TRANSWORLD

THE TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONSHIP AND THE FUTURE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

ISSN 2281-5252 WORKING PAPER 27 | OCTOBER 2013

EU Adjustment to New and Evolving Trends of International Security

Tomáš Weiss

This paper analyzes the European Union's adjustment to the current international security environment. It focuses on the selected issues of terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyber-security, and failed states. Moreover, it addresses the EU's engagement of emerging powers, as well as the tools and practices used when approaching other states. Structural and political determinants of the EU adjustment as well as the internal constraints of this process are discussed. The paper concludes that the EU has failed to become a leader in global security policy, although it has adjusted profoundly, commands considerable capabilities, and has the potential to play a much more important role. The lack of international leadership can be understood as a function of weak internal institutions and the conflicting interests of the member states.

Transworld is supported by the Seventh Framework Programme

SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

EU Adjustment to New and Evolving Trends of International Security

Tomáš Weiss*

EU Security Policy Terrorism Non-proliferation Cyber-security Multipolarity

1. Introduction

The international security environment has been undergoing a profound structural change in recent years. Following the brief "unipolar moment" after the Cold War (Krauthammer 1991), the rise of new powers and the emergence of new threats and actors have led to a diffusion of power at the global level (Peterson, Tocci and Alcaro 2012). The evolving environment requires actors to revisit their strategies, tools and policies in order to be able to react flexibly and adjust to the changing situation.

Arguably, the European Union (EU) often behaves as one of the emerging powers "jealous of its independence, sensitive about its dignity, and determined to make its own mark on the world" (Peterson, Tocci and Alcaro 2012:11). The EU established its security policies relatively recently, although it built on its previous extensive international presence in trade and development assistance and, naturally, on the past (in some cases still residual) glory and vast experience of its member states. Having focused on its immediate neighbourhood in the beginning, the EU slowly expanded its attention to more distant areas and became a security actor beyond Europe, in particular Africa, and to a more limited extent also in the South Caucasus, Middle East and South Asia. In all these places, the EU needs to adjust to the existing or emerging presence of other actors with congruent or conflicting views and interests.

The EU's performance cannot be assessed without taking the member states into account. Security policy has long been in the firm grip of the member states' governments, unwilling to recognize an EU role in security and defence. The states have also retained control of most of the tools necessary for conducting security policy, in particular the military and police forces and their equipment, as well as the bulk of the budget. As a result, the EU has served as one of the fora through which the member states conduct their security policy rather than an actor in its own right. In parallel, the member states continue to act unilaterally and bilaterally with one another, cooperate through other institutions, such as NATO, or engage international partners bilaterally where they deem necessary. At the same time, however, the EU has played an ever-growing role in the security policies of its member states in recent years. It has built up new capabilities, new structures, new frameworks for member

**** Tomáš Weiss is the Head of Department of West European Studies, Charles University in Prague.*** ***The author would like to thank the participants of the November 2012 Transworld Work Package 3 meeting in Paris for their ideas about the focus and structure of this paper, and Manuel Muniz, Anne-Marie Le Gloannec, and Evan Thompson for comments on the first drafts.***

states' capability development, and it has steadily continued to consolidate its international personality. The following pages, therefore, focus primarily on the EU level. National activities are mentioned only where necessary to understand the full EU picture.[1]

The paper aims to review the EU's adjustments to the new and evolving security environment and analyse to what extent and in which areas the EU is capable and willing to exert leadership. It contributes to the wider debate within the Transworld project, which studies the evolution and re-definition of the transatlantic partnership in several policy areas, including security. Conceptually, it builds on an extensive paper edited by Anne-Marie Le Gloannec, Bastien Irondelle and David Cadier (2013), which discusses the current security trends and the character of actors and threats. This contribution complements Shoon Murray's parallel paper on the adjustments in the United States' security policy.

Firstly, the paper briefly analyses the EU's perception of the current security environment and the development of new capabilities for security policy. Secondly, it develops in greater detail the way in which the EU deals with key security threats of today, namely terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyber-crime, and failed states. The third part studies the EU's attempts to engage other rising powers through bilateral and multilateral means. Fourthly, the paper pays attention to the EU's stance to current forms of intervention and the tools and methods that the EU uses to transform other states. The fifth part then turns to the structural and political determinants and discusses the internal constraints to the effective adjustment of the EU security policy. The final part concludes.

2. The EU's Perception of Threats

"Europe has never been so prosperous, so secure nor so free." The introductory sentence of the European Security Strategy (ESS) (European Council 2003:1) sums up neatly the overarching feeling in the European Union, its member states and populations at the beginning of the last decade. Having gone through two major wars and a Cold War during the 20th century, the turn of the millennium seemed to be a relatively peaceful period. EU and NATO membership expanded the zone of peace to most of the continent and there was no external adversary to face. As a result, the ESS could state that a "[l]arge-scale aggression against any Member State [was] improbable" (European Council 2003:3). Most tangibly, this feeling translated into a "peace dividend" in European states with a rapid decrease in defense spending (cf. Chan 1995).

The European Union recognized, however, a number of phenomena that were threatening the security of its states and citizens. Building on experience from the wars in the Balkans, the new European foreign and security policy was grounded in an expanded concept of security that recognized security threats outside the traditional military sphere and included other levels of analysis besides the nation state (cf. Buzan, Waever and Wilde 1997). As a result, the ESS identified five main threats to European security in 2003 – terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, state failure and regional conflicts. The ESS implementation report of 2008 simply added a few other threats, such as cyber-crime, piracy, energy security and climate change (European Council 2008).[2] The ESS and the implementation report have defined the specific European view of the new security environment and the ways to deal with current threats.

1 The reader can refer to other sources for a more detailed analysis of the national security adjustments (cf. Wagner 2005, Chevènement 2009, Gearson and Gow 2010, Pesme 2010, Chafer and Cumming 2010, Dover and Phythian 2011, Ritchie 2011, Guitton 2013).

2 In a similar vein, the internal security strategy adopted in 2010 highlighted terrorism, cross-border crime and cyber-crime as the main threats that the EU must tackle through cooperation of internal security forces and judiciary (Council of the EU 2010).

The European approach to the new security threats rests on a notion of interconnectedness and complexity. While identifying individual threats, such as terrorism and state failure, the ESS also builds a clear connection among them. Indeed, all threats that the ESS lists stem from or connect with other threats. A failed state may, for example, become a safe haven for terrorist or organized crime. It may, furthermore, give rise to regional conflict and lead to weapons proliferation. Regional conflict may, in turn, cause states to fail and provide profit opportunities for criminal organizations as well as training ground for terrorists groups. Ultimately, alleged or actual proliferation of weapons of mass destruction may stir up regional conflict and, in combination with terrorism, represent the "most frightening scenario" (European Council 2003:4). At the same time, the European Union understands security policy as broader than territorial and reactive self-defence. Given that the character of the threats, which often have a non-state origin, are very hard to deter and are linked to more complex issues of state and regional stability, the EU strives to act preventively through a broad variety of means, including military, police, judicial, economic and political. This mixture of coordinated tools is better suited to tackle the challenges in their complexity and not just as separate phenomena, which should help resolve the problems instead of suppressing them temporarily.

Building on the specific historical experience of the European states that resolved the security dilemma in Europe by creating common institutions and giving up parts of their sovereignty to the supranational Union, institutions and rules are at the core of today's EU security policy. The ESS has argued in favour of an "effective multilateralism", which in short means relying on international organizations, especially the United Nations (UN), and making sure they are powerful enough to effectively "act when their rules are broken" (European Council 2003:9). Whereas the UN should bear the primary responsibility of maintaining peace and security, a number of other regional and global regimes and organizations should play a part in everyday resolution of conflicts in their respective fields and regions – just like the European Union works as a conflict resolution forum for its member states.

The ESS and the implementation report, however, have remained silent on a number of issues that are crucial to international security and to the EU's role. They deal with the emergence of non-state actors, but ignore the shifts of power among states in the system. In particular, they do not pay attention to the rise of "new" powers, such as China, and do not analyse their impact on the international environment and the position of the West. Nor do they address the legal and political ambiguities related to the current (and future) security policies, such as the distinction between prevention and pre-emption. In a similar vein, the documents are not particularly strong in looking forward and positioning the EU in the future security environment. Simply put, the drafters of the ESS have fallen short of providing the EU with a real grand strategy (Biscop 2009, Biscop and Coelmont 2011).

To sum up, the European Union and its member states perceive the current security landscape as composed of mutually connected and constitutive threats that do not respect state borders and cannot be faced by any single actor alone. As a result, international cooperation conducted within international organizations and regimes is the only viable option to deal with such threats in a comprehensive manner. In practice, however, the EU's policies often based on considerations related to socio-economic challenges that are perceived as more urgent by the population.

3. The Development of the EU's Institutional Capacity

Having avoided a significant role till the end of the Cold War, the European Union first moved into the international security realm cautiously with the establishment of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) in 1993 and later more vividly through the European (later Common) Security and Defence Policy (ESDP/CSDP) in 1999. The broadening of the security agenda, however, resulted in responsibilities for European security tasks being dealt with through different policies.

The specific structure of the European Union resulted in two separate hubs of capacity building. On one hand, the European Commission continued to play an important role in foreign trade, development assistance and humanitarian crisis management, which it had acquired during the development of these policies in the past. The technical expertise and management of EU budget turned the Commission into a key player in conflict prevention, post-conflict reconstruction and transformation (cf. Santiso 2003). The Commission had at its disposal a wide network of external delegations managed by DG RELEX that fed in first-hand information on developments on the ground. It also represented the EU at various international organizations, most notably the World Trade Organization (WTO), and led the negotiations with candidate states and later also with participants of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). In all these negotiations, the Commission could use the leverage of the single market over which it presides.

On the other hand, the newly established CFSP/CSDP structures remained under the full control of the member states and were located within the structure of the Council and its secretariat. In the 1999-2010 period, a number of working groups under the General Affairs and External Relations Council (now just the Foreign Affairs Council) were created to deal with security policy. In particular, the Political and Security Committee (PSC) became the hub of the CFSP and, more specifically, of operational CSDP decision-making (cf. Juncos and Reynolds 2007). Within the Council secretariat, a number of expert bodies, notably the EU Military Staff and the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability, were established to advise the Council and the PSC on military and civilian crisis management. The EU's specific approach to security was reflected in the establishment in 2010 of the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate, which was supposed to encompass both military and civilian crisis management (Blair 2009, Gebhard 2009, Khol 2010, Simón 2010).

In the early 2000s, the European Union developed additional capabilities. First, it took over Western European Union's assets – the Institute of Security Studies in Paris and the Satellite Centre in Torrejon (Wessel 2003). Second, it established a number of specialised institutions and networks within the CFSP, such as the European Security and Defence College and the European Police College. Third, it founded the European Defence Agency to coordinate and jointly conduct defence procurement and research (Trybus 2006).

