



REPORTS FROM 10TH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM “CZECH FOREIGN POLICY”

**1. FUTURE OF THE EU: WHAT TO EXPECT FROM CENTRAL EUROPE
(11:00-12:30 19TH SEPTEMBER IN THE GREAT HALL)**

Panelists:

- Vít Dostál (Moderator, Association for International Affairs, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Vít Beneš (Metropolitan University Prague, Czech Republic)
- Milan Nič (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik, Germany)
- Dániel Bartha (Centre for Euro-Atlantic Integration and Democracy, Budapest, Hungary)
- Monika Brusenbauch Meislová (Masaryk University Brno, Czech Republic)

Abstract

Four panellists discussed the future of the EU, as well as Czechs' possible approach to upcoming events such as Brexit and the EU Parliament election in 2019. The key arguments of each speaker were as follows:

- The Czechs' lack of interest and superficial public debates regarding the EU allows Eurosceptics to blame minor EU-related issues for the failure of the EU integration project. The Czech public needs to encourage more substantive debate regarding its strategic and cross-sectorial approach towards the EU. (**Vít Beneš**)
- Despite their strong economic ties, the Czech Republic and Germany have no immediate incentive for bilateral cooperation, except with regard to migration. In the eyes of Berlin, however, so-called V4 countries are often perceived in the context of migration crises as well as EU-scepticism. (**Milan Nič**)
- The incoming 2019 EU Parliament election is possible to have a larger fragmentation due to the greater polarisation of voters and the rise of radical populism (i.e. Hungarian Prime Minister Orbán and Italian Deputy Prime Minister Salvini). This trend will not only weaken centric movement in EU, but also hijack EU countries' foreign policy making and cause mistakes. (**Dániel Bartha**)
- Although not much attention has been paid to the post-Brexit situation, the Czech Republic would face new challenges in the EU since the UK has been a strategic partner with shared interests in immigration, Euro and security issues. (**Monika Brusenbauch Meislová**)

Details

This session dealt with how the Czech Republic and so-called Visegrad countries should think about the future of the EU when confronted with challenges such as North-South/West-East tensions, Brexit, and the Euro policy.

First, **Vít Beneš** pointed out that compared to the 2000s, Czech people lost interest in the EU's institutional reforms as well as the country's strategic position in the EU. This in turn triggered more Euro-scepticism and unsubstantial debates, one of them being migration issues in Czech Republic. He argued that Czechs must become engaged in more substantial arguments about matters such as membership of the Eurozone and cultivate broader and strategic views towards the EU.

By quoting his German colleagues' perspectives, **Milan Nič** introduced Berlin's insight into the Czech Republic and other V4 countries. Despite their strong economic ties, he argued that Berlin has no need to enhance its strategic relationship with the Czech Republic, except perhaps when it comes to tackling the migration crisis.

Moreover, contrary to some fears, Germany is not concerned about the "Hungarianisation" of the Czech's foreign policy. As for V4 states, Berlin has not raised much discussion regarding its relationship with them, but perceives the framework mainly in the context of migration and Eurosceptic contexts.

From the perspective of Brexit, **Monika Brusenbauch Meislová** analysed Brexit's potential impact on the Czech Republic. Describing Brexit as “a new phenomenon in the EU”, she insisted that the Czech government has to reconsider its position on the EU. The UK has been an influential member state, sharing many common interests with the Czech Republic on matters such as economic governance of the EU, Brussels' expanding power, as well as the status of non-Euro zone states.

Without the UK, she claimed that the Czech Republic would have to seek different allies within the EU to promote its own interests. Furthermore, she mentioned that the Czech Republic should work on strengthening its bilateral relationship with the UK, since the latter remains an important partner in the fields of education, environmental protection and labour supply.

Throughout the discussion, some panellists indicated that the next European Parliament elections could induce a possibility of major current parties having to form a coalition due to their declining popularity. If so, the Parliament would have less of a say due to its political instability, whereas the EU Council could hold relatively more power.

Report 2: Future of the EU: What to expect from the Central Europe?

The moderator of the panel was **Vít Dostál**.

The spotlight was on the main problems in the region of Central Europe, as well as the Czech perspective on them. The issue of increasing fragmentation within the EU (between North, South, East and West) was also discussed.

Vít Beneš began with a broader perspective of the Czech Republic's European policy. He posed two questions: First; what is the current policy of the Czech Republic? Second; how can Czechs contribute to the EU's further development? At present, the main issue is an overabundance of unproductive discussions. Compounding this problem is citizens' insufficient interest in discussing the EU's future. He pointed out that currently, the most important issue is deemed to be the temporary migration crisis, despite the fact that the Czech Republic is not even a border country. The issue has also been an important source of Euro-scepticism in the country, and the speaker called for a return to the times when discussions about the Eurozone prevailed.

The second speaker, **Milan Nič**, shared his perspective on the region from abroad, specifically from Germany because the region was shaped by German influence for such a long time. Prime Minister Babiš's recent trip to Berlin served as an opportunity to reiterate the strong ties between Berlin and Prague. Germany considers Babiš to be a pragmatic politician with a

knack for business. But on the other side, the instability of Czech governments could alter Germany's favourable disposition towards the country. Generally speaking, the region tends to be perceived negatively, not least because of its approach to the migration crisis. Nowadays, the V4 project is presented as a euro-sceptical project. The speaker then focused his last point on the upcoming European parliament elections, which will only increase divisions between the EU's east and west. Should they lead to a reconfiguration of the European Parliament, they could signify a reorganization of the entire Brussels system.

Dániel Bartha followed up the discussion about upcoming elections and the changes they could signify for the EU's political agenda. Larger fragmentation of the Parliament is probable, something which would make it more difficult to maintain the cohesiveness of the EU. New possible risks include political parties with leaders such as Hungarian Prime Minister Orbán and Italian Deputy Prime Minister Salvini. Results of elections could reflect the rise in popularity of more radical forces. At the same time, a greater polarisation of voters, both to the left and to the right, could weaken centrist movements. Mr. **Bartha** criticized the lack of strategical thinking in foreign policy, also discernible in the Czech Republic. And, due to the influence of domestic politics, it tends to be over-politicised. As a result, foreign ministries themselves have less of a say about the direction that the country's foreign policy should develop in. This can lead to missteps, as it was the case with Hungary's Orbán not deciding not to join the Eurozone.

The last talk was led by **Monika Brasenbauch Meislová**, who provided not only a viewpoint of the EU's future after Brexit, but also the impact that these developments could have on Central Europe. Till now, it seems like far more attention has been dedicated to Brexit itself, rather than to the post-Brexit situation. There are still uncertainties as to what Brexit will ultimately entail. What is certain, however, is that the UK and the Czech Republic have good relations in political, cultural and economic fields. After Brexit, an emphasis should therefore be placed on renewing relations and reaching new agreements with the UK on a bilateral level. The UK has been such an important partner for so long that both sides should strive to consistently improve or maintain good mutual relations. In fact, this year marks the 25th anniversary since the establishment of Czech-British diplomatic relations, as well as the 100th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Czechoslovakia and the UK.

To summarize, all speakers consider that it is important to continually orient the Czech Republic towards the European Union, and to promote membership of the Eurozone as an important national strategy. The risk of Orbán's increasing power, as well as that of

the region's "hungarianisation", were highlighted. Should these trends continue, a decline in the European Parliament's power could be observed.

2. THE CZECH FOREIGN POLICY AS VIEWED BY PRACTITIONER AND EXPERT

(12:30~13:00 19TH SEPTEMBER IN THE GREAT HALL)

Panelists:

- Tomáš Petříček (Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic)
- Ondřej Ditrych (Director, Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)

Details

Although the Czech Republic has rather limited influence on international affairs due to its relatively small size, it still chooses to take active foreign policies because of its open nature of economy, high degree of integration and dependency of collective defence and connection with NATO allies. **Tomáš Petříček** stated that the EU and NATO are two main anchors for the Czech Republic foreign active policy. The two organisations' values are inspiring and shared by Czech Republic, which include the freedom, democracy, rule of law, respect of human rights and open-market economy.

Mr. **Petříček** mentioned that Czech Republic has benefited from the rule-based liberal global order formed by international organisations like UN and WTO, this international structure enable small and middle size players like Czech Republic to join in global arena, although it is not perfect, it is still better than law of Jungle. Therefore, Czech Republic is in favour of maintaining, promoting and improving effective multilateralism.

EU is important for both Czech Republic and the international society, and Mr. **Petříček** pointed out if EU wants to fully use its influence on global arena, EU should keep developing its common foreign policy, and Czech Republic is willing to contribute on that; EU will also need to invest a lot in constructing its own common security strategies to defence itself and deal with the over reliance on US forces, although it does not mean EU has to achieve this goal immediately; NATO is still the key guarantor of collective defence security and US remains the main security provider for Europe. But in the long term, EU will build its own security capabilities through many ongoing transnational projects. Furthermore, a root-causing focused security solution is necessary for EU's security strategy as well.

Mr. **Petříček** also emphasised the importance to build harmony relations with Czech Republic's neighbouring countries, and up to now, Czech Republic has managed to maintain good relations with all its neighbours.

EU has been experiencing many crises in the recent 10 years and it has solved many of them, although there are more challenges waiting in front, i.e. the rising of populism. Mr. **Petříček**

believed that to keep the unity and cohesion of EU is the most important way for EU member states to tackle with incoming challenges.

