



**ECPS**  
EUROPEAN CENTER for  
POPULISM STUDIES

# ECPS-CASE COMPETITION

Europe Between Oceans:  
The Future of the EU Trade  
Between the Atlantic and  
the Indo-Pacific



## ABOUT

Case competitions are a type of event in which teams of students or professionals compete against each other to develop and pitch solutions to a business, public affairs, political, or international relations problem. Teams are given a limited amount of time to research, analyze, develop, and pitch their solutions.

## Real-world Problems

Case competitions are based on contemporary and relevant real-world problems that challenge participants to analyze and find innovative solutions.

## Teamwork

Participants are divided into teams to work together on solving the case, allowing them to enhance their teamwork skills.

## Expert Assessment

The proposals for the case competition will be evaluated by a panel of distinguished scholars and experts in the field based on a set of criteria such as creativity, feasibility, and presentation skills.

**SAVE THE DATE!**  
**6 - 10 July 2026**

**CONTACT US**  
**+32 24658318**

# OUR MAIN GOALS

Our main goal in carrying out a case competition in the field of political science and international relations is to provide a platform for students and professionals to showcase their analytical and problem-solving skills while addressing real-world issues relevant to the field. The competition will force participants to think critically and creatively as they research and develop solutions to a complex political or international relations problem.

The case competition will serve as a valuable learning experience for participants, helping them develop critical skills in high demand in today's fast-paced and ever-changing landscape. By contributing to the competition, participants will gain a deeper understanding of the complexities of global and European politics and international relations. They will be better prepared for their future careers. Participants will be able to apply their knowledge and skills in a competitive setting and will be evaluated by a panel of experts in the field.



**To Develop and Improve  
Participants' Analytical and  
Problem-solving Skills**



**To Boost Participants'  
Professional Networks**

# PRACTICALITIES

## KEY CONSIDERATIONS

- **Understanding the case:** You should fully understand the case, including the background, key stakeholders, and any constraints that may affect the proposed solution.
- **Using your analytical & problem-solving skills:** You will need to put into action your theoretical knowledge to develop creative and feasible solutions to address a complex real-life problem.
- **Presenting a feasible solution:** You should aim to present policy options/recommendations/solutions that are creative, feasible, and practical.
- **Teamwork:** Working as a team is critical to success; you should work efficiently together to achieve the best results.
- **Learning and Development:** Come with an open mind and a willingness to learn new ideas and perspectives to deepen your understanding of the subject matter.

## AGENDA OF THE WEEK

03.07.2026 Friday 12:00 - 13:00 CET	Introduction to the Case Competition and Delivery of Case Instructions and Questions
06.07.2026 Monday 12:00 - 13:00 CET	Definition of the key issues and how to deal with them. Task Distribution among the group members.
07.07.2026 Tuesday 12:00 - 13:00 CET	Collection of all information and data to structure the final proposal.
08.07.2026 Wednesday 12:00 - 13:00 CET	Analysis of the gatherings and development of the solution.
09.07.2026 Thursday 12:00 - 13:00 CET	Preparation of the final presentation.
10.07.2026 Friday 12:00 - 14:00 CET	Performance of the Pitches. Assessment and Announcement of the Winners.  Closing Remarks by the ECPS.

## ESSENTIAL MATERIALS

Remember to bring a **laptop** or **tablet** (participants will use their own devices to work on the case, access resources, and present their solutions), and **presentation materials**, such as slides and an active account in Google Drive

## PRESENTATION FORMAT

The final output will be a presentation. Each team will have 4 minutes to present their ideas and proposals. Presentations must be created using provided Power Point template and will be reflected on the shared screen during the final session.

After the Summer School, participants will also have the opportunity to further develop their work into a policy paper for publication on the ECPS website.

## MOVING FORWARD

On the first day of the Summer School, ECPS will provide you with an information pack that includes documents and sources that outline the case and its context. This collection of articles will act as the basis of your research towards a policy solution.

