



**SECOND TAORMINA/MESSINA CONFERENCE<sup>1</sup>**

**18<sup>TH</sup> – 21<sup>ST</sup> JUNE 2021**

**THE FUTURE OF EUROPE IN A POST PANDEMIC WORLD  
(ORGANIZED BY VISION AND TAOBUK FESTIVAL)**

**LA METAMORFOSI DI EUROPA<sup>2</sup>**

**THE MANIFESTO AND CONFERENCE FOLLOW UP**



---

<sup>1</sup> The first day of the three days conference was hosted by the University of Messina. We thank the Rector, Professor Salvatore Cuzzocrea, the Pro Rector, Professor Giovanni Moschella, the faculty and the staff for the support.

<sup>2</sup> Europa is the mythological Phoenician princess whose seduction from JOVIS gave birth to the kingdom of CRETE and to the idea of the WEST as civilization.

## PLENARY SESSIONS

### THE OTHER NEXT GENERATION EU AND ... REFORMING REGIONAL COHESION POLICIES

Introduction: Francesco Grillo

Chair: John Hooper.

Discussants: Alberto Bramanti, Mikel Landabaso.

Much of the debate on the response of the Union to the Pandemic crisis has been absorbed by the implications of the new 750 billion EURO package called Next Generation EU (NGEU – see the conclusions of Working Group 2). However, NGEU is only a part of a much larger multiannual financial framework whose total size is of 1,850 billion EURO to be spent in 2021 – 2027 programming period (which is almost twice the budget of 959 billion EURO that were made available to the Commission for the previous 2014 – 2020 period). One third of the budget of the Commission is dedicated to Cohesion Policies to be spent mostly in less developed Regions (like the ones of South Italy including Sicily) with the objective to reduce important gaps in growth and employment across the EU's territory.

However, statistical evidence from the Vision concept paper<sup>3</sup>, suggests that in recent years inequalities amongst regions reverted their previous downward trend and they are growing<sup>4</sup> again.

The participants to the plenary do then agree that it is time to ask ourselves a number of questions with the objective to give back efficiency and legitimacy to one of the pillars of the EU's policies: Which are the pre-existing conditions (infrastructure; level of development; education achievements and R&D expenditure) that seem to be associated to better performance of cohesion policies? Is there a certain threshold (in terms of a certain percentage weight of cohesion policies over a given Region GDP) below which structural funds are too little to matter? If this is the case how can structural funds multiply themselves by mobilizing private money (and for instance close end funds)?

Does the concentration of the expenditure on few targets (specific segments of population; certain industries or industrial areas) increase the efficiency? If this is the case which is the best mechanism to identify specializations which may be smart enough and thus enough targeted to their place's potential competitive advantages? Could regional policies adopt the NGEU's philosophy to only pay member states when expected results are achieved?

The answers to the above questions is made difficult by another overarching question. The evaluation practice which is necessary to respond in a "place specific" manner and which administrations have been using for years, seems to have run its own course: with few, remarkable exceptions, it seems not to be able any longer to work as a learning exercise meant to increase the policy performance. Although innovation in a rapidly change environment amplifies the need to use

---

<sup>3</sup> See the section on "cohesion policies" from the conference concept paper at [https://www.thinktank.vision/images/2021/Taormina\\_conference/Concept\\_paper/THE\\_TAORMINA\\_CONFERENCE\\_concept\\_paper\\_100621\\_.pdf](https://www.thinktank.vision/images/2021/Taormina_conference/Concept_paper/THE_TAORMINA_CONFERENCE_concept_paper_100621_.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> As in a recent Vision paper mentioned by THE ECONOMIST <https://www.thinktank.vision/en/media-en/articles/you-can-keep-your-money>

programs to generate knowledge on what works and what does not, evaluation occurs too late to impact existing programs (and too disconnected by the concrete drafting of the future ones) and it normally says too little on the change of behaviors that programs should encourage.

In a context where technologies are challenging all “theories of development”, we should not only

- a) evaluate more and scale up monitoring systems by using the opportunities that technologies provide (“big data”), but also
- b) compare regions amongst them (most likely across national borders) on how did they tackle specific problems in similar situation, so that the policy could recover one of its original “European value”; and
- c) develop a proper “knowledge management systems” capable to use the results of experiments constructed with the deliberate aim to better understand which action may more efficiently achieve our political objective.

