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Student Panelists of the 2014 Transatlantic Policy Symposium at Georgetown University with
Professor Jeffrey Anderson (BMW Center for German and European Studies, Georgetown University)
Panel Summaries

Expert Panel I.: A Continent of Many Languages Learns to Speak with One Voice

F. Stephen Larrabee
Distinguished Chair in European Security
RAND Corporation

Jean-François Pactet
Visiting Fellow, Europe Program
Center for Strategic & International Studies

François Rivasseau
Deputy Head of Delegation
Delegation of the European Union to the United States of America

Kathleen Smith (Moderator)
Visiting Professor, Center for Eurasian, Russian & East European Studies
Georgetown University

The conference began with an expert panel focusing on how the EU is starting to speak with a single voice, a situation that, according to moderator Kathleen Smith, Russia finds quite daunting. François Rivasseau started the panel by reviewing seven reasons why the EU is increasingly speaking with one voice. Firstly, he stressed the tri-partisan spirit of the EU Commission presidency: the President is proposed by the European Council and approved by the Parliament to work with the members of the Commission. Secondly, Commission Vice-President and High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Catherine Ashton is able to coordinate external action thanks to this spirit. The remaining reasons are external: the rise of Asia; Russia’s strengthening voice; the US push for a united Europe; immigration; and reorganization of EU representation abroad. Mr. Rivasseau pointed out efforts on Iran as one of the positive examples of the EU’s ability to speak with a single voice.

Continuing the panel discussion, Jean-François Pactet called on the EU to strengthen its voice. Mr. Pactet disagreed with those who believe this is merely a matter of changing institutions—he stressed that the issue is deeper. Member states diverge in their views because each has a different perception of its own environment for both geographical and historical reasons. Mr. Pactet argued that the EU needs to work on bringing these different perceptions together and on shaping a sense of confidence in the future. This may seem like a daunting task, but Mr. Pactet pointed out that while there was initially just as much disagreement over the EU’s common trade policy, consensus had been reached.

F. Stephen Larrabee wrapped up the panel. He noted, “as I listen to François, there is nothing I can disagree with, and that could not be said a decade ago.” Mr. Larrabee discussed how, over the last few decades, Washington has gone from viewing the European Security and Defense Policy as a competitor to NATO to seeing it as a
complementary force. While Mr. Larabee listed several reasons for this shift, he argued that the end of the war in Iraq was an important turning point when the U.S. came to realize that civilian power was necessary to stabilize a country after the end of military combat. This is precisely what the ESDP specializes in, and something it could help with in the future.

When a member of the audience insisted that the EU should “do something concrete” in situations such as the current political crisis in Ukraine, Mr. Pactet stressed that the situation in Ukraine displays the progress of the European External Action Service, contrasting the EU’s current efforts with the gravely discordant European position on Ukraine's 2004 Orange Revolution. Mr. Rivasseau also defended the position of the EU in the Ukrainian crisis, describing the situation as the result of Russia’s provocation in what it sees as a zero-sum geopolitical game. The discussion also touched on Libya, and while all panelists felt that the country has a potentially problematic future, they also stressed the lessons that the EU learned in its engagement with the country.

Student Panel I: Building New Bridges: EU Neighborhood Policy 10 Years Later

Volha Charnysh (Belarus)  
Harvard University

Elnur Ismayilov (Azerbaijan)  
University of Münster

Marta Mylyan (Ukraine)  
University of Konstanz

Jacob Schrot (Germany)  
Humboldt University

The first student panel, entitled “Building New Bridges: EU Neighborhood Policy 10 Years Later,” built on the earlier panel on EU diplomacy by discussing the European Union’s European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) and Eastern Partnership (EaP). Student panelists evaluated both the achievements and pitfalls of the policy up to now, and outlined specific approaches the European Union should adopt to ensure its success in the future. Ms. Charnysh began the discussion by introducing the “ambitious agenda” put forth by the Eastern Partnership, but she lamented that despite noble initial ambitions, there has been more continuity than change in central and Eastern Europe. She warned that if the European Union does not take a more proactive approach in its Neighborhood Policy, Eastern European states are at risk of becoming a permanent periphery in Europe. Mr. Ismayilov expanded on Ms. Charnysh’s assessment of the EaP’s success and stated that the soft power of the European Union simply isn’t working. He explained that EU has already lost Armenia to Russia, and he worried that Georgia and Azerbaijan are currently at risk of falling into Russian control.