# CASE COMPETITION SCENARIO

## What is the case?

In this case competition, students will act as policy analysts, counsellors, or trade advisors within the European Commission, specifically in the Directorate-General for Trade (DG TRADE). Each group will be assigned one of six key EU trade partners: China, India, the United States, Canada, Japan, or South Korea.

The task is to develop concrete, feasible, and policy-ready recommendations to guide the European Union's trade and economic relations with the assigned partner country. Proposals should be realistic and designed for potential implementation by the European Commission, taking into account both external global dynamics and internal EU constraints. Special attention should be given to the growing influence of populist pressures on trade policy decisions within the EU and in partner countries, as well as to the increasing role of geoeconomic competition and shifting geopolitical alignments in shaping international trade relations.

## Your proposal must:

As a group, focus on a specific and concrete aspect of the EU's trade relationship with your assigned partner country, such as an ongoing negotiation, a critical sector, a trade dispute, or a strategic dependency that requires policy action. Draw on real and current EU trade policy challenges — such as the the implementation of the EU-India Free Trade Agreement following the conclusion of negotiations, EU-US tensions over subsidies and the Inflation Reduction Act, EU-China economic coercion and de-risking, or EU-Japan and EU-South Korea supply chain cooperation — to ground your analysis in the present realities of EU trade policy. Propose feasible recommendations that the EU can realistically adopt within its institutional framework, accounting for the role of populist forces and domestic political constraints on both sides, and explain how your proposals remain viable despite these pressures. Finally, clearly argue the added value of your recommendations for the EU in strategic, economic, or geopolitical terms, and why your approach is preferable to the current EU policy.

## Guidelines for Research

- Try to grasp the general picture of EU trade policy and understand how your assigned partner country fits within the broader Atlantic and Indo-Pacific strategic context.
- Understand the partner country's reaction to EU trade policies and measures — examine how they have responded to existing agreements, disputes, or EU regulatory demands.
- Discuss the shortcomings of the current EU trade relationship with your assigned country and their repercussions on EU internal politics, the partner country's stance, and global trade dynamics.
- Consider how populist forces on both sides shape and constrain trade negotiations — examine how domestic political pressures in both the EU and the partner country affect what is realistically achievable.
- While drafting your proposals, explain why the current approach needs to change and what added value your recommendations bring for both the EU and the partner country.
- Indicate your resources at the end of the presentation. The minimum requirement is to benefit from at least 15 resources.

# THE TOPIC

## Europe between Oceans: The Future of the EU Trade between the Atlantic and the Indo Pacific.

*This literature review will examine the shift from liberal, WTO-based trade policies towards strategic autonomy and economic security, the balance between promoting EU values and protecting economic and geopolitical interests, the evolution of trade relations with the United States amid protectionism and trade tensions, the expansion of trade partnerships in the Indo-Pacific through bilateral agreements and diversification strategies, and the management of cooperation, competition, and de-risking in relations with China*

### Intro

The European Union (EU) is the world's largest trading bloc. For the past three decades, its trade strategy has been guided by a framework grounded in World Trade Organization (WTO) multilateralism, transatlantic cooperation, and liberal economic principles. However, this framework is now facing increasing pressure (Hoekman, 2020; Meunier & Nicolaïdis, 2006). A range of economic and geopolitical developments has prompted this reassessment, including renewed US protectionism (Ikenberry, 2018), the economic effects of COVID-19 pandemic (Baldwin & Evenett, 2020), China's increasing assertiveness (Garcia Herrero, 2019), the geopolitical consequences of the war in Ukraine (Borrell, 2022) and the trade and energy disruptions associated with the 2026 Iran conflict (Matthijs, 2026). Together, these developments have encouraged Brussels to reconsider its trade partnerships and the conditions under which it engages in international trade (Leonard et al., 2019), and the language of EU trade policy has changed accordingly. The risk of disruption to the Strait of Hormuz has further underscored the EU's exposure to external energy shocks. Approximately 20% of global oil and liquefied natural gas supplies transit through this strategic waterway (Tagliapietra, 2026). As a result, calls for greater strategic autonomy in both trade and energy policy have intensified (IDDRI,

While case competitions are widely used and popular in consulting, finance, and risk management, we firmly believe they can be effective tools for putting theory into practice in the fields of political science and international relations. Thus, ECPS has decided to launch the ECPS Case Competition Series, which will focus on different topics in the field of populism studies.