The Lisbon Treaty aimed at bridging the two hubs by creating two new institutions – the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the European External Action Service (EEAS). The position of High Representative was designed to centralise and streamline the representation of EU policies at the international level by taking up responsibilities in both the Commission (Vice-President for External Relations) and the Council (permanent chair of Foreign Affairs Council) (Elsuwege 2010, Dijkstra 2011, Thym 2011). The EEAS makes up a "European diplomatic service" bringing together officials from the Commission, Council secretariat and member states' diplomats, supporting the High Representative and coordinating European foreign policy in general and, in particular, representing the EU's position in international organizations and in relations with third countries (Duke 2009, Bindi 2011, Duke 2012, Erkelens and Blockmans 2012, Spence 2012).

Nevertheless, neither the new agencies nor the new Lisbon institutions have changed the basic setup of European security policy. The decision-making in CFSP remains intergovernmental with a limited role for supranational institutions, which makes quick and coherent reaction often difficult or outright impossible. Above all, the member states have retained control over the key capabilities, namely the military, police and administrative forces. They decide on any possible deployment overseas, they pay the bills and provide crucial democratic legitimacy through their respective national parliaments. As a result, the EU's capabilities in security policy can provide for coordination and joint planning in case the member states so decide, but it is the member states that lead, conduct and implement security policies either through the EU, through other international organizations, such as NATO and the UN, or individually.

4. Adjustment to Evolving Security Threats and Domains

The European Union has adjusted its policies to the individual threats perceived as important security challenges in the post-Cold War environment. In general, the adjustment took place in three dimensions – creating and modifying policies, creating and reforming institutions and capabilities, and taking concrete actions. This chapter will analyse the EU's adjustment along these three lines to four key security threats – terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), cyber-crime, and state failure.

4.1 International Terrorism

Adjustment 1: Establishing Cooperation in the Field

Terrorism represents an issue typical of the new security environment as it elevates non-state entities into internationally recognized actors capable of endangering states. It is, however, not a new threat, particularly not in the European context. Terrorism was the rationale for the beginning of internal security cooperation in the European Community back in 1970s (Zagari 1992, Benyon 1996). The TREVI group, composed of officials from national ministries of justice and interior in several working groups, aimed at coordinating the fight against terrorism and organized crime among the member states in a purely intergovernmental manner. Later on, Schengen cooperation and the creation of the third pillar of the EU in Maastricht (judicial and home affairs cooperation) further developed cooperation among police forces and judicial systems of the member states. In counter-terrorism, however, member states remained rather cautious in expanding cooperation within formal EU mechanisms and stuck to informal arrangements. When the Tampere European Council included the fight against terrorism into the broad five-year programme for police and judicial cooperation in 1999, it was regarded, as Coolsaet suggests, as "the ultimate frontier in the member states' willingness to cooperate in these fields" (2010:858).

The attacks in New York and Washington in 2001 changed the situation completely. Proposals that had for a long time been stalled gained momentum. As a result, the EU was able to adopt a long-negotiated framework decision on combating terrorism in 2002, where the member states managed to agree on a single definition of the crime of terrorism (Council of the EU 2002b). Moreover, the development of an information network between member states' judiciaries to enhance effectiveness of investigation and prosecution of cross-border crime accelerated, resulting in the creation of Eurojust in 2002 (Council of the EU 2002a).

The second wave of EU adjustment to the terrorist threat followed the first major jihadist attacks on EU soil – the Madrid bombings in 2004. A few days later, the European Council adopted a broad Declaration on Combating

Terrorism, in which the EU leaders committed to doing "everything within their power to combat all forms of terrorism in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Union, the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the obligations set out under United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001)" (European Council 2004:1). The declaration listed a number of measures that should be adopted in order to enhance cooperation among member states and the exchange of information between their internal security institutions. Among others, the European Council established a new position of Counter-Terrorism Coordinator within the Council secretariat tasked with overseeing the EU's fight against terrorism, facilitating cooperation among member states and regularly reporting to the Council. The declaration also pledged to include a clause of solidarity into basic treaties that would allow for assistance to a member state hit by a terrorist attack.

Adjustment 2: Emphasizing Internal Security

In general, the EU's reaction to the terrorist attacks focused on internal security measures, particularly in the field of police and judicial cooperation. In striking contrast to the United States, the European Union never waged a "war" against terrorists and emphasized the internal aspect of the threat and of the reaction to it (cf. Zimmermann 2006). Accordingly, the European Union's Counter-Terrorism Strategy, as well as the subsequent Action Plan on combating terrorism, focused mainly on measures introduced within the Union and the member states' internal security policies (Council of the EU 2005b and 2006). The four pillars – Prevent, Protect, Pursue, and Respond – aimed at strengthening the member states' ability to forestall future terrorist attacks by both deterring potential attackers and making assaults against possible targets difficult. In case of a successful attack, the member states should be capable of minimizing the damage and of quickly apprehending and convicting the suspects.

Although the number of EU documents dealing with counter-terrorism and the strong reaction to the attacks of 2001 and 2004 might suggest otherwise, EU internal cooperation has suffered from various problems. Primarily, the elevated threat of terrorism has not overcome the general cautiousness of member states to deeper integration in the sensitive area of internal security. In particular, the exchange of information between police forces and intelligence services has remained far from ideal. The difficulties were made apparent in March 2007 when the first counter-terrorism coordinator, Gijs de Vries, stepped down in despair after not receiving sufficient cooperation from the member states (Mahony 2007, cf. Lugna 2006, Monar 2007). At the same time, an agreement among member states on a concrete dossier could be hampered at the EU level. One case was the failure of the Passenger Name Record (PNR) treaty between the EU member states and the United States, which was brought down by the European Parliament's (EP) concern with personal data protection (Hailbronner, Papakonstantinou and Kau 2008, Archick 2011).[3]

Defining terrorism as a primarily internal security issue at the EU level has not prevented the EU member states from tackling terrorist groups with military means when necessary. Almost all of them have participated in Afghanistan within the NATO's ISAF since 2001. Moreover, in 2013, France deployed soldiers unilaterally in Mali to fight "narco-jihadists" that took over large parts of the country and threatened to further destabilize the whole region (Cristiani and Fabiani 2013). In both cases, the European Union engaged in the region only through training missions aimed at strengthening the host state's institutions, leaving the actual use of force to others (NATO, the US, individual member states).

3 The difficult cooperation at the EU level is illustrated by the fact that another initiative, the Prüm Convention, to step up the cross-border cooperation and data exchange, in particular in combating terrorism, was signed outside the EU framework by a group of EU member states in 2005. Similarly to the Schengen cooperation before, the core features of the Prüm Convention were later incorporated into EU law.

The cautious approach to the use of force in counter-terrorism can be illustrated by the EU's very low profile on the issue of targeted killing by unmanned aerial vehicles, so-called drones, which is a practice extensively employed by the United States particularly in Pakistan's tribal areas. The Europeans have been eager to purchase drones for surveillance and reconnaissance purposes (mainly from the US and Israel) and even develop their own (Hatzigeorgopoulos 2012). Their use of armed drones has been rather limited, however, not least because only very few European armed forces are equipped with this type of weaponry at the moment. Despite the questionable legality and legitimacy of the targeted killing of terrorist suspects, the EU's conceptualisation of terrorism as an internal threat, and the emphasis put on the rule of law and international law in the fight against terrorism in the joint EU-US declaration on combating terrorism (Council of the EU 2004a), both the EU and the member states have refrained from commenting on the practice publicly. They have silently tolerated it and in some cases actively provided the United States with necessary intelligence (cf. Raemdonck 2012).

Adjustment 3: Developing the External Dimension of Internal Security

Being primarily conceptualized as an internal security issue, the EU's counter-terrorism has always had a significant international dimension. From the very beginning, international cooperation belonged to the EU's toolkit and was listed as a key element of counter-terrorism in all relevant documents (cf. Council of the EU 2005b:7). Broadly speaking, the EU has supported international initiatives on countering terrorism in both multilateral and bilateral formats, especially in cooperation with the United States.[4] Besides, it has, in a very typical move used in other policy areas as well, linked counter-terrorism with other policies in negotiations with third countries, or aimed at "addressing counter-terrorism concerns into all relevant external assistance programmes" (European Council 2004:12). Under the threat of development assistance or trade relations suspension, which is incorporated into EU external agreements, the EU requires its partners to become party to the main international conventions on combating terrorism, in particular on terrorist financing. Naturally, this instrument works much better with developing countries or small countries in the EU neighbourhood, which are dependent on EU assistance or trade with the EU, than with major or regional powers (cf. Council of the EU 2005a, Edwards 2006, Wolff, Wichmann and Mounier 2009).

Without bringing any significantly new initiative to the global counter-terrorism policies, the EU has attached itself to and coordinated member states' existing obligations under international treaties. Particularly in the area of financing terrorism, there has been significant room for common EU policies related to the single market and free movement of capital (cf. Bures 2010, Kaunert and Della Giovanna 2010). In this respect, the adjustment at the EU level has resided in the creation of structural capacities (legal and institutional) to support the fight against terrorism at the global level.

4.2 WMD and Non-proliferation

Due to advances of technology, weapons of mass destruction are becoming deadlier, more accessible and easier to handle. As a result, the international community has in general, attempted to cut their numbers and stop their proliferation in order to reduce the probability of their use by states and the possibility of their abuse by non-state actors. The proliferation of WMD is considered "potentially the greatest threat" to European

4 There is, naturally, a striving cooperation between the US on one hand and individual member states on the other, besides the EU-US format. This has worked, in particular, in areas of operational cooperation and information exchange (an example might be the traditional special relationship between the US and the UK services). NATO has been another channel of transatlantic cooperation on counter-terrorism, but due to the character of threat, its role has been rather limited (Nevers 2007).

security (European Council 2003:3). Unlike in counter-terrorism, EU action against proliferation of WMD has been less plagued by disagreements between member states, and has been unhampered by member states' unwillingness to share information. Due to the fact that the WMD proliferation is clearly an external threat that needs to be dealt with by means of foreign policy, the role of the EU has been less controversial, with the member states often using the EU to pursue their policies on the topic.

Adjustment 1: Supporting Multilateral Institutions and Regimes

The EU's approach to WMD proliferation is closely connected to the approach to international security in general – the EU believes in the irreplaceable role of international institutions and regimes. The prominent role of the issue in the EU's security policy has been acknowledged by the fact that the Union's non-proliferation strategy was adopted together with the ESS in December 2003 by the European Council (Council of the EU 2003a). The EU's policy is therefore based on the notion of effective multilateralism and in practice, the Union aims at strengthening and supporting existing international non-proliferation regimes, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) or Security Council Resolution 1540, as well as relevant institutions, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (Council of the EU 2008). The EU's own initiative is specifically meant to make others align with these international regimes through mainstreaming non-proliferation into other EU policies. The EU includes non-proliferation clauses into all agreements with third countries which require them to ratify international conventions on non-proliferation and establishing effective national mechanisms of export controls (Council of the EU 2009b). In addition, the EU contributes bilaterally to maintaining the security of sensitive objects, for example by paying for secure storage equipped with specialised protection measures for fissile materials at Bochvar Institute in Moscow (Council of the EU 2004b).

Besides the general non-proliferation approach at the EU level, most EU member states have actively supported the US-led shift from non-proliferation to counter-proliferation. A number of EU member states were among the first signatories (all EU members have become signatories since) of the 2003 Proliferation Security Initiative, which calls for interception of the transportation of WMD-related material. As a result, although there is no "policy on counter-proliferation" (Quille 2008:14) at the EU level, the initiative "has had a relatively strong European Union component" (Durkalec 2012:2).