Shifting away from the Caucasus, Ms. Mylyan discussed the success and failures of the Eastern Partnership in her presentation on the Eastern Partnership controversy in Ukraine. From her perspective, the Eastern Partnership was successful in fostering the feeling among the Ukrainian population that, culturally, Ukraine is part of a larger “Europe” and that, because of this, European integration is the choice of the people. Mr. Schrot started his presentation with an amusing and thought-provoking analogy, comparing the
EU’s current Neighborhood Policy approach to the United States attempting to pressure Germany to ban beer consumption in exchange for a financial package equal to 1% of Germany’s total GDP. Mr. Schrot assured us “from personal experience” that these US funds simply would not be enough to persuade Germany to change this core aspect of German life. Although the analogy may seem provocative, Mr. Schrot argued that the EU’s Eastern Partnership policies are just as unpersuasive. Mr. Schrot described the EU’s current “more for more” strategy towards EaP countries as a defective checkbook policy, because the total amount of funds the EU allocates for EaP countries is not nearly enough to successfully facilitate change.

After outlining the current struggles of European Neighborhood Policy, all four student panelists articulated clear and specific policy recommendations to ensure its effectiveness. Ms. Charnysh argued that the EU needs a more decisive and assertive policy approach that would incentivize Eastern Partnership states to comply with EU objectives. Her view found wide agreement, and Mr. Ismayilov further explained that the EU should shift away from its cautious soft power approach, since it is unlikely to serve as an effective catalyst for rapid political compliance. Mr. Ismayilov argued that the EU and the US should work together to create mechanisms that will better ingrate Georgia and Azerbaijan into European structures. Ms. Mylyan echoed these sentiments and stated that the European Union and the United States need to “speak in one voice” to condemn Russian interference and violence, especially in the context of the recent Ukrainian protests. Finally, Mr. Schrot argued that the European Union should reaffirm its core objectives and reallocate Eastern Neighborhood Policy funds to EaP states with significant potential to join the EU. Mr. Schrot expanded on Mr. Ismayilov’s critique of the EU’s current soft power strategy, saying that the EU should take a more hard-edged approach towards Russia. Mr. Schrot advocated for the EU to clarify the consequences of non-compliance, which could include trade restrictions or the freezing of assets.

While each of the panelists was in favor of the original tenets of the European Neighborhood Policy, they all agreed that more work needs to be done to accelerate change within Eastern Partnership states.

**Keynote Speech**

**Richard Kauzlarich**  
Non-Resident Senior Fellow; Brookings Institution  

Ambassador Richard D. Kauzlarich delivered the keynote speech of the Transatlantic Policy Symposium. Drawing on his distinguished career as U.S. Ambassador to Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and as
U.S. National Intelligence Officer for Europe, Ambassador Kauzlarich addressed the changing role of the United States in foreign affairs and the continuity of U.S. and European strategic objectives. With the 100-year anniversary of the outbreak of World War I in mind, the Ambassador drew upon Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points as inspiration for his remarks. The Ambassador drew parallels between the Fourteen Points and current principles of U.S. and European foreign policy. Ambassador Kauzlarich affirmed the continuing geopolitical importance of engagement with Russia, the potential gains of free trade, and the need for open and peaceful dialogue among nations. In times of fiscal austerity and aversion to use of military force, Ambassador Kauzlarich encouraged the United States and Europe to create values-based relationships with neighbors to promote strategic objectives. Ambassador Kauzlarich cited democracy, human rights, freedom of expression, and energy security as lasting objectives that should guide the United States and Europe in promoting peace and prosperity around the world.

Expert Panel II.: Greater than the Sum of its Parts? Taking the Long View on the Common Foreign and Security Policy

Christopher Chivvis
Senior Political Scientist
RAND Corporation

Angela Stent
Director, Center for Eurasian, Russian & East European Studies
Georgetown University

Kenneth Yalowitz
Professor and former U.S. Ambassador to Belarus and Georgia
Georgetown University

Dieter Dettke (Moderator)
Adjunct Professor, Center for Security Studies
Georgetown University

The first panel of the afternoon was entitled “Greater than the Sum of its Parts? Taking the Long View on the Common Foreign and Security Policy.” Moderated by Georgetown's Professor Dieter Dettke, the panel focused on the EU’s long-term approach toward conflicts on its borders and beyond, and drew upon the expertise of Dr. Christopher Chivvis, Dr. Angela Stent, and Ambassador Kenneth Yalowitz. To begin the conversation, Dr. Dettke put forth the following assertion: a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) has been on the whole absent within the EU. Will that change with Germany’s President Joachim Gauck, Minister for Foreign Affairs Frank-Walter Steinmeier, and Defense Minister Ursula von der Leyen all recently advocating a more active German foreign policy?