The low capability to produce specific, relevant knowledge out of projects, is, however, linked to an even more structural problem: there is no real incentive system so accountability for the results and responsibility of the programs are both linked to the same program managers.

The program managers (“managing authorities”) do, often, have just the administrative responsibility to run the programs minimizing the legal risks. Programs overlap in the same Region (there are five European Structural and Investment Funds), same target group, same industry so that it is difficult to understand who is responsible.

Administrations with lower institutional capabilities do, normally, have hard time to ask themselves the right evaluation questions and tend to produce poor selection procedures of their evaluators. The paradox is that less developed regions that manage to become even poorer after one programming period, are rewarded by getting even more funds for the next one. As a result, the (rather closed) community of administrators and practitioners seems to suffer a “policy implementation syndrome” which appears to ignore what structural funds have taught for generations: different policy design can yield very different results so structural effects depend on not linear, place specific, innovative strategies.

Last but not least, policies cannot survive without policy makers. And public opinions. Politicians need to make explicit their objectives and program managers need to seek politicians’ engagement in the strategy design. Targets must be relevant enough to everybody’s life and sufficiently easy to understand so that citizens have solid reasons to change individual behaviors and support the society wide transformation that programs promote.

Clear political objectives and explicit “theories” of the desired change. Incentive systems so that the objectives of policy makers, program managers and beneficiaries are aligned. Better tools to generate knowledge from the projects and from specific experiments so that they can be corrected and steered towards those general aims. More efficient implementation based on clear and shared ideas: this could be one recipe for the future of cohesion policies.

## POSITIVE ACTIONS FOR BUILDING EUROPE FROM THE BOTTOM UP<sup>5</sup>

Introduction: Lorenzo Fioramonti

Chair: Angela Giuffrida (The Guardian)

Discussants: Kalypso Nikolaidis, Francesca Pellegrino, Stefania Baroncelli, Sandro Gozi, Roberto Castaldi.

*"We (half) made Europe; we now need to make Europeans"*. What the Italian patriot Massimo D'Azeglio said about the project of "making Italy" in 1861, may well apply to Europe.

Nineteenth century's "nation states" became (at least partially) "united" through the adoption of institutions like free public education, general welfare, the nation-wide television and military conscription. EU embodies, however, a very different idea from the states conceived in Westphalia and, yet, it is not much disputed the idea that without a European Demos and a European-wide debate that cannot be split along national lines, further integration of the Union will be politically weak and could even backfire.

So much has been done in the last 15 years by the European Union in the way of creating that sense of *Europeanness*, the sense of a common citizenship and belonging. The pandemic itself was somehow useful to show everyone the importance of "staying (sticking?) together" and the problems derived by staying isolated. But still so much has to be done in order to create a common *demos*. The Conference considered actions aimed to encourage the creation of a European *demos*, or at least a European public opinion, without which the entire construction is fragile.

It is, of course, necessary for the European Union to create a new democratic connection with its citizens. Especially the younger generations want to be involved. The representative institutions are still the centre of the democracy, but these must be supported through collective intelligence. In this process, Europe can inspire the rest of the World, at a time when many other countries' democracies are faltering. An example might be the so-called *democratic Panopticon*. The citizens, collectively, can permanently control what the politicians do and call on them for accountability by being able to trace through online portals the use of European funds. There are still margins to make the work of the European Union clearer and more transparent.

A necessary condition for more accountability is, however, to clarify who is responsible for each policy, whereas too much "shared management" may blur that: Europe should try not to do everything for everyone, but instead focus on the things that it can do better.

The reform of the EU Parliament voting system is not less necessary. Some of the options considered by the participants to the session are:

- a) electoral incentives so that parties are rewarded for having individual candidates for being voted outside their country of origin (after all voting systems already include quotas and mechanisms which favour specific outcomes – for instance stability, diversity, ... - and distance them from perfect proportional representation);
- b) the option for electors to join EU wide electoral constituencies; votes would then be counted at European level and not by Region and this would favour the creation of EU wide political arenas; this option would be made greatly more feasible by the adoption on a European scale of electronic voting already successfully experimented in EU countries like Estonia.