Our research has highlighted the numerous potential benefits of designing and hosting a case competition in this field, and we are confident that this series will be a valuable experience for all involved.

2026). Terms such as 'open strategic autonomy' (European Commission, 2021a), 'de-risking' (European Commission, 2023), and 'geo economics' (Blackwill & Harris 2016) have quickly moved from academic discussions into official policy documents. This shift suggests that Brussels increasingly views trade as a matter of security as well as economy.

This securitised turn also reflects the broader resurgence of populism within Europe. As in the United States, the rise of nationalist and populist movements within EU member states has put pressure on Brussels' traditionally liberal, multilateral trade orientation. Some scholars argue that the EU's pursuit of strategic autonomy is partly a defensive response to the erosion of the liberal international order by illiberal and populist actors, both within and beyond Europe (Kotzur, 2025). This points to an internal normative tension. The EU presents itself as a value-based trade actor, conditioning market access on respect for human rights and democratic norms. Yet several member states have moved toward illiberal governance, weakening the coherence of the EU's external normative claims (Paris, 2022). The EU's trade relations with autocratic or illiberal third states raise a similar problem. Scholars describe this as a paradox between the EU's strategic and commercial interests and its stated normative commitments, since human rights conditionality clauses are applied inconsistently, depending more on a partner state's strategic importance than its human rights record (Meissner & McKenzie, 2019).

Learn more about populism on the website of ECPS:



## **The EU's Role as a Trade Actor**

Scholars have long debated whether EU trade policy is mainly driven by the promotion of values and rules or by economic interests (Manners 2002; Meunier & Nicolaidis, 2006). According to Manners' concept of 'Normative Power of Europe', the EU's unique political identity enables it to influence international norms. In trade policy, this means that EU trade agreements aim not only to reduce tariffs but also to promote regulatory standards, human rights, and environmental protection (De Ville & Siles-Brugge, 2015; Van den Putte & Orbie, 2015). This view of the EU as a normative actor has faced significant criticism. Meunier and Nicolaidis (2006) argue that the EU gains influence mainly through access to its larger market rather than through the promotion of values. Similarly, social and environmental provisions in EU trade agreements often lack strong enforcement mechanisms, limiting their practical impact (Van den Putte & Orbie, 2015). More recently, Meunier (2022) observed a 'geopolitical awakening' in EU trade policy with Brussels increasingly treating trade agreements as a tool for advancing strategic interests rather than only economic or normative objectives. This change is reflected in the European Commission's (2021 a) Trade Policy Review which introduced the concept of 'open strategic autonomy'. This approach aims to reduce the EU's dependence on critical external partners while maintaining an open trading system (Leonard et al., 2019). A concrete institutional expression of this geopolitical awakening is the Anti Coercion Instrument (ACI), adopted by the EU in 2023, which authorises the bloc to impose countermeasures against third countries that use trade or economic tools to pressure the EU or its member states into changing their policy positions (Freudlsperger & Meunier 2024). The ACI represents a significant change in EU trade governance, moving from a mainly defensive regulatory approach to one that recognizes the potential use of economic interdependence as a tool of coercion and aims to prevent its misuse (Blackwill & Harris, 2016).

The adoption of the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009 also reshaped EU trade policy by giving the European Parliament greater authority over trade agreements. While this increased democratic oversight, it also made the approval process more complex and raised concerns about the EU's ability to act quickly in trade negotiations (Ripoll Servent, 2014).

