



# **Diverging Problems in the EU**

EUI Max Weber Programme and James Madison University  
11<sup>th</sup> Graduate Symposium, 10<sup>th</sup> April 2018

EUI, Badia Fiesolana, Emeroteca

The Max Weber Programme and the James Madison University's M.A. Program in European Union Policy Studies are pleased to announce the 11th Joint Graduate Symposium.

The symposium gives JMU's MA students in European Union Policy Studies an opportunity to present and discuss their own research with Max Weber Fellows and the wider EUI community in an academic setting. This year, the symposium highlights ever diverging problems in the EU, including economic, social, political, and security issues. The symposium will culminate with a keynote lecture by Prof. François Foret, Professor of Political Science at Université Libre de Bruxelles.

**Symposium Organizers:**

Akisato Suzuki, Max Weber Programme, EUI, [Akisato.Suzuki@eui.eu](mailto:Akisato.Suzuki@eui.eu)  
Caterina Paolucci, James Madison University in Florence, [paoluccx@jmu.edu](mailto:paoluccx@jmu.edu)

EUI Max Weber Programme and James Madison University  
11<sup>th</sup> Graduate Symposium, 10<sup>th</sup> April 2018

*Badia Fiesolana, Emeroteca, EUI*

## **Diverging Problems in the EU**

### **10:00 – 10:10 Opening Remarks**

**Chair: Akisato Suzuki**

- Caterina Paolucci, Academic Coordinator, JMU
- Karin Tilmans, Program Coordinator, MWP-EUI

### **Panel 1 (10:10 – 11:30): Foreign Policy**

**Chair: Chiara Steindler**

**Discussant: Ioannis Galariotis & Leon Castellanos**

- Victoria Lee  
“How China Sees the EU: An Analysis of China’s Economic Ties to Member States after the Lisbon Treaty and How This Affects the EU as a Single Voice”
- Carl Anderson  
“The Eurasian Economic Union: A Realist Alternative to the European Union”
- Robert Stokka  
“Young but Developed? The European External Action Service and the U.S. Department of State in Foreign Policy”
- Marisa Campanella  
“Protection of Minorities in Turkey as EU Accession Criteria”

Break (11:30-11:40)

### **Panel 2 (11:40 – 13:00): National and Transnational Politics**

**Chair: Caterina Paolucci**

**Discussants: Mario Quaranta & Mirjam Dageförde**

- McKenzie Otus  
“Bilateral Agreements, Pushbacks, and Double Standards: Why Is It Okay For Some Countries to Pushback Migrants and Others Not?”
- Rachel Young  
“Brexit: The United Kingdom’s Soft Power without the EU”
- Jonathan Harsh  
“Rule of Law within the Balkans: EULEX, the European Union’s Mission in Kosovo”
- Jessica Parker  
“An Analysis of Voter Turnout in National European Union Member State Elections”

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch upon invitation

**Panel 3 (14:00 – 15:20): Defense and Security**

**Chair: Akisato Suzuki**

**Discussants: Richard Maher & Jonas Driedger**

- Sara Leming  
“A Comparative Study that Addresses the Challenges and Obstacles in the Historical Development of a European Army”
- Richard Shapiro  
“Europe’s Response to Terrorism: How the European Union Can Improve Its Counterterrorism Efforts”
- Elsa Lang  
“Small States in the European Machine: How do Estonia and Lithuania Influence the EU and NATO?”
- John Hood  
“Smoke & Mirrors: Cyber Attacks and Disinformation in Former Soviet States”

15:20 – 15:40 Coffee Break

**Panel 4 (15:40 – 17:00): Welfare Politics**

**Chair: Gemma Scalise**

**Discussants: Nevena Kulic & Giulia Maria Dotti Sani**

- Nicholas D’Ambra  
“Rolling with the Changes? The Effect of the Digital Economy on the Swedish Welfare State”
- Kyle Conahan  
“Sharing the Pot of Gold: Universal Basic Income in the Republic of Ireland”
- Alexis Hollon  
“Inequalities in Child Health Services: A Case Study”
- Ciara Watson  
“The Influence of European Identity and Immigration on National Welfare Systems: A Case Study of the United Kingdom and Germany”

