

FGGA Research Symposium, 22 June 2018

LUC, Anna van Buerenplein 301, The Hague, room 3.01

Programme

13.30-14.00	Welcome with coffee/tea
14.00 – 15.15	Session 1 Chair: 14.00 – 14.20 Filiz Dogan (ISGA; PhD candidate) Europe As a Global Actor? Common Security and Defense Policy Question and British and German Role This dissertation aims to analyze reasons of the European Union's (EU) inability to develop a strong Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) with regard to the role of main EU member states, namely Germany and the United Kingdom (UK) and find an alternative approach to overcome the CSDP question. For this purpose, this study starts with providing a brief historical overview of CSDP which has been established by the Treaty of Lisbon as a part of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and examine its amendments and developments and main objectives by discussing its operation structure. Then, the study will look at challenges of CSDP faces today by examining EU institutions concerned with implementing CSDP and foreign policy tools. In this case, this research aims to study Libya conflict and Ukraine crisis as case studies to define the obstacles of building and maintaining a common foreign and defense policy and question whether development of a common security and defense policy is desirable by examining specific mechanisms which it includes. Within that regard, this study will examine the impacts of two influential states that affects the EU–Germany and the UK- on those cases and their role on future of CSDP. Also, this study will question whether they make a contribution to the achievement of an intensive CSDP and a more effective EU foreign policy depend on actions on these two states. As a conclusion, by looking alternative approaches to that problem, this study will argue that the EU will leap over the cradle of CSDP threshold and act as a global actor or abandon CSDP experiment and remain as a soft power in the global arena.

14.20 – 14.40 Machiel van der Heijden (BSK; PhD candidate)

Agencies without Borders: Explaining Partner Choice in the Formation of Bilateral Agreements in Transnational Regulatory Governance

The internationalization of markets and the need to cope with transnational policy issues has facilitated the development of regulatory networks in diverse policy areas, such as energy, telecommunications, privacy protection, human rights, international competition, and financial markets regulation. In these networks, agencies are connected through complex webs of information exchange agreements, partnerships, memoranda of understanding, and other forms of bilateral collaboration. These agreements institutionalize channels of regulatory cooperation between countries and are often seen as a means to reduce the transaction costs involved in the exchange of sensitive regulatory information. However, such perspectives typically underestimate that these bilateral agreements are embedded in a broader structure of relationships, potentially increasing the probabilities of future agreements between some countries and decreasing the probabilities of such agreements between others.

In this paper, we present a longitudinal network analysis of the evolution of inter-agency agreement formation over time. We thus define the existing transnational network of regulatory agencies as a strategic environment in which agencies bargain over new agreements, endogenously influencing the way in which future agreements are formed. In particular, we analyze whether agencies are more likely to form agreements with agencies to whom they are already indirectly connected (triadic closure), or with agencies with which they share important exogenous characteristics (homophily), such as market size and regulatory capacity. The data on which we base our analysis is an original, self-coded dataset in which bilateral Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) between national agencies (n>100) are mapped out over a 30-year period, for three different regulatory sectors (securities, banking, and insurance).

14.40 – 15.00 Maja Vodopivec (LUC) (with Wout Broekema and Gabriele Landucci, ISGA)

Aftermaths of Disaster: Organizational Learning and Collective Memory in post-war Japan

Disasters are complex events, and even when classified as natural and unique (assuming that it is most difficult to learn from such), in most cases they are associated with the vulnerability of society, so they become “human-caused” since we are not prepared to cope with critical events. The impact of disasters is multilevel, multi-scale, multi-directional and highly complex in which a number of social, ecological, organizational, and political factors interact, often in an unexpected way. While most disaster studies focus on the immediate disaster response, this research will take a complex systems approach in order to analyze how different social and organizational responses interact in the post-disaster recovery phase, with posing the main questions: how the recovery impacts the vulnerability and resilience of people, and what, if anything, can be learned from disasters? Our case study will be the triple earthquake-tsunami-nuclear disaster occurred in Japan on March 11, 2011.

	<p>While the nuclear disaster is still ongoing and poses a threat with unforeseeable consequences, it has accelerated a number of conservative trends in Japanese politics and reopened debates about what the future of Japan may look like. More than seven decades after Japan's defeat, the triple disaster brings back the old memories and reveals that Japan's postwar history is anything but uniform understanding of the nation's past. How is it possible that, in the only country in the world that has experienced devastation due to the atomic bombs, and the country with the population's strong "nuclear allergy", possession of any sort of nuclear capacity has been allowed? In order to explore the learning process in the aftermath of a disaster causing a multi-dimensional social shifts, this study will deploy case study research with multiple disciplinary perspectives and paradigms from memory studies, crisis management and industrial safety fields.</p>
	<p>15.00 – 15.15 Discussion</p>
<p>15.15 - 15.30</p>	<p>Coffee/tea break</p>
<p>15.30 –</p>	<p>Session 2</p>
<p>16.30</p>	<p>Chair:</p> <p>15.30 – 15.50 Jean Yves Ndzane Ndzane (ISGA; PhD candidate) Addressing the Iranian ballistic missile program. Three lessons from the Iranian nuclear negotiation After deep and intense negotiations, Iran and the UN Security Council members together with Germany (P5 + 1) finally reached a "historic" agreement on Tehran's controversial nuclear program two years ago. While this agreement foreshadowed a certain regional lull, there is an upsurge in tensions between Iran and its regional neighbours, and the bone of contention is its ballistic missile program. Regarding this issue, Trump administration, on the one hand, has firmly required from Iran a substantial change in its regional behavior, and foremostly the inclusion of its ballistic program in the nuclear agreement the package. Iran however, is strongly opposed to such an initiative it claims that the two dossiers are clearly distinct. Facing this deadlock, negotiating with Tehran seems to be the only viable option. However, the implementation of a diplomatic strategy faces many obstacles. This modest article is an attempt to identify three main lessons from the negotiations on the Iranian nuclear program, which could be applied to its ballistic missile program.</p> <p>15.50 – 16.10 David Zetland (LUC) (with Bene Colenbrander) The evolution of the Dutch drinking water sector Dutch drinking water companies now deliver safe affordable water to the entire population, but this result was not planned. It emerged, rather, from an evolutionary process in which various pressures on the commons resulted in changes to drinking water systems that addressed old concerns but uncovered new problems. Our analytical narrative traces this problem-solution-new problem pattern through four eras in which a common-pool dilemma is addressed by a private-good solution (1850-</p>

	<p>1880), a club-good solution (1880-1910) and public good solution (1910-1950) before returning to a private-good solution in the last 1950-1990 era. Actions, like the dates just given, were not always exact or effective, as the process was shaped by changing social norms regarding the distribution of costs and benefits from improved water services. This Dutch history, while unique, supplies insights for improving drinking water services elsewhere.</p>
	<p>16.10 – 16.30 Discussion</p>
16.30	<p>Drinks</p>