## **EU Trade Policy vis-à-vis the US**

The EU and the US, to this day, represent each other's largest trading partners by far, with a total of €1.7 trillion trade in goods and services as of 2025. However, the trade policy of the EU vis-à-vis its transatlantic ally has undergone important evolutions. Since the EU's shift towards bilateralism under the 2006 Global Europe strategy, transatlantic relations were expected to deepen through the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) (European Commission, 2013). However, the negotiations, launched in 2013, were ultimately abandoned by the Trump's administration (Jungmittag & Welfens, 2020). This means that, despite being each other's main trading partner, the EU and the US currently have no dedicated free trade agreement between them. Moreover, Trump's use of trade as a tool for political coercion has been perceived by the European Union as a form of "weaponisation of interdependence", further straining transatlantic relations (Rühlig & Teer, 2025). It is no coincidence that specific Trump's practices, such as the implementation of tariffs on steel and aluminium, catalysed the Anti-Coercion Instrument's development (Freudlsperger & Meunier, 2024). Recently, the Thurnberry Agreement appeared to bring a degree of stability to transatlantic relations by averting the risk of a full-fledged trade war following Trump's imposition of "reciprocal tariffs" in 2025. However, the agreement rests on fragile foundations that reflect broader tensions between the two allies (Matthews, 2025). These tensions have been further exacerbated by the lack of coordination in the Asian region, with the EU favouring open commercial trade routes and avoiding to decisively side with one party in the US-China rivalry.

## **EU Trade Policy in Asia**

### ***Asia-Pacific Region***

The evolution of EU trade relations with the Asia-Pacific region has also been characterised by a transition from rules-based multilateralism towards a strategy of bilateral agreements, and more recently to "open strategic autonomy" in order to counter geoeconomic disorder. The peculiarity of this region is that it represents the primary arena for this geoeconomic turn, considering that all major global trade powers -

the United States, China and the European Union - are actively promoting their interests in opposition to one another (Adriaensen & Postnikov, 2022). Initially, the EU treated the Asia-Pacific region as an homogenous bloc, and only with the Global Europe strategy did it recognise the need for individual trade negotiations and for a more comprehensive trade liberalisation that went beyond simple tariff removals (Bungenberg & Hazarika, 2017; Park, 2017). That is why, for example, negotiations on an EU–ASEAN investment agreement launched in 2007 were paused in 2009 in favour of bilateral negotiations. The first Free Trade Agreement (FTA) to inaugurate this new generation of trade agreements was signed with South Korea in 2011, serving as a blueprint for future FTAs (Adriaensen & Postnikov 2022). As of today, the EU managed to seal FTAs with several Asia-Pacific countries - such as Singapore, Vietnam, or Japan<sup>1</sup>- and is negotiating with countries such as Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines. The most recent developments are represented by the successful conclusions of trade negotiations with Australia and India in 2026. The latter is particularly significant because negotiations with India had started in 2007 and were relaunched only in 2022 after years of stalemate, driven by the threat of American protectionism and US imposition of sanctions on India. This deal is a demonstration that the EU's trade diversification strategy can actually deliver results (Hinz et al., 2026).

## **China**

The European Union trade policy towards China is defined by a complex framework. In fact, Beijing is perceived by the EU simultaneously as a cooperation partner, an economic competitor, and a systemic rival (European Commission, 2019). Economically, this translates into a relationship of interdependence between the two countries, with China being the EU's second-largest trading partner for trade in goods alone, despite significant asymmetries in market access and a persistent trade deficit for the Union. The EU and China even reached an agreement in principle in 2020 on a Comprehensive Agreement on Investment (CAI), which would have addressed long-standing grievances of the EU while granting market access, fair competition and sustainable development for both countries (Adriaensen & Postnikov, 2022). However, the European Parliament suspended its ratification in 2021, following concerns over human rights violations in Xinjiang (Noesselt, 2022). Yet, European concerns regarding China are not limited to domestic human rights violations, but also extend to its growing assertiveness abroad. In response to this, the EU has championed the concept of “de-risking”, that is reducing dependencies on China for raw materials and technology without fully severing economic ties (European Commission, 2023). Meanwhile, as the US-China economic rivalry intensifies, posing risks to European competitiveness, the EU has stated its intention to avoid “systematic confrontation” and to exercise strategic autonomy (Aggarwal & Kenney, 2023). Nevertheless, it is also important to understand that the European Union's approach is characterised by internal fragmentation, and the various EU member states are defining their distinct positions within the Sino-American competition (Noesselt, 2022).