Then, Mr. **Petříček** talked about the development and future of transatlantic allies, which is not just a coalition of military force; instead it is formed by all countries share the same value: appreciation of freedom, respect of human rights, support of democracy, etc. Although currently the allies cross the Atlantic have disagreement on many issues due to the new US administration, Mr. **Petříček** still believes that the transatlantic bond is far more important for Europe to watch it fails so Europe will keep cooperating with US on many important issues.

In the end, Mr. **Petříček** addressed the current main focus of Czech foreign policy, it has been and will be very focused on issues of Western Balkan. Czech Republic is always willing to promote and welcome Western Balkan countries to join in EU as member states.

Then **Ondřej Ditrych** addressed the importance of having systematic principles to form Czech foreign policy, a set of moral principles that can guide and legitimise the process of Czech foreign policy. And once again, Mr. **Ditrych** highlighted the important rule-based global order, without this order, small size countries like Czech Republic will not be able to survive. Therefore, to promote and improve current international order is the core idea of Czech foreign policy.

3. GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT US FOREIGN POLICY: TAKING STOCK OF THE FUTURE

(14.00 - 15.30, 10TH SEPTEMBER IN THE GREAT HALL)

Panelists:

- Jan Hornát (Moderator, Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Mary Thompson-Jones (National Security Affairs, US Naval War College, USA)
- R. James Ferguson (Faculty of Society and Design, Bond University, QLD, Australia)
- Michito Tsuruoka (Faculty of Policy Management, Keio University, Japan)
- Constantino Xavier (Carnegie New Delhi, Brookings Institution, media correspondent and adviser for the Embassy of Portugal)

Abstract

Four panellists from the U.S., Japan, Australia and India discussed the implications of the US' current foreign policy on each country. The key arguments of each speaker were as follows:

- Despite much unpredictability in President Trump's policy, it is crucial to focus on activities of other relevant actors in the U.S., namely the Congress and the Administration, to get a better grasp of the intra-US policy-making process. (**Mary Thompson-Jones**)
- As Japan's only treaty ally, the US is, and will, remain the most important strategic partner in the future because no country can replace its significance for Japan, especially when it comes to security. (**Michito Tsuruoka**)
- The recent severe conflicts between China and the U.S. deepened Australia's dilemma. On the one hand, the country seeks to strengthen its security alliance with the U.S. On the other hand, maintaining a stable trade relationship with China remains crucial. (**R. James Ferguson**)
- Decreasing U.S. diplomatic engagement in Asia, as well as China's rise, provided India with a momentum to seek new and stronger partnerships with EU states, Japan and Australia. Nevertheless, the U.S. plays an important role in helping India cultivate such partnerships in the capacity of facilitator. (**Constantino Xavier**)

Details

This session focused on how three important actors in Indo-Pacific region, namely Japan, Australia and India, could adapt to major shifts in U.S. foreign policy.

First, from an American perspective, **Mary Thompson-Jones** highlighted the sharp contrast between (1) the long-standing paradigm in American diplomacy, two of whose pillars are that the US is the "world indispensable nation" and the importance of a liberal, multilateral global order and (2) Trump's recent pushes for bilateralism which undermine this very multilateral framework.

Moreover, she pointed out that President Trump justifies hostile trade policies and increasing military spending by linking them with security threats. But despite much unpredictability in Trump's foreign policy, she concluded by saying that it was crucial to observe relevant actors in the U.S. other than President Trump, such as the Congress and the Trump administration, to calmly analyse the intra-US policy-making process.

Next, **Michito Tsuruoka** explained that the current Japan-US relationship is doing well, although some uncertainty remains when it comes to tension engendered by the U.S.'s trade deficit. He argued that, compared to the Obama administration, President Trump has indeed advanced Japan-US security cooperation. The seemingly steady Japan-US relationship can be also explained by Prime Minister Abe's efforts to build a personal relationship with his US counterpart, as well as stable domestic politics in Japan.

He denied the possibility of Japan's US-oriented foreign policy-making being altered by stating that the U.S., as Japan's only treaty ally, will remain the most important strategic partner in the future. Indeed, no country can replace the US's significance for Japan, especially when it comes to security.

R. James Ferguson analysed Australia's position in the context of recent conflicts between China and the U.S. He suggested that increasing tension between China and the US has had a negative impact on Australia, given while Australia does have strong security ties with the

U.S., its economy is in large part driven by China's massive energy demands. He proposed that Australia could maintain its policy favouring multilateral diplomacy by not picking sides in the China-US conflict. At the same time, he also raised concern about how the order of Asia-Pacific region would be secured in the post-Trump era.

Lastly, **Constantino Xavier** provided an interesting analysis by arguing that decreased U.S. diplomatic engagement in Asia, combined with China's rise, provided a momentum for India to seek new partnerships with EU states, Japan and Australia. To support this claim, he cited Modi's increasing visits to EU states, as well as his active bilateral engagements with Japan and Australia. Nonetheless, he emphasised that the U.S. remains an important partner for India because, as facilitator, it could provide a gateway for India to deepen its ties with Japan and Australia.

Throughout the discussion, the panellists actively exchanged their views on alternatives to US-oriented foreign policy, or what they referred to as "Plan B". Mrs. **Thompson-Jones** stressed that the US will retain its substantial influence on its partners, since it is the only country that can restrain China and Russia's aggressive behaviour. Mr. **Tsuruoka** argued that there will be no Plan B for Japan, considering the strength of the current Japan-US relationship. Mr. **Xavier** predicted that less influential states, among them India, will have more of a say in the framing of a new global system, especially in fields such as IT, since the US seems to be playing a less significant role in Asia-Pacific region.

4. PLAYGROUND OF PLAYER: WHAT ROLE FOR THE CZECH REPUBLIC IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMIC REORDERING?

(15-15~17-15 10TH SEPTEMBER IN THE GREAT HALL)

Panelists:

- Michal Parížek (Moderator, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Andreas Nölke (Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany)
- Françoise Nicolas (Institute Français des Relations Internationales /IFRI/, Paris, France)
- Rudolf Fürst (Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Vladan Hodulák (Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic)

Andreas Nölke – Economic Models for Emerging Markets

- State-permeated capitalism: one of the economic models that has become reinforced over the last decades with the strengthening of states like India and China.

- The shifting of the world economy's centre, which has been noticed in past years, has given rise to a number of questions, namely those regarding the future of European and other (primarily) Western established markets.
- Whereas the Washington Consensus remained unrivalled in the past, there are now acknowledgements that a new economic order will gain more traction going ahead.
- Strong contrasts between state-permeated market economies (SPMEs) and the “traditional capitalism of the West” persist. Examples of differentiation between the two:
 - Corporate governance: **SPMEs are far less dominated by foreign capital** than, say, countries like Hungary, Poland, Slovakia or the Czech Republic who still adhered to the Washington Consensus and (in various degrees) to liberalisation programmes. Thus, SPMEs currently have more control over their own economies.
 - There is a **greater degree of state/domestic control of the economy**. Surprisingly, India's control surpasses that of China. In all cases, such close control is meant to ensure more rapid industrialisation, thereby allowing for catching-up to the West. From this point of view, it is understandable why governments in such countries have high stakes in keeping an eye on the economy.
 - A **hesitance to embrace global capital markets** can be detected in states like China. Deepening ties and involvement with these markets would have a seemingly unattractive but inevitable trade-offs; less independence, as well as amplified risks of turbulence, instability and resorts to the IMF.
 - Therefore, **money in SPMEs more often than not comes from domestic sources** (i.e. bank loans), with are also tightly controlled. Foreign banks, who in times of economic/financial downturns risk relocating closer to states where their headquarters are located, are viewed with a certain degree of distrust.
 - SPMEs also have some other special characteristics; most notably, large parts of the total workforce still receive **low wages**, a phenomenon that could only diminish in case of increasing productivity.
 - However, there is a noticeable motivation among SPMEs to catch up with more developed economies. This is most visibly manifested in the **large-scale investments in technology and research and development (R&D)**, a field that China exceeds in.
 - Since some infant industries often require protection, it is not surprising to learn that SPMEs have to engage in protectionism. According to the OECD, China is the country most protective of its own firms.
 - **Foreign direct investment (FDI) is also strictly regulated**, and SMEPs have the possibility of imposing and subsequently altering conditions for foreign investors.
- As the examples above demonstrate, SMEPs today do not pursue the same trajectory as the Visegrad group countries did in the 1990s. In lieu of encouraging foreign investors and buyers to enter national markets, SMEPs underline the necessity of maintaining tight national control of firms. Although both models have had some successes, it is crucial to point out that they can pose challenges for entire states and their economies.