Break (17:00-17:10)

17:10 – 18:00

## **Keynote lecture**

**Professor François Foret**

**Professor of Political Science  
Université Libre de Bruxelles**

## **The European Strategy against Radicalization A Touchstone of the Diversity of National Religions**

Chaired by Akisato Suzuki

François Foret is Professor of political science and Director of the Centre d'Etudes de la Vie Politique (Cevipol) at the Université Libre de Bruxelles. He was recently a visiting scholar at UCLA, Sciences Po Paris, Waseda University and the University of Cambridge. His research interests are the symbolic dimensions of politics; comparative politics; the legitimization of the EU; interactions between culture and politics; religion and politics. Among his last publications are: *Religion and politics in the European Union. The Secular Canopy*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2015; (ed.), *Religion at the European Parliament and in European multi-level governance*, London, Routledge, 2015.

Followed by a Reception

# Symposium Paper Abstracts

## Panel 1: Foreign Policy

**Victoria Lee**

### **How China Sees the EU: An Analysis of China's Economic Ties to Member States after the Lisbon Treaty and How This Affects the EU as a Single Voice**

The European Union works to establish foreign policy in the realms of both economic policy as well as human rights policy. Taking into consideration that the European Community (EC) first established relations with China in 1975, the ways that the EU has negotiated with China has developed greatly, but so has the way China responds to the EU. It is uncertain whether China appears to accept the European Union's efforts to appear as a *sui generis* system or prefers handling policy depending on independent member states. It is important to identify the possible future of the EU-China relationship because it questions if the EU has the ability to hold a dominant role in foreign policy relations as one single voice. By examining the Lisbon Treaty changes to the EU's foreign policy measures, the paper will identify the privacy of human rights dialogues between the EU and China and the inconclusive data regarding the universal EU position in the UN. The concluding findings are that although the EU has developed its foreign policy with the Lisbon Treaty, it must continue to work to resolve the gaps between the member states and the institutions to be able to speak with a single voice.

**Carl Anderson**

### **The Eurasian Economic Union: A Realist Alternative to the European Union**

Established in 2015, the Eurasian Economic Union, a single market in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, mirrors many of the characteristics of the already existing and largest trade bloc in the world, the European Union. Comprised of five member states; Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Armenia, and Kyrgyzstan, the Eurasian Economic Union is founded on the principles of free trade and closer integration among its member states, not only emulating the European Union, but also serving as an economic alternative to it. The purpose of this paper is to study the development of the Eurasian Economic Union and to measure to what extent it is a realist alternative to the European Union. As international organizations begin to resemble states, this paper adds to the discussion on realist theories by making comparisons between the European Union and the Eurasian Economic Union. After researching the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the paper discusses the establishment of and motivations behind the Eurasian Economic Union in its current form. It then compares and contrasts the two single markets to determine their economic strength in relation to one another. It concludes that the Eurasian Economic Union, while similar, though with major structural and institutional differences, is modeled after the European Union, but its economic growth indicates that it is far from being a close competitor to the European Union. Geopolitically, however, membership to the Eurasian Economic Union represents a Russian mechanism to thwart EU expansion, as membership to the two trade blocs is mutually exclusive. In conclusion, this paper shows that the Eurasian Economic Union is a realist alternative to the European Union, which enables Russia to assert its sphere of influence in Eastern Europe and Central Asia in light of EU expansion.

**Robert Stokka**

## **Young but Developed? The European External Action Service and the U.S. Department of State in Foreign Policy**

On December 1<sup>st</sup> 2009, the Treaty of Lisbon entered into force changing the European Union's competences in Foreign Policy, creating a High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy that is assisted by the European External Action Service (EEAS). The diplomatic service of the EEAS has several civilian and military missions operating in third countries. In comparison, looking at the U.S. Department of State we have a longstanding agency in diplomacy abroad. This paper analyzes the foreign policy similarities between the European Union's EEAS and the U.S. State Department diplomatic services in the Israel-Palestine conflict. Examining the legal framework, foreign policy instruments and what missions are operating in the conflict shows that the EEAS is functioning at a U.S. State Department level but overall is vastly different. The concluding findings are that the main difference between the institutions are the legal framework each diplomatic service works under and the transparency in number of staff, financial contributions and mission information. When analyzing the EEAS it acts as a hybrid functioning diplomatic service between the civilian and military missions. The U.S. State Department is less transparent on the missions but has distinguished the use of military operations with the Department of Defense and the diplomacy abroad missions. With the signing of the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) in December, 2017 the EEAS may change even more with the possibility of a common European army. In the last decade, the EU has changed drastically in Foreign Policy and Security and will continue to change over the next decade as Europe becomes more integrated.