## **Conclusion**

Taken together, the literature indicates a significant transformation in the EU's trade policy. The Union has increasingly moved beyond a predominantly liberal, market-oriented approach and now views trade as an instrument of geopolitical influence and economic security. This shift is evident in its evolving relations with the United States, its diversification toward Asia-Pacific partners, and its more cautious stance toward China. At the same time, the rise of populist and illiberal politics, both within the EU and among key trading partners, has complicated the Union's ability to maintain a consistent value-based trade agenda. As demonstrated by the suspension of the EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment, strategic, economic, and normative objectives frequently come into tension. Consequently, contemporary EU trade policy is best understood as the product of intersecting economic, political, and security considerations in an increasingly fragmented international environment.

1.The Trade Agreement with Japan is formally classified as an Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA), although in practice it functions in a way similar to the EU's newer-generation free trade agreements (FTAs).

# REFERENCES

- Adriaensen, J., & Postnikov, E. (Eds.). (2022). A geo-economic turn in trade policy? EU trade agreements in the Asia-Pacific. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81281-2>
- Aggarwal, V. K., & Kenney, M. A. T. (Eds.). (2023). Great power competition and middle power strategies: Economic statecraft in the Asia-Pacific region. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-38024-2>
- Baldwin, R., & Evenett, S. J. (Eds.) (2020). COVID-19 and trade policy: Why turning inward won't work. CEPR .
- Blackwill, R. D., & Harris, J. M. (2016). War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1c84cr7>
- Bungenberg, M., & Hazarika, A. (2017). The European Union's trade and investment policy in Asia: New challenges and opportunities in a changing global environment—or following individual roadmaps. *Asia Europe Journal*, 15(4), 377–397. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10308-017-0485-2>
- Borrell, J. (2022, March 3). The future of Europe is being defined now. European External Action Service. [https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/future-europe-being-defined-now\\_en](https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/future-europe-being-defined-now_en)
- European Commission (2019, March 12). EU–China: A strategic outlook – Commission and HR/VP contribution to the European Council (21–22 March 2019). [https://commission.europa.eu/publications/eu-china-strategic-outlook-commission-and-hrvp-contribution-european-council-21-22-march-2019\\_en](https://commission.europa.eu/publications/eu-china-strategic-outlook-commission-and-hrvp-contribution-european-council-21-22-march-2019_en)
- European Commission. (2013, February 13). European Union and United States to launch negotiations for a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (MEMO/13/95). [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/memo\\_13\\_95](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/memo_13_95)
- European Commission. (2021 a). Trade policy review: An open, sustainable and assertive trade policy (COM(2021) 66 final). European Commission. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0066>
- European Commission. (2023, March 30). Speech by President von der Leyen on EU–China relations (SPEECH/23/2063). [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/speech\\_23\\_2063](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/speech_23_2063)
- European Commission. (n.d.). Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Retrieved June 8, 2026. [https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/eu-trade-relationships-country-and-region/countries-and-regions/association-south-east-asian-nations-asean\\_en](https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/eu-trade-relationships-country-and-region/countries-and-regions/association-south-east-asian-nations-asean_en)
- European Commission. (n.d.). China. Retrieved June 8, 2026. [https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/eu-trade-relationships-country-and-region/countries-and-regions/china\\_en](https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/eu-trade-relationships-country-and-region/countries-and-regions/china_en)
- European Commission. (n.d.). United States. European Commission. Retrieved June 8, 2026, from [https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/eu-trade-relationships-country-and-region/countries-and-regions/united-states\\_en](https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/eu-trade-relationships-country-and-region/countries-and-regions/united-states_en)
- Freudlsperger, C., and Meunier, S. (2024) When Foreign Policy Becomes Trade Policy: The EU's Anti-Coercion Instrument. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 62: 1063–1079. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13593>.