---

<sup>5</sup> The background is completed by the VISION paper on "ERASMUS and Community Service: the way forward" <https://www.thinktank.vision/en/media-en/publications/erasmus-and-civil-service-as-the-way-forward-to-a-european-demos-rationale-and-feasibility>

As far as using education as a very important lever strengthen the sense of *Europeanness*, participants discussed the VISION proposal to make Erasmus free and compulsory for all EU students both at secondary and university levels<sup>6</sup>. The Messina/ Taormina conference appreciated the great value for money of Erasmus relatively to other policies and the need for these mobility programs to receive more funds and enlarge the participating population.

Alongside the *Erasmus for all*, (including youth and adult workers), the session considered other actions which may be less expensive and more feasible in the short term:

- Short, online compulsory modules on European citizenship education funded by the European Union, to increase the knowledge of its functioning and purpose.
- Mandatory courses on European citizenship education in the school systems (for the youngsters).

Finally, it is central for the survival of the European Union to the *European way*. If the recovery and resilience facility is not focused on strengthening what makes Europe stronger from the social point of view, the opportunity to make Europe not only the largest common market of the World, but also a common area of shared responsibility and vision, will be missed. The social pillar is more important now than ever, in fact Europe cannot afford to become a highly unequal continent and an area of social fragmentation. A central element to impede this is to put at the centre of the recovery and resilience facility investments on people (education will be a central part of such investments) and not on only on physical infrastructure.

---

<sup>6</sup> See the section on “positive actions” from the conference concept paper at [https://www.thinktank.vision/images/2021/Taormina\\_conference/Concept\\_paper/THE\\_TAORMINA\\_CONFERENCE\\_concept\\_paper\\_100621\\_.pdf](https://www.thinktank.vision/images/2021/Taormina_conference/Concept_paper/THE_TAORMINA_CONFERENCE_concept_paper_100621_.pdf)

# MEDIAMORFOSI. LA TRASFORMAZIONE DEI MEZZI DI COMUNICAZIONE

Introduction: Alexandra Borchardt

Chair: Viviana Mazza

Discussants: Kelly Falconer, Paul Nemitz, Virman Cusenza, Lino Morgante, Virginia Stagni

Mediamorphosis was the title of a 50-minute event that took place in Taormina on June 20th, 2021, organized by Taobuk Festival in collaboration with the GDS/SES Group and with the participation of Vision Think Tank. It was moderated by Corriere della sera journalist Viviana Mazza and it saw the participation of Lino Morgante, Virginia Stagni, Virman Cuzenza and, via remote, Alexandra Borchardt, Paul Nemitz and Kelly Falconer.

Alexandra Borchardt, a professor at the Hamburg Media School and Senior Research Associate of the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism at the University of Oxford, began her presentation with the following question: “What needs to happen to make journalism a European affair?”. She said that “the media is not facing a trust crisis, but an attention crisis”. In fact, only 29 percent of people say that the topics chosen by the news media feel relevant to them, according to the Digital News Report 2019 by Reuters Institute. Borchardt suggested, however, that there are new opportunities today (i.e.: publication has become easier, journalism has become participatory, automated translation has made it easier to transcend language barriers, the development of a platform ecosystem has made it easier to reach young people and potentially the disengaged; the Erasmus generation has produced plenty of curious young journalists; lots of young and older founders aim to develop journalism for everyone). The way forward is to “put the user first”, in terms of content (what are the challenges for the people in Europe and how can they be tackled and solved?), platforms (what are the platforms people use, how can they be best reached?), audiences (diversity is a must, but journalism has been dominated by the paradigm of political journalism that has failed to reach diverse audiences), formats (constructive, investigative, explanatory, cross-border journalism). Of course, it is also very important to think of the financial aspects: “European media needs support”.

Lino Morgante, president of Gruppo GDS SES reiterated the importance of funding and defending copyright in order to guarantee quality information. He pointed out that “during the Covid-19 pandemic, an incredible number of people, including young people”, read the digital edition of local newspaper such as Gazzetta del Sud and Giornale di Sicilia, which are part of his editorial group. They were looking for trust-worthy information they could not find on social media, they wanted to verify the rumours. These newspapers websites, which had previously been a secondary platform, have become crucial now, Morgante said. He pointed out the financial challenges, in order to guarantee “quality information at the speed and consistency that people are expecting nowadays”. Virginia Stagni, business development manager & director FT Talent Challenge, is responsible for attracting a younger audience – mainly under 30– to the Financial Times, which is traditionally the newspaper of the financial elite. The Talent Challenge is aimed to hiring them but also to understanding how they see the FT. “There are many preconceptions about the youth”, she said, adding that she is 28 years old. One of the issues that Stagni discussed it “the dilution of brands” on social media. She mentioned that the Reuters Institute at Oxford University did much research on the issue: one example is users remembering the content of an article shared on social media, but not the media where it was originally published or the journalist who wrote it. The newspaper is countering this phenomenon by trying to be “clear on its values”. The FT’s motto – “Without fear, without favour” – tries to signal to the readers that they will receive quality information and the analysis needed to fully understand it. The FT is also trying to be a pan-European voice: when Brexit happened, the CEO was photographed while planting a EU flag on the headquarters of the