Dr. Stent framed CFSP concerns within the context of Eastern Europe, the ex-Soviet states, and Russia. The EU, Stent reiterated, never offered membership to the six Eastern Partnership (EaP) countries, a highly problematic choice in her eyes. “Enlargement fatigue,” the question of Russia, as well the EU’s financial crisis all contributed to this decision, Stent explained. Moreover, policy
regarding Russia has divided the EU; member states had diverging opinions on what should be done regarding Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution, for example. These days, it is the question of what approach to take toward Russia, especially with regard to the EaP states, that is causing rifts within the Union. Stent dubbed Russia’s proposed Eurasian Union a “negative vision” that only seeks to prevent the EU from making inroads into Russia’s “sphere of influence.” Stent concluded that this behavior requires a united CFSP policy in response; specifically, the EU must offer membership to EaP states in the near future. Dr. Stent felt that only this approach would keep Russia at bay.

Christopher Chivvis framed the discussion with regard to structural factors, pointing to two under-the-radar concerns: North Africa and the Middle East. With both regions facing political and economic crises, as well as expanding terrorist networks, Chivvis argued that EU could no longer “close its eyes” to the grave terrorism threats and humanitarian problems driving migration to Europe’s shores. Noting that the US has “rebalanced” to Asia, Chivvis argued that Europe has to take a greater role in maintaining its own security. Chivvis also remarked on the Common Security and Defense Policy's (CSDP) failures in Libya—where the EU deferred to French and British political and military initiative—and in Mali. Still, he expressed hope for the EU’s training mission in Mali, as well as for the changes currently underway in German foreign policy. If Germany commits more, “that is positive for the EU,” he concluded. However, a common European foreign policy will require building a “cadre of people, capabilities that are deployable, and above all financing,” forcing the EU to finally determine who will pay for all of this.

Ambassador Kenneth Yalowitz also focused on CSDP on the EU’s Eastern border, and like Stent, concluded that membership must be offered to the EaP states. Framing his argument historically, Yalowitz spoke of the “Soviet legacy” and its effects on generations in the region. Whereas Central and Eastern European states had a stronger incentive to try to grasp democracy and market economies, ex-Soviet states have no such promise and are now in “limbo,” left to commit to reform with only the promise of closer trade relations. Leaving Ukraine and Georgia out of NATO, for example, proved to be a factor leading to the 2008 Georgian war, Yalowitz claimed. He further contended, “we underplay the influence of the EU and overplay Russia’s hand,” especially considering Russia’s weak growth projections, the increased competition it faces in the energy sector, and its alienation from Western Europe. Yalowitz thus recommended that the EU promote education, civil society and travel within EaP areas. With the EU’s values still so attractive, as proven by the current demands of Ukrainian civil society, this first step should be a no-brainer. Collectively, the panel agreed that creating a united CSDP policy is a process. The panel supported extending EU membership to the EaP, and looked favorably on a more active Germany, which they believed would help the EU react more quickly to conflicts. Finally, they called for increased diplomacy in order to reach civil society in contested areas. They all agreed that there are grave security concerns facing the EU, whether regarding the Caucusus, North Africa, or the Middle East, but are optimistic that the EU’s member states will be able project a more proactive EU presence abroad.
The second student panel of the day tackled a region that is very much in the news these days, and which had been extensively discussed throughout the day. Under the title “Is it a Zero-Sum Game?: The Contest for Influence over Eastern Europe and Central Asia,” Jana Vránková, Hasmik Grigoryan, Noah Solomon, Tomasz Dziadkowiec and Greta Butaviciute discussed the prospects for the EU's foreign policy in the post-Soviet states of Eastern Europe and the Caucasus.

Emphasizing the strategic role that Ukraine plays for both the European Union and Russia especially in terms of oil and gas, Ms. Vránková contextualized the current situation in Ukraine with its origins in the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Since this period, Ukraine has been divided into two camps: one pro-Russian and the other pro-Western. After the Orange Revolution in 2004, Ukraine turned more pro-European, but while President Yanukovych has been in charge, the country has built stronger relations with Russia. In order to have a more secure supply of energy and a more stable Ukrainian polity, Ms. Vránková recommended that the European Union negotiate more forcefully over Ukraine, develop standardized relations with Russia, and embark on a continuous and consistent effort to integrate Ukraine.