Françoise Nicolas – China’s Evolving role in the global economic reordering

- Similarly, to Mr. Nölke, Mrs. Nicolas acknowledges that an economic reordering on a global scale is underway.
- Certainly, debates about shifts towards Asia and the East can be traced to the 1980s. What is new, however, is China’s reinforcement of its economic power.
- Deng Xiaoping’s reforms, dating back to the late 1970s, saw the appearance of gradual but sustained growth. However, it wasn’t until the 1990s that integration into the world economy took place. In particular, opening up to FDI (albeit not indiscriminately) allowed China to play a more active part in the global economy.
- China continued to acquire economic power in subsequent years. However, the financial crisis of 2008/9 proved to be a turning point. With a perceived decline in the US’ role, as well as a weakening of the once-hegemonic “Western” economic model composed in part of economic liberalisation, the country felt encouraged to offer an attractive alternative.
- Some US economists rushed to label this the “Beijing Consensus”, a potential contender to the aforementioned Washington Consensus’ primacy. However, Chinese leaders were eager to present this as a solution, rather than a model, that would serve (merely) as an inspiration to other states. In fact, adherence to it was seldom promoted abroad.
- In the present time, however, a competition between established and rising systems has emerged. There is even talk of a “war” between norms and practices. This will have ripple effects on the entire region that is South-East Asia. After all, as Malaysia and Thailand are learning, relying on the US for security and China for economic matters is more often than not wishful thinking, and such balancing acts are difficult to sustain in the long run.
- So, to conclude, it is worth pointing out that while Asia’s growing economic power is not a novelty by any means, China’s behaviour certainly is. Whereas Asian countries like Japan historically held back from establishing models and proposing economic solutions to other countries, China seems to be doing just that at the moment. Considering the Belt and Road Initiative to be “only” an infrastructure project would signify brushing over China’s increasing motivation to impose values onto foreign states.

Rudolf Fürst – China’s Involvement with Central and Eastern European States

- After having viewed countries in Central and Eastern Europe somewhat disparagingly for a number of years, mainly due to a lack of subordination that they should have shown to the USSR as its satellite states, China nevertheless decided that these states, which together make up approximately one-third of the European Common Market and have the ability to support projects by voting for them as EU members, possess considerable relevance for its goals.
- The trillion-dollar Belt and Road Initiative in particular requires good relations with Central and Eastern Europe.
- There are big plans with regard to infrastructure; for instance, the modernisation of the railway line between Budapest and Belgrade is being highlighted as a priority. At the same time, however, some disappointment among European states has been

discernible. FDI is not as large as it had been anticipated, and the EU has, to a certain degree, been able to harness negative coverage.

- The 16+1 Initiative has the same multilateral format as initiatives in Africa or Latin America. It therefore appears to be China's *modus operandi*.

Vladan Hodulák – Czechia and the Global Economic Reordering

- Czech dependency on exports is high when considering the fact that exports constitute nearly 80% of the GDP. And although reliance on exports appears to be smaller when taking into account domestic value added in gross exports (reaching approximately 45%), dependency is still estimated to be relatively elevated.
- Although the gap between Czech imports and exports has increased in recent years, with trade surplus currently reaching roughly 10% (which is important to note since it might highlight structural imbalances and the country's chronic living below its means), the current account balance doesn't show that same surplus.
- This finding directs researchers to one of the country's most pressing economic challenges; an income outflow whose magnitude is nearly unrivalled in the region, let alone in Europe (in that regard, Germany may be considered to be polar opposite of the Czech Republic). In fact, Czech income outflow is twice larger than that experienced by any of the other three other Visegrad group members.
- For a country whose prosperity oftentimes results precisely because of foreign trade (especially with other EU states), the key is to maintain strong ties with the international environment and foreign investors by creating an accommodating working environment. At the same time, when large income outflows dampen the positive effects of increasing prosperity, new rules have to be agreed upon with foreign investors.
- Although the Czech government has emphasised its attempts to persuade investors into keeping and re-investing money in the country, the presenter has underlined that more convincing policies have to be put into place, which will require policy makers to step up their game.
- Bearing all of the above in mind, the question which remains is: which measures could the country implement in order to correct some of the gravest structural imbalances pertaining to international trade? Several scenarios were presented.
 - Continuing along the current trajectory would be possible for a while. As long as increasing competitiveness is guaranteed (easier said than done), prosperity could, theoretically, continue rising.
 - Trade relations could be diversified, and new avenues could be explored with regard to China or the US. However, this is quite unlikely, given that the country has (unsurprisingly) historically traded most with neighbouring countries.
 - Similar to what has been seen in Hungary, where the ruling party has advocated for retaining dividends that would have otherwise flown out of the country, some believe that this income could be used more productively in the Czech economy (although there are doubts as to whether these funds really are used for the right purposes).

Conclusion

Some view the growing influence of state-permeated capitalist economies as a threat. China's case in particular demonstrates how increasing economic power is, sooner or later, bound to be accompanied by political ambitions and strategic interests, according to Mrs. **Nicolas**. This is most clearly visible in trillion-dollar projects like the Belt and Road Initiative, highlighted by Mr. **Fürst**, which have raised concerns among some European leaders that European unity could (once again) be endangered. Others, such as Mr. **Nölke**, point out that a global economic reordering does not have to be a zero-sum game. After all, the East's growth and development have not only lifted many of its people out of poverty, but it has also bolstered demand for goods across the world.

But if there is one thing that (nearly) all can agree upon, it is that the Washington Consensus, while tackling a considerable number of difficulties faced by states since the 1990s, has not been without fault. Liberalisation and privatisation are no longer perceived as self-evident truths. Instead, election results in some Central and Eastern European states illustrate rising challenges to the status quo. In Poland and Hungary, for instance, increased opposition is being manifested towards economic and financial elites who retain many of the benefits from foreign direct investments, without allowing for their diffusion into rural and oftentimes under-developed areas. Thus, calls for increasing domestic demand which would replace eventually FDI are gaining increasing traction among parts of electorates. Similarly, maintaining a tight grip over firms and entire industries, which used to be antithetical to success and good practices as defined by the Washington Consensus, now appears to be working for countries like China, who are in some cases able to protect infant industries and invest in R&D extensively (of course, this doesn't take into account potential corruption or the inefficacy of firms who would otherwise be unable to compete on an unregulated market).

Report 2: Playground or Player: What Role for the Czech Republic in the Global Economic Reordering?

On Wednesday 19. 09. 2018, as a part of the programme of 10th International Symposium, panel with the title "Playground or Player: What Role for the Czech Republic in the Global Economic Reordering?" was held. **Michal Parízek** appeared as moderator and speakers included representatives of institutions, such as **Françoise Nicolas** and **Rudolf Fürst**, as well as representatives of the academic sector, namely **Andreas Nölke** and **Vladan Hodulák**. They analyzed the role of the Czech Republic in the global economic order.

As the first panellist, Mr. **Fürst** argued that studying economic relations is very interesting because the centre of the economic world, which during the last 150 years had been limited to Japan, Europe and the US, has now significantly shifted towards developing markets. He also outlined that while the global economy in the past reflected the Washington Consensus, we

can't be sure about the future of the global economy at the moment because we don't know how it will be influenced by economic institutions. According to Mr. **Fürst**, there are two types of capitalism in the modern economic order: on the one side, there is the state – sponsored economy and on the other hand, there is the market – dependent economy. These two types of economies were predominant and most successful in the last three decades. The first model – market dependent economy predominated in Europe and in the US, whereas the other one, state regulated economy, was most common in China, India, Brasil and South Africa.

Mr. **Fürst** outlined that, although economies such as those of China and India are state-regulated, the direct involvement/intervention of foreign investors is still considerable. In fact, the amount of these foreign investments depends directly on the volume of domestic capital in that specific country. Mr. **Fürst** also emphasized that direct control of the state economy is at highest in China, although the country also attracts a significant number of foreign private companies.

He also stressed that in China the government makes an effort to regulate the entrance of foreign investors on their capital markets, and they don't want to accept foreign capital markets. China (and India as well) intervenes in the proprietorship of banks extensively, which is in strong contrast with the liberal economies (i.e. Great Britain), and their primary effort is aimed at research and development. Mr. **Fürst** also pointed out that these economies (namely the Chinese and Indian ones) rely on the policy of protectionism, because they already know they can't compete with developed economies. China and India are thus very important markets when it comes to exporting, but export is performed under the conditions of China, so there is inevitable regulation from the side of China (India). To sum up, Mr. **Fürst** concluded that in countries such as China or India, which prefer to have state-regulated economy, protection of their own capital is dominant, whereas for instance in the V4 countries they insist on opening up domestic markets, focussing on attracting foreign investors and giving up state control in order as a means of opening up the economy.

Then Mrs. **Nicolas** continued with her own presentation on economic reordering, outlining that the same global economic order had persisted since the end of World War Two. Nevertheless, we can now see changes in the distribution of economic power, and these changes are primarily represented by the shift towards Asia. She stressed that from the end of the 1970s, Chinese economy started to expand more significantly.

With the emergence of a political will for reform, crucial changes in the economic balance took place. Regardless, it is important to note that many processes of integration would have to wait for another two decades, till the 1990's, when China first opened its markets to foreign investments. But once foreign investments did start flowing into China, they began altering the distribution of investments. She argued that although the country played a crucial role in the global economy, it shied away from proclaiming itself as the leader before 2009. It was only after that year, Mrs. **Nicolas** emphasized, that China recognised the decline that the ongoing financial crisis had triggered in the USA, thereby allowing it to re-define itself as a global leader and encouraging it to play a more active role in world politics – not just in commercial and economic fields, but also in the political domain. In tandem to this, China came with the idea that they have their own “Chinese way” of proposing alternatives to global challenges. Thus, after 2009, one has been able to detect increasing competitiveness not only among the two greatest global players, but also among two different systems of thought. There probably won't be war between China and United States, but conflict has persisted in the form of political competition.