newspaper. “Although such an approach may be considered marketing-oriented – she said – I think that there will be an increasing contamination between journalism and other fields, which are more consumer-oriented, in order to really put the audience first. “Dialogue creates trust”, she concluded. “Audience first” is something that several speakers said. However there was no agreement on how. Kelly Falconer, a literary agent, seemed to object to a point raised by Stagni. “I don’t think it’s the job of European media to foster a sense of European Union – Falconer said -. It is condescending to audiences”.

Paul Nemitz of the Global Council on Extended Intelligence said that he is working on a non-profit and publicly funded European platform. The platform will share contents from all European public televisions, universities, museums and other high-quality video producers. “It must be independent from the States and from financial interests – Nemitz said-. Private TVs and newspapers can contribute with their political and documentary contents”. This platform would be a bridge between European media and citizens but would not damage the companies budgets according to Nemitz. The idea behind it is that media needs to help European citizens talk with one another, overcoming ideological and language barriers. Technology increasingly allows it, offering more efficient translation tools.

Virman Cusenza is the former editor-in-chief of Il Mattino and Il Messaggero, and is now a consultant for the Fremantle Group.. He explained that newspapers have become editorial companies that, along with more traditional content, need videos, podcasts and much more, if they want to survive. The competition between traditional media and social media is a crucial part – both a cause and a consequence - of this transformation. Cusenza quoted the former editor-in-chief at The Independent, a British newspaper where he worked in the past, as saying that there is a difference “between a newspaper and a viewspaper”, between a paper of information and a paper vision. According to Cusenza’s former boss, a viewspaper is more difficult to produce. The issue, he concluded, is: should the editorial company “just” inform or should it promote civic duty?

## **BREXIT FIVE YEARS ON: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED AND WHERE NEXT?**

Introduction/Chair: Bill Emmott.

Discussants: Koert Debeuf, Gavin Hewitt, Michele Messina.

The discussion highlighted what a politically fraught topic Britain's exit from the European Union remains, five years on from the June 23<sup>rd</sup> 2016 referendum and six months on from the formal end of the UK's 'transition period' as it detached itself from EU laws and procedures. The pandemic has undoubtedly slowed and interrupted the process of adjustment and of establishing new relationships, both for the UK and for the 27 EU member-states, but it is still striking how much remains to be defined, developed and determined after five years.

For the UK, the case for Brexit always revolved around a trade-off between expected economic losses, at least in the medium term, and gains in autonomy and identity. In the five years since the referendum, the identity issue has if anything become intensified, thanks to the UK media and to the politics that has surrounded negotiations with the EU and negotiations within Parliament to reach final agreement.

For the EU, an important and explicit objective in the negotiation was to ensure that Britain paid a price for leaving the Union, so as to ensure that no country could believe it could have the advantages of EU membership without bearing the costs and responsibilities of membership. This objective was made easier by the UK's political decision to opt for a "hard" Brexit, leaving the single market and customs union and refusing any post-Brexit involvement in the UK of the European Court of Justice. This reflected a clear preference for autonomy or sovereignty over economic or procedural convenience.

Nevertheless, the exit procedure, being unprecedented, turned out to be quite legally peculiar. Moreover, thanks to the agreement to keep Northern Ireland inside the EU customs union so as to avoid a land border with Ireland, to the fact that some major areas (such as financial services) have yet to be settled, and to the fact that new UK laws have not yet been passed in some areas, it is still the case that EU law is being applied in the UK. This co-existence is likely to last for some time.