Ms. Grigoryan continued the discussion by stressing the value that the EU’s Eastern Partnership could provide to nations in Eastern Europe and the Caucasus. According to Ms. Grigoryan, the Eastern Partnership could enable these countries to develop societies where the rule of law plays a larger role and to build stronger and more extensive relations with Europe. Ms. Grigoryan expressed the opinion that the European Union should have been much more active with its partner countries and recommended that the drive to integrate these countries into Europe be intensified. The European Union must show stronger signs to these countries if they expect their support.

Mr. Solomon took a more power-politics approach to the relationship between the EU and Russia. He focused on Russia’s insistence on maintaining its sphere of influence and its underlying fears of potentially being encircled by unfriendly or hostile neighbors. Mr. Solomon
explained the influence of Russia in Eastern Europe and Central Asia and its attempts to forge a Customs Union as Russia's attempt to reassert its hegemony in these regions. According to Mr. Solomon, any gain by the European Union in Russia's vicinity is seen as a loss in Russia. He explained that in any given negotiation, it only requires one party to view the process as a zero-sum confrontation to make it so, in a sort of self-fulfilling prophecy. If the European Union expects its standing to improve in these regions, Mr. Solomon suggests that it reevaluate its strategy in light of these hard facts.

Mr. Dziadkowiec and Ms. Butaviciute co-presented a policy paper on Moldova's breakaway territory of Transnistria. The potential for this frozen conflict to thaw remains significant, and the risk of hostilities breaking out is especially high given the current situation in Ukraine. Mr. Dziadkowiec and Ms. Butaviciute suggested that Moldova sign a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with the European Union and engage themselves with the Eastern Partnership. Additional priorities for Moldova should include weaning themselves off Russian oil and energy dependency as well as expelling the Russian troops that are stationed on their land, which limit Moldova's sovereignty.
Speaker Biographies

Keynote Address

Richard D. Kauzlarich served as National Intelligence Officer for Europe on the National Intelligence Council from 2003 to 2011. Among other issues Ambassador Kauzlarich was responsible for analyzing European energy security, the role of Turkey as an energy hub, and energy relations with the Caspian region. He served as United States Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina and to Azerbaijan. He also worked as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the Bureau of European Affairs from 1991-93, responsible for relations with the former Soviet Union and economic ties with the European Union. Ambassador Kauzlarich received his A.A. from Black Hawk College, his B.A. from Valparaiso University, and M.A.s from Indiana University and the University of Michigan.

Expert Panel 1: *A Continent of Many Languages Learns to Speak with One Voice*

F. Stephen Larrabee holds the Distinguished Chair in European Security at the RAND Corporation. Before joining RAND, Dr. Larrabee served as vice president and director of studies of the Institute of East–West Security Studies in New York from 1983 to 1989. Dr. Larrabee also served on the U.S. National Security Council staff in the White House as a specialist on Soviet–East European affairs and East-West political-military relations. He is an author of several monographs and articles on Turkey, Ukraine, ESDP and the Balkans. Dr. Larrabee has taught at Columbia, Cornell, New York University, Georgetown and others. He is an alumnus of Amherst College and received his Ph.D. in political science from Columbia University.

Jean-François Pactet is a visiting fellow with the Europe Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). An experienced French diplomat, he served previously in Brussels as counselor in the French permanent mission to NATO from 2009 to 2012. His areas of research include European affairs and transatlantic security issues, nuclear deterrence, missile defense, nonproliferation issues, cyber defense, and NATO’s smart defense. Prior to his work in Brussels, he served as deputy spokesperson in the French Foreign Ministry, with responsibilities for public diplomacy, media outreach for North Africa and the Middle East, as well as Schengen and immigration issues. He is an alumnus of the French Ecole Nationale d’Administration and of the French Institute of Higher National Defense Studies.