Besides that, China is influencing European states. More specifically, it seems particularly interested East-Central European states, which also in return try and set China as an example. Despite calls for improved (economic) ties with China, there are persisting concerns pertaining to security risks and political issues. On the other hand, many states in East Asia don't oppose Chinese influence (Cambodia is an example). But even among them, one can find some that are still undecided as to the side that their politics should tilt towards (Malaysia, for instance).

The panel discussion continued with Mr. **Fürst**, who started his presentation with the claim that there is a visible shift towards China and “easternization”. He also pointed out a difference between China and other East Asian states, namely that Chinese expansion commenced only after the year 2000, whereas other Asian states, such as South Korea, Thailand or Japan, already knew far earlier that if they wanted to observe improvements in their economies, they had to develop investment strategies, particularly in cooperation European states and European Union. China also didn't want to influence post-communist states because they thought of the region as belonging to the Russian sphere of influence and interest.

Mr. **Fürst** also mentioned that for the Chinese government, member states of the European Union are now interesting. This is especially the case with central European states such as Hungary, Slovakia and Czech Republic, all of whom are perceived as attractive potential business partners. China thus tries to make new “silk roads”, thereby attempting to develop new business strategies and refining methods which could help it gain more power in the region. There are three alternative routes along which the silk road project could develop.

However, the main problem for China pertaining to its involvement in central European states is that, while the country can offer 10 billion dollars on projects, central European states such as Slovakia and Czech Republic have expressed their desire and need for investments, rather than credits. On the other hand, new member states of the EU get different investments and structural funds from European Union. Mr. **Fürst** then concluded by stating that China does try to influence smaller countries, but the results of its investment policy are underwhelming. Not only that, but its involvement in the region is criticised by political leaders in Brussels.

Mr. **Hodulák**, as the last panellist, held a critical view of Czech Republic’s situation. He was also critical with regard to some politicians who stated that eight percent of GDP stems from export. He questioned the veracity of these claims by pointing out that, actually, reliance on exports is far lower than what it is usually made out to be. Certainly, the Czech Republic exports more than it imports. The problem, however, is that the country has huge financial imbalances, meaning that there can be no surplus.

In conclusion, he noted that the Czech Republic relies on foreign business, much of which is dependent on the state of Germany’s economy. Mr. **Hodulák** also proposed possible solutions which could tackle the aforementioned imbalances. One option would be to prevent firms from leaving the country. Indeed, according to some sources, Czech Prime minister Babiš tried to convince foreign investors to stay in the Czech Republic. The second option would be to diversify business relations, or at a least to try and reduce dependence on foreign businesses.

At the end of the panel, there was an exchange of questions. The first one was asked by Mr. **Nölke**, who was curious as to what could be done with these issues from the view of policy development. Mr. **Fürst** answered that the model followed by the Czech Republic is coherent and comparable with that of other V4 countries. Moreover, it was highlighted that foreign investors might present risks to the host country. For instance, once they find cheaper work force abroad, they could be tempted to leave their primary country.

5. ENERGY AND THE EXTERNAL RELATIONS OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC

15-16-17-18 10TH SEPTEMBER IN THE MIRROR HALL

Panelists:

- Lukáš Tichý (Moderator, Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Markéta Votoupalová (University of Economics in Prague, Czech Republic)
- Jitka Holubcová (Net4Gas, Czech Republic)
- Zbyněk Dubský (University of Economics in Prague, Czech Republic)
- Nikita Odintsov (Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Jan Mazač (Institute of International Relations, Prague, and Faculty of Social Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)

Details

The panel was focused on the external energy relations of the Czech Republic with different actors, such as the EU, Visegrad Group, Germany, Russia and the USA. The chair of the panel **Lukáš Tichý** proposed four questions for the speakers to follow:

- What are the main topics in Czech external energy relations?
- What is the attitude of the Czech Republic towards these energy relations?
- To what extent is the discussion on energy politicized in the Czech Republic?
- To what extent is the discussion on energy polarized in the Czech Republic?

Mr. **Tichý** presented his own views on the topic and answered the questions as follows: the subjects of Czech external relations in energy unfold according to the very nature of those relations and the main commodities such as gas, oil or nuclear power. Relations are on both multilateral and bilateral levels. Tichý pointed out that Czechia does not agree with the EU's support of renewable energy resources, however is not willing to block the process. Discussion on the state level is partial, and there is a consensus on finishing the construction of the Temelín nuclear power plant; however, politicians do not agree on a system of financing it.

The first speaker, **Markéta Votoupalová**, introduced her study about Czech-EU relations in the energy dimension. She pointed out that Czechia is dependent on imports, and should be more optimistic about the European Energy Policy. However, the Czech Republic follows EU discourses in energy, where cooperation is pragmatic, but states should be more solidaristic and pay more attention to values and mutual trust, as Mrs. **Votoupalová** added. European ambition to be the leader in renewable resources is not supported by Czech politicians, mainly

excused by the argument of losing competitiveness. There is also consensus among political parties to follow EU discourse in energy policy with the exceptions of SPD, KSČM and ODS, which are typically against tight cooperation with the EU. Czechia would rather welcome non-binding obligations in numbers and renewable resources. Mrs. **Votoupalová** evaluated politicization and polarization as limited due to previous points. Her prediction for the future is a continuity in the energy dimension.

The next presentation by **Jitka Holubcová** was about cooperation of the Visegrad Group and the EU. She started with an interesting point mentioned in the Bratislava Declaration,¹ in which states agreed to harmonize their energy policies. The main topics of Czech energy policy are covered in three levels: the first one includes EU debate on energy mix and common policy, the second one on the V4 level is about promoting voluntariness in renewable resources obligations, and the last one occurs on the state level, and concerns, for example, related companies.

Mrs. **Holubcová** continued with her comparison of V4 states. All of them are above the European average in energy imports and possess limited amounts of resources. The main energy resources are coal, except for Hungary, and nuclear power, except for Poland. Countries' political arenas are polarized, according to Mrs. **Holubcová**. By comparing different governments, she concluded that the level of cooperation depends on e.g. relationships between Prime Ministers at a particular time or specific leaders.² Mrs. **Holubcová** presented other topics of V4 cooperation, such as security and gas supply and the Crimea annexation, when V4 states helped to sustain EU-Ukraine stability by activating reverse flow to the country.

In conclusion, Mrs. **Holubcová** assessed V4 energy cooperation as a reflection of countries' national interests that depend on particular governments and pointed out that coordination is sometimes ad-hoc and hold-up. However, the V4 is quite successful in relations with countries of the Eastern Partnership.

The view on energy relations with Germany was taken from two levels. For **Zbyněk Dubský**, the first level is a discussion about questions and their solutions as well as searching for new topics. The other point is materialization of energy relations: for example, an interconnection of electricity and energy resources. He stressed that Germany is the most significant economic partner of Czechia, which interlinks other fields as well as the energy sector. Another important point is that these two countries share borders, and Germany expects the Czech Republic to have a common attitude towards energy policy. What stands out is the new German policy of "Energiewende", increasing the share of renewable resources in their energy mix, which Czechia is not quite inclined to do.

Dubský mentioned two main topics of Czech-German relations. The first one is a dimension of energy resources, mainly gas. He pointed out Nord Stream 2 to be one of the most current topics, which extends to other external relations of the Czech Republic, mainly within the V4.

¹ The Bratislava Declaration founded the Visegrad Group in 1991.

² As an example, she pointed out the quite close relationship between former Czech PM Sobotka and former Slovak PM Fico. For the leaders, she used an example of decline in energy debates after Tusk's leaving.

This project was quite depoliticized, mainly due to Angela Merkel, because according to her it is more of an economic topic rather than political. It was discussed among Czech politicians, but after 2015 it fell out of the discourse.

As he briefly mentioned before, another topic of external energy relations between Germany and Czechia is nuclear power, where these two countries have opposite positions. Germany, on the one hand, plans to shut down all its nuclear power plants, whereas the Czech Republic wants to finish the construction of nuclear power plants in Dukovany and Temelín, on the other. Despite this contrast, countries do not debate the topic, unless it is through third parties.

Mr. **Dubský** concluded his presentation as follows: Germany usually sets topics and expects Czechia to react in a positive way. The Czech Republic's position is to cooperate or stand by a neutral stance. Overall, this debate is little politicized or polarized.

Nikita Odintsov presented relations between the Czech Republic and Russia. According to him, the energy topic is not politicized in the Czech political arena as a result of the government's decision to not bring this topic to the table. Another point he makes is that Czech energy policy often seems to be inconsistent.

During his presentation, Mr. **Odintsov** focused on three main points. The first point was nuclear power, in which the most important role belongs to Russian companies related to Czech nuclear power plants, such as OMZ. For Mr. **Odintsov**, this is more of an issue of economy and domestic politics. The second point was natural gas, where Mr. **Odintsov** stressed the Ukrainian crisis. There was a decline in securitization mainly due to the fact that the state does not play the leading role in this issue (for example in Poland), but rather companies. Nord Stream 2 was mentioned as his last point, where the Czech approach is relatively inconsistent. As an example, Mr. **Odintsov** presented a disagreement on this project between former Prime Minister Sobotka and the Ministry of Industry and Trade.

The last bilateral relations presented at the panel were relations with the USA. As the main topic, **Jan Mazač** mentioned completion of construction of the third and fourth block of the nuclear power plant in Temelín. In this case, Mr. **Mazač** stressed the economic side, in particular the issues around cancelled tender in 2014 and new contracts with Westinghouse. However, this company went bankrupt, so the future of construction is uncertain.

Another significant topic of US-Czech energy relations is LNG,³ which is supposed to be transported from the US to Europe. The Czech Republic is very optimistic about this project and along with CEE countries it supports easier ways of trading. As the last point, Mr. **Mazač** briefly mentioned Nord Stream 2 as a disputable topic in EU-US relations mostly in terms of securitization. In this issue, Czechia stands by a pragmatic central position.

For the final point of his conclusion, Mr. **Mazač** emphasized the significance of LNG as a reserve in gas imports and a will for cooperation in construction of Temelín. In the issue of polarization and politicization of energy topics in the Czech political arena, he agreed with other speakers, that it is limited. He added that the Czech Republic had an active approach, but after a change in the government in 2018, there are no negotiations in process.

³ Liquefied Natural Gas.

As the presentations had ended, Mr. **Tichý** proposed two questions. The first one was about the advantages of Nord Stream 2 for the Czech Republic. Mr. **Dubský** responded, that countries of CEE see the pipeline differently than those in the West, because only 20% of capacity would flow there. The second question concerned linking up on US pipeline via Poland. Mr. **Mazač** pointed out that there are some discussions and it would be possible. It is also why the USA are critical to Nord Stream 2, because they see it as a competitor. Votoupalová added that it does not really matter which gas flows to the country, since the calorific value is the same. It is more of a price competition and that is why the EU should put more efforts to market liberalization.

Conclusion

The speakers in this workshop presented their studies on the external relations of the Czech Republic with various actors. The attitude of Czechia is mostly neutral, mainly on an EU-level by following the discourse, despite its negative position against increasing a share of renewable resources on energy production. The main topics in Czech energy policy are nuclear power, renewable resources, imports and its security. As the most current topic, speakers considered Nord Stream 2, which was mentioned by all. Politicization and polarization of the Czech political arena is limited, as it was mostly agreed, with the few exceptions of the ODS, SPD and KSČM. Dimension of energy is occasionally mentioned in political programmes of parties, however it is not a widely discussed topic.

6. GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON DEFENCE POLICY CHALLENGES

109-15~10-45 20TH SEPTEMBER IN THE GREAT HALL

Panelists:

- Lukáš Dyčka (University of Defence in Brno, Czech Republic)
- Mary Thompson-Jones (National Security Affairs, US Naval War College, USA)
- Rosita Delios (Faculty of Society and Design, Bond University, QLD, Australia)
- Michito Tsuruoka (Faculty of Policy Management, Keio University, Japan)
- Martin Michelot (EUROPEUM Institute for European Policy, Czech Republic)

Abstract

The Global Perspectives on Defense Policy Changes panel was led by **Lukáš Dyčka**. The panelists discussed various issues that global society faces nowadays in terms of defense and global security:

- **Rosita Dellios** focused on Chinese Defense Policy and its future prospective, highlighting the importance of the role of the Communist Party of China in building the features of its Army's culture. She stressed the increasing role of Chinese military forces in peacekeeping missions and the pace of their development of technologies in the military and space sectors.
- **Michito Tsuruoka** couldn't agree on the positive points of growing militarization in China, stressing their assertive behavior in South China Sea region. He also underlined the importance of international cooperation and development of cyber and space security.
- **Mary Thompson-Jones** spoke about the Arctic region and its security development. She states that as the effects of climate change begin to become more pronounced, the region will become an increasing flashpoint in international relations.
- **Martin Michelot** spoke about challenges that the Czech Republic faces currently in defense institutions. He stressed the importance of the Capability Development Plan in the long and short terms.
- **Lukáš Dyčka** focused on the issues of the modern Czech Army: old personnel without motivation, lack of new tech, military supplements, etc.

Details

The panel was focused on the different perspectives on defense and security challenges all over the world. The panelists approached the issues from the global point as well as from the regional one. For example, Mrs. **Rosita Dellios** talked about the current state of affairs in China and the role of the People's Liberation Army in the sense of international defense policy. She stressed that the main feature of the Chinese Defense Policy is predicated on defense of their socialist views, which is why the PLA is de facto a tool of the Chinese Communist Party. However, the PLA is based on long-lasting traditions, such as value of the marshal, cultivation of civil views etc., and there is a modern tendency that is represented in the development of the PLA (e.g. increasing of the role of the nuclear arsenal as well as huge number of personnel). She highlighted two main roles of the PLA, one external, and one internal. The external role is tackling the representation issue of the PLA abroad, and the internal is about supporting the activity of China's Communist Party. She also mentioned that China can be offensive in the territorial issues as it is a country of many borders. However, nowadays the PLA is actively engaged in leading peace-keeping missions, and is working on improving its image. Moreover, China is interested in the development of cooperation in common security, especially in the Southern direction: "We change each other by cooperation".

The opponent to Mrs. **Dellios** in the Chinese question was **Michito Tsuruoka**. He underlined the assertiveness in China's foreign policy and saw a correlation between the behavior of Russia and China regarding their neighboring countries. He also called into the question the role of the South-North Korean Summit as he could not find any positive changes in the denuclearization process in North Korea. Challenges that the Asian region face today cannot be easily and rapidly solved, which is why measures should have long-term in character. One of the measures he stressed was the strengthening of Japanese-European cooperation in the field of security and defense.

The main idea of **Mary Thompson-Jones's** speech was to attract attention to the Arctic region. She stressed that the main destabilizing actor in this region is Russia, as the Northern countries nearby are concerned about increasing militarization recently. Russia represents the largest military presence in the Arctic region (mainly due to territory). She also underlined American commercial and industrial interests in this region, while pointing out the increasing militarization of the Arctic by Russia. She called international society to discuss the Russian intentions and hopefully to understand why Russia wants the Arctic region so much.

Martin Michelot was focused on the European approach to common security and defense cooperation. He admitted that recently the EU has made important strides for greater cooperation in defense. He stressed the role of the Common Defense Plan and the challenges it was facing (he mainly focused on the bureaucratic and financial problems that come hand in hand with the process of CDP execution). He also said that the European defense fund will unfairly favor large countries with larger and more powerful military industries.

The last word belonged to the chair of the panel, **Lukáš Dyčka**. His speech was dedicated to the current affairs of the Czech defense forces. He highlighted three main challenges that the Czech forces face nowadays: the Russian threat, migration, and terrorism. He also paid attention to the decreasing motivation of military personnel, lack of officers, and the problem of aging.

7. SPECIAL PANEL: THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRAGUE SPRING — OUR FREEDOM SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN FOR GRANTED

14.15 - 16.00, 20TH SEPTEMBER IN THE GREAT HALL

Panelists:

- Joseph M. Siracusa (Moderator, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia)
- Marie Černá (Institute of Contemporary History, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Daniela Kolenovská (Institute of Contemporary History, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Pat Lyons (Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic)

Details

This special panel was opened by profesor **Joseph M. Siracusa**. He presented his own perspective because he was present here during the 60's. Nowadays, the Cold War has faded away from memory. It is necessary to have that memory return in this time of great fear. We all have an obligation to learn from the past. Today's leaders of powerful countries around the

world, especially in Europe, have the great responsibility to secure the history of the Cold War, so that the Czech Republic position in that conflict is not repeated. We are forced to repeat our mistakes again and again until we learn their lessons. He considered the Prague Spring an event which has still many secrets. He ended with quote from M.L. King: *I came not to inspire you, I came to be inspired by you.*

Second speaker was **Marie Černá**. Her speech started with highlighting the commemoration of 50 years since the interference of Warsaw Pact armies in our territory. She was mainly speaking about the period of normalization after the Prague Spring, which was part of the Soviet “friendly” renovative plan. The plan was consisting of cooperation between the Soviet army, political bodies and the public. Her research question is: How was this political Soviet Army influence fulfilled, especially on the local level? Soviet propaganda presented main articles in news, school debates, speeches, and were often connected with entertainment programs. The propaganda in news included marriages of soldiers with Czechoslovakian women as presented not only as a connection of two people, but also of two organizations and countries. Czechoslovakian society was not prepared for such an intense contact with the Soviet Army. Eventually, Soviets replaced high positions in offices. They had detailed insight into local political bodies. In the end of 1969, political bodies such as town halls were opened to the Soviets.

Daniela Kolenovská, dealt with the transformation of “Socialism with a human face”. What changed in the Russian perspective of the Prague Spring during the 1990s? There are two approaches to this. The first takes the Prague Spring as a foiled opportunity to renew socialism, and the second takes it as looking for democratic alternatives to socialism. Both approaches agree on the fact that the interference marked the end of Russophiles in the country. What is important, is that a big part of results were not shared with the Russian public. According to Russia Today, 34% know about the interference and 26% heard about it. This historical event still has influence on relations between the Czech Republic and Russia, yet Russians continue writing and promoting the interference as the right choice. 36% of Russians have agreed that the invasion was the best option for protection of their way of life. This is in part caused by a publication by Platoškin, who supported the intervention. Platoškin points to history, and believes that Czechs should be thankful for the Soviet Union because of the Second World War, when Soviets liberated their country. Since 2014, a growing trend emerged among new Russian institutes and researchers working with trustful sources and trying to accurately interpret the invasion.

The special panel was ended by **Pat Lyons**, who focused on what society thinks about it. In 1968, the newly-founded Czech Institute of Public Opinion Research (UMMV) had circulated 22 surveys, 14 of which had political tones. The general idea about political change was discussed and built since 1966. Before 1968, there were more general questions like what society thinks about the future, the structure of households, whether people are satisfied or if social status is important for the people. Just before the Prague Spring though, one of the most important of such surveys was circulated. It had five questions, including 1) If elections were held this month, who would you vote for? 2) How can we change the electoral system, or what kind of new system would you like? 3) Which institutions guarantee democracy? 4) What is the biggest threat to Czechoslovakia? The survey showed that there was no new ideology, since 40% of respondents would have voted for the Communist Party, and for most of the people the Party was a guarantee for democracy. There were no existing foundations for supporting the democracy. Society viewed its biggest threat to be military intervention.

To sum up I would like to mention another important result of the survey, which was about public opinion and negative effect of the invasion, where 90% of Czechs agreed with statement that Prague Spring had a negative impact on their country. This truly shows approach of Czechs to the intervention. Previous president of Russia, Yeltsin, and also current president Putin were expressing sympathy for the victims of the Prague Spring. This is the first step for reduction of tension in this case. The second step should be changing public opinion in Russia, and talking about it in an honest way.

8. GENDER ISSUES IN CZECH EXTERNAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Panelists:

- Petra Ali Doláková (Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic to the United Nations in New York)
- Lenka Vochocová (ECREA-CEE, Gender Expert Chamber of the Czech Republic)
- Tomáš Dopita (Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Kateřina Kočí (Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Blanka Nyklová (Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic)

Abstract

Four panelists were discussing gender issues in Czech external relations and international relations. The whole discussion was led by chair, who was Petra Ali Doláková. The key ideas of each speakers are as follows:

- This is a man's world. Women are not represented in language and also, there is a predominance of male photos. Society is lacking expertise in gender issues among both the implementers and the CDA. In addition, the cultural aspects of the receiving countries worsen the situation, as the women are not accepted as communication partners same as men would be accepted. (**Lenka Vochocová**)
- Gender statistics can contribute to long-term improvements in programming of development, identification and formulation of projects, monitoring and evaluation. (**Tomáš Dopita**)
- One of the possible reasons, why women are poorly represented in diplomacy is, that a woman's main role at home is a housekeeper. (**Kateřina Kočí**)
- Lack of attention paid to how gender affects the work environment dynamics/classroom. Students are open to gender issues although their imagination is limited as to how to use the perspective in their work, although sexism is limited but still remains. (**Blanka Nyklová**)

Details

This panel focused on gender issues that are present in the field of international relations and diplomacy. Mainly, it was devoted to the Czech Republic, but the difficulties for women in this field appear all over the world. All said is based on an analysis project the panellists on. The research **Lenka Vochocová** participated in and was aiming at Communicating Gender

Equality with Implementers of the Czech Development Cooperation. The data for the research was collected from the Czech Development Agency – its website, Facebook page, and press releases. The analysis of content from sources mentioned above shows that women are not represented in language, especially in relation to experts, teachers, lecturers, but also receivers of development aid or in job offers. Most photos showing signing of contracts or negotiations are men. Gender issues generally are more visible on Facebook in relation to international campaigns. Women are used in pictures as a tool against criticism of underrepresented groups. Implementers, who were chosen to discuss the gender issues are considered to be the most informed ones. But this is very individual, the level of their gender expertise differs significantly. Generally, there is a pretty narrow perception of gender approaches, mainly through equal employment opportunities plus job flexibility for women as parents. Implementers show some contradictions in their ability to identify gender inequalities (at work) vs pronouncing gender stereotypes. As a feedback to the Czech Development Agency and the absolute lack of information related to the expectations of the CDA, people do not understand whether they evaluate their application based on what they write in the equal opportunity section and lack of understanding of the relevance of the topic. There are barriers to gender perspective implementations, such as a lack of expertise in gender issues among both the implementers and the CDA. The organization doesn't consider this issue an important, cultural aspect – women wouldn't be accepted in the receiving country the same way a man would as a communication partner. Also political barriers might appear on the side of the receiving country. For example: legislative, social politics, implications for national budgets etc. The gender projects should be long-term, continuous and conceptual.

Next contribution to the topic is a proposal for gender statistics in the Czech development cooperation presented by **Tomáš Dopita**. It was said that the gender statistics can contribute to long-term improvements in programming of development, identification and formulation of projects, monitoring and evaluation. This project is based on project documentations of 96 unique projects implemented under the auspices of the Czech Development Agency. One of the findings of this analysis is that in half of the analyzed projects, the gender was ignored or avoided by declarations of gender-neutrality or non-discrimination. The project observed a clear promise that the project will improve the situation regarding gender-equality or women's empowerment. Most of these promises, however, did not provide any concrete information that could confirm or justify the promise. This project gathered some interesting information. For example, in Moldova, some sectors are highly feminized. However, the implementers do not have a clear idea about what information to submit and no one requires coherent information.

Kateřina Kočí informs, that the project she cooperated on analyzed some countries, such as EEAS, Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Latvia, Poland etc. The representation of women in diplomacy is pretty low. In France it is 28%, in the UK 21,5% and in the USA just 18%. One of the reasons for this outcome, as Mrs. **Kočí** provides, is the fact that women are housekeepers, and so, there is little space for anything else beside the home.

For gathering informations for other project, presented by **Blanka Nyklová**, were interviewed students of all levels at an IR department of a public university in the Czech Republic. The main question was: "Why is there a dearth of women among IR researchers in the Czech Republic?" Accepted perspectives of gender in IR are as a critical perspective affecting epistemological starting points in the discipline and as a part of work environment. One of the positive findings is that gender is considered in specific areas as development and peace studies. The disciplinary barrier was gender sensitivity contrary to strong compartmentalization in Czech environment. Students are open to gender issues although their imagination is limited as to how to use the perspective in their work. In working environments, sexism is limited but still present, nowadays. The suggestions that come out of

this research are the following: Students of both genders need to become a part of research projects. Female students should be actively sought out and supported to counter the effects of gendered socialization. The interaction between students and teachers should be increased. Feminism should become a stable part of the syllabus. Should be studied the feminist approaches to teaching IR. The faculties should hire more women.

9. FUTURE OF HUMANITY IN SPACE: THE ROLE OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC

(10:45-12:15 20TH SEPTEMBER IN THE MIRROR HALL)

Panelists:

- Petr Boháček (Chair, Association for International Affairs, Czech Republic)
- Václav Kobera (ITS, Space Activities and Research Development and Innovations Section, Ministry of Transportation of the Czech Republic)
- Nikola Schmidt (Institute of Political Studies, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Jakub Brož (Deputy Head of International Industrial Cooperation Unit, Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic)
- Mahulena Hofmann (SES Chair in Space, SatCom and Media Law, University of Luxembourg)

Details

Petr Boháček: Future of Humanity in Space, Role of the Czech Republic as technology advances the questions of space migration, asteroid mining, planetary defense and interstellar travel are becoming reality in the 21st century. In 2018, the Czech Republic celebrates 40 years since the first Czechoslovakian human space flight, the satellite launch, and 10 years of European Space Agency membership. Meanwhile, the imprint of the Czech Republic on the future of humanity in space is increasing. Prague's Global Navigation Satellite Systems Agency is considered to be the home for all EU space activities, growing and becoming integrated into supply chains of breakthrough peace projects, and the new National Space Plan is being crafted for the post-2020 period. What does the future hold for humanity in space? What role should the Czech Republic play in space?

This panel can be characterized as a representation of speakers setting and agenda, with 5 important discussions, and motivational speeches which inspire an exchange of ideas.

Nowadays the space is not limited only by national borders. We may observe a rapid rise of non-governmental actors in the international world system. The whole of humanity, behaving as one actor in relation to space, with recent technological inventions, and modern research investigations that allow global navigation system improvements. The Czech Republic still has little influence, but keeps on improving the Czech National Space Plan, increasing its participation capacities, and increasing the amount of investment from the state budget allocated to the National Space Plan improvement.

Václav Kobera: It is rather important to mention, the fact that the first Space Plan was prepared by the Czech government in 2010. The plan's implementation can be considered successful. It was prepared in cooperation with NASA. Nowadays, space is not only about scientific research, but also about business. Among the countries that belonged to the Eastern bloc, the Czech Republic was the second country (after Hungary), that was very active in space activities, and the first which succeeded in this area. The third National Space Plan will be quite different from the two previous ones. Nowadays, outer space is much more about pilot sector and public investments. The Czech Republic is applying itself to succeed in improving space technologies and building the space industry. We may monitor the cooperation of domestic and global markets, private and public sector. The engagement of the Czech Republic to the outer space industry can be defined as quite stable, as the Czech Republic is supporting business investments in such a complex area. The Czech Republic's primary strategic goal is to focus its whole potential to motivate of business sector to engage their activities and keep on further improving its achievements in the space industry, which is today quite competitive. Every state is nowadays endeavouring to be faster and better, compared to other actors. Every actor is endeavouring to be more active and more ambitious on the international stage, and to be placed in a higher position in the international community.

Mr. Boháček: The integration of Czech industry with the international outer space industry, its cooperation with international companies that are operating on the international market is rather frequently based on fortune, the ability of an actor to communicate and deal with appropriate successful participants and representatives of international outer space market. The representatives of the Czech business sector who specialize in the outer space industry are in most cases managing small companies, that are not well known in the international market. For example, there is a factory in Klatovy. We must stimulate the emergence of new projects, that will allow the Czech industry to integrate to the global international outer space projects. In this sense the great role in the Czech market process plays the ministry of defense, which coordinates the activities of the whole Czech outer space industry and stimulates potential investors to participate in global international projects and inspires the local companies to improve their national space projects. Today the Czech Republic is struggling in the implementation of different types of new technologies and systems in the process of its outer space market formation. Meanwhile on the individual level, there exists no such thing as the Czech satellite at the Czech outer space industry.

Nicola Schmidt: I would like to open the debate on the potential capacities of the Czech Republic and its potential in the outer space industry. The new solar projects are much more about the new inventions that are connected with the solar system. The last project was not good enough for the investments for the researching process. The budget intended for the researching process is rather limited but still constantly increasing. The main aim is still searching for the new innovative methods of researchings. Nowadays, our researchers are

working on the artificial impact improvement which was sent by NASA. There are plenty of opportunities in the Czech industry from the technical perspective. For example, the project on a small lander on an asteroid. We are now building the infrastructure in outer space, which can be used for pushing satellites in orbit, that already fell down, to push them back to the solar system. From the technical perspective, the Czech Republic has a special research system in Prague. Nowadays there is a possibility to conduct practical research. The defense is much more about the fact that we have a capability we can implement researching projects with using technologies for cleaning the orbit, to explore the solar system.

Mr. Boháček: All humankind in the 21st century is facing the legal challenges from the IR system, analyzing the space and governmental strategies about the business and investments in the outer space.

Mahulena Hoffman: There are a number of countries that are involved in international projects devoted to realization of international outer space projects. I would like to put on the main focus on Luxembourg activities. Just fifty years before the outer space projects were absolutely an old fashioned unstudied field of international law. Several years later there was announced the policy that specifies on the initiatives of bringing Know-How development into the outer space business industry. There are 6 EU firms, that brought their staff and started the explanatory activities. Before this policy was implemented, the primary agenda was focused on the correlation with the national space law. We had to analyze the international law and activities of space cooperations and interests of other states, if they do not violate the national or international law. The legislation has now two points: the US legislation system in correlation to the outer space last innovative researchings are appropriate, the several sanctions would be imprisoned. It focuses on activating the outer space resources only, it does not cover the satellites. The outer space resources activities only, as the outer space activities of Luxembourg in future will be regulated by the legislation law under the new legislation of Luxemburg. The new legislation system would already be adopted during this year. However, the members of international community, like for example Belgium, that would appreciate the total strict regulation system of all the international activities, which implies regimes that would regulate the activities in space. The existence of an international institution that would control the respect to the fixed international regimes. That would distribute the international outer space regimes and laws. The discussions are now led on this issue. Luxembourg is nowadays active in bilateral cooperators and agreements, is participating on international activities. There are countries that are building blocks which are exploring how would international regimes look like in future, which principles would require the international protection, that would be entitled of space activities. The principals of international mass media communication, how should it work to be successful, the safe interference with the activities of international community.

Mr. Kobera: We believe that our industry will increasingly become more popular and the name of the CR will be heard in the world in correlation to the outer space market industry. We will keep on improving the outer space industry. We need to install the permanent connection of private and public sector of the CR market on the global stage. To achieve these goals we definitely will need some activism approach. We need to keep on searching of some injection, to inject some topics with the standard presages in order to discuss the outer space future approaches and the global space approach, to support our entities and missions

that are held in the outer space, to establish the discussion on space security and improve private initiatives and the state investments.

Mrs. Schmidt: Now let us pay attention to the international cooperation and global projects that are devoted to the activities in the outer space. Nowadays there is a number of new topics and agendas that focus on the outer space activities. In the past it was much more about the astronomy, nowadays it is about sharing the knowledge about the sky database, following the asteroids, the near future nuclear weapons, significant changes in space. The whole humanity is nowadays facing the new types of problems, such as for example asteroid in approximation to the Earth. We should confess that we do not know much about the asteroids and do not have the ability to predict the possible danger that may be caused by asteroids. The security space projects are not sponsored well enough nowadays, we have small budgets. The member states of the international community are setting not just the agenda of security, but also an agenda of special technologies to be built by the new industry, to implement in military proposals that are set by Security Council. There are plenty of new opportunities and big issues to be discussed.

Jakub Brož: Talking honestly about the outer space security, I think there are far more important things we may do to increase the budget that is intended to the outer space researchings. In this case, I mean not only a national budget, but also a private sector budget. For example the implementation of the UK project, that is representing new ideas how to insure the number of satellites in the outer space. The project represents some interesting proposals how to find a right instrument that can affect the satellites. The reason is that in fact the whole population can be affected by asteroids and satellites. Unfortunately, the great part of population does not realise the extent to which everyone can be affected by the artifacts such as satellite and asteroid. The CR companies are involved in some international projects that are devoted to the asteroid research, to provide the innovation solutions. We have to be prepared in the future for the private activities in this sector. We should stay on supporting this policy, as there is a great potential of building the outer space industry.

Mrs. Hoffman: There are many levels how the international cooperation could be structured, how to implement the mechanisms of international space government. We should think about inviting the colleagues from developing countries in Africa and distribute the cooperation with African states. For example, we may allow their students to participate in the outer space studies, allow them to take part in the international discussions, to implement the equal principles of participation in such types of international projects, to involve the colleagues as much as it is possible.

Mr. Kobera: There are new actors in the international system. It is important that even not actors, that do not have a big influence in the international system like for example transnational companies, should be still heard. Their critical perspective is important. Besides, there is a discussion about the public investments of non-state actors. The wide spectrum of activities in this field is changing. A number of states are not so much ambitious about that. The international discussions could help all of us to build ambitious collective projects, but not only private initiatives. The real ambitious projects should be coordinated globally, from the global perspective. We need to distinguish the national scale, and international scale. It is necessary to support the CR activities.

Mrs. **Schmidt:** There are small non-state actors that do not much care about the government policies. They just have enough money to do what they want, to invest in building a racket. They do not care about the political structure of the international system and the council agenda. Philanthropies were not significant some years ago, but nowadays there is a number of independent non-state actors, involved in investing in improving the technologies. The problem is that the whole world investigations are not regulated.

Mr. **Brož:** The private companies need profits. Any type of scientific investigations and scientific missions requires much money. The agencies should rethink their strategy of behavior in space, to provide the cooperations with the aim of investigating a lot of money. The key goal for all of us should be how to make this world safer. We should invest in projects that are safe.

Mrs. **Hoffman:** In the outer space operations there should be involved working group resources. The primary attention of the UN should be paid to the International Regime, that should be newly fabricated. Non-state entities would really create the substance. It is really surprising that few non state actors are not invited by the UN secretariate, they are not allowed to present their activities and investigations.

The potential role of the CR, Summary: The CR will play the active role. We will build our industry, will be visible. It is idealistic perspective. The outer space can be inspirational. Researchers and politicians are constructing the agenda. They would like to see the humanity pushing the society for new explorations and developments. The first moon landing was only 50 years ago. The great role of the CR. The big potential of czech researchers, shaping the new kind of mentality, to be globally involved in cooperation about the safe environment. Space influences each of us. We should increase the budget. The CR has a great potential, qualitative researchers, interest, technologies. The czech students are active participants of discussions. GPS, Google maps is waste of money, but it improves the every day life. Should be more active in exploring the foreign technologies.

10. NEW APPROACHES TO FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS I: NEW MODALITIES OF COOPERATION IN THE V4 GROUP

Panelists:

- Jan Daniel (Chair, Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Jakub Eberle (Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Ruth Ferrero-Turrión (Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain)
- Vladislav Strnad (Metropolitan University Prague, Czech Republic)
- Monika Brusenbauch Meislová (Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic)

Details

The first workshop on New Approaches to Foreign Policy Analysis focused on cooperation among V4 states in various spheres. **Jan Daniel** opened the workshop with presenting its intention, which was to promote new theoretical approaches in foreign policy analysis on Central European states, especially on foreign policy of the Czech Republic in the Czech Journal of International Relations. Three speakers presented their papers on topics related to V4 cooperation and received comments by **Jakub Eberle**.

The presentation started with a paper on V4 as a new actor in the European Council in terms of refugee crisis management by **Ruth Ferrero-Turrión**. At the very beginning of her presentation, she emphasized that refugee crisis in Europe is a crisis of management and a debate about border control. In the paper, Mrs. **Ferrero-Turrión** sees the refugee crisis in 2015 as a triple crisis – humanitarian, management, and identity crisis. She elaborated by pointing out hotspots, and that border control was unprepared and still under construction in the time of discussion over European values.

The main disputed point for the V4 was relocation policy and quotas, when states urged on voluntariness. Individually, Visegrad states had slightly different positions, for example Hungary was more intransigent than Czechia, but overall, they stood by the same rejecting stance. According to Mrs. **Ferrero-Turrión**, the Czech approach to the migration crisis became more negative when a shift in public discourse happened. For society, migration crisis became a security threat that brings terrorism and different kinds of illnesses to the country.