The economic losses from Brexit have been more or less as expected, although the effects of the pandemic make them hard to isolate or put into proportion. Investment, both by UK and by foreign firms, has fallen since July 2016, a trend generally ascribed to increased uncertainty about future regulations and trade terms. Since January 1<sup>st</sup> 2021 when new trade terms came into force, there has been a clear decline in UK-EU trade, especially in the food and drink sectors. Some of this is expected to be temporary, but most will be permanent as the costs of UK-EU trade have risen permanently. Trade between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland has increased substantially, however. It is too soon to assess the long-term impact of this decline in trade on UK living standards, as its effect is anyway dwarfed by that of the pandemic.

Politically, the major benefit of Brexit has been seen in the UK's fast, early and successful vaccination programme. The benefit of this is chiefly psychological and political: economically, a lead of 6-8 weeks in vaccinations is hard to quantify, especially as there are other factors such as social restrictions to take into account. But to those who favoured Brexit, the vaccination success has provided a substantial boost.

As the UK and the EU enter the sixth year since the 2016 referendum, they do so in an atmosphere of considerable mistrust, even rancour. Disputes over the Northern Ireland protocol section of the Withdrawal Agreement make this mistrust and rancour unlikely to fade any time soon. Paradoxically, on everything barring bilateral issues the UK and EU policies remain quite closely aligned: on climate, corporate tax, China, Russia and Iran, for example, the UK's stance is at least as close to the EU's as it is to the USA.

From the plenary discussion, two principal ideas emerged:

1. That for both the UK and the EU, it would be desirable to develop, over time, a form of association agreement that reflects the two parties' closeness geographically, economically and culturally. This "outer circle" form of close association could potentially be attractive for other countries too. Unless and until the UK's political preferences change, the parties would need to remain legally separate but through equivalence, mutual recognition and collaborative mechanisms there was an opportunity for them to be much closer than they are in 2021, to mutual benefit.
2. That a loss of special importance for both the UK and the EU promises to be the decline of educational exchange, as the UK leaves Erasmus, and as the research participation of UK universities is also degraded under the new arrangement. In the interim, these ruptures reflect identity politics. But to foster and preserve for the long term the "outer circle" close relationship desired, new means can and should be found to restore and even enhance the depth of educational and research exchange.

# BACK TO AFRICA: THE NEIGHBORHOOD'S AS EUROPE'S NEXT FRONTIER

Introduction: Stefania Giannini

Chair: Laura Silvia Battaglia

Discussants: Ruggero Aricò, Hanna Lucinda Smith, Demit Murat Seyret, Luca Jahier, Steven Everts.

Stefania Giannini: Unesco is investing in education, nutrition, health, security. UN advocates for a comprehensive approach to mobilize a multilateral mechanism in prioritizing education, more likely between African governments, European institutions and universities. There's also a need of better data to understand where EU has to focus on, to identify the gap which put Africa behind (200million of children are illiterate) and the reasons why Africa is not able to invest in specific policies. What is the missing point so far? We are still looking at this global South with a post-colonial approach: we tend to prioritize basic education and this is not the right way to go. We have to stay focused more in gender issues and education, especially after the pandemic, a time when GFM increased a lot, including the practice of early marriages in all sub-Saharan Africa.

Ruggero Aricò: Africa is playing a crucial role in the energy sector in particular in energy transition, sustainable energy, renewal energy. This key sector is developing in Africa and is becoming a priority in the African's countries agenda as well as in Europe, at the point that the goal is now having Africa independent on energy business using the solar energy, considering the fact that Africa is using only the 1% of the solar energy available in the world. The room is there and the historical momentum is there. At the same time we have to face the problem of the climate change in Africa. Climate change has having a big impact on the continent and it is responsible of what we are still calling "natural disasters". Natural disasters are causing conflicts, death, migration and scarcity of natural resources, including water. The recent creation of a Free Trade Area Agreement among African countries is an enormous opportunity, in terms of population and GDP aggregated. The Agenda 2063 "The Africa we want" signed by African Union can use the Free Trade Area as a pillar for a sustainable and inclusive development. If we give power to the words *sustainability* and *inclusion* and we make them the main goals for African countries, we will help the private sector everywhere, in EU for sure, and we can do a lot in terms of dialogue, global trade and foreign policy.