Institutionally, the non-proliferation policy was conducted and coordinated by the Council and the High Representative for CFSP who appointed his personal representative for the issue in 2003. With the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the dossier was taken over by the European External Action Service and its security policy and conflict prevention section. The position of personal representative was abolished. A major institutional development – the acceptance and relative institutionalization of a foreign policy triumvirate of the United Kingdom (UK), France and Germany, often labelled as EU-3 – has been the direct result of the three countries' engagement in the international negotiations on the Iranian nuclear programme.

Adjustment 2: Taking Responsibility for Coordinating Negotiations with Iran

The EU has played a visible role in negotiations with Iran in the P5+1 format (the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany). What originally started as a joint British, French and German activity carried over from the UN Security Council was presented (and accepted by other member states) as, more or less, an EU initiative (Hill 2006). The coordinating role was handed over to Javier Solana (and later to Catherine Ashton), so that the High Representative has led the negotiations with Iran not only on behalf of the EU, but also for the

whole P5+1 group. The EU has also initiated a number of international (together with the US) and unilateral sanctions against Iran for non-compliance with the UN Security Council's demand for greater transparency and cooperation with UN inspectors (cf. Einhorn 2004, Sauer 2007, Bergenäs 2010, Erästö 2011).

Despite its involvement in the Iranian case, the European Union has yet to actually achieve a leading global profile in non-proliferation issues. For example, neither the EU nor its member states play any part in the multilateral talks with North Korea. The EU has aligned with the sanctions against the regime, but has left the initiative to others, most notably the US and the countries in the region.

4.3 Cyber Security

Tackling cyber-crime is qualitatively different from ensuring other forms of security. Cyber-security is characterized by the lack of strong "territorial" control and the major role of private actors, which limits the EU's and member states' capacities and actions. At the same time, cyber-security has been recognized as a major concern by the EU and the member states (European Council 2008:4). The issue cuts across internal and external security, because the threats can be both profit-driven and politically motivated. One of the member states, Estonia, was actually the target of such a politically motivated, externally-organized attack in cyberspace in 2007, which triggered developments in both the EU and NATO (Shackelford 2010, Svete 2012). Unlike other threats analyzed in this paper, cyber threats are genuinely new and appeared in parallel to the evolution of information technology and the Internet. Correspondingly, the EU and the member states have been responding (creating institutions, capabilities and policies) from scratch.

Adjustment 1: Creating Institutions to Coordinate Member States' Action

The primary responsibility for cyber-security remains with the member states, but the European Union has offered a number of initiatives and bodies to coordinate and strengthen the efforts of state authorities. In 2004, the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA) was established to serve as a hub of EU-wide cooperation of member states, EU institutions, businesses and academia and to provide risk assessment, assistance and information on cyber-threats in the EU (European Union 2004). In 2013, the European Cybercrime Centre within Europol began providing operational support to the member states' police forces on cyber-crime (Europol 2013). Finally, in February 2013, the High Representative together with the Commission issued a Cyber-Security Strategy, the first EU document of this type, which lays down the main objectives and responsibilities at the EU level (European Commission and High Representative 2013).

Adjustment 2: Seeking the Balance between Cyber-Security and Internet Freedom

The European Union understands cyber-security as a multifaceted phenomenon that takes many guises and requires a combination of public and private as well as, civilian and military action to protect infrastructure and minimize any potential impact of cyber-attacks. International cooperation on the issue, however, remains partly problematic due to the connections between data protection, privacy and freedom of expression. EU member states were, for example, staunch opponents to more international regulation of the Internet promoted by Russia, China and others at the 2012 International Telecommunications Union conference (Arthur 2012, European Commission 2012). As a result, the EU maintains cooperation with actors that also emphasize these values, most notably the United States. There is an EU-US Working Group on Cyber-Security and Cybercrime active since 2010. Following from this, in 2011 a joint cyber-security exercise was organized by ENISA and the

US Department of Homeland Security, and the EU and the US also co-sponsored the launch of a Global Alliance to Fight Child Sexual Abuse Online a year later (European Union Delegation to the US 2012). The EU declares, at the same time, that it does not seek new international legal instruments to tackle cyber-crime (European Commission and High Representative 2013:15).

Outside of the EU, the member states have adopted measures to counter cyber-security threats nationally and at other international fora. In particular, NATO has been very active in this domain. It has included cyber-security and defence against cyber-threats into its latest strategic concept and created new capabilities, such as the Cyber Defence Management Authority and Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence based in Estonia (NATO 2010, Healey and Bochoven 2012, cf. Schreier 2012).

4.4 Weak States

The concept of state failure encompasses the situation where state institutions cease to fulfill their basic functions, including controlling their own territory. State failure is primarily dangerous for the country itself and its population, but may induce or intensify phenomena that can threaten other states in the region or beyond. The European Union considers weak or failing states a major security threat (European Council 2003:4) and connects other countries' inability to control their own territory and population with challenges such as uncontrolled migration flows, organized crime and terrorism. The EU recognized the importance of stable institutions in its neighbourhood during early 1990 when countries in Europe started falling apart after the collapse of communism – most notably in the former Yugoslavia – and the European Union was directly hit by the influx of refugees. Later on, the attacks of 9/11 and the rise of piracy off the Horn of Africa were directly connected to the failure of state authority in Afghanistan and Somalia respectively, and revealed that the EU may even be threatened by weak states well beyond its immediate neighbourhood.

In general, the EU's approach to weak states can be understood in the broader context of the EU's effort to prevent violent conflicts. The EU aims at working with weak states and regions on a long-term basis. It offers them strong incentives in the form of perspective membership or financial assistance as well as ready-made solutions, such as best practices and institutional designs. The EU's preventive engagement can be put in contrast to the former US administration of President Bush's approach of pre-emption (cf. Heisbourg 2003, Cohen 2004). Unlike pre-emption, which aims at removing supposedly imminent threat by all possible means, including military force, the EU's preventive engagement is meant to target the root causes of the conflicts and, by mostly non-military means, aims to resolve the conflicts by changing the context before an imminent threat emerges.

Adjustment 1: Approaching State Failure as a Complex Phenomenon Requiring Multiple Tools

The EU has consolidated old and developed new tools to support weak or potentially weak states at various phases of decay. They range from political incentives (such as enlargement policy), financial instruments (such as development assistance), mentoring and monitoring programmes (such as twinning – transfer of good practices between public administrations, security sector reform advice), to civilian and military missions supporting and substituting the work of state institutions on the ground.

The EU's enlargement policy can be considered the most efficient asset at the EU's disposal: "its most successful foreign policy tool" (Smith 2011:300). The Eastern enlargement, in particular, was motivated among other reasons, by security concerns (Higashino 2004). The accession process requires the candidate not only to implement the EU *acquis*, but through the Copenhagen criteria, which were drafted to set requirements for transition countries in Central and Eastern Europe, to also more broadly develop stable and working institutions that would guarantee democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the protection of minorities – all aspects of a well-functioning state (European Council 1993:13).

The conditionality-based policy has a limited impact, however, because the target country needs to have an EU membership perspective for it to be willing to meet the conditions set by the EU. Therefore, the Union has developed a number of policies for countries that are not going to join the Union at all or not any time soon. These range from the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) to the Union for Mediterranean and the Eastern Partnership, for countries in the immediate geographical vicinity, to development assistance primarily aimed at the least developed countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. In all these policies, European financial and technical assistance as well as access to the EU market have been subject to more or less strict conditions comprising rule of law, democracy, and human rights (Sasse 2008, Carbone 2007 and 2010, Whitman and Juncos 2012).

Also, the EU's assistance in this framework is often meant for strengthening and re-building state institutions. In particular, twinning projects aim to transfer experience in all areas of state administration and can help countries develop new institutions or reform existing ones (cf. Tulmets 2005). In the realm of security, the security sector reform programmes offer advice, assistance and monitoring of broader reforms of security forces including their political and administrative management (Spence and Fluri 2008, Pardo Sierra 2009, Dursun-Ozkanca and Vandemoortele 2012).

The ultimate tool to strengthen defunct state institutions is to substitute them with EU missions and fulfill their duties until the state is able to do so by itself. The CSDP provides the EU with a framework that allows for the conduct of such operations in states whose institutions cannot be mended by financial assistance and mentoring alone. A prominent example of such conduct has been the EU's engagement in Kosovo since 2009 under the framework of the EULEX Kosovo operation. The EU forces took over the UN-led mission and supported or replaced police and judicial authorities in Kosovo for a limited period of time, while assisting the newly independent state in developing its own capabilities (Shepherd 2009, Bono 2010, Greiçevci 2011, Papadimitriou 2012).

The obvious problem of the EU's approach towards weak states is the need for a long-term engagement. Resolution of conflicts that cause state failure takes a lot of time and costs a lot of financial and political capital. Being mostly connected only indirectly with threats to the European homeland, it is extremely difficult to maintain the public support for engagement in support of weak states, particularly more distant ones.

Adjustment 2: Struggling with Coherence Among Individual Policies

The European Union has a number of tools at its disposal to help weak states, which on one hand allows for tailored action, but on the other creates problems of coordination and coherence. These may occur across policies, such as between development assistance and trade, as well as within policy areas, such as within development assistance between the Commission and the member states (cf. Carbone 2008, Olsen 2008, Lurweg 2011). In addition, the European Union's track record in strengthening institutions and the rule of law

in weak states has been mixed at best. Whereas enlargement has been a huge success, the carrot on offer in neighbourhood policy has proved to be insufficient. The conditionality in development assistance is weakened by differing views among member states and by competition from other global actors, such as China in Africa (Carbone 2011). The lack of capabilities, both human and financial, restrict the EU from being more active on the ground and deploying more training and substitution missions in weak states. The CSDP operations are also geographically focused on the EU's immediate neighbourhood and sub-Saharan Africa. In spite of all these imperfections, however, the EU remains one of the few global actors able to cover such a broad spectrum of tasks in assistance to weak states either alone or in cooperation with others, such as NATO and the UN.

5. Adjustment to Rising Powers

The current security environment is defined by the relative decline of US influence and the emergence of other states that want to co-shape international relations – the rising powers. The EU needs to react to this new situation. In principle, the EU seems to be the ideal "soft-balancer". Having been unable and unwilling to use its hard power at a greater scale, it relies instead on its economic power and influence in international organizations (cf. Paul 2005). In line with the idea of effective multilateralism, the European Union has tried to integrate the rising powers into international institutions and regimes and make them co-responsible for global affairs. It has engaged them through a web of multilateral and bilateral relations and tried to use its market power to induce internal change (Damro 2012). However, nowhere else is the lack of EU external policy coherence more visible than in relations with important international actors. The problems hampering a more effective EU action stem from an incoherent institutional framework, the lack of agreement among EU member states, and the structural problems of the EU's character under international law.