There were similar scenarios in V4 countries and Mrs. **Ferrero-Turrión** stated that the region became rather more anti-Islamic than anti-migration. However, she ended her presentation more positively by saying that the V4 was successful in pressure on debate about European values and identity. Mr. **Eberle** pointed out a need to specify actorness, because it is a wide term. He also mentioned that presenting positions of the West versus the East is quite a cliché.

Vladislav Strnad introduced his work about the role of the Visegrad Group as a security actor in context of the European migration crisis. Strnad pointed out that the V4, as a promoter of social stances, is a key actor, and shifted from a position of “policy taker” to “policy shaper” and even “maker”. Up until 2015, V4 states had been implementing EU migration policies with no big issues. However, after the crisis broke out, they came to the realization they did not want to keep up anymore and rather started to present their national interests.

As a method of analysis, Mr. **Strnad** used role theory, when V4 is taken from a social perspective. To be more specific, an actor identifies itself with some role and acts according to it. From this stance, there are expectations from the V4, which are both internal (what states expect) and external (what the EU anticipates from the group). Mr. **Strnad** said that the purpose of this role is to minimize the threat of illegal immigration and diminish Brussels as they say a supranational dictate. Thus, the Visegrad group is seen as a troublemaker, who stand against solidarity and immigration policy of the EU. Mr. **Strnad** concluded that there is a conflict between the EU’s expectation of V4 to be a follower and V4 perceiving itself as a security actor, who wants to save civilization.

Comments on this paper were mostly concerning utilization of Mr. **Strnad's** role theory, which should be more specified according to Mr. **Eberle**. Moreover, it is disputable whether V4 can be seen as a security actor, since states did not perform any significant security policy.

The last paper presented on this workshop was written by **Monika Brusenbauch Meislová** on the topic of the role of the Visegrad Group in the Brexit process. In the beginning, she emphasised that each involved actor follows its own interests. Meislová looked at the issue in two key phases – the first one is a period of Cameron's EU negotiations, the second one is the time of the first phase of activation of article 50 and its negotiations. Mrs. **Brusenbauch Meislová** chose an outline by Michal Kořan built on Drulák's work of six variables for explaining the recent success of V4 affairs such as political determination, flexibility, internal cooperation, strategic goals, specification of goals and partnership with other states and self-confidence.

Great Britain has always been an important partner, as Mrs. **Brusenbauch Meislová** pointed out, however the strength of relationship differs from country to country. Altogether, V4 states were very keen on keeping the UK in the EU, especially Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán.

In the first phase, the V4 had concerns in several issues, for example discrimination of V4 citizens living and working in the UK. As for individual states, Poland was the most active and on the other side Slovakia was more moderate, mostly due to its presidency of the Council of the European Union. Mrs. **Brusenbauch Meislová** evaluated cooperation of Visegrad Group to be confident and effective with clear goals mostly in social policy.

However, states eased up in the second phase and cooperation became limited with little common input. Goals were vague and less confident. In conclusion, Mrs. **Brusenbauch Meislová** summarized V4's approach to Brexit as unbalanced and inconsistent followed by internal disagreements. According to Eberle, the paper was fine, but he suggested to be more ambitious and work better with resources.

After discussion over comments on paper, two questions were proposed. The first one was about switch in personal chemistry mentioned by Mrs. **Brusenbauch Meislová**. She reacted that relationships between leaders of V4 states are quite tight, which contributed to the final strategy. Another question concerned different topics for the V4. Mrs. **Brusenbauch Meislová** suggested the future of the EU and its reform as a potential topic, however the position of V4 states is vague and without any significant actions.

Conclusion

Speakers presented their papers about cooperation of the Visegrad Group from different perspectives using various methods of analysis. As Mr. **Eberle** summarized, it is important to sell the argument in the right way, since there is a huge amount of papers. It is crucial to mention what is important, so the reader knows what to take from the analysis. All in all, researchers should be bolder in their work and add a bit of storytelling.

11. NEW APPROACHES TO FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS II: EXPLORING FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE CENTRAL EUROPEAN STATES

(15:30~16:50 20TH SEPTEMBER IN THE MIRROR HALL)

Panelists:

- Tomáš Dopita (Chair, Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Klaus Brummer (Moderator, Catholic University Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Germany)
- Ladislav Cabada (University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic)
- Jakub Záhora (Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)
- Aliaksei Kazharski (Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia)
- Clarissa Tabosa (Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia)

Details

On Thursday, September 20, representatives of the Institute of International Relations and those of the academic sector debated issues related to the foreign policy of the Central European States.

Tomáš Dopita opened who gave the word to **Ladislav Cabada**. The latter proceeded with his talk by evoking issues related to the V4 group. Mr. **Cabada** argued that developing V4 policy has to be the Czech Republic's priority and main strategy. But despite this, he pointed out that there are several alternatives for European cooperation. In this context, it is worth mentioning the so-called Slavkov triangle. Nonetheless, one should underline that Austrian, Slovak and Czech positions remain uncertain, mainly due to elections due to take place in the near future.

Mr. **Cabada** also argued that although the V4 is the most often discussed sub-regional organisation, there are also other initiatives, such as Three Seas Initiative.

Mr. **Cabada** also emphasized the importance of the Kromeriz declaration, in which countries of the V4 declared their determination to continue development of cooperation among Visegrad Group countries as member states of the European Union and NATO. Important to note is also the fact that the V4 group has defined its three important priorities, namely:

- European security
- EU enlargement
- Energy security and policy

Mr. **Cabada** then outlined issues related to the V4 presidency – he explained that its presidencies were overshadowed by the migration crisis, which in turn brought along new challenges. He stressed that in the newspapers worldwide, the V4 group was being presented as the “big bad V4”, mainly due to anti-migrant statements which had been expressed. He also mentioned Mr. Orbán, an advocate for V4 and proponent of the movement, as an alternative to European integration.

Mr. **Cabada** argued that attempts to undermine policies of the V4 have been discernible, despite the fact that critics themselves then failed to provide alternatives. Regarding the Czech Republic, he evoked the significant strengthening of the Czech-German strategic partnership. During the government of Petr Nečas, for instance, a visit to Bavaria contributed to improved bilateral relations.

Mr. **Cabada** noted that there were also appeals for the Czech Republic to leave V4, in spite of the fact that planning to the Visegrad policy seemed to go ahead full steam – as evidenced by visit of Czech Prime Minister Babiš in Budapest or Košice, for example.

Then the panel continued with the presentation of **Jakub Záhora**, who started out with an argument that there are now exceptionally good Czech-Israeli relations, pointing out that, as proof of these good relations, the Czech Republic voted against the recognition of Palestine. Furthermore, we can't forget that such Czech-Israeli relations are the result of a liberal and open relationship of Czech people towards Jews. Of course, one can still come across antisemitism, but politician on both sides view it as more of a deviation, rather than as a norm. A common denominator in Czech-Israeli relations is also the issue concerning the Munich Agreement – the topic is often brought up because it illustrates the difficulties that small, besieged states faced because of Hitler, nationalism and anti-Semitism.

Mr. **Záhora** also outlined that theoretical building blocks with regard to Czech identity are to large extent based on a desire to become more western, and to belong to the community of western countries. On the other hand, however, there is a counter-argument that countries needn't feel inferior when compared to western countries. With regard to this, it is worth underlining that aversion towards progressive ideas persists, and that citizens of the Czech Republic, but also of Europe in general, don't want to adopt everything from the West. In this regard, it is important to note that Israel is presented as a progressive country in the Czech mainstream, although Israelis don't adhere to so-called “political correctness” when it comes to politics. To sum up, Mr. **Záhora** concluded that Czechs have a desire to belong to the West, although this sometimes has to be nuanced with the aforementioned considerations.

The discussion continued with **Aliaksei Kazharski** and **Clarissa Tabosa**, who empirically focus on Czechia and Slovakia. They emphasized that for states, there is crucial difference between “being” small or “feeling” small. The difference lies in the fact that when states “feel” small, their sense of vulnerability increases, thereby leading to securitisation. Furthermore, concerning the Czech case, there always seems to be a drive to escape the periphery, primarily the eastern one.

They also mentioned that the migration crisis also presents new challenges, which are most reflected in increasing securization and a sharpening of statements and vocabulary by official political leaders. The common denominator seems to be the utilisation of words such as “fear” and “threat”, as well as anti-Muslim discourse in general. As a consequence of the migration

crisis, politics became more restrictive. At the same time, however, many Central European states reduced restrictions for Ukrainians.

Klaus Brummer, the last panellist, replied to policy papers sent by these authors. He questioned Mr. **Záhora** about how present relations between Israel and the Czech Republic look like (or, more specifically, the approach Israel had fostered towards its partner).

Mr. **Brummer** then pointed out to Mr. **Kazharski** and Mrs. **Tabosa** that there should never be excessive focus on domestic policy, but that one should strive to take into consideration the whole picture, comprising also of foreign affairs on a global scale. He then emphasised that migration crisis should be presented separately, and not included in the above mentioned presentation.

In conclusion, it was stated that although the Czech Republic views itself as a guardian of democracy in Europe (hence its anti-migration stance), the country nonetheless contributes to perceptions that V4 states are parts of “Eastern Europe”.

PARTNERS



Ministerstvo zahraničních věcí
České republiky