**Marisa Campanella**

## **Protection of Minorities in Turkey as EU Accession Criteria**

The European Union has expanded its membership from six to 28 member states. With so many members it has had to adjust its accession criteria so that the countries follow the same regulatory framework. One of the criteria is the protection of minorities, and while the EU does not have its own document that outlines specifically what this means, it asks that candidate countries uphold standards of protection of minorities before they can become member states. One country of particular interest is Turkey, which has been a candidate since 1999. It has had significant problems ensuring minority protection, and the EU has been asking it to implement better measures for protection since negotiations began in 2005. It has also been noticed among scholars that during negotiations for the 2004 enlargement protection of minorities was not stressed by the EU to the same extent as for Turkey now. This paper will address the question about what made the EU change its demands for protection of minority groups in Turkey as opposed to the countries involved in the 2004 enlargement. It will explore potential explanatory factors including the regime of President Recep Tayyip Erdogan and his political party, Justice and Development, the attempted military coup d'état in 2016 and the migration crisis of 2015-2016. For each of these possible explanations, the paper will show how they impacted minority groups in Turkey and what kind of response they each evoked from the EU. The analysis revealed that each of these circumstances have contributed to increasing instability in Turkey, and have refocused EU attention to other areas in addition to requiring the protection of minorities that have further prevented it from becoming a member state.

## **Panel 2: National and Transnational Politics**

**McKenzie Otus**

### **Bilateral Agreements, Pushbacks, and Double Standards: Why Is It Okay For Some Countries to Push Back Migrants and Others Not?**

Among today's rising global challenges, migration has led the way into a top economic and security concern of countries. Long before the EU-Turkey deal was crafted, individual states stepped up to the challenge of addressing migration through the creation of bilateral readmission agreements with third countries. However, there appears to be a double standard when it comes to the backlash against these agreements, as some are deemed appropriate and a fair policy response to migration while others are condemned for violating human rights. By analyzing bilateral agreements through three different International Relations approaches, we seek to determine the discernible causes of these double standards. To do this, we examine two different cases, Italy's agreements with Libya and Spain's agreements with Western African countries. Using indicators such as migration salience, incentives, empowerment, and backlash, the paper advanced the notion that the manner in which migrants are repatriated and the type of third country a state is negotiating with have large implications on the expected level of backlash they will receive against readmission agreements.

**Rachel Young**

### **Brexit: The United Kingdom's Soft Power without the EU**

Founded in Nye's concept of Soft Power, or the "attractiveness" of a country based on elements such as culture, diplomacy and education, this paper explores the extent to which the United Kingdom's soft power is impacted by its decision to leave the European Union. To do so, this paper conducts a micro-analysis of data from 2016, prior to the official start of Brexit, and data after March 2017, when Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Theresa May, triggered Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty to begin the negotiation process. The data is based on an index to measure soft power including cultural indicators, diplomacy indicators, and education indicators of soft power. The cultural indicators include the UK music industry globally, UK ranking in international sports, and the number of visiting international tourists broken down by fiscal quarters. The diplomacy indicators include the number of UK embassies abroad, the number of multilateral organizations the UK participates in, the amount of overseas development aid the United Kingdom spends per year, and the UK's score on the Nation Brand Index created by GfK and Anholt. The educational indicators include the number of international students studying in the United Kingdom (also broken down by EU and non-EU students), the relative quality of the United Kingdom's universities, and the academic output of the United Kingdom's top universities. Using these indicators, the paper compares the data from before and after Prime Minister May triggered article 50. The conclusions provide insight into not only what the United Kingdom's soft power will look like after Brexit negotiations are complete, but also into what areas of soft power the United Kingdom faces the greatest potential loss.