Adjustment 1: Upgrading Bilateral Links to Strategic Partnerships

Despite its emphasis on multilateral solutions, the EU uses other diplomatic strategies just as often (Klein, Kunstein and Reiners 2013). It has concluded ten "strategic partnerships" with the most important global players, including all so-called rising powers (cf. Smith and Xie 2010, Bava 2012, Whitman and Rodt 2012). There is no single understanding of what these partnerships mean, because they exist with "natural" allies, such as the United States, as well as with countries with differing worldviews and often colliding interests, such as Russia and China (Grevi 2011). Some have criticised the whole concept of strategic partnerships for the lack of strategic vision behind it – the EU knows how to work with the partners, but has never defined what it wants to achieve with them (Renard 2011).

Moreover, there is no single approach to and structure of the strategic partnerships. They are overviewed in bilateral meetings that take place regularly once or twice a year. In some partnerships ministerial or working group meetings complement the summits of heads of state and government. There have been, for example, regular meetings between the Russian government and European Commissioners since 1997. The partnership between the EU and the US is conducted at multiple levels with many standing working groups in place.

However, the main problem of the strategic partnerships rests on the fact that for many member states they do not represent the main tool for engaging with strategic partners. Whereas the EU partnerships may work when dealing with relatively less prominent actors, such as Mexico and South Korea, the member states prefer maintaining autonomous relations with the more important ones, such as Russia, China and India, often to the detriment of the European interest. A case in point might be the issue of energy, and especially trade in gas, in

relations with Russia. Some member states prefer bilateral talks, which allow them to negotiate lower prices for their consumers, and hamper the creation of a unified European position that would strengthen the European bargaining power as a whole (Kaveshnikov 2010, Verhoeff and Niemann 2011, Kazantsev 2012). Similarly, the issue of human rights, which figures high on the EU agenda in relations with China, is often ignored in bilateral relations between China and individual EU member states (Wiessala 2009, Balducci 2010, Kinzelbach and Thelle 2011). The arms embargo on China has also been a divisive topic among EU member states for a long time (cf. Kreutz 2004). The EU's partners are fully aware of these internal divisions and have been successful in using them for their own purposes (Kulhanek 2010).

Adjustment 2: Overcoming Structural Problems with EU's Presence in Multilateral Organizations

The EU has been more successful in engaging other regional organizations and cooperating with the rising powers through them. This is particularly true for the EU's relations with Brazil through Mercosur and South Africa through the African Union. In particular, the cooperation with and the support of the African Union in various crises in sub-Saharan Africa can serve as an example of positive engagement, even though not all interventions achieved the desired results (Giorgis 2010, Vines 2010, Bono 2011).

At the same time, however, engaging rising powers within multilateral organizations has proved problematic, because the EU has struggled with its own position in these fora. Although the EU has been developing new institutional capacity to act in a unified manner, the structural and political obstacles to a more coherent representation of EU interests continue to diminish the EU's influence (cf. Gowan and Brantner 2008). The EU's position in the United Nations may serve as an example of structural problems that are difficult to overcome. Whereas the EU acquired a special status in the UN General Assembly that makes it almost equal to the member states, there is no such option for the Security Council – the key body for security policy. As a result, it is the UK, France and a few other member states that serve as non-permanent members at any given moment that are better positioned to engage Russia and China in addressing security issues around the world.

Even where the EU is a full member of multilateral bodies, the member states often hesitate to diminish their national presence. The G20 is a good case in point, because of the fact that the European Union is a full member of it has certainly not encouraged the UK, France, Germany and Italy to leave their seats at the table or Spain and the Netherlands to keep insisting on participating in the meetings (which they usually do, although not on a permanent basis). However, there are many more multilateral platforms where the EU member states meet the rising powers through EU institutions and their independent national representations. For example the Steering Group of Peace Implementation Council that oversees the implementation of Dayton peace accords in Bosnia and Herzegovina includes the European Union along with four EU member states (Weiss, Mikhelidze and Šlosarčík 2013).

6. Adjustment to New Forms of War

Since International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty issued its *Responsibility to Protect* in 2001, the responsibility of the international society to engage in favour of human security has been understood by many to be based on three pillars – to prevent, to react, and to rebuild (ICISS 2001, Bellamy 2009, Fleck 2012), which broadly fall in line with conflict prevention, humanitarian intervention and crisis management, and post-conflict stabilization. The European Union has incorporated the concept of "responsibility to protect" into its worldview. Several key foreign policy documents refer to the EU's obligation and readiness to react to

crises outside its borders, such as the European Consensus on Development or the ESS implementation report (European Union 2005:7, European Council 2008:2). Some member states have included the responsibility to protect into their national security documents (cf. French Government 2008, UK Government 2008).[5] The EU and its member states have also belonged to the most vocal supporters of the concept at the international level, in particular within the United Nations (cf. Council of the EU 2009a).

The EU has been widely regarded a well-suited champion of responsibility to protect, because it has the whole spectrum of tools at its disposal to assist and intervene in all three phases or pillars – prior to the crisis, during the crisis, and after the crisis (Evans 2008, Kirn 2011). Development, neighbourhood and enlargement policies as well as monitoring missions help prevent conflicts, CSDP military operations are in theory able to intervene while the conflict is still ongoing, and humanitarian aid and development assistance help rebuild what has been destroyed. The full potential has not, however, been reached so far. The EU has suffered from a lack of coordination among institutions, between institutions and the member states, as well as across various policies. This has been the case both in the general approach to the responsibility to protect (Bailes 2008) and in its particular pillars (Stewart 2008). Huge expectations built up prior to the Lisbon Treaty's entry into force and the creation of the EEAS, which should have provided more coherence in all streams of EU foreign and security policy (Duke 2012). However, the reality lags far behind the expectations – either in overall foreign policy or the specific areas (Reynaert 2012, Concord 2011). This part focuses on two main areas relevant for the EU's performance in the current forms of intervention – the CSDP, which provides the toolbox for intervention in all stages of conflict development and resolution, and the international cooperation between the EU and other actors, which is crucial for understanding where and how the EU gets engaged.

Adjustment 1: Creating the Common Security and Defence Policy – A Toolbox for Crisis Management

The EU Common Security and Defence Policy is a unique toolbox for the EU's engagement in external crises at all stages. No other international organization has such a framework that allows for combining and coordinating different types of responses during a whole crisis cycle (cf. Diehl 2008, Gilboa 2009, Wallensteen 2012). The so-called Petersberg Tasks, listed in Art. 42 of the Treaty on European Union, neatly sum up what types of missions the EU should be able to conduct during the pre-violent phase (conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks), during the hot phase of the conflict (tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking; humanitarian and rescue tasks), and after violence ceases (post-conflict stabilisation tasks; joint disarmament operations; military advice and assistance tasks).

Since 2003, when the first CSDP operation was launched, the EU has conducted missions of all types with the exception of peacemaking. Both civilian and military capabilities have been used, depending on the type of task. On the military side, the EU soldiers have engaged in combat in the antipiracy naval operation Atalanta, maintained peace in Bosnia, Macedonia and the Democratic Republic of Congo, trained troops in Somalia and Mali, and contributed to security sector reform in Guinea Bissau and DR Congo. On the civilian side, the EU has covered a wide range of tasks from substituting local institutions in Kosovo, to training local forces in Afghanistan, Kosovo, Macedonia and DR Congo, to monitoring the status quo and enforcement of rules in Georgia, the Palestinian Territories and Aceh (cf. Grevi, Helly and Keohane 2009, EEAS 2013).

The EU has been equipped, at least on paper, with the means to develop relatively quickly, not only the whole institutional and procedural framework for the CSDP operations, but also a number of new capabilities. Among

5 It should be noted, however, that the UK security strategy of 2010 dropped all references to the responsibility to protect concept (UK Government 2010).

the most important ones should be the so-called battle groups – small and independent multinational military units capable of rapid reaction in case of a crisis (Jacoby and Jones 2008, Chappell 2009). Formed on the basis of EU's experience in operation Artemis in DR Congo, the battle groups should become the flagship of CSDP and the forces of first entry. Since 2007, there has always been at least one battle group on standby, ready to be deployed upon the Council's request. The problem, however, is that the battle groups have not yet been deployed. The lack of agreement among the member states has prevented the use of a battle group and necessitated instead assembling *ad hoc* intervention forces from specific national contributions. A case in point might be the military operation in Chad and the Central African Republic, which had to be postponed by several months due to lack of capacities and was very close to not taking off at all (Gowan 2009, Dijkstra 2010, Haine 2011, Styan 2012).

The use of military power, although generally acceptable for the EU, remains problematic for some member states. In principle, the EU requires a clear UN Security Council mandate, but even with the mandate, political constraints often hamper quick and effective action. At the end of the day, therefore, the member states willing to intervene may have to make use of other means. This was the case of the British-French intervention in Libya, which was supported by the US and later taken over by NATO (Koenig 2011, Miskimmon 2012), or the engagement in Mali where the French did all the fighting and the EU joined only at a later stage with a training mission (Faleg 2013).

The EU has been more successful in civilian CSDP missions where it can build upon its experience with stabilizing the countries in its neighbourhood that later became members. It is of no surprise that the number of civilian missions top the military operations by a considerable margin (Kammel 2011, Malešic 2011). The civilian crisis management is considered the EU's key competitive advantage (Marquina and Ruiz 2005). It often follows the EU-led military operations, but is also widely used to cooperate with and to follow upon other international actors' engagements.

Adjustment 2: Cooperating Internationally as an Agent and Assistant

The European Union maintains scores of ties with other international organizations and actors. In crisis management three such links stand out – with the United Nations, with NATO, and with the African Union.

From the very beginning, the CSDP was designed to support the leading role of the United Nations in providing international security (European Council 1999a:Annex III, 1999b:Annex IV and 2003). Cooperation between the two organizations, based on a 2003 joint declaration, (Council of the EU 2003b) has featured the EU as the implementation agency for the UN decisions as well as a complementary actor to the UN's own crisis management efforts. Whereas the implementing role can be observed in Kosovo, where the EU-run mission EULEX took over the responsibilities of a UN one (cf. Wet 2009, Dursun-Ozkanca and Vandemoortele 2012), the supporting role can also be seen in DR Congo (cf. Major 2008). The prominent role of the United Nations in EU crisis management has been further emphasised by the fact that EU member states require a UN mandate to participate in a CSDP mission due to domestic constraints (cf. Laffan and O'Mahony 2008:175-184, Agius 2006).

Cooperation between EU and NATO has been an inevitable result of the largely overlapping membership in the two organizations. Having been constructed as a way to increase European contributions to their own security, the CSDP developed under *de facto* conditions set by the US and agreed to by many member states: the CSDP is not supposed to create duplications of NATO's assets; it should engage non-EU NATO members; and it should not decouple Europeans from NATO (Albright 1998). The efforts to minimize duplications, in particular, led the

EU to conclude an agreement with NATO on access to Alliance's assets in EU-led operations, the so-called Berlin Plus arrangement (Reichard 2006:ch. 8). Not all EU members understood the creation of CSDP identically from the very beginning, which led to fierce debates about NATO's or the EU's primacy as a crisis management framework. The CSDP started off, to a large extent, as an institution relieving NATO of some of its obligations in Europe by taking over its missions in Bosnia or conducting the operation in Macedonia, and supporting NATO's military crisis management with its civilian capabilities, such as in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan. However, not least due to political problems between some members of the respective organizations, namely Cyprus and Turkey (the former a member of the EU but not NATO, the latter the other way round) cooperation between the EU and NATO has stalled at the strategic level (Duke 2008, Acikmese and Triantaphyllou 2012). The issue remains an obstacle for further CSDP development.[6] In some cases, it has even led to duplication or overlap in deployments, such as off the coasts of Somalia where two parallel NATO and EU antipiracy missions operate, or in Darfur where both the EU and NATO have supported the activities of the African Union (Monaco and Gourlay 2005, Touzovskaia 2006).

Apart from the Balkans, the region where the EU plays an important, maybe even leading, role in crisis management is Africa. With autonomous missions, such as those in DR Congo, Somalia and Guinea-Bissau, as well as through cooperative efforts, the EU has been a key supporter of the African Union's efforts to maintain peace on the continent. The framework and objectives of this partnership were set at an EU-Africa summit in Lisbon (Council of the EU 2007). Besides serving as a role model for the African Union, the EU assists the Africans in numerous ways from development assistance, to human rights, to military aid (Pirozzi 2010). The most visible practical results of this cooperation so far have been the EU's assistance to Sudan and Somalia and the EU's engagement in the creation of the African Peace Facility (Miranda, Pirozzi and Schäfer 2012).

7. Constrains to an Effective Adjustment Process

In many respects, the European Union is very well suited to deal with the current security environment. It has adjusted its institutions and policies to reflect the new security threats and has got a more or less clear strategic idea about its place in the world. Yet, the EU is far from achieving its full potential or playing a more important role in international security, which would reflect its economic weight and international ambitions. The constraining factors can be broadly packed into three categories, which all fall back on the member states and their often reserved approach to common European security policy.

7.1 Member States' Views of the EU's Role in Security Policy

The member states are far from united in their views on what role the EU should play in foreign and security policy. There is a general agreement that the EU's foreign activities should be more coherent, easier to read for partners and more efficient (cf. European Council 2001). The institutional debate has, however, always covered the more profound disagreement on what issues should be dealt with at the EU level and what should be left for the member states alone or for member states in other international venues.

Occasionally, this debate comes to the surface, usually during major treaty reforms where the member states avoid a more clear-cut and definite delimitation of responsibilities. The Maastricht Treaty famously created

6 The recurring controversy about an autonomous EU operational headquarters may be an example of this fact (cf. Pop 2011). Similarly, the parallel processes of "smart defence" and "pooling and sharing" aiming at restructuring European militaries have been connected through the individual member states' single sets of forces, but lacked coherent high-level coordination (Faleg and Giovannini 2012).

a special "pillar" for foreign and security policy and the subsequent intergovernmental conferences always preserved the leeway for member states to pursue their own policies. The intergovernmental decision-making in CFSP/CSDP that remained intact despite the abolition of the pillar structure after the Lisbon Treaty entered into force serves as an example. Even more vocal are the Declarations 13 and 14 to the Lisbon Treaty (despite their limited legal power). In these declarations the member states satisfied their urge to emphasise that they remain solely responsible for the formulation of their foreign policies, continue to have the right to maintain specific security and defence policy, do not cede any new powers to the European Commission or the European Parliament, and retain the right to participate in international organizations, including, explicitly, the UN Security Council (European Union 2007). Apparently, the sensitivity of the foreign and security policy still prevents the member states from giving up the fullest possible control of the domain (cf. Blagden 2008, Mayer 2009, Tonra 2011).

Considering the emphasis of the member states on national control over foreign policy, it is not surprising that even where the member states agree on cooperation they may disagree on the right framework. The EU's reach overlaps with many other international organizations. There is a reasonably delimited complementarity with some, such as the Council of Europe and its court for human rights, or with the UN where the primacy of the UN Security Council is not questioned. In some cases, however, the member states may be tempted to venue-shop. For example, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), to which all EU member states are parties, has been engaged in crisis management in the EU's neighbourhood – basically in all areas where the EU attempted to maintain peace and order – with very similar focus and aims (cf. Weiss, Mikhelidze and Šlosarčík 2013 for the cases of Georgia and Bosnia). The most obvious case of such institutional overlap is the EU-NATO relationship. The 22 countries that are members of both EU and NATO have the option, and make use of it, to choose which of the two organizations should deal with a particular issue. The lack of clear guidelines leads to major duplications: among others, both the EU and NATO have created capabilities in the cyber-security domain, NATO deliberates about moving more into civilian crisis management and the EU regularly plays with the idea of an autonomous military headquarters. In the end, it is the member states that decide which venue (if any) will be used as a political compromise. This explains the dual presence of Europeans off the Horn of Africa in parallel EU and NATO maritime missions, or the dual support to the African Union's operation in Darfur by both the EU and NATO.

The issue of competence stretches beyond the hard security area, because it is relevant to most "new security" domains as well. Energy security, one of the most popular areas, may serve as an example. Having ceded significant powers to the EU on internal energy policy, including market liberalization and interconnection, the member states have so far not been ready to give up their individual policies vis-à-vis foreign suppliers. As a result, the EU is creating a huge internal energy market, but lacks its external personality, which is crucial from the perspective of security of supply (cf. Hoogeveen and Perlot 2007, Jong and Schunz 2012). Similarly, the Schengen member states have harmonized rules and procedures for short-term visa, but they have retained control over long-term stays and maintained separate asylum systems, which makes more effective EU cooperation in migration control problematic.

7.2 Conflicting Interests and Cultures Among Member States

The caution with which the member states approach the transfer of decision-making to the EU level can be, to a large extent, explained by the conflicting interests and different strategic cultures among them (cf. Gordon 1997, Rummel and Wiedemann 1998, Ferreira-Pereira and Groom 2010). Not being sure that they would be able

to push through their national interest into the aggregate EU interest, the member states prefer the absence of a common policy to the creation of a policy that might be, from their perspective, disadvantageous. Foreign and security policy is extremely sensitive in this respect, because it is close to state sovereignty and closely connected to values, traditions and identity. As a result, it is highly politicised and always prone to media reflection – much more so than highly technical matters of, for example, competition policy or workplace safety. Furthermore, there are significant differences between the member states' approaches to intervention, use of force and, more generally, engagement in the world stemming from differing traditions, size, capabilities, and historical developments. There are several consequences of this situation.

Firstly, the EU has problems in becoming a reliable player in foreign policy in general and in security policy in particular. It is difficult to lead when you always struggle to reach an internal compromise and create a common position. As a result, the EU can provide useful backing to others, but makes a sloppy leader. The example of Bosnia where the EU became the main player responsible for paving the way for reform and stabilisation has shown how the EU spends a lot of time in internal bargaining and lacks the capacity and flexibility to involve other organizations (as well as local actors) into decision-making. The often difficult and long internal negotiations leave limited time for engaging other actors and the EU, working with the hard-won compromise among the member states, cannot deviate from its negotiating position (Weiss, Mikhelidze and Šlosarčík 2013). Moreover, the non-existence of common positions often leads to member states taking up autonomous action (either alone or with other international backing). The Libyan intervention in 2011 was instructive: the EU contemplated on various forms of involvement in Libya, but ended up completely side-lined and passive.

Secondly, the European Union, despite all institutional reforms, lacks a streamlined and coherent representation at the international level. Most notably, the EU is simultaneously over- and under-represented in the most important international organizations that set the direction of international politics today, namely the UN Security Council and the G20. In the security domain, the case of the UN Security Council is particularly painful. The EU considers the body the hub of global policy-making, but its representatives cannot be members of the body and need to be invited every time they want to make a point. At the same time, two of the member states are permanent members (but reserve their right to act independently from the EU) and others participate on a non-permanent basis. Moreover, the member states do not agree on how to reform the institution. Some of them have proposed a joint EU seat, but rather as an expression of their low chance of acquiring a permanent seat for themselves and a way to complicate the upgrade of fellow member states, not as an expression of their commitment to unified European representation (Pirozzi and Ronzitti 2011, Kundnani 2012).

Thirdly, the European Union is prone to being a victim of divide-and-rule tactics by other actors. It is easy to hamper EU agreement by raising issues that force member states' governments to take firm positions for the sake of the public and thereby forestalling a compromise. A case in point was Donald Rumsfeld's old and new Europe speech, which alienated European countries during the Iraq crisis in 2003 (Roter and Šabič 2004). On a long-term basis, a similar strategy is pursued by Russia in the energy domain, effectively preventing a creation of a single EU negotiating position on gas supplies.

7.3 Lack of Capabilities

Finally, the European Union lacks capabilities and procedures that would make it a successful leader in security matters. Even when there is a broad agreement on what should be done or when the emergence of a European position is not hampered by any member state's veto, the EU often lacks the manpower and ability to engage

effectively. This deficiency also falls back to the member states' reluctance to commit sufficient resources to the EU's cause.

The EU commits a very limited budget to foreign and security policy, including crisis management. The "Global Europe" chapter makes just over 6 per-cent of overall EU expenditure in the upcoming Multiannual Financial Framework (European Council 2013). Moreover, the treaties do not allow the EU to finance any military crisis management from its budget. Instead the additional costs of such missions must be met by the member states that are also responsible for a huge portion of the civilian operation costs (Scannell 2004). This complicates the force generation process for EU-led military missions, as the case of EUFOR Chad/CAR and its repeated delays revealed.

Considering the austerity measures everywhere in the EU today, the perspective of the member states being willing to invest more money into crisis management operations seems very bleak, despite rising criticism from the United States (cf. Gates 2011). Consequently, there is little hope that another major gap in the EU's preparedness to act will be overcome any time soon, namely the lack of (particularly military) capabilities at the level of the member states. Very few member states are able to project military power abroad. Even the most capable ones, the UK and France, had to rely on US support during their campaign in Libya. Defence budgets have been steadily decreasing all over Europe, suggesting that there is no end in sight to the problem. Attempts to substitute the low level of funding at the state level by better collective spending at the level of the EU through the European Defence Agency and pooling and sharing initiatives have not brought any visible results so far – mainly due to member states' efforts to protect their national industrial champions (Missiroli 2003, Heuninckx 2009).

Finally, the EU is unable to make use of some of its existing capabilities, because of a lack of trust among the member states and their agencies. This is the case of the emerging European External Action Service, which has been created to streamline EU external representation and support the member states in their foreign policies. However, the member states (and the Commission) have curtailed the EEAS' role in foreign policy, especially in terms of financial backing of external action or of consular affairs. Some member states even announced that they would increase their international presence, which, at least partly, goes against the idea behind the creation of the service (Rettman 2011). Similarly, the EU has not been able to expand cooperation and data sharing among national intelligence services, because of persistant distrust among them (Walsh 2006).

It is worth pointing out that important developments have taken place at the national level. Whereas the EU-wide initiatives got bogged down in conflicting national interests or politics, major adjustments were undertaken by individual member states or small groups of them. Whereas some groups of states had traditionally had closer relations and a tradition of cooperation, such as the Nordic states (cf. Neumann and Heikka 2005) and the Benelux countries (cf. Sauer 2005), the declining defence budgets made other member states explore previously unthinkable possibilities. A prime example of such an initiative may be the 2010 Franco-British Defence and Security Co-operation Treaty, which anticipates bilateral cooperation between the two countries in the most sensitive areas of nuclear research and nuclear weapons testing, creation of common and interoperable capabilities such as expeditionary forces and aircraft carriers, as well as in defence research and procurement (UK and France 2010, Jones 2011, O'Donnell 2011). As a result, some suggest that this type of bottom-up regional (cluster) cooperation might pave the way for future defence integration, creating new and maintaining old capabilities (cf. Biscop 2013, Missiroli 2013).

8. Conclusion

The European Union does have the ambition to play a significant role in international security. The member states have managed to agree on the definition of the broader strategic framework and to commonly identify the major security threats. On one hand, the EU has been able to adjust its policies and institutional framework to the current security situation and continues to evolve and develop new capabilities, deepening the cooperation among its member states. It could make a significant contribution to global security because it can build on long-term experience, significant financial resources, vast member state capabilities, and a common institutional framework which brings everything together. Especially on some pressing issues, such as state failure, the EU could potentially play a leading role internationally. On the other hand, the EU has not adjusted quickly and profoundly enough to actually become a leader and one can even ask whether, despite all the rhetoric, it in fact would like to be one – or to put it more bluntly, if its member states want it to become one.

The EU is not a single actor in the security domain, but rather a framework for security policies of its member states, which all retain the freedom to use other international fora or to act uni- and bilaterally. The EU is often the "missing" actor – it does not create any common position if there is no agreement among the member states. It spends a lot of time on internal bargaining and is prone to problems when none of the member states wants to throw its weight and resources behind a common action, which easily ends up in non-action. The few success stories mostly feature one of the member states acting unilaterally and bringing others in later. For example, the French in Mali recently, or small groups of members paving the way and later being joined by the rest of the EU, such as the UK, France and Germany in negotiations on the Iranian nuclear programme. Yet, there is clearly no readiness among the member states to change the basic principles behind the CSDP, notably intergovernmental decision-making and national sovereignty over foreign and security policy. As a result, the supranational institutions that could provide leadership for European foreign and security policy, in particular the High Representative and the EEAS, lack the formal and informal powers to do so.

Lacking leadership within, the EU is not able to exert leadership internationally. The concept of effective multilateralism can be understood as an attempt to diffuse responsibility within the international community in order not to tackle the challenges alone. Furthermore, the EU is not very successful in doing things alone; its track record is much better in supporting others and backing international motions and multilateral initiatives. In such cases, it is able to make use of its capabilities and resources quite well, as the record of CSDP missions to support weak states and to back international non-proliferation and counter-terrorism conventions through mainstreaming has shown. Even in the Balkans and in sub-Saharan Africa, the two places where EU leadership is requested by the international community, Europeans have often hidden behind others – the US and NATO in the case of the Balkans and the African Union in Africa.

The low leadership ability is most visible in EU relations with other powers. Conflicting national interests of the member states together with the weak institutional framework makes the EU prone to falling prey to divide-and-rule strategies of other actors. Indeed, the more important a country becomes for the EU, the less likely it is that the EU hammers out a common strategy. Whereas the member states have no problem to act collectively in relations to Myanmar or Panama, they fail to define common guidelines towards India or Brazil, not to mention China or, indeed, the United States.

To sum up, the European Union has been caught unprepared by the diffusion of power in the international system. In security policy, it has considerable capabilities and the potential to play an important role globally. However, it does not live up to expectations, mainly due to internal constraints even despite external demand for EU leadership in some areas. The EU has been adjusting to the current security environment, but it will not become a leader any time soon.

Bibliography

Acikmese, Sinem Akgul, and Triantaphyllou, Dimitrios (2012), "The NATO-EU-Turkey trilogy: the impact of the Cyprus conundrum", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (December), p. 555-573.

Agius, Christine (2006), *The Social Construction of Swedish Neutrality. Challenges to Swedish Identity and Sovereignty*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Albright, Madeleine (1998), "The Right Balance Will Secure NATO's Future", *Financial Times*, 7 December.

Archick, Kristin (2013), "U.S.-EU Cooperation Against Terrorism", *CRS Report for Congress*, No. RS22030 (21 May), http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22030.pdf.

Arthur, Charles (2012), "Internet remains unregulated after UN treaty blocked", *The Guardian*, 14 December, http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2012/dec/14/telecoms-treaty-internet-unregulated.

Bailes, Alyson J.K. (2008), "The EU and a 'better world': what role for the European Security and Defence Policy?", *International Affairs*, Vol. 84, No. 1 (January), p. 115-130.

Balducci, Giuseppe (2010), "The Limits of Normative Power Europe in Asia: The Case of Human Rights in China", *East Asia*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (March), p. 35-55.

Bava, Ummu Salma (2012), "India and the European Union: From Engagement to Strategic Partnership", *International Studies*, Vol. 47, No. 2-4 (July), p. 373-386.

Bellamy, Alex J. (2009), *Responsibility to Protect. The Global Effort to End Mass Atrocities*, Cambridge and Malden, Polity.

Benyon, John (1996), "The Politics of Police Co-operation in the European Union", *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (December), p. 353-379.

Bergenäs, Johan (2010), "The European Union's Evolving Engagement with Iran. Two Steps Forward, One Step Back", *The Nonproliferation Review*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (November), p. 491-512.

Bindi, Federiga (2011), "One Year On: Assessing the European Foreign Policy and the European External Action Service", *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Spring/Summer), p. 125-137.

Biscop, Sven, ed. (2009), "The Value of Power, the Power of Values. A Call for an EU Grand Strategy", *Egmont Papers*, No. 33 (October), http://www.egmontinstitute.be/paperegm/ep33.pdf.

Biscop, Sven (2013), "Pool it, Share it, Use it: The European Council on Defence", *Egmont Security Policy Briefs*, No. 44 (March), http://www.egmontinstitute.be/papers/13/sec-gov/SPB44.pdf.

Biscop, Sven, and Coelmont, Jo (2011), *Europe, Strategy and Armed Forces. The making of a distinctive power*, London and New York, Routledge.

Blagden, David (2008), "Modeling European Security and Defence Policy: Strategic Enablement, National Sovereignty and Differential Atlanticism", *Yale Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Spring/Summer), p. 87-99, http://yalejournal.org/?p=54.

Blair, Stephanie (2009), "Towards Integration? Unifying Military and Civilian ESDP Operations", *European Security Review*, No. 44 (May), p. 5-7, http://www.isis-europe.eu/programme/responding-conflict-amp-gender-and-security/towards-integration-unifying-military-and.

Bono, Giovanna (2010), "The European Union and "Supervised Independence" of Kosovo: A Strategic Solution to the Kosovo/Serbia Conflict?", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2, p. 249-264.

Bono, Giovanna (2011), "The EU's Military Operation in Chad and the Central African Republic: An Operation to Save Lives?", *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (March), p. 23-42.

Bures, Oldrich (2010), "EU's Fight against Terrorist Finances: Internal Shortcomings and Unsuitable External Models", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 22, No. 3, p. 418-437.

Buzan, Barry, Waever, Ole, and Wilde, Jaap De (1997), *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner.

Carbone, Maurizio (2007), *The European Union and International Development. The politics of foreign aid*, London and New York, Routledge.

Carbone, Maurizio (2008), "Mission Impossible: the European Union and Policy Coherence for Development", *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (July), p. 323-342, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07036330802144992.

Carbone, Maurizio (2010), "The European Union, Good Governance and Aid Co-ordination", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 1, p. 13-29.

Carbone, Maurizio (2011), "The European Union and China's rise in Africa: Competing visions, external coherence and trilateral cooperation", *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (April), p. 203-221.

Chafer, Tony, and Cumming, Gordon (2010), "Beyond Fashoda: Anglo-French security cooperation in Africa since Saint-Malo", *International Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 5 (September), p. 1129-1147.

Chan, Steve (1995), "Grasping the Peace Dividend: Some Propositions on the Conversion of Swords into Plowshares", *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (April), p. 53-95.

Chappell, Laura (2009), "Differing member state approaches to the development of the EU Battlegroup Concept: implications for CSDP", *European Security*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (December), p. 417-439, http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/235561.

Chevènement, Jean-Pierre (2009), "Le 'retour' de la France dans l'OTAN: une décision inopportune", *Politique étrangère*, Vol. 74, No. 4 (hiver), p. 873-879, http://dx.doi.org/10.3917/pe.094.0873.

Cohen, Herman J. (2004), "The Bush Doctrine of Strategic Preemption: A Revolutionary Upheaval or a Predictable Evolution of the International System?", *American Foreign Policy Interest*, Vol. 26, No. 2, p. 123-127.

Concord (2011), *EEAS One Year On: "Work in progress" for poverty eradication*, Brussels, Concord, http://www.concordeurope.org/98-eeas-one-year-on-work-in-progress-for-poverty-eradication.

Coolsaet, Rik (2010), "EU counterterrorism strategy: value added or chimera?", *International Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 4 (July), p. 857-873.

Council of the EU (2002a), *Decision setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime* (2002/187/JHA), Brussels, 28 February, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=celex:32002d0187:en:not.

Council of the EU (2002b), *Framework Decision on combating terrorism* (2002/475/JHA), Brussels, 13 June, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=celex:32002f0475:en:not.

Council of the EU (2003a), *EU strategy against proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction* (15708/03), Brussels, 10 December, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/st15708.en03.pdf.

Council of the EU (2003b), *Joint Declaration on UN-EU Co-operation in Crisis Management* (12730/03), Brussels, 19 September, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/st12730.en03.pdf.

Council of the EU (2004a), *EU-U.S. Declaration on Combating Terrorism* (10760/04 Presse 205), Dromoland Castle, 26 June, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/10760EU_US26.06.04.pdf.

Council of the EU (2004b), *Joint Action 2004/796/CFSP for the support of the physical protection of a nuclear site in the Russian Federation*, Brussels, 22 November, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=celex:32004e0796:en:not.

Council of the EU (2005a), *EU Counter-Terrorism Clauses: assessment* (14458/2/04 REV 2 EXT 1), Brussels, 11 May, http://www.statewatch.org/news/2005/may/eu-terr-clauses.pdf.

Council of the EU (2005b), *The European Union Counter-Terrorism Strategy* (14469/4/05 REV 4), Brussels, 30 November, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/st14469-re04.en05.pdf.

Council of the EU (2006), *EU Action Plan on combating terrorism* (5771/1/06 REV 1), Brussels, 13 February, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/st05771-re01.en06.pdf.

Council of the EU (2007), *A Joint Africa-EU Strategy* (16344/07), Lisbon, 9 December, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/er/97496.pdf.

Council of the EU (2008), *The European Union Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Effective multilateralism, prevention and international cooperation*, Brussels, November, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/EN%20prolif_int%202008.pdf.

Council of the EU (2009a), *EU priorities for the 64th United Nations General Assembly* (10809/09), Brussels, 9 June, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/st10809.en09.pdf.

Council of the EU (2009b), *Note on the implementation of the WMD Clause* (5503/09), Brussels, 19 January, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/st05503.en09.pdf.

Council of the EU (2010), *Internal Security Strategy for the European Union: "Towards a European Security Model"* (5842/2/10 REV 2), Brussels, 23 February, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/st05842-re02.en10.pdf.

Cristiani, Dario, and Fabiani, Riccardo (2013), "From Disfunctionality to Disaggregation and Back? The Malian Crisis, Local Players and European Interests", *IAI Working Papers*, No. 1308 (March), http://www.iai.it/content.asp?langid=2&contentid=878.

Damro, Chad (2012), "Market power Europe", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 19, No. 5 (June), p. 682-699.

Diehl, Paul F. (2008), *Peace Operations*, Cambridge and Malden, Polity Press.

Dijkstra, Hylke (2010), "The Military Operation of the EU in Chad and the Central African Republic: Good Policy, Bad Politics", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (June), p. 395-407.

Dijkstra, Hylke (2011), "EU External Representation in Conflict Resolution: When does the Presidency or the High Representative Speak for Europe?", *European Integration online Papers*, Vol. 15, No. 1, http://eiop.or.at/eiop/index.php/eiop/article/view/2011_001a.

Dover, Robert, and Phythian, Mark (2011), "Lost Over Libya: The 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review - An Obituary", *Defence Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (September), p. 420-444, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14702436.2011.630175.

Duke, Simon (2008), "The Future of EU-NATO Relations: a Case of Mutual Irrelevance Through Competition?", *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (March), p. 27-43.

Duke, Simon (2009), "Providing for European-Level Diplomacy after Lisbon: The Case of the European External Action Service", *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 211-233, http://www.graspe.eu/document/DukeHJD2009.pdf.

Duke, Simon (2012), "The European External Action Service: Antidote against Incoherence?", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (February), p. 45-68.

Durkalec, Jacek (2012), "The Proliferation Security Initiative: Evolution and Future Prospects", *EU Non-Proliferation Papers*, No. 16 (June), http://www.nonproliferation.eu/documents/nonproliferationpapers/jacekdurkalec4fcc7fd95cfff.pdf.

Dursun-Ozkanca, Oya, and Vandemoortele, Antoine (2012), "The European Union and Security Sector Reform: current practices and challenges of implementation", *European Security*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (June), p. 139-160, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2012.665881.

Edwards, Geoffrey (2006), "Is there a European Security Culture in the Enlarged European Union?", *The International Spectator*, Vol. 41, No. 3 (July-September), p. 7-23.

EEAS (2013), *EU Operations*, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/eeas/security-defence/eu-operations.aspx.

Einhorn, Robert J. (2004), "A Transatlantic Strategy on Iran's Nuclear Program", *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (Autumn), p. 21-32, http://www.gees.org/documentos/Documen-171.pdf.

Elsuwege, Peter van (2010), "EU External Action after the Collapse of the Pillar Structure: In Search of a New Balance between Delimitation and Consistency", *Common Market Law Review*, Vol. 47, p. 987-1019.

Erästö, Tytti (2011), "Transatlantic diplomacy in the Iranian nuclear issue - Helping to build trust?", *European Security*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (September), p. 405-430.

Erkelens, Leendert, and Blockmans, Steven (2012), "Setting up the European External Action Service: an act of institutional balance", *European Constitutional Law Review*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (June), p. 246-279. Publ. also as *CLEER Working Papers*, No. 2012/1 (January), http://www.asser.nl/default.aspx?textid=40197.

European Commission (2012), *Digital Agenda: EU defends open internet at Dubai international telecommunications conference* (MEMO/12/922), Brussels, 30 November, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-922_en.htm.

European Commission and High Representative (2013), *Cybersecurity Strategy of the European Union. An Open, Safe and Secure Cyberspace* (JOIN(2013) 1 final), Brussels, 7 February, http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=1667.

European Council (1993), *Conclusions of the Presidency* (SN 180/1/93 REV 1), Copenhagen, 22 June, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/72921.pdf.

European Council (1999a), *Presidency Conclusions* (150/99 REV 1), Cologne, 4 June, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/57886.pdf.

European Council (1999b), *Presidency Conclusions*, Helsinki, 11 December, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm.

European Council (2001), *Laeken Declaration on the Future of the European Union*, Laeken, 15 December, http://european-convention.eu.int/pdf/lknen.pdf.

European Council (2003), *A secure europe in a better world. European Security Strategy*, Brussels, 12 December, http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf.

European Council (2004), *Declaration on Combating Terrorism*, Brussels, 25 March, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/DECL-25.3.pdf.

European Council (2008), *Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy: Providing Security in a Changing World* (S407/08), Brussels, 11 December, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/104630.pdf.

European Council (2013), *Conclusions (Multiannual Financial Framework)* (EUCO 37/13), Brussels, 8 February, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/st00037.en13.pdf.

European Union (2004), *Regulation (EC) No 460/2004 establishing the European Network and Information Security Agency*, Brussels, 10 March, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=celex:32004r0460:en:not.

European Union (2005), *Joint statement on European Union Development Policy: The European Consensus* (2006/C 46/01), Brussels, 20 December, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=celex:42006x0224%2801%29:en:not.

European Union (2007), *Final Act of the Intergovernmental Conference* (2007/C 306/02), Lisbon, 13 December, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=oj:c:2007:306:0231:0271:en:pdf.

European Union Delegation to the US (2012), "Thwarting Cybercrime and Safeguarding Cyber Security in the European Union", *EU Focus*, No. 11 (November), http://www.euintheus.org/resources-learning/eu-focus/november-2012-thwarting-cybercrime-and-safeguarding-cyber-security-in-the-european-union.

Europol (2013), *European Cybercrime Centre*, https://www.europol.europa.eu/ec3.

Evans, Gareth (2008), *Responsibility to Protect. Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and for All*, Washington, Brookings Institution Press.

Faleg, Giovanni (2013), "Castles in the Sand: Mali and the demise of the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy", *CEPS Commentaries*, 28 January, http://www.ceps.eu/node/7641.

Faleg, Giovanni, and Giovannini, Alessandro (2012), "The EU between Pooling & Sharing and Smart Defence: Making a virtue of necessity?", *CEPS Special Reports*, No. 61 (May), http://www.ceps.eu/node/6956.

Ferreira-Pereira, Laura C., and Groom, A.J.R. (2010), "'Mutual solidarity' within the EU common foreign and security policy: What is the name of the game?", *International Politics*, Vol. 47, No. 6 (November), p. 596-616.

Fleck, Dieter (2012), "The Responsibility to Rebuild and Its Potential for Law-Creation: Good Governance, Accountability and Judicial Control", *Journal of International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 16, No. 1-2 (February), p. 84-98.

French Government (2008), *The French White Paper on Defence and National Security 2008*, http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/France_English2008.pdf.

Gates, Robert M. (2011), *The Security and Defense Agenda (Future of NATO)*, Brussels, 10 June, http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1581.

Gearson, John, and Gow, James (2010), "Security, Not Defence, Strategic, Not Habit: Restructuring the Political Arrangements for Policy Making on Britain's Role in the World", *The Political Quarterly*, Vol. 81, No. 3 (July-September), p. 406-419.

Gebhard, Carmen (2009), "The Crisis Management and Planning Directorate: Recalibrating ESDP Planning and Conduct Capacities", *CFSP Forum*, Vol. 7, No. 4, p. 8-14, http://carmengebhard.com/CFSP_Forum_vol_7_no_4_Gebhard.pdf.

Gilboa, Eytan (2009), "Media and Conflict Resolution: A Framework for Analysis", *Marquette Law Review*, Vol. 93, No. 1 (Fall), p. 87-111, http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/mulr/vol93/iss1/9.

Giorgis, Andebrhan W. (2010), "Coordinating International Support for African Peace and Security Efforts: From the G8 to the EU", *The International Spectator*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (June), p. 69-83.

Gordon, Philip H. (1997), "Europe's Uncommon Foreign Policy", *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Winter), p. 74-100.

Gowan, Richard (2009), "The Case of the Missing Battlegroups: Is EU-UN Military Cooperation in Decline?", *Studia Diplomatica*, Vol. 62, No. 3, p. 53-60, http://www.egmontinstitute.be/SD/10/Studia_3_Int.pdf.

Gowan, Richard, and Brantner, Franziska (2008), "A Global Force for Human Rights? An Audit of European Power at the UN", *ECFR Publications*, No. 8 (September), http://ecfr.eu/content/entry/the_european_union_at_the_united_nations.

Greiçevci, Labinot (2011), "EU Actorness in International Affairs: The Case of EULEX Mission in Kosovo", *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (September), p. 283-303, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15705854.2011.596307.

Grevi, Giovanni, ed. (2011), *Mapping EU Strategic Partnerships*, Madrid, FRIDE, http://www.fride.org/publication/956/mapping-eu-strategic-partnerships.

Grevi, Giovanni, Helly, Damien, and Keohane, Daniel, eds. (2009), *European Security and Defence Policy: The first 10 years (1999-2009)*, Paris, EU ISS, http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/esdp-the-first-10-years-1999-2009.

Guitton, Clement (2013), "Cyber insecurity as a national threat: overreaction from Germany, France and the UK?", *European Security*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (March), p. 21-35.

Hailbronner, Kay, Papakonstantinou, Vagelis, and Kau, Marcel (2008), "The Agreement on Passenger-Data Transfer (PNR) and the EU-US Cooperation in Data Communication", *International Migration*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (June), p. 187-197.

Haine, Jean Yves (2011), "The Failure of a European Strategic Culture - EUFOR CHAD: The Last of its Kind?", *Contemporary Security Policy*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (December), p. 582-603.

Hatzigeorgopoulos, Myrto (2012), "European Perspectives on Unmanned Aerial Vehicles", *European Security Review*, No. 63 (December), http://www.isis-europe.eu/publication/european-security-review/esr-63-european-perspectives-unmanned-aerial-vehicles.

Healey, Jason, and Bochoven, Leendert van (2012), "NATO's Cyber Capabilities: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow", *Atlantic Council Issue Briefs*, 27 February, http://www.acus.org/publication/natos-cyber-capabilities-yesterday-today-and-tomorrow.

Heisbourg, François (2003), "A Work in Progress: The Bush Doctrine and Its Consequences", *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Spring), p. 75-88.

Heuninckx, Baudouin (2009), "Defence Procurement: The Most Effective Way to Grant Illegal State Aid and Get Away with It ... Or Is It?", *Common Market Law Review*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (February), p. 191-211.

Higashino, Atsuko (2004), "For the Sake of 'Peace and Security'?: The Role of Security in the European Union Enlargement Eastwards", *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (December), p. 347-368.

Hill, Christopher (2006), "The Directoire and the Problem of a Coherent EU Foreign Policy", *CFSP Forum*, Vol. 4, No. 6, p. 1-4, http://paperroom.ipsa.org/papers/paper_5321.pdf.

Hoogeveen, Femke, and Perlot, Wilbur (2007), "The EU's Policies of Security of Energy Supply Towards the Middle East and Caspian Region: Major Power Politics?", in M. Parvizi Amineh, ed., *The Greater Middle East in Global Politics. Social Science Perspectives on the Changing Geography of the World Politics*, Leiden and Boston, Brill, p. 473-495, http://ts.clingendael.nl/publications/2007/20070000_ciep_chapter_hoogeveen.pdf.

ICISS (2001), *The Responsibility to Protect*, Ottawa, International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), December, http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf.

Jacoby, Wade, and Jones, Christopher (2008), "The EU Battle Groups in Sweden and the Czech Republic: What National Defense Reforms Tell Us about European Rapid Reaction Capabilities", *European Security*, Vol. 17, No. 2-3 (June-September), p. 315-338.

Jones, Ben (2011), "Franco-British military cooperation: a new engine for European defence?", *EU ISS Occasional Papers*, No. 88 (February), http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/franco-british-military-cooperation-a-new-engine-for-european-defence.

Jong, Sijbren de, and Schunz, Simon (2012), "Coherence in European Union External Policy before and after the Lisbon Treaty: The Cases of Energy Security and Climate Change", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (May), p. 165-187.

Juncos, Ana E., and Reynolds, Christopher (2007), "The Political and Security Committee: Governing in the Shadow", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (May), p. 127-147.

Kammel, Arnold H. (2011), "Putting Ideas into Action: EU Civilian Crisis Management in the Western Balkans", *Contemporary Security Policy*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (December), p. 625-643.

Kaunert, Christian, and Della Giovanna, Marina (2010), "Post-9/11 EU counter-terrorist financing cooperation: differentiating supranational policy entrepreneurship by the Commission and the Council Secretariat", *European Security*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (June), p. 275-295.

Kaveshnikov, Nikolay (2010), "The issue of energy security in relations between Russia and the European Union", *European Security*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (December), p. 585-605.

Kazantsev, Andrey (2012), "Policy networks in European-Russian gas relations: Function and dysfunction from a perspective of EU energy security", *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 3-4 (September–December), p. 305-313.

Khol, Radek (2010), "EU Civilian Crisis Management in Early 2010. The Beginning of a New Chapter Fraught with Complex Tasks", *International Policy Analysis*, September, http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/ipa/07484.pdf.

Kinzelbach, Katrin, and Thelle, Hatla (2011), "Taking Human Rights to China: An Assessment of the EU's Approach", *The China Quarterly*, No. 205 (March), p. 60-79.

Kirn, Andrej (2011), "The European Union's Role in Promoting and Implementing the Responsibility to Protect in Africa: Turning Political Commitments into Effective Action", *Bruges Regional Integration & Global Governance Papers*, No. 1/2011 (March), http://www.cris.unu.edu/fileadmin/workingpapers/BRIGG_papers/BRIGG_2011-1.pdf.

Klein, Nadia, Kunstein, Tobias, and Reiners, Wulf (2013), "Assessing EU Multilateral Action: Trade and Foreign and Security Policy Within a Legal and Living Framework", in Caroline Bouchard, John Peterson and Nathalie Tocci, eds., *Multilateralism in the 21st Century. Europe's Quest for Effectiveness*, London and New York, Routledge.

Koenig, Nicole (2011), "The EU and the Libyan Crisis - In Quest of Coherence?", *The International Spectator*, Vol. 46, No. 4 (December), p. 11-30, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03932729.2011.628089.

Krauthammer, Charles (1991), "The Unipolar Moment", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 70, No. 1 (America and the World 1990/91), p. 23-33.

Kreutz, Joakim (2004), "Reviewing the EU Arms Embargo on China: the Clash between Value and Rationale in the European Security Strategy", *Perspectives*, No. 22 (Summer), p. 43-58, http://www.pcr.uu.se/digitalAssets/18/18337_Reviewing_EU__Arms__Embargo_China_Kreutz060130.pdf.

Kulhanek, Jakub (2010), "The Fundamentals of Russia's EU Policy", *Problems of Post-Communism*, Vol. 57, No. 5 (September/October), p. 51-63, http://academia.edu/362992.

Kundnani, Hans (2012), "The Scorecard tour: Madrid", *ECFR's Blog*, 28 March, http://ecfr.eu/blog/entry/scorecard_tour_madrid.

Laffan, Brigid, and O'Mahony, Jane (2008), *Ireland and the European Union*, Basingstoke and New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Le Gloannec, Anne-Marie, Irondelle, Bastien, and Cadier, David, eds. (2013), "New and Evolving Trends of International Security", *Transworld Working Papers*, No. 13 (April), http://www.transworld-fp7.eu/?p=1175.

Lugna, Lauri (2006), "Institutional Framework of the European Union Counter-Terrorism Policy Setting", *Baltic Security & Defence Review*, Vol. 8, p. 101-127, http://www.bdcol.ee/files/docs/bsdr/6-EU%20Counterterrorism%20policy-Institutional%20Framework-Lauri%20Lugna.pdf.

Lurweg, Meike (2011), "Coherent Actor or Institution Wrangler? The European Union as a Development and Security Actor in Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo", *African Security*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (June), p. 100-126.

Mahony, Honor (2007), "EU anti-terror coordinator to step down", *EUobserver*, 12 February, http://euobserver.com/justice/23472.

Major, Claudia (2008), "EU-UN cooperation in military crisis management: the experience of EUFOR RD Congo in 2006", *EU ISS Occasional Papers*, No. 72 (September), http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/eu-un-cooperation-in-military-crisis-management-the-experience-of-eufor-rd-congo-in-2006.

Malešic, Marjan (2011), "Civilian Crisis Management in the EU - Structural and Functional Aspects", *Journal of International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 15, No. 1-2 (February), p. 152-177, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/187541110X540526.

Marquina, Antonio, and Ruiz, Xira (2005), "A European Competitive Advantage? Civilian Instruments for Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management", *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Spring), p. 71-87.

Mayer, Sebastian (2009), "Erodiert das Gewaltmonopol? Zum Wandel äußerer Staatssouveränität im Lichte der Europäischen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik", *Die Friedens-Warte*, Vol. 84, No. 4, p. 95-112.

Miranda, Valérie Vicky, Pirozzi, Nicoletta, and Schäfer, Kai (2012), "Towards a Stronger Africa-EU Cooperation on Peace and Security: The Role of African Regional Organizations and Civil Society", *IAI Working Papers*, No. 1228, http://www.iai.it/pdf/DocIAI/iaiwp1228.pdf.

Miskimmon, Alister (2012), "German Foreign Policy and the Libya Crisis", *German Politics*, Vol. 21, No. 4 (December), p. 392-410, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2012.739610.

Missiroli, Antonio (2003), "Ploughshares into Swords? Euros for European Defence", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Spring), p. 5-33.

Missiroli, Antonio, ed. (2013), *Enabling the Future. European Military Capabilities 2013-2025: Challenges and Avenues*, Paris, EU ISS, http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/enabling-the-future-european-military-capabilities-2013-2025-challenges-and-avenues.

Monaco, Annalisa, and Gourlay, Catriona (2005), "Supporting the African Union in Darfur: a test for the EU-NATO partnership", *European Security Review*, No. 26 (June), p. 3-5, http://www.isis-europe.eu/sites/default/files/publications-downloads/esr_26.pdf.

Monar, Jörg (2007), "Common Threat and Common Response? The European Union's Counter-Terrorism Strategy and its Problems", *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (Summer), p. 292-313.

NATO (2010), *Active Engagement, Modern Defence: Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, Lisbon, 19 November, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-CBDE960B-832E4724/natolive/topics_82705.htm.

Neumann, Iver B., and Heikka, Henrikki (2005), "Grand Strategy, Strategic Culture, Practice: The Social Roots of Nordic Defence", *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (March), p. 5-23.

Nevers, Renée de (2007), "NATO's International Security Role in the Terrorist Era", *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Spring), p. 34-66.

O'Donnell, Clara Marina (2011), "Britain's coalition government and EU defence cooperation: undermining British interests", *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (March), p. 419-433, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2011/87_2odonnell.pdf.

Olsen, Gorm Rye (2008), "Coherence, consistency and political will in foreign policy: The European Union's Policy towards Africa", *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (June), p. 157-171.

Papadimitriou, Dimitris (2012), "Whose Rule, Whose Law? Contested Statehood, External Leverage and the European Union's Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 50, No. 5 (September), p. 746-763.

Pardo Sierra, Oscar (2009), "Stabilizing the Neighbourhood? The EU's Contribution to SSR in Georgia", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (November), p. 479-500.

Paul, T.V. (2005), "Soft Balancing in the Age of U.S. Primacy", *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer), p. 46-71.

Pesme, Frédéric (2010), "France's 'return' to NATO: implications for its defence policy", *European Security*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (March), p. 45-60.

Peterson, John, Tocci, Nathalie, and Alcaro, Riccardo (2012), "Multipolarity and Transatlantic Relations", *Transworld Working Papers*, No. 1, http://www.transworld-fp7.eu/?p=656.

Pirozzi, Nicoletta, ed. (2010), "Ensuring Peace and Security in Africa: Implementing the New Africa-EU Partnership", *IAI Quaderni English Series*, No. 17 (May), http://www.iai.it/content.asp?langid=2&contentid=569.

Pirozzi, Nicoletta, and Ronzitti, Natalino (2011), "The European Union and the Reform of the UN Security Council: Toward a New Regionalism?", *IAI Working Papers*, No. 1112 (May), http://www.iai.it/pdf/DocIAI/iaiwp1112.pdf.

Pop, Valentina (2011), "UK snubs Ashton over EU military headquarters", *EUobserver*, 19 July, http://euobserver.com/defence/32639.

Quille, Gerrard (2008), *The EU's approach to tackling the proliferation of Materials and Weapons of Mass Destruction and prospects for cooperation on the eve of a new US Administration*, European Parliament, Directorate-General for External Policies of the Union, November 2008, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/sede/dv/sede070909briefingpapernpt_/sede070909briefingpapernpt_en.pdf.

Raemdonck, Nathalie van (2012), "Vested Interest or Moral Indecisiveness? Explaining the EU's Silence on the US Targeted Killing Policy in Pakistan", *IAI Working Papers*, No. 1205 (March), http://www.iai.it/pdf/DocIAI/iaiwp1205.pdf.

Reichard, Martin (2006), *The EU-Nato Relationship. A Legal And Political Perspective*, Aldershot and Burlington, Ashgate.

Renard, Thomas (2011), "The Treachery of Strategies: A Call for True EU Strategic Partnerships", *Egmont Papers*, No. 45 (April), http://www.egmontinstitute.be/paperegm/sum/ep45.html.

Rettman, Andrew (2011), "UK champions own diplomacy over EU 'action service'", *EUobserver*, 5 May, http://euobserver.com/foreign/32271.

Reynaert, Vicky (2012), "The European Union's Foreign Policy since the Treaty of Lisbon: The Difficult Quest for More Consistency and Coherence", *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 207-226.

Ritchie, Nick (2011), "Rethinking security: a critical analysis of the Strategic Defence and Security Review", *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (March), p. 355-376.

Roter, Petra, and Šabič, Zlatko (2004), "'New' and 'Old Europe' in the Context of the Iraq War and its Implications for European Security", *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (December), p. 517-542.

Rummel, Reinhardt, and Wiedemann, Jörg (1998), "Identifying Institutional Paradoxes of CFSP", in Jan Zielonka, ed., *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International, p. 53-66.

Santiso, Carlos (2003), "Sisyphus in the Castle: Improving European Union Strategies for Democracy Promotion and Governance Conditionality", *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (June), p. 1-28.

Sasse, Gwendolyn (2008), "The European Neighbourhood Policy: Conditionality Revