’s role in South Asia and examine Brussels’ policy towards Pakistan, Indo-Pakistan differences and Kashmir as well as the EU’s role in conflict resolution in Nepal and Sri Lanka. The paper concludes that there are significant differences between India and the EU in dealing with South Asian issues and problem areas and that, for the most part, the driving force behind EU-South Asian relations has been, is, and will continue to be trade and commerce.

Rajendra K Jain is Chairperson, Centre for European Studies and Jean Monnet Chair, Jawaharlal Nehru University New Delhi and Adjunct Principal Research Fellow, Monash European and EU Studies Centre, Monash University, Melbourne. He was formerly President of the European Union Studies Association – Asia Pacific (EUSA-Asia Pacific) (2009-2010). He has been Visiting Humboldt Foundation Professor at Freiburg, Leipzig and Tübingen.
universities in Germany, the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, Paris (2006, 2008, 2010), and the Asia-Europe Institute, University of Malaya (2010). He was formerly Humboldt Fellow at the University of Constance and the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, and Visiting International Fellow, Monash Europe and EU Centre, Melbourne (2009). He has participated in nearly 150 national/international conferences, including 80 conferences in various parts of the world. Prof. Jain is the author/editor of nearly 30 books and has published 90 articles/chapters in books. He has most recently published *India and the European Union: Building a Strategic Partnership* (editor) (2007). He has also published articles in various journals, including *Asia-Pacific Journal of EU Studies, Asia Europe Journal*, and *Japanese Journal of Political Science*.

**Dr Natalia Chaban**

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

*En’vision’ing Europe’s Crisis: A Visual and Textual Analysis of the EU Imagery in Chinese, Indian and Russian Business Newspapers* (with Dr Jessica Bain and Dr Serena Kelly)

In facing its worst economic crisis, the EU must continue to seek answers to questions on its identity and purpose. Despite considerable scholarship on EU identity, as reflected in European media, there remains a deficit of research into the contribution of external media images. There is also a need to go beyond a strictly textual analysis of discourse towards an understanding that visual images play an important role in constructing an identity of the EU. This paper makes such a contribution by investigating visual and textual images of the EU’s current economic crisis conveyed in the leading business dailies of key partners; China, India and Russia. Uniquely, this analysis explores the relationship of visual imagery to textual images of the EU and questions the degree to which the EU is presented externally as an effective actor in the crisis.

**Dr Natalia Chaban** is a Jean Monnet Chair in European Identity and Culture and Deputy Director of the National Centre for Research on Europe at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. She is a Member of New Zealand EU Centers Network Executive Board since 2006 and a co-editor of a peer-reviewed “Australian and New Zealand Journal of European Studies” since its inception in 2009. She teaches and designs a variety of undergraduate and postgraduate courses and supervises MA/PhD students in EU Studies. Dr Chaban has significant experience in analysing EU identity outside the EU, widely publishing and advancing methodological training in this regard. She is actively pursuing her research interests in cognitive and semiotic aspects of political and mass media discourses, cross-cultural adjustment, image studies, and European/EU identity studies outside the EU. Since 2002, she has led a comparative transnational project on EU external perceptions comprising a multicultural team from 20 Asia-Pacific locations. Among her publications is *The European Union and the Asia-Pacific: Media, Public and Elite Perceptions of the EU*, (2008) Routledge, (co-ed with M. Holland). She has also published articles in journals such as *European Foreign Affairs Review, Journal of European Integration, European Law Journal, Mobilities, International Journal of Intercultural Relations.*
With a global shift towards Asia, lastly signalled by US President Obama’s announcement during his visit to Australia in November 2011 to “step up the US’ commitment to the entire Asia-Pacific”, the Europeans also aim to increase their role in East Asia. European pundits as well as officials of the EU and of EU Member States are quick to demand a more active role of the Europeans in the Asia Pacific, and particularly in East Asia, be it during the Munich Security Conference in January 2012 as well as in NATO and EU circles and the academic debate is becoming ever more intense. But how is the EU’s role in security affairs in the Asia Pacific seen from the rising power of East Asia, China? Do assessments and analyses in Europe and China match each other? Or deviate significantly? The paper aims to given an overview of the current state of debate on the EU as a security actor in general and specifically in the East Asian region in European and Chinese discourses and to identify factors that cause differences between both perspectives.

May-Britt U. Stumbaum, PhD, is Head of the NFG Research Group "Asian Perceptions of the EU" at the Free University of Berlin, funded by the German Ministry of Education and Research. She has served at different established senior positions at Harvard, SIPRI, German Council on Foreign Relations, as well as other institutions in Europe, China and the USA. She is a co-founder of Women in International Security Deutschland (WIIS.de) and served as its president from 2003 – 2008. May-Britt U. Stumbaum graduated from the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) and received her PhD from the Free University of Berlin. Focus of her expertise is EU-China/Asia, security policy and dual-use technology transfer.

As the European Union (EU) is struggling with the economic, political and social risks of the financial and economic crises in an increasing number of its member states, the importance of Asia for EU policy-making is rising. The crises only highlight the undergoing power shift from “the West” to “the East” and the need for the EU to adapt to the structural changes in the international political economy. One important arena of this power shift is the regional. The economic development of emerging countries like China, India or Indonesia reinforces the cooperation and integration processes among Asian economies. These cause the formation of an increasing number of institutions for regional political and economic governance in Asia. In this paper I shall argue that an expectations deficit exists in EU-Asia relations. It results from an expectation-capability gap (see Tsuruoka 2004): capabilities for regional cooperation and integration in Asia are higher than Europeans expect them to be. The expectation-capability
gap emerged because, in the public discourse, European expectations vis-à-vis Asian regional dynamics remain low despite the increasing weight and influence of Asian regional institutions. This mental state of EU-Asia affairs is precarious because it results in a European disconnect from Asian affairs which is to the detriment of European political, economic and security interests in Asia. The EU and its member states cannot protect their interests if the EU is not adequately connected to a region that is increasingly shaping regional and global governance institutions. Europeans will have to adjust their Asia policies – thereby keeping in mind the new-found determination of the current US administration to lead “America’s Pacific Century” (Clinton: 2011), the resulting relative decrease in the strategic importance of the Atlantic region, and Europe’s decreasing independence from Asian actors’ interests in a multitude of policy areas and institutions, e.g. during climate negotiations, in the International Monetary Fund or the G20. The question of how Asia is perceived by Europe is thus becoming increasingly relevant for European as well as for Asian policy makers. It addresses the issue of existing gaps between expectations and realities and their impact on Asia-Europe affairs.

Dr. Sebastian Bersick is Associate Professor in International Politics, at the School for International Relations and Public Affairs, Fudan University, Shanghai. Dr. Bersick obtained his Ph.D. in political science from Free University Berlin in 2002. He studied political science, Sinology, and economics in Cologne and Berlin and Mandarin at Xiamen University, China. In 1998 he graduated from Free University Berlin. Between 2007 and 2009, he was Associate in the Research Division Asia at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) in Berlin. From 2004 until 2007 he was Senior Research Fellow at the European Institute for Asian Studies (EIAS) in Brussels. Before joining Fudan University in October 2011, he was Lecturer in the Department of Government, National University of Ireland, Cork. Dr. Bersick is Associate Fellow at the German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) in Berlin. His main scholarly interests lie in Asian international relations, regional co-operation and integration in Asia-Pacific (esp. ASEAN, EAS, APEC, TPP), interregional relations (esp. ASEM, EU-ASEAN) and the role of perceptions in EU-Asia affairs.
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**Ms Ika Riswanti Putranti**  
University of Ferrara, Italy  
*The Role of the GSP to Discover ASEAN – EU Trade Relationships*

During 40 years Generalized System of Preferences is recognized as the only one trade preferences given by the European Union to ASEAN member states. As such, it seems Southeast Asian countries were placed in the low priority within EU foreign trade policies. Such circumstances were influenced by the political economy situation because of the regional dominant power of US and Japan in the Southeast Asian market. Establishment of AFTA and ASEAN membership enlargement
has raising prospectus of ASEAN internal market and its international trade bargaining power. Due to the various levels of economic developments ASEAN member states are granted different arrangement in the EU GSP scheme. Most of ASEAN member states are able to utilize EU GSP with utilization rate up to 75%. On May 2011, the European Commission has submitted proposal of the new GSP scheme regulation to the Councils, which intended to be in effect by January 2014. There are some crucial changes in the new regulation in order to improve the GSP scheme. First, the application of open ended system review to replace the annual review aimed to develops more stable and predictable GSP scheme. Second, the GSP would be given based on the consideration of the country most in need. Consequently, based on such policy’s European Union would cut down the number of beneficiary countries from 176 to 80 countries. Such reduction purposed to increase the efficiency of GSP utilization. On the other hand, after the deadlock of AEUFTA negotiation, European Union commenced to carry out FTA negotiation with the individual ASEAN member states. Such negotiation has been started with Singapore and Malaysia. Questions were raised regarding how the new EU GSP regulation would govern trade relations between ASEAN-EU? How are the positions of ASEAN member states in the new EU GSP schemes? How is ASEAN supposed to address such new policy after the negotiation of AEUFTA postponed?


Mr Vlad Vernygora
University of Canterbury, New Zealand
Mirroring the EU? Functional Capacity of Integration in Asia (co-authored with Dr Natalia Chaban)

This paper contributes to the debate on the multidimensional phenomenon of Asian regional integration. Considering one case study –a regional grouping known as ‘ASEAN+3’ – this paper offsets it against relevant achievements on the European continent. Admitting that direct application of the EU’s model to the ASEAN+3 frameworks is counterproductive, this study uses a different approach, treating the EU’s legal composition as a leading tool to assess if the European ‘know how’ in regional integration could be applied to facilitate the inter-relations within the ASEAN+3. Three barriers to regional integration are explored: differing democratic practices, dominating intergovernmental interactions, and the globally- (vs. regionally)
orientated China. Yet, this paper argues that the aforementioned challenges have a potential not only to subvert, but, paradoxically, reinforce the Asian integration process, particularly within the ASEAN+3 grouping.

Vlad Vernygora, PhD Candidate (University of Canterbury, New Zealand) and Visiting Researcher (Pusan National University EU Centre, South Korea). His research interests include the EU and its neighbourhood, regionalism, the EU’s legal character and the EU’s interactions with Asia-Pacific. He is a member of the editorial panel of the Baltic Journal of European Studies (Estonia) and former Chairman of the Ukrainian Association of New Zealand.

Ms Suet Yi Lai
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

Going Forward, Backward or Going Nowhere? ASEM Turning Sixteen and ASEM9 in Vientiane

Being the highest level of diplomatic event between Asia and Europe, the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) began in 1996 with euphoria and optimism. It was once seen as a historical mark for the “renaissance” of the EU-Asia relations and as an innovative format of meeting between the two regions. Sixteen years have passed, ASEM witnesses not only changes in itself but also in the players in Asia and Europe. Notably, one thing which has not changed is that ASEM has been aware of and understood by very few people. This paper will first illustrate the lack of awareness of the process among the public, media and national elites in both the EU and Asia. Then, it will clarify the common misunderstandings on ASEM (e.g. the “A” in ASEM refers to “Asia” but not “ASEAN”, it is different from APEC in many aspects, its members are not only nation-states). Then, through an overview of the development of the ASEM process from its first summit to present, this paper will determine the impacts of ASEM on the EU-Asia relations. Moreover, it will explore the influence of ASEM on the roles of its partners from the EU and Asia in multilateralism and global governance. Consequently, whether ASEM has brought the EU-Asia relationship forward, backward or nowhere will be assessed. Eventually, some suggestions for the ASEM partners on how to ameliorate the process and not to waste the ASEM9 would be made.

Cher was born, brought up and educated in Hong Kong up to Bachelor level (European Studies-French Stream in Hong Kong Baptist University 2006). Her honour paper was on “the role of France in the Treaty of European Constitution”. In 2004, she went to France as an exchange student in Institute d’étude Politique de Lille for one year. In 2008, she moved to New Zealand and began her PhD research on EU-Asia relations, under the supervisor of Prof. Martin Holland, Dr. Natalia Chaban and Dr. Kenneth Chan. Her PhD studies focus on the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), regionalism and inter-regionalism in the EU-Asia relations. The PhD research will be finished in early 2012. On the final undergraduate year, she joined the research team of “EU in the eyes of Asia” and was responsible of the data collection and analysis of perception of the EU in Hong Kong. She has been part of the research team until present and published numerous
research papers basing on the findings. She is also part of the team for the mirror project “Asia in the eyes of EU”.