# REFERENCES

- Garcia Herrero, A. (2019). Europe in the midst of China–US strategic economic competition: what are the European Union’s options? *Journal of Chinese Economic and Business Studies*, 17(4), 403–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14765284.2019.1706292>
- Hinz, J., Langhammer, R. J., Mahlkow, H., & Thakur, V. (2026). The EU–India trade deal: Strategic diversification in an era of uncertainty (Kiel Policy Brief No. 202). Kiel Institute for the World Economy. <https://www.kielinstitut.de/fileadmin/Dateiverwaltung/IfW-Publications/fis-import/82e3902e-610e-46e7-9176-83e37af0d5ab-KPB202.pdf>
- Hoekman, B. M. (2020). Trade wars and the world trade organization : causes, consequences, and change. *Asian Economic Policy Review*, 15(1). <https://hdl.handle.net/1814/66050>
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2018). The end of liberal international order? *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), 94(1), 7–23. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48587221>
- IDDR. (2026, March 9). Iran war: A turning point for European energy transition policies? <https://www.iddri.org/en/publications-and-events/blog-post/iran-war-turning-point-european-energy-transition-policies>
- Jungmittag, A., & Welfens, P. J. J. (2020). EU–US trade post-Trump perspectives: TTIP aspects related to foreign direct investment and innovation. *International Economics and Economic Policy*, 17(2), 259–294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10368-020-00459-1>
- Kotzur, M. Europe’s quest for strategic autonomy in response to Trumpism. *Glob. Public Policy Gov.* 5, 457–466 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43508-025-00133-9>
- Leonard, M., Pisani-Ferry, J., Ribakova, E., Shapiro, J., & Wolf, G. (2019). Redefining Europe's economic sovereignty (Policy Contribution Issue No. 9/2019). Bruegel. <https://www.bruegel.org/policy-brief/redefining-europes-economic-sovereignty>
- Matthews, A. (2025, December 27). Navigating the EU–U.S. trade relationship . CAP Reform. <https://capreform.eu/navigating-the-eu-u-s-trade-relationship/>
- Meunier, S & Nicolaïdis, K (2006) The European Union as a conflicted trade power, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13:6, 906-925 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13501760600838623>
- Matthijs, M. (2026, March 6). Europe's disjointed response to the U.S.–Israeli war with Iran. Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/articles/europes-disjointed-response-to-the-u-s-israeli-war-with-iran>
- Meissner, K. L., & McKenzie, L. (2019). The paradox of human rights conditionality in EU trade policy: when strategic interests drive policy outcomes. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(9), 1273–1291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2018.1526203>
- Park, S. (2017). The new politics of trade negotiations: The Case of the EUKorea FTA. *Journal of European Integration*, 39(7), 827–841. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2017.1371707>
- Paris, R. (2022). European populism and the return of ‘illiberal sovereignty’: A case-study of Hungary. *International Affairs*, 98(2), 529–547. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iia004>

# REFERENCES

- Rühlig, T., & Teer, J. (2025). *Resilience by design: A new EU foreign economic policy to counter global disorder*. European Union Institute for Security Studies. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep70603>
- Servent, A. R. (2014). The role of the European Parliament in international negotiations after Lisbon. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21(4), 568–586. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2014.886614>
- Tagliapietra, S. (2026, March 2). *How will the Iran conflict hit European energy markets?* Bruegel. <https://www.bruegel.org/first-glance/how-will-iran-conflict-hit-european-energy-markets>
- Van den Putte, Lore & Orbie, Jan.(2015) 'EU Bilateral Trade Agreements and the Surprising Rise of Labour Provisions'. *The International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations* 31, no. 3 ,263–284. Kluwer Law International BV, The Netherlands.
- Ville, F. d., & Siles-Brügge, G. (2016). *T.T.I.P. : the truth about the transatlantic trade and investment partnership*. Polity Press.



ECPS

EUROPEAN CENTER for  
POPULISM STUDIES

Connect With Us!

155 Wetstraat/RuedelaLoi 1040

Brussels, Belgium

+32 24658318

[www.populismstudies.org](http://www.populismstudies.org)

[ecps@populismstudies.org](mailto:ecps@populismstudies.org)