Demir Murat Seyrek: We can't talk about Africa nowadays without talking about China and Russia involvement there. Both countries are increasing their economic power as they have already done in Middle East. I'm talking about disinformation, misinformation and propaganda in the communication system. Something that tries to destroy the principles of the democracy and the pillars of the Western countries. There are no big differences but while EU is more prepared to face these dangers in the Eastern neighborhood, is not aware about what is happening in Africa, where China is working much more freely. Here, while Russia is more involved in political and military influence, especially through Russian mercenaries – 10 African countries have Russian mercenaries on their soils and in Central Republic they are involved in torturing and killing civilians – China is using its political influence too, but much more through the economic means, reaching out and buying the political and economical elites in the African countries. Disinformation and misinformation are for both countries powerful tools, used also during the pandemic, fabricating conspiracy theories against the Westerns vaccines. If we look on how this misinformation targets the health sector and affects the life of people, we can be aware of it and prioritize our observation on that, in order to contrast this influence. Considering also that this kind of misinformation is anti-Western, anti-democratic and it is the best and more effective way for the two powers to impose a different political model. EU has to develop a best unified strategy, not fragmented among the different European States like it is now. Last but not least, many members of EU consider Africa so Southern and so far from them, in geography and politics, so we have to increase their interest for

the common goal. Definitely we have to change the way to look at Africa, not only as a continent of migrants, but as a continent of opportunities, putting aside the usual Western post-colonial perspective. Continuing along this old way will give China the best excuse to extend its power more and more on African States.

Steven Everts: The main and strategic question is: which kind of society and model of society will prevail in Africa? Africa in 20 years time will have one billion people more. This is a question of planetary consequence. And, regarding this, there's a main difference, between elites that can be also authoritarian, repressive, anti-democratic and African citizens that are not happy with that model for power. Young people are contesting everywhere this old model. There's a lot of pressure and competition on Europe but I don't think Africa voted for China. EU spends 20 billion in aid every year in Africa, while China spend only between 4 and 5. We have to build a better narrative and a better communication: our offers are often not understandable by African leaders. It's necessary to imagine a new diplomacy, a different future, and figuring out how we can get there. We have to say that we are not equals in development, and is better to say that Africa is a sister continent and that we can face all the problems of the sustainability all together in the global context. But this can't be done without fundamental freedom, respect for the individuals, and multilateralism. In order this to be done, we have to count on local capacities, and so the question is how avoid corruption, for example? When National authorities are not the first we want to work with, we have to count on local NGOs and civil societies.

Luca Jahier: Africa was an issue very high in the EU Commission agenda under the start of the new presidency of Ursula von der Leyen, but sadly pandemic brake and EU lose his goal, at the point that the biggest failure in foreign policy and diplomacy for EU in the last two years is the vaccination strategy in Africa. We're not talking about lack of vaccines' delivery but also about capacity of production and inoculation of vaccines. Combining all these factors, we see a clear failure in terms also of insecurity and extremism in Africa. Meanwhile, there, for the first time, out of all the external powers, African States have established their own major strategy for the years to come: the African Continental Free Trade Agreement under the The African Union. EU is not profiting from this great market and is not understanding the advantages, even though knows Africa better than China, Russia, USA and Turkey in the legal framework. We need to have a strategy and a clear partnership with the continent to not lose our advantages. It's not a matter of new colonialism or imperialism, it's a matter of partnership. We can partner African Union to build up what the States have already chosen to do and develop, starting from regional markets. This is the drive for the future.

Hanna Lucinda Smith: Looking to Africa means also looking to Asian and Middle Eastern countries who want to have power and interest in Africa, in competition with EU. Turkey is one of them and Erdogan policies are going to this direction, in Libya, in Horn of Africa and other sub-saharian countries, Turkey is developing a mixture of hard and soft power to extend its ties in the Continent. At the point that Erdogan asked to many African countries to close schools run by Gulenists, now his main internal enemies. And he was quite successful in most of these countries. Another tool of his soft power is the aid system, provided in an extensive way to Somalia since 2010 and, on the other hand, is the military trade, in terms of arms sells, thanks to a growing Turkish defence industry, and military trainings for local troops. All this business reached Somalia, Kenya and Uganda as well. Last but not least, construction and reconstruction, in the same way China does: this happened again in Somalia, with ports and airports, with roads. Looking to all this picture, is clear that Turkey is making a bet to extend and reinforce its presence in Africa on the long terms. Not counting on its involvement in the Lybian conflict, where the purpose is clear. So, the question for EU is: can EU work alongside Turkey in this context? How this plan could be done, where EU and Turkey have a clash of interests? Turkey is a rival or not in Africa? The question is still open.