**Jonathan Harsh**

### **Rule of Law Within the Balkans: EULEX, the European Union's Mission in Kosovo**

The European Union's Rule of Law Mission (or EULEX) was undertaken to improve the rule of law within the Western Balkan country of Kosovo according to the European Union's

Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). The Commission's recent goal of EU enlargement to include several of the Western Balkan countries in southeastern Europe by 2025 makes the issue of improving democratic functions within these countries, including Kosovo, all the more urgent. This paper focuses on the effectiveness of the EULEX mission based on passages from key EU texts, such as the Copenhagen Criteria, which focus on improving democratic functions via the rule of law. Other texts, such as the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the Convention on Human Rights, were also used in order to establish the rule of law as one of the most vital criteria for a democratic society that the EU wishes to promote. Two case studies were selected to show several threats to the rule of law within Kosovo and how effective the EULEX mission has been to address them: the first being corruption and crime, and the second being judicial autonomy. Based on the results from these case studies, the analysis shows that the mission has been successful in accomplishing short-term goals in improving the rule of law. This includes improving the judiciary's ability to pass charges on criminals through court cases as well as identifying the sources of corruption within outside criminal organizations and politicians overreaching political authority onto local officials. However, the evidence also shows a lack of will by local law enforcement and the judiciary to utilize the frameworks developed, and thus more long-term advising and coordination by EULEX is necessary in order to ensure rule of law is maintained.

**Jessica Parker**

### **An Analysis of Voter Turnout in National European Union Member State Elections**

Voter identification laws are a largely debated topic around the world, but have been absent in the discussions in European Union literature. As many scholars have argued that voter identification has limited a citizen's ability to vote due to the process of acquiring and presenting identification at polling locations, European Union member states have implemented various national policies about requirements to show identification documents when voting. This paper examines the relationship between voter identification laws and voter turnout in national elections of all twenty-eight European Union member states. This fills the gap of literature about voter identification laws in Europe, as the literature only discusses the continuing decline of voter turnout in national elections. To understand the relationship between voter identification laws and voter turnout in European nations, a multivariate regression analysis was used with the inclusion of ten major control variables to account for the differences throughout the twenty-eight member states. The concluding findings resulted in the failure to reject the null hypothesis, as there is no relationship between the stringency of voter identification laws and voter turnout in national elections in Europe. As the political climate of Europe continues to polarize with numerous issues being discussed, it is important for national leaders to represent their constituents through democratic elections. Therefore, voter turnout and voter identification laws become a relevant topic for discussion in European Union member states in their upcoming national elections.

### **Panel 3: Defense and Security**

**Sara Leming**

### **A Comparative Study that Addresses the Challenges and Obstacles in the Historical Development of a European Army**

In 2015 European Commission President, Jean Claude Juncker called for a European Army. Many Europeans perceived this to be a bold claim. However, President Juncker is not the first high ranking European official to call for a united European Army. This raises the question of why does the European Union, a major world player, not have its own established army? Many scholars have attributed this to a lack of political will within the European Union. This paper examines whether or not political will is the sole factor as to why there is not currently a unified European Union Army. In order to answer this question this paper establishes a clear definition of political will and conducts three case studies on different European defense movements each from varying time periods of European integration: 1) The European Defense Community (EDC, 1948-1953), 2) The Petersberg Tasks of 1998, and 3) Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO, 2015-). Each case study examines potential intervening factors that have affected the establishment of a future European Army such as the political climate, key players, and the support of the transatlantic alliance. After conducting the analysis this paper comes to the conclusion that while there was a lack of clear political will in the European Defense Community and hesitancy to act through military intervention with the Petersberg Tasks, PESCO displays a potential shift in political will by the European Union due to changes in the political climate, key players, and the support of the transatlantic alliance.

**Richard Shapiro**

### **Europe's Response to Terrorism: How the European Union Can Improve Its Counterterrorism Efforts**

Recently, there has been a significant increase in the number of terrorist attacks throughout the European Union (EU). More than 50 terrorist attacks related to jihadist terrorism have occurred within the EU over the last decade and have killed nearly 300 people. The EU has made combatting terrorism a priority and created numerous institutions to address the problem since the terror attacks in Madrid (2004) and London (2005). Due to the increased threat posed by jihadist terrorism, there is a need to address the inefficient cooperation between the institutions. The transnational nature of terrorism requires a transnational response. To decrease the number of attacks occurring within the EU, this paper proposes a different coordination strategy that incorporates different organizational methods to improve counterterrorism efforts. Establishing harmonized institutional priorities of deterring, detecting and disrupting security threats across the EU member states will decrease the number of attacks, save lives, increase safety and lead to a more effective pan-European approach. This paper presents a background on jihadist terrorism and then describes the EU's counterterrorism approach through the many institutional bodies and transnational security networks addressing jihadist terrorism. Recommendations for ways the EU can improve its counterterrorism efforts against jihadist terrorism within the institutional structures that already exist through deterrence, detection and disruption are proposed at the end of the paper. Future prospects for coordinated counterterrorism efforts within the European Union and on how the deter, detect, and disrupt methods can fit into the improved counterterrorism coordination among EU institutions will be described by placing the different institutions within the respective method that is the best fit.

**Elsa Lang**

### **Small States in the European Machine: How do Estonia and Lithuania Influence the EU and NATO?**

As both the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) have increased in size and capabilities over the years, these institutions have undergone significant changes to their respective structures and overall missions. Although it is only logical that

larger, more populous states with more resources would be capable of profoundly influencing EU and NATO policies, smaller member states have also been successful in this regard. Considering this, the paper seeks to answer the following question: how do the Baltic States use institutions like the European Union and NATO to promote their foreign policy and security interests, due to their status as small European states? To answer this question, we will examine the cases of Estonia and Lithuania using the theoretical framework of defensive realism and small state theory. For each case study, two main evaluative criteria will be used—the priorities for and influence of each state’s presidency on the Council of the European Union and successful policies introduced to NATO by each state. While this paper specifically looks at the two Baltic states as case studies, the findings from these case studies under the theoretical framework of defensive realism and small state theory could also be applicable to other small EU or NATO member states.

**John Hood**

### **Smoke & Mirrors: Cyberattacks and Disinformation in Former Soviet States**

Russia has been posturing itself to become a regional power. Furthermore, Russia has been successful in spreading disinformation and executing cyberattacks in former Soviet nations for the past ten years. The Kremlin has been successful in promoting pro-Russian narratives as well as executing cyberattacks in Georgia, Ukraine, and Lithuania. The goal of this paper is to study the scope of Russian tactics in former Soviet nations. The paper has two primary questions. First, how has Russia affected Georgia, Ukraine, and Lithuania through disinformation and cyberattacks? Second, did the activities and attacks that took place constitute cyber warfare? The works of Timothy Thomas and the theory of reflexive control will help frame the first question. On the other hand, the Clausewitz theory of war will frame if the attacks that took place was cyberwarfare. In general the types of attacks can be separated as informational or psychological warfare, covert or overt, with varying levels of political influence. The concluding findings are that there are varying levels of influence and attacks but it is evident that Russia has made advancements and the threat is growing but also evolving.

### **Panel 4: Welfare Politics**

**Nicholas D’Ambra**

### **Rolling with the Changes? The Effect of the Digital Economy on the Swedish Welfare State**

Digitalization has overwhelmingly made the European economy more efficient. However, Steven Hill (2017) has documented how the digital economy’s creation of Clickworkers in information technology leads companies in Germany to avoid their responsibility to provide benefits by misclassifying employees as self-employed. Further, Hill (2017) suggests that cross-border independent work in the digital economy allows large sums of income to go untaxed, leaving the welfare state without the necessary resources to function properly. Here, I evaluate how the digital economy has affected the Swedish welfare state under the assumption that if the digital economy affects a remarkably strong welfare system, then it will affect weaker welfare states across Europe as well. Through evaluation of the number of Clickworkers in Sweden and the total income tax revenue over time, I find that the rise of independent work has not negatively affected total income tax revenue in the Swedish case. In the conclusion, I

suggest that the digital economy does not hinder Swedish welfare state function due to a missing incentive in Sweden to misclassify workers as self-employed since Swedish firms are not responsible for providing benefits as they are in Hill's (2017) German case. Finally, I suggest that future work should evaluate the effect of the digital economy on other welfare states within the Continental Model in order to develop a better understanding of which welfare states will be most affected as this independent structure of work continues to become more and more popular in the future.

**Kyle Conahan**

### **Sharing the Pot of Gold: Universal Basic Income in the Republic of Ireland**

Universal Basic Income (UBI) has been proposed as an alternative to the traditional method of social welfare. Several experiments have taken place over time but there are very few basic income policies being implemented today. The case for a guaranteed minimum is found throughout political philosophy in the schools of libertarianism all the way to liberalism. Most basic income schemes are not rooted in realistic parameters and are too theoretical to be taken seriously. Often, they are presented with a flat tax and the argument for implementation is based on higher weekly earnings. I attempt in this paper to create an experimental universal basic income payment in a progressive tax system in the Republic of Ireland. Ireland is an interesting case for universal basic income because of its small population and highly progressive tax system. To create a UBI in Ireland, I restructure the Irish tax code and create an experimental UBI tax code to create a monthly payment which in total is worth 2,000 euro per year. The experimental tax code raises the tax burden significantly on those earning more than 50,000 euro a year because the needed tax dollars to finance a basic income payment are centered in those high earning individuals. While I am not able to guarantee that my experimental UBI tax system will yield the necessary revenue to finance a universal income, I am able to show what a universal basic income tax code in a progressive tax system may look like.

**Alexis Hollon**

### **Inequalities in Child Health Services: A Case Study**

Research has shown that inequities in health services are still present throughout life and across the European Union (EU). Inequalities in access to primary care can begin during intrauterine period. Early childhood, considered the period from prenatal care to eight years of age, is critical in determining future health. During this stage, health care services provide the foundation needed for strong physical and mental growth, especially in determining possible complex health conditions. Therefore, the quality of early childhood care is exceptionally important, and negative effects of poor health services cannot be dismissed. While there are inequities in access health because of socioeconomic factors most likely caused by the wealth of a country or the distribution of wealth, healthcare professionals can act as a buffer to unfavorable socioeconomic factors. This paper will evaluate the inequalities in primary childhood health care across three European Union member states: Sweden, Germany and Romania. These member states vary in terms of their financing, services and regulation of their healthcare systems. In order to measure healthcare quality across EU member states I will use three factors; vaccination rates, care and age of diagnosis of complex mental health needs, and the inequity of care between migrant children and native-born. To analyze these primary care models this paper will use qualitative data from MOCHA (Model of Child Health Appraised). Through the analysis this paper will provide, we will be better able to compare, understand and evaluate the different models of early childhood health care services offered in Sweden, Germany and Romania. Through this understanding, this paper will analyze why there are

major difference and/or similarities between the different healthcare systems including Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Human Development Index (HDI), migrant variations and the socioeconomic gap in each country.

**Ciara Watson**

**The Influence of European Identity and Immigration on National Welfare Systems: A Case Study of the United Kingdom and Germany**

As the European Union seeks a deeper approach for further integration, the idea of reassigning means of personal identification to create a 'European identity', is controversial and has had an effect on the present norms of national identity. Europe has always been diverse in terms of its political, economic and cultural structures. However, European integration and identity are questioned in times where there have been patterns of inward migration that disrupt the concept of social solidarity because of the lack of a common identity between natives and migrants. The purpose of this paper is to assess how the concept of identity affects support for national welfare states in countries with high levels of immigration within the context of European integration. To do this, we examined two countries, The United Kingdom and Germany. The cases were selected to include states whose welfare policies have both been impacted by migration but have differences in terms of European identity and solidarity. The analysis will be conducted by using data from the European Social Survey (ESS) and the 2017 Eurobarometer survey. We will discuss the concept of national and European identity and the impact of increased ethnic heterogeneity in Germany and the UK on social welfare policies. We will conclude with an assessment of whether there is public support for immigrants' right to social welfare and the presence of solidarity among the European Union, one of the foundational values on which European identity is based.