Mr Gyula Toth
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

Europe and Asia: Governance, Sociological Constructivism and Society

During the next decades the European Union will have great opportunities. Through increasing globalisation and the discovery of new information and other technologies, there will be a greater increase in knowledge and ideas. China and India will likely continue to grow, and become stronger during the coming decades. The challenge for the EU will be to form cooperative and meaningful relationships with these huge countries of Asia. The environmental problems on Earth can only be solved through global cooperation, and the EU ought to strive to achieve this cooperation not only within its own Union, or with Europe and the West, but even with fast emerging and increasingly powerful countries, such as China and India. This collaboration may be achieved through emergence of new ways of thinking. The biophysical earth-systems are interconnected with the human economic and socio-political systems. The interactions between these major systems are very significant and far reaching, even though the exact scientific nature of these relations is as yet difficult to understand. There is a growing understanding that the natural earth system with the biosphere and ecosystem, as well as the multiple systems created by humanity, including international relations, interact with each other and this interrelationship demands new ways of policy analysis. The changing biophysical earth-systems will gradually merge with the human systems, and a new social reality will arrive. According to social constructivist understanding a system of ideas is the most powerful factor during the different meetings and negotiations, pointing far further than the actual physical assets and the manifest material profit, which are usually at stake during the manifold interactions. The development of ideas, meanings, shared understanding and shared intellectual outlook, knowledge, intersubjective norms, thinking, and social interaction among the participants could create a system of relationship between the European Union, China and India.

Gyula Toth is a PhD student at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand.
While the EU and India have engaged in long term cooperation, there is a significant gap in academic literature on how the EU is perceived in India and where do their foreign policy goals converge and divide. This paper seeks to analyze that while both recognize the other as an important actor, and the EU and India are seen as possessing ‘common values’ like multilateralism and democracy, why this rhetoric does not translate to policy. I aim to explore the Indian elite’s perceptions of the EU as a security actor by focusing on the case study of International Peacekeeping operations, where India has been an active participant, however has voiced criticisms regarding EU’s intervention in certain post conflict zones. By analyzing the policy papers and statements of the Indian government on why it sends its troops on peacekeeping missions and why certain countries are not considered fit ‘candidates’, I propose to isolate the norms India supports in global governance and see if they differ from the EU. Using government policy papers, speeches and published documents, this paper seeks to understand if India and EU have inherently differing logics of foreign policy, one rooted in a Westphalian tradition and the other in a post-national environment.

Garima Mohan is a PhD candidate at the NFG-Research Group on “Asian Perceptions of the EU”. She completed her Masters with distinction in Global Politics at the London School of Economics. Her thesis on global civil society, ‘Representing the Local in Transnational Advocacy Networks: The Limits of Global Civil Society’ was also received with distinction. She did her Bachelor degree in History from St. Stephen’s College in Delhi. Garima has also worked with an international human rights organization, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, on the issues of access to justice for minority communities, progressive legislation and police reforms in India. Her PhD project is on the impact of EU aid on civil society in India.

Mr Florian Britsch
Free University Berlin, Germany
*Tall in Talk – Short in Action? Security Concepts of India and the EU and Possibilities for Cooperation*

Recent power shifts towards Asia and the EU’s approach to develop and foster its own identity as a global actor calls for new, systematic studies that do justice to the complexities that characterize the
global security dynamics and strategic interests of these key countries/blocs. The EU as a security actor strives to pursue its goals by promoting norms and paradigms that aim to foster effective multilateralism worldwide. The EU’s concept of security is unsurprisingly not driven by the nation state as the referent object of security. India’s ‘traditional’ view of security emphasises both a high degree of traditional external threat (compared to Europe) and also a high degree of fear of internal secession and is more grounded in ‘realpolitik’, sovereignty and state interests. This Paper sketch out factors that have been influencing each entity’s shaping of the security paradigm and contrasting them. It will compare governmental reports and official security documents/statements on both sides to see the differences in the conceptualization and the connotations of security concepts. The paper will develop a typology of different security paradigms to see possible areas of closer cooperation and will show that the security paradigms of the EU and India are rather marginal convergent when it comes to traditional security threats.

Florian Britsch is a research fellow and PhD candidate at the NFG-Research Group “Asian Perceptions of the EU” at Freie Universität Berlin. He studied Political Science of South Asia, Political Science and International Law in Munich, Heidelberg, Granada, New Delhi and Tokyo. Florian received his Magister Artium (M.A.) from Heidelberg University, where he also worked as a teaching- and research assistant in the Department of Political Science. He was Managing Editor of an academic peer-reviewed journal (Heidelberg Papers in South Asian and Comparative Politics). In New Delhi, Florian is associated with the ‘Centre de Sciences Humaines’, a research institute part of the research network of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr Jizhou Zhao
Free University Berlin, Germany

Europe Lead, China Follows? The European Union, China and International Peacekeeping & Export Controls: One Partnership, Different Perspectives

The European Union (EU) has been striving for “a better world” by promoting “effective multilateralism” in its strategic partnership with an emerging China. Yet very little research has focused on EU’s role in engaging China in international peacekeeping and export controls. Is the EU really a “leader” while China just a “follower” in these two areas? And, if so (or not), why? Serving as a qualitative, empirical study, this paper draws on current research of “normative power Europe”, and explores whether or not the EU has played a role of “leader” in promoting “effective multilateralism” towards China with China’s policies and involvements in international peacekeeping (such as in Afghanistan) and export controls (such as in recent Iran). It argues that China perceives the EU as a normative power differently from Eurocentric debates; and notwithstanding its gradual and yet important progress in the past, China’s its interpretations of and attitudes to peacekeeping, current nonproliferation regimes and bilateral diplomacy have not changed much. Due to their varied perspectives, the EU is not a real “leader” to China who is definitely not just a “follower” to EU’s norm of multilateralism. Therefore, EU’s “ineffectiveness” in engaging China with “effective multilateralism” constitutes future
challenges both to its normative power and their partnership.

Jizhou Zhao, a Research Fellow on the NFG Research Group “Asian Perceptions of the EU”, an Associated Project of the KFG Research College “the Transformative Power of Europe”, Free University Berlin, Germany. He is also a Ph. D Candidate of Berlin Graduate School For Transnational Studies (BTS). Jizhou received his Master’s degree with distinction in International Relations on EU ESDP in Shanghai, China, and currently works on Chinese perceptions of the EU as a security actor in Export Controls and ESDP Peacekeeping. His publications include the EU’s foreign, security and defense policy and China-EU Relations.

Ms Olivia Gippner
Free University Berlin, Germany
“Agent China”: Multilateral Negotiations and the Role of the EU – Discovering the Patterns of Interaction in Negotiations on Climate Change and Technology Transfer

For several years, it has been argued that the EU has been following a “policy of unconditional engagement” vis-à-vis the PRC, pursuing its promotion of international engagement and multilateralism (by Godement amongst others). In the field of Climate Change China has been an increasingly important member of the UNFCCC process and a key target of European engagement policies. But how do Chinese decision-makers perceive these efforts? In order to better understand and evaluate how Chinese climate elites see the EU, the paper details the nascent theoretical debate and critically assesses the Chinese discourse on climate change. To analyse the role of the EU it draws on current research on transfer and diffusion. As an empirical, qualitative study, it uses the case of clean energy transfer negotiations, which sees the EU and China as two main actors. Located in the discourse post-Copenhagen it attempts to capture the new global dynamics that have been integral to the subsequent rounds of negotiation.

Olivia Gippner is a research fellow and PhD candidate at the NFG-Research Group on “Asian Perceptions of the EU” at the Free University Berlin. She received her Bachelor in European Studies from the University of Malta, where she also published her thesis on the German position on Turkey’s EU-membership bid. During her Master in Public Policy at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy in Singapore she refocused her studies on the role of energy policy in development. Since March 2012 Olivia has been researching Chinese perceptions of the European Union in the areas of climate change and peacekeeping missions as a visiting student at Beijing University.
Dr Maria Garcia  
University of Canterbury, New Zealand  
*Redefining EU-Asia Relations Through Free Trade Agreements*

As the EU’s most visible, practical and potent tool for strengthening its relationship with Asian states, free trade agreement (FTA) negotiations take on a special significance in shaping the future of relations between the two regions, especially as the EU requires FTA partners to negotiate a complementary political cooperation agreement, which institutionalizes future coordination initiatives in all areas of international politics. Despite all the actors’ desires to diversify their trade and investment relationships and ameliorate market access, in the backdrop of competitive diffusion of free trade agreements throughout the region and the stalemate at the multilateral Doha Round, negotiations have proven more protracted and controversial than expected, given different industrial and economic policy preferences amongst negotiating partners. Process-tracing documentary evidence and interview materials, this paper explores how the EU’s preferences for a certain type of economic governance as portrayed in ‘Global Europe’ (and continued in ‘Trade, Growth and Jobs’), centred around export of its regulatory preferences especially in intellectual property, liberalization of services, harmonization of competition rules, and the opening of public procurement markets, have been translated into its FTA negotiations, and how this has been mediated and modified by the preferences of its interlocutors. It pays particular attention to the EU-South Korea FTA (as it is the only finalized once at the moment) and identifies elements in it that could set precedents that could facilitate or complicate ongoing negotiations with other states in the region (India, Malaysia, Vietnam, Singapore), and therefore shape the future of EU-Asia relations.

Maria Garcia is a Marie Curie Fellow at the National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury, New Zealand working on free trade agreements in the Asia Pacific region. She previously lectured on European Politics at Birkbeck College, University of London and the University of Nottingham.

Mr Karel Čada  
Charles University Prague, Czech Republic  
*Negotiations of Economic Justice and Global Health: The Xase of the FTA between EU and India*

Health care markets and production of pharmaceuticals in Asia have expanded rapidly. Emerging economies such as India or China promote growth and profitability in pharmaceutical and related industries through a wide range of interventions. They significantly contribute to the spread of the global
market for generic pharmaceuticals. My presentation will be based on analysis of public discussion on the EU-India Free Trade Agreement [FTA] and it will be focused mainly on patent protection and access to medicines. Bilateral negotiations on FTA between the EU and India began in 2007 and they have not been completed yet. The regulation of pharmaceutical industry has been important part of these negotiations. Between 1970 and 2005, Indian patent law only provided little protection for pharmaceuticals. As a result, a thriving generics industry developed there and resulted in export of pharmaceuticals to the range of developing countries. In 2005 India implemented the changes required by the World Trade Organization. Despite these changes Indian policies still provide important flexibility in the law and make it possible to produce more generic drugs. While the proponents of the agreement stress its contribution to research and development of the industry, critics warn that it could radically restrict access to cheap generic drugs across the developing world. On the basis of the analysis of arguments of stakeholders from the business and civil society I would like to demonstrate how the discussion was framed in terms of economic and social justice and global solidarity. The presentation shows how claims to justice were mobilized by different stakeholders, and it also identifies the key challenges that Europe and India face in their on-going relationship building in the field of global health policy.

Karel Čada is an Erasmus Mundus doctoral scholar at ANU Centre for European Studies. He is pursuing a PhD degree in sociology at Faculty of Social Sciences at Charles University in Prague. After working for several years as a journalist and a researcher in a commercial company, he decided to return to academia. Since 2007, he has been doing his PhD. in the field of medical sociology. He focuses on construction of pharmaceutical policy in the Czech Republic from both institutional and discourse perspectives. He has also participated in several research projects on social exclusion, inequalities in education and communication of science and he has published articles in these fields.

Dr Hitoshi Suzuki
University of Niigata, Japan
EU’s Not Unknown Partner in Asia: Japan, FTA Negotiation, And Fukushima

This presentation will focus on the two most urgent issues between Japan and the EU: the nuclear disaster of Fukushima after 11 March 2011 and FTA negotiations between Japan and the EU. The image of Japan for the EC/EU member states have long stayed as “Japan as a threat” because of Japan’s aggressive export. Trade conflict between Japan and the EC/EU continued throughout the 1970s, 80s and 90s, and was gradually eased by two solutions: Japanese firms reducing export from Japan by operating factories in the EC/EU, and European industry expanding export to Japan. Japan and the EU have not, however, agreed on an FTA up to present. Compared to the Korea-EU FTA, Japan lagged behind in the negotiations, in which both the European Commission and Japanese government have taken un-compromising positions. Japan asks for reducing tariff walls in Europe, namely for cars, while the Commission asks Japan to reduce tariff and non-tariff walls, including agriculture products. The deadlock could enjoy a break-through, thanks to the earthquake and nuclear disaster in Fukushima of March 2011. EU member states show a sign of compromise to
reduce tariffs, with the view that this could help Japan’s economic revive. On the other hand Japan, although suffering resistance from the agriculture sector, strongly willing to agree on an FTA for the aim to increase exports to the EU. Contrary to such “optimistic” and “reformist” perspectives, Japan’s case, which is not new and unknown, seems to show that countries in the Asian region are willing less for multilateral FTAs but seeking for a limited and regulated free trade based on bilateral agreements.

Hitoshi Suzuki is Lecturer of the Faculty of International Studies and Regional Development, University of Niigata Prefecture (Niigata, Japan) and teaches international relations and European integration. His research interests are in the history of European integration and how it was influenced by pressure groups, trade unions and public opinion. He received his Ph.D. (History and Civilization) from the European University Institute in Florence (Italy) in December 2007 and is one of the first Japanese students who received a Ph.D. from the EUI. He has written extensively about the Schuman Plan, the European Coal and Steel Community, Euratom and trade unions. His current interests are in the historical process of how the European Commission took initiative to solve the trade conflict against Japan during the 1970s and 1980s. He was International Visiting Fellow at the Monash European and EU Centre (Melbourne, Australia) in August 2009 and is Associate Researcher of the Keio Jean Monnet Centre for EU Studies (Tokyo, Japan).