François Rivasseau is the Deputy Head of the EU Delegation to the United States. Prior to joining the Delegation, he served as the Deputy Head of Diplomatic Mission at the French Embassy to the United States. Dr. Rivasseau has spent much of his career working on disarmament, security, and multilateral affairs. Following an early tour at the French Embassy in Colombia, he served at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and at the French Mission to the Conference on Disarmament. Later, he was the Spokesperson of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Chairman of the Geneva Forum. He has studied at the Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Bordeaux, École Nationale d’Administration (ENA) in Paris and University of Bordeaux III. He received his Ph.D. in law from the University of Bordeaux I.
Expert Panel 2: Greater than the Sum of its Parts? Taking the Long View on the Common Foreign and Security Policy

Christopher Chivvis is a senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation and adjunct professor at the Johns Hopkins, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS). His research interests include European and Eurasian security, NATO, military interventions, and nation-building. Dr. Chivvis has served in the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Policy where he worked on Eurasian security issues and NATO-Russia cooperation. He has held research positions at the French Institute for International Relations (Ifri) in Paris and at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) in Berlin, and taught graduate courses at Johns Hopkins University, New York University, and Sciences Po in Paris. Dr. Chivvis received his Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins, SAIS.

Angela Stent is the Director of the Center for Eurasian, Russian and East European Studies and Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University. She is also a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-chairs its Hewett Forum on Post-Soviet Affairs. Previously, she served as National Intelligence Officer for Russia and Eurasia at the National Intelligence Council and in the Office of Policy Planning at the U.S. Department of State. She has also been a member of the advisory panel for NATO’s Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. Dr. Stent’s academic work focuses on the triangular political and economic relationship between the United States, Russia and Europe. Dr. Stent received her B.A. from Cambridge University, her MSc. with distinction from the London School of Economics and Political Science and her M.A. and Ph.D. from Harvard University.

Kenneth Yalowitz is an Adjunct Professor at Georgetown University. He served as a U.S. Foreign Service Officer for 36 years and was twice an ambassador: to Belarus from 1994-1997 and to Georgia from 1998-2001. He also served in Moscow, The Hague and the U.S. Mission to NATO in Brussels. He was chosen for the Ambassador Robert Frasure award for peacemaking and conflict prevention in 2000 for his work preventing spillover of the Chechen war into Georgia. Ambassador Yalowitz directed the Dickey Center for International Understanding at Dartmouth College from 2003-11. He has been adjunct professor at Georgetown University, Stanford University in Washington and Washington & Lee University, and diplomat-in-residence at American and George Mason Universities. Ambassador Yalowitz received his B.A. from the University of Wisconsin and M.A. and MPhil from Columbia University.

Moderators

Dieter Dettke is an Adjunct Professor at Georgetown University teaching courses on European Security and Russia. Dr. Dettke served as the U.S. Representative and Executive Director of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Washington from 1985 until 2006 managing a comprehensive program of Transatlantic cooperation. In 2006 he joined the German Marshall Fund of the United States as a Transatlantic Fellow and from September 2006 to June 2007 he was a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. He studied Law and Political Science in Bonn and Berlin, Germany and Strasbourg, France and was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Washington in Seattle in 1967/68.
Kathleen (Kelly) E. Smith is Visiting Professor of Post-Communist Studies in the Edmund Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. A specialist in Russian and East European politics, she received her Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley. She has published two books on the intersection of politics and history—Remembering Stalin's Victims: Popular Memory and the End of the USSR and Mythmaking in the New Russia: Politics and Memory in the Yeltsin Era. Dr. Smith is currently writing a social, political and cultural history of the year 1956 in Russia.

Student Panelists

Greta Butaviciute (Lithuania) is a student at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where she is focusing on economics and politics of Eastern Europe. Before coming to Washington D.C., Greta spent several years in Italy studying economics at Bocconi University. She completed internships in Brussels and her home country, exploring areas ranging from communications to transport innovation. Greta is fascinated by Eastern European cultures, religion, and the region’s transformation.

Volha Charnysh (Belarus) is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Government at Harvard University and a Fellow of the Program on Global Society and Security at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs. Her dissertation examines the long-term effects of WWII ethnic and demographic shifts on political attitudes and behavior, based on evidence from Central and Eastern Europe. Related research interests are migration, issue framing, and the political economy of the post-Soviet space. In her spare time, she writes for Belarus Digest, a non-partisan news portal on Belarusian politics. She also draws political cartoons for publications and international events.

Tomasz Dziadkowiec (Poland/USA) is a current second year M.A. candidate in European & Eurasian Studies Program at Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS). Tom was born in Poland and immigrated to the United States in the early 90s. Since earning his B.A. from UCLA, Tom has lived and/or worked in South Korea, Belgium, Italy and Chile. Tom speaks Polish, English, Spanish and a small amount of Russian. His research interests include transatlantic economic relations and European political economy, especially in Central/Eastern Europe. He is also an avid kayaker, runner and a huge aviation buff.

Hasmik Grigoryan (Armenia) is currently studying at the Graduate School for Social Research of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences. She has finished her M.A. at the Yerevan State University, Faculty of International Relations and Diplomacy. She also works as a program manager at Yerevan based Analytical Centre on Globalization and Regional Cooperation and as an expert at the YSU Centre for European Studies. Her research interests include Armenia-EU relations, Eastern Partnership, Armenian-Turkish relations, conflict resolution and trust-building.
Elnur Ismayilov (Azerbaijan) is a Ph.D. candidate in political science at Westphalian Wilhelms University of Münster in Germany. He has received his B.A. degree in International Relations from the Baku State University, Azerbaijan and M.A. degree in Peace and Conflict Studies from the Otto von Guericke University of Magdeburg, Germany. His teaching and research interests cover foreign policies of the United States and Russia in the post-Soviet countries, EU’s Neighborhood Policy and Eastern Partnership Policy, Turkish and Iranian foreign policies in the post-Soviet region, and others. He has research and work experiences from the Subcommittee on Human Rights of the European Parliament in Brussels, Belgium.

Marta Mylyan (Ukraine) is a Masters student of Economics at the University of Konstanz in Germany. Previously, she received a degree in International Economic Relations from Ivan Franko National University of Lviv in Ukraine. She is interested in financial markets and their influence on economic development as well as economic and political processes within Eastern Europe. Marta has gathered professional experience at State Agency for Investment and National Projects of Ukraine in Kyiv and at Deutsche Börse AG in Frankfurt am Main. She enjoys volunteering, travelling and learning foreign languages.

Jacob Schrot (Germany) is a graduate student in Transatlantic Relations at the European Centers of Excellence of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (USA), University of Bath (UK) and Humboldt University Berlin (Germany). His research interests include the implementation of NATO’s concepts of “burden-sharing” and “smart defense,” the “Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership” (TTIP) and the “Pivot to Asia.” Underlining his dedication to the transatlantic partnership, he founded and leads the Young Transatlantic Initiative, which seeks to foster understanding and cooperation among the younger generations on both sides of the Atlantic and counts more than 200 members in 7 countries.

Noah Solomon (USA) is a graduate student in the Sam Nunn School of International Affairs at the Georgia Institute of Technology. His classwork and research focuses on international security, energy security, and energy policy issues and he recently presented a paper on the biofuels program of the United States Navy at the Georgia Tech Research and Innovation Conference. Noah has a very diverse professional background, having worked in research and analysis capacities for Senator Saxby Chambliss’s office, Herman Cain’s presidential campaign, and the Carter Center in Atlanta.

Jana Vránková (Czech Republic) is a first-year Ph.D. student at the University of Economics in Prague, where she also earned her Bachelor and Masters diploma. She studies international trade and focuses on shale gas and the economic implications of its use for the United States and the EU. She also works for the E.ON group, a global provider of specialized energy solutions based in Germany.
Organizing Committee Members

From left: Rukmani Bhatia, Neil Walther, Jakub Hlávka, Jacqueline Viselli, Joshua Dill, Stephanie Shoemaker

Concluding Remarks

The 2014 Transatlantic Policy Symposium represents another milestone in a long line of major conferences organized by the graduate students in the Master of Arts in German and European Studies program at Georgetown (the 18th, to be exact). At the same time, it is something entirely new -- a successful attempt to bring students, scholars, and active practitioners together with an eye to generating timely, comprehensive analyses of the challenges Europe faces as a global actor. And as attendees at the conference witnessed for themselves, the mix of panelists grappled with the theme of Europe's growing role in foreign and security policy in its near abroad, and provided valuable insights into historical context, geopolitical concerns, the contest for influence and resulting implications for the European Union and its neighborhood.

This conference allowed for a vibrant exchange of ideas and perspectives across the generations, and we sincerely thank our panelists, as well as the many students, faculty experts, and practitioners in the audience, for their contributions. We hope the event will encourage a lasting dialogue across the Atlantic, throughout Europe, and all points East.

Prof. Jeffrey Anderson
This year’s Graduate Student Conference was generously supported by the BMW Center for German and European Studies, the American Consortium on European Union Studies, the CGES Alumni Association, and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).