Associate Professor SooYeon Kim
National University of Singapore, Singapore

*Designing Commitment: The Political Economy of Dispute Settlement Design in Preferential Trade Agreements*

While the European Union is characterized by high levels of legalization, the conventional wisdom about Asian regionalism is that it has not progressed beyond codes of conduct and informal principles due to Asian countries’ strong aversion to legalization and traditional rejection of formal rules and obligations. This paper takes a new look at this conventional wisdom and focuses on the political economy of legalization. It specifically addresses the puzzling variation in the levels of obligation and delegation in the dispute settlement provisions of Asian preferential trade agreements (PTAs). We try to answer two questions regarding the determinants of legalization. First, can the degree of legalism be explained by a demand-driven account in which domestic economic actors seek greater protection through formal and highly legalized dispute settlement provisions? The second question concerns the supply of such protection. More specifically, it asks whether membership of PTA-participants in the World Trade Organization affects the level of legalism in 'their' PTAs. These political economy arguments of demand and supply are juxtaposed with diffusion accounts of dispute settlement design. In the empirical part of the analysis, we test our theoretical arguments using quantitative methods on a sample of 57 PTAs in the Asia-Pacific region. The findings support the demand-side and diffusion explanations of dispute settlement mechanism design.

Soo Yeon Kim is Associate Professor of Political Science at the National University of Singapore. She is a former Fellow of the Transatlantic Academy, based at the German
Marshall Fund of the United States (Washington, DC), and of the Niehaus Center for Globalization and Governance, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University. Soo Yeon Kim holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Yale University and B.A. in Political Science and International Studies from Yonsei University. She is the author of *Power and the Governance of Global Trade: From the GATT to the WTO* (2010, Series in Political Economy, Cornell University Press). Soo Yeon Kim’s main research area is trade politics, in particular free trade agreements, WTO disputes, and rising powers in the global economy. She is currently at work on a book-length project on free trade agreements in Asia, focusing on the impact of production networks. Soo Yeon Kim’s most recent publications include “Reciprocal Trade Agreements in Asia: Credible Commitment to Trade Liberalization or Paper Tigers?” (with Raymond Hicks, *Journal of East Asian Studies*) and “Preventing Protectionism: International Institutions and Trade Policy” (with Leonardo Baccini, *Review of International Organizations*).
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Assistant Professor Reuben Wong  
National University of Singapore, Singapore  
*Identity in the EU’s Relations with China*

This paper examines the EU's relations with perhaps its most important partner in Asia- the People's Republic of China. Many scholars suggest that economic interests are primary in this bilateral relationship- the EU sacrifices normative ideals so as to protect its vested economic and strategic interests in China (Shambaugh 1996, Baker 1998, Foot 2000, Shambaugh 2004). This paper argues that beyond double standards in the EU''s desire to protect its material interests in China, the EU's downgrading of human rights in its relations with Beijing can be better understood as a function of the changing identities in Europe about its role in the world, as well as in the changing international political economy of EU-China relations. This paper employs a constructivist framework (Checkel 2008, Wong 2012) to argue that the evolving identities in the EU as well as in China, give a better account of the ups and downs in the EU's relations with China.

Reuben Wong teaches International Relations in the Political Science Department, NUS. He was a Foreign Service officer and served in Paris (1995-98) after graduating from NUS as the top Direct Honours student in Political Science. He completed an M/Phil in Oxford and a PhD in the LSE. He is the author of several articles on EU relations with China and ASEAN, 'The Europeanization of French Foreign Policy' (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), and 'National and European foreign policies' (co-edited with Christopher Hill, Routledge, 2011). He has held visiting positions at Cambridge University, the LSE, the Stimson Center (Washington DC), and the East Asia Institute (Singapore). He is also the Liaison Officer for Antonians (the alumni of St Antony’s College Oxford) in Singapore and Malaysia. Dr Wong speaks French, Chinese and
Ms Lucie Macku  
Charles University Prague, Czech Republic  
*Freedom of Media – Perceptions in the EU and Asia*

Freedom of media is a topic which is widely talked about but often without any concrete research. Widespread European perception of Asian media is that most of them are not free. Countries such as China or Fiji are often mentioned in several media studies as bad examples of media freedom but self-reflection of our own European media is often missing. Few European academics pay attention to current developments in Italy or Hungary where several indicators suggest that media freedom is becoming more limited in the last years. In the case of media freedom, why is there a focus on external countries over internal EU issues? According to the French organization Reporters Sans Frontières 2011 was truly challenging for the freedom of media. The Arab spring, the Occupy movement and continuing protests in China were “tests” for journalists and editors all over the world. How did some European and Asian media reflect these events? And what is the perception of media freedom in EU and Asia?

Lucie Macku is working on her PhD thesis on the topic of “Freedom of media” through Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic. Her work and research in this area has brought her to study at the National Center of Research of Europe in Christchurch, New Zealand. In the Czech Republic she worked as both journalist and a lecturer, where she taught classes in subjects as “Media and Human Rights” and “Theory of Ethnicity”.

Mr Eijiro Fukui  
Keio University, Japan  
*Images of the EU in the Japanese Television News*

The objective of this paper is to clarify the images of the EU in the Japanese television news. Previous studies have tended to employ a method of selecting a particular news programme and analysing the EU related news within it. While this method has the strength of making possible a thorough content analysis of the EU related news, at the same time it has two weaknesses. The first is that the particular image of the EU derived from the analysis may be biased as a consequence of focusing on only one programme. The second is that the approach does not provide a basis for comparison between the EU and other international actors such as the US and China. This paper tries to account for these weaknesses by analysing most of the Japanese television news programmes and by comparing the EU with other actors. The analytical target is the news programmes of six stations in the morning, evening, and prime time broadcast by digital terrestrial between January and December in 2011. Through this observation, this paper shows that the presence of the EU was as
prominent as other actors and that the EU images were negative reflecting the European financial crisis.

Eijiro FUKUI is Associate Researcher at the Keio Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence for EU Studies, Keio University in Japan. He holds a LL.M from Keio University and a MA in International Relations from the University of Warwick. His research interests are the EU perceptions in Asia and the Asia-EU relations. His publications include ‘The EU Perceptions in Asian Citizens from the Perspective of Public Opinion Survey’ in Hogaku Seijigaku Ronkyu (Journal of Law and Political Science). He participated in the perceptions’ project, ‘The EU through the Eyes of Asia’, which was the first project planned by the European Studies in Asia (ESIA) of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), as an assistant researcher for the Japanese team.

Mr Nicholas Smith
University of Auckland, New Zealand
Closing the ‘Expectations-Capabilities’ Gap post-Lisbon? External Media Portrayals of the EU’s reaction to the Arab Spring in the BRIC Countries (written in conjunction with Dr Serena Kelly)

Arguably, the ratification of the Treaty of Lisbon represents an attempt by the European Union (EU) to become a more visible and effective international actor through acquiring state-like capabilities. However, this paper forgoes the typical analysis on EU foreign policy, which posits what type of power it is or what level of actorness it has, through specifically looking at the EU’s international action from the perspective of external countries. External perceptions of the EU in three of the emerging BRIC countries (China, India & Russia) are examined through systematically analysing newspaper articles which focussed on the EU’s action in the Arab Spring movements in North Africa and the Middle East (MENA). This paper argues that despite the Treaty of Lisbon’s intentions, the EU is still perceived as an inefficient and perhaps irrelevant international actor in these countries not only because of the EU’s difficulty in reaching common positions on tough international issues (as illustrated by the Arab Spring) but its inability to successfully project its decisions and action beyond its borders to external countries.

Nicholas Smith is in the first year of his PhD at the University of Auckland looking at the EU-Russian relationship and its implications in the Shared Neighbourhood state of Ukraine. Along with post-Soviet transition, Nicholas has a strong background in EU studies, particularly EU foreign policy and external perceptions of the EU. Recent publications include journal articles on the EU’s democratization policy in Armenia and the role of return migration in furthering the EU's utilization of public diplomacy with further submissions awaiting review on the EU's potential for further enlargement after Croatia and the external perceptions of the EU’s effectiveness in the Arab Spring.
India and the EU are known to share a vital and dynamic relationship with each other. This paper shall seek to examine the degree of proximity between the two partners and the level of awareness about the EU in India by means of content analysis of coverage of the EU in Indian newspapers (January to June 2011) and through elite interviews (November 2011-February 2012). The analysis shall include the categorization of the EU as an economic, political, social, developmental or environmental actor based on its area of involvement in the news article. The news item shall also be subjected to evaluation of being positive, negative or neutral contingent upon the immediate response that it triggers. The focus of centrality would be determined by means of assessing the importance and visibility of the EU as a major or secondary or minor actor in the news articles. The paper shall reflect upon responses of the elites belonging to politics, business, civil society and media spheres on issues pertaining to the EU and factors that should be kept in mind while formulating governmental policy in relation to the EU. The paper shall also make an attempt to compare the findings of a similar analysis done in 2009 with the study carried out in 2011 in order to provide a more holistic view about what India thinks about the EU. This exercise should also help in identifying existing trends and issues of concern and improvement that have emerged. The paper shall try to find out and indicate the strengths, weaknesses and the gaps that need to be filled for forging a closer and a more enduring partnership between India and the EU.

Shreya Pandey is a Ph.D candidate of the Centre for European Studies (CES), School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi. She is working on her doctoral dissertation entitled "EU-India Relations: Perceptions of the Print Media and the Indian Elite". She is currently associated with the project, “After Lisbon: The EU as an Exporter of Values and Norms through ASEM” which is co-ordinated by the National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury and funded by the European Commission. She holds an M.A. degree in Political Science (with specialization in International Relations) (2007) and has done her MPhil.(2009) from CES, JNU. Her M.Phil dissertation is on "EU and Minority Protection in Central and Eastern Europe: A Case Study of the Baltic States". She has worked as Assistant Professor (Political Science) at Janaki Devi Memorial College, University of Delhi during 2008-2009. Her research interests include Kosovo, Common Foreign and Security Policy, German foreign policy, Normative Power Europe and situating the European Union as a global actor.

email id – spandey63@gmail.com
Ms Huong Le Thu  
National Chengchi University, Taiwan  
*Re-assessing socio-cultural cooperation in the ASEM process: the role and contribution of ASEF*

This research evaluates the performance of ASEF— the manifestation of the third pillar — as the contributor to the ASEM’s relevance and visibility. The Asia-Europe Foundation works under three main thematic fields: cultural exchange, intellectual exchange, and people-to-people exchange, and is the only framework of ASEM that directly involves civil society and professionals from all member state countries. It has launched over 500 programs engaging over 15,000 individuals and organizations. Despite its significant contribution to trans-regional cooperation, mutual understanding and exchanges, as well as enhancing ASEM’s visibility, there does not exist a comprehensive assessment of 15 years of ASEF activity. Not only does it serve the prime purpose of the inter-regional relations – bridging the knowledge gap between the regions by launching a dialogue of civilizations – but it also essentially contributes to the democratization of the process by including the non-state actors and civil societies. Engagement of people into the process pluralizes the Asia-Europe Meeting and adds to its credibility. This part sees culture as agenda, as an ends for Asia-Europe trans-regional cooperation. Another facet of this study addresses culture as means of multilateral collaboration. Having attended to a number of ASEF and ASEM activities, the author has made participating observation on the nuances of cross-cultural communication among the partners. It is interesting for the author to explore the processes of negotiation about agenda, the design, and targets of launched cooperation programs. An in-depth observation aims at answering to the question on decision mechanisms and common interests in such a form of multilateral cooperation. The main research questions that this study addresses are: What is the role of the third pillar in trans-/cross- or inter-regional framework of ASEM? Can it be the value-added unique “product” of ASEF as opposite to other multilateral trans-regional institutions? How essential it is for trans-regional cooperation and to the existence of ASEM itself? To answer the above questions this research examines how does politically-rooted institution work in un-politicized agenda of culture? To what extend is ASEF – governmentally funded and governed, can be govern cultural, social and intellectual agenda without political agenda? How does it exercise multilateral governance when engaging so many partners? What are the decision-making mechanisms behind the design of ASEF activities? To approach these issues this study adopts the theories of global governance and international regimes. The purpose of it is to understand to what extend is culture relevant in international relations, particularly in inter-regional cooperation, where interests and motives for cooperation are so diverse and widespread. The purpose of this study is to offer a first comprehensive analysis of Asia-Europe Foundation process. It also aims at understanding to what extend “low-politics” engaging non-state actors, is relevant to such a multilateral inter-governmental cooperation framework of ASEM. Finally, it attempts at
measuring the effectiveness of multilateral governance exercised by a foundation attached to international institution.

**Huong Le Thu** is a PhD Candidate in Asia-Pacific Studies at National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan. She was born in Hanoi, Vietnam; lived many years in Poland, where she obtained her BA and MA from Jagiellonian University in International Cultural Studies and East Asian Regional Studies. Huong conducts research in Southeast Asian regionalism and the community building, Asia-Europe cultural inter-regionalism, and the cultural development in Vietnam. Her publications include studies on ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights and Vietnamese cultural policy as strategy of sustainable development since the Renovation Doi Moi in 1986.

Huong is also a fellow of UNESCO U40 World Forum “Cultural Diversity 2030” and serves as an informal ambassador to the Asian region to promote the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expressions. She is also a member of Young Researchers Team working for Asia-Pacific Regional Center of the CultureLink Network (APRCCN) in association with Korean National Commission for UNESCO. She is interested in the practices of cultural diplomacy, sustainable development, and multilateral governance of international institutions, with particular cases of UNESCO, Asia-Europe Foundation, and ASEAN Foundation. She speaks 5 languages and has working experience as interpreter to diplomatic delegations, including Presidential visits. Privately Huong is passionate about travel, art, and food.

**Assistant Professor Anna Rudakowska**
Tamkang University, Taiwan

*China, India and Japan: The EU’s Strategic Partners Through the Eyes of the European Parliament*

The understanding of the Asian states within the European Union (EU) is not static or given, but constantly negotiated among all the EU’s institutions. This article is interested in the vision of China, India and Japan presented by the European Parliament (EP) within the Parliamentary debates. The Parliamentary debates are particularly valuable for the analysis interested in the EU’s perception of Asia for several reasons. Firstly, as Nugent (2006: 262) highlights, the EP ‘reflects the wide range of political opinion that exists across the EU with regard to ideological and national orientation’. Hence an analysis of EP debates provides insights into the national political discourses on the same issues. Secondly, the linguistic activities of the Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) may lead to a particular interpretation of the events within the EU and in consequence might draw attention to some problems, but background others, create opinion, popular support or disagreement. Additionally, the easy access to the Parliamentary debates was not without the impact on the choice of the EP for the analysis. While debates of the European Council and the Council take place behind the closed doors, those of the MEPs are available to the public. The analysis of the MEPs’ comments in relation to the three countries, that have been recognize by the EU as its strategic partners, i.e. China, India and Japan, should be particularly interesting as it is expected to reveal whether the MEPs agree with the official discourse of the EU. In order to examine the discursive activities of MEPs, this article applies discourse analysis. It focuses on the plenary sessions during the period from 1 January 2011 till 30 December 2011.
Dr Anna Rudakowska works as the Assistant Professor at the Department of Global Politics and Economics, Tamkang University. She teaches topics related to globalization, regionalization, civil society, European integration and political and economic developments around the world. In her research, dr Rudakowska specializes in European Union external relations, EU’s relations with China and Taiwan and in discourse analysis. She is interested in the role of beliefs, values and norms in international politics. She is associated with the Institute of European Studies (IES) at Vrije Universiteit Brussel. She is a member of the editorial board of the IES Working Paper Series.

Dr Mathew Doidge
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

Patterns of Engagement: Europe-Asia Relations and Comparative Interregionalism

This paper explores the patterns of engagement that have begun to emerge in interregional Europe–Asia relations, both in the bilateral interregional (EU–ASEAN) and transregional (ASEM) variants. It contends that these patterns are gradually becoming evident beyond the Europe–Asia context, making Europe–Asia structures a potential foundation stone for the emergence of studies in comparative interregionalism.

Mathew Doidge is a Fellow of the National Centre for Research on Europe at the University of Canterbury (New Zealand), prior to which he lectured at the University of Warwick (United Kingdom). His research interests are in the areas of regionalism and interregionalism, the external relations of the European Union, and the politics of international development. His most recent publications are volumes titled The European Union and Interregionalism: Patterns of Engagement (Ashgate, 2011) and Development Policy of the European Union (with Martin Holland, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Assistant Professor Sandra Marco Colino
Chinese University of Hong Kong

Methods of European Integration and their ‘Exportability’ into Asia

The proposed paper aims to explore perceptions of the EU integration process in Asia with a view to assessing the exportability of the European integration experience. It offers insights into the impact of the Union’s development on Asia’s regional integration and cooperation schemes, and looks at how this is impacting the budding Europe-Asia ‘special relationship’. Traditionally the interaction between Asia and Europe was seen as the Achilles’ Heel of the EU-US-Asia global power triangle. However, bilateral, multilateral and inter-regional co-operation between them is on the rise, unavoidably leading to an increase of mutual influences. As a result, underlying the paper as a principal theme is an analysis of the ASEAN and the EU, considered two of the most successful regional organisations, and how they may influence one another. Both have in common the perception of having
preserved co-operation among members for decades, and for having increased the economic efficiency and international strength of the various members. Given the evident parallelisms, they unavoidably look towards one another for inspiration. Nonetheless, conceptual gaps between Asian and European erudites have been identified which have the power to leave a negative imprint on their relationship. Importantly, there are two conflicting views on sovereignty: EU-style supranationalism is seen as incompatible with ASEAN’s respect for state independence. Yet questions can be raised as to how ASEAN political elites envisage furthering regional integration in the absence of supranational elements, and how they may ensure the protection of human rights without intervention mechanisms. The EU is generally considered the most advanced integration process in the world, and it would appear that that its history could be useful for budding integration processes and for furthering transnational relations in Asia. Nonetheless, as Murray has explained on occasion, a certain ‘EU arrogance’ is perceived by some in the assumption that there is merit (or even interest) in drawing from the European experience. In fact, interest in the EU within Asia varies greatly from one country to another. Even so, when the subject of the EU is discussed among the general public or among national stakeholders, it is favourably regarded, both in economic and political terms. Therefore, EU experience remains attractive for ASEAN regionalism, and the contributions make suggestions as to how to reconcile European integration principles with the prevailing views and priorities in Asia.

'Sandra Marco Colino is a Research Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Law of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Prior to that she was a Lecturer in EU Law at the University of Glasgow. A qualified lawyer in Spain, her main interests lie in the fields of competition law, communications law, EU law and the regulation of gambling. She holds a PhD from the European University Institute in Florence, and an LLM in EU Law from the University Carlos III of Madrid. She has worked as a stagiaire at the European Commission in Brussels, and has been a Visiting Scholar, inter alia, at the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Melbourne. Prof. Marco Colino is the founder and director of the Communications Policy and Regulation Scholars Forum and the co-founder of the Global Gambling Law Forum. She is the section editor for the Asia-Pacific region of the Journal of Contemporary European Research and the Hong Kong news correspondent for the European Competition Law Review.'
**Singapore Airport**

Changi International Airport is the main airport in Singapore (www.changiairport.com). After your arrival you will be required to go through Immigration. To enter the country you will have to fill out a disembarkation/embarkation card if you are not a Singaporean, and produce valid travel documents (passport) and a visa if applicable.

In the following link you will find information on customs, items that require clearance and/or are prohibited to bring into the country: [http://www.changiairport.com/passenger-guide/arrival/customs/prohibited-and-controlled-items](http://www.changiairport.com/passenger-guide/arrival/customs/prohibited-and-controlled-items)

Singapore Changi Airport is easily accessible with many modes of transportation available to and from the Airport. Please see [http://www.changiairport.com/getting-around/to-and-from-the-airport](http://www.changiairport.com/getting-around/to-and-from-the-airport)

The conference hotel is located above the Lavender MRT station, a 20 minute ride from the CHangi Airport. Board the train at the Changi Airpot MRT station located at the Changi Airport Terminal 2, heading towards Tanah Merah MRT station and get off at the Tanah Merah MRT station. Transfer to a train heading towards Joo Koon MRT station (East-West Line) and get off at the Lavender MRT station. You will find more information on available tickets and multi-day-passes below.

Please note that EUSA AP will NOT reimburse any local costs, ie taxi, public transport etc. Please make your own way to the hotel.

**Conference Hotel**

The Conference Hotel is Vhotel at 70 Jellicoe Road, Singapore 208767, [www.vhotel.sg](http://www.vhotel.sg)

Check-in will be available after 2pm, check-out will be required by 11am. The EUSA AP covers your accommodation, breakfast and use of internet for conference presenters. Please be aware that we cannot cover or reimburse any local costs. You will receive a 20% laundry discount during your stay.

The hotel offers a special rate for conference participants that would like to arrive earlier than the 3rd of June or depart later than the 6th. The price is SGD$128 per room per night, breakfast SGD$12, both prices plus service charge 10% and GST 7%. If you would like to book the hotel outside the covered three nights, please contact Mr Sean Choo, Sales Manager (seanchoo@vhotel.sg), quote ‘EUSA AP Conference’ when booking and cc Yvonne.grosch@canterbury.ac.nz in your email. This special rate also applies for conference attendants.

Conveniently located directly above Lavender MRT Station, V Hotel is a 20-minute train ride away from Changi International Airport and minutes away from Orchard Road, Singapore's premier shopping belt.
EUSA AP Conference, June 4th and 5th, Singapore

Please see the following link for more information on how to get to and from the airport: [http://www.vhotel.sg/location.html](http://www.vhotel.sg/location.html)

Transport on Conference Days

On conference days a bus transfer to and from the venue will be offered. Buses will also return participants to the hotel each evening.

**Departure Times**
- **Monday, 04 June 2012** at 7.30am sharp
- **Tuesday, 05 June 2012** at 8.00am sharp

Alternatively you can use the extensive net of public transport that covers Singapore. We recommend the MRT East-West line for transport to and from the conference venue if you prefer to make your own way to the venue by the MRT system.

Board the East-West-Line at Lavender MRT station (EW11 station) (directly at the Vhotel) heading towards Joo Koon MRT station, getting off at the Buona Vista MRT station (EW21). Take EXIT A for a 15 minutes walk to the conference venue.

You can also take a bus from the opposite Buona Vista MRT, bus stop code no 11369. You can use the following bus lines: 74, 91, 92, 95, 191, 198 and 200. Get off at the next station which is opposite the Anglo-Chinese JC, bus stop code no 18149, along North Buona Vista Road. The frequency of the bus is about 5 to 15 minutes. It should take under 30 minutes.

You can purchase a Singapore Tourist Pass (STP) which offers unlimited rides on basic bus and trains in Singapore. The STP comes in 1-Day, 2-Day or 3-Day passes which cost SG$10, SG$16 and SG$20 respectively. You may purchase the Singapore Tourist Pass (STP) from the following TransitLink Ticket Offices located at these MRT stations:

- Changi Airport
- Orchard
- Chinatown
- City Hall
- Raffles Place
- Ang Mo Kio
- Harbour Front
- Bugis


A convenient, rechargeable Adult Stored Value Card is a contactless stored value smartcard which can be used on buses, the MRT and LRT. These can be purchased at any TransitLink Ticket Office. There are currently two types of adult stored value card available for purchase – the Adult ez-link card (recommended) and the NETS FlashPay. Both cards cost $12 ($5 non-refundable card cost and $7 travel value).
For more information on the Adult ez-link card, you may log on to EZ-Link website www.ezlink.com.sg.
The minimum amount that you can top-up is $10 and the maximum is $500.

You may also use the Add Value Machines (AVMs) and General Ticketing Machines (GTMs) in MRT stations and bus interchanges to top-up your smartcards by cash or NETS. Please use the exact amount when paying via cash as the GTM does not accept coins or issue change. The AVM only accepts transactions via NETS.

To return your prepaid card visit any TransitLink Ticket Office and you will receive a refund of the remaining travel value in the card. Please note that the $5 card cost paid during the purchase of the card is non-refundable.

The Vhotel Lavender is directly above the Lavender MRT station which is serviced by the East-West-Line (EW, green on the maps).

From Monday to Saturday the first train terminating at Joo Koon (east) leaves the Lavender station at 5.50am. The last train from Lavender station towards Joo Koon leaves at 23.45.

From Monday to Saturday the first train terminating at Pasir Ris (west) leaves the Lavender station at 6.03am. The last train from Lavender station towards Pasir Ris leaves at 00.13am.

The train ride from the Lavender MRT station to Buona Vista MRT station takes approx. 25 minutes.

At the end of Day One, Monday, we will provide a bus service to the Conference Dinner Venue and back to the hotel.

Please note that EUSA AP will NOT reimburse any local costs, ie taxi, public transport etc. Please make your own way to the hotel.

Conference Venue

The conference will be held at the One North Executive Centre (ONEC) campus of the National University of Singapore, 11 Slim Barracks Rise (off North Buona Vista Road), #06-01 Executive Centre (NTU@one-north campus), Singapore 138664.
Access for Email, Computer, Printing and Your Presentation

Internet access will be available at your hotel room free of charge. There will be limited access to computer terminals (with internet) at the conference venue on level 5.

*Please ensure that you bring your necessary print-outs with you, as we cannot provide printer access locally. The hotel provides printing for a small number of pages. Small costs may apply.*

*There will be computers/laptops in the conference rooms. We require that every presenter saves his/her presentation onto the desktop of the computer BEFORE HIS/HER just before the session begins.*

Conference Dinner

The Conference Dinner will be held on **Monday, 04 June 2012 at 6.30pm** at The National University of Singapore Society, Kent Ridge Guild House, 9 Kent Ridge Drive, Singapore 119241.

We have catered for vegetarian and gluten/wheat-free guests. If you have any other special food requirements, please contact us immediately.

A bus service back to the hotel will leave at 20.15pm from the dinner venue back to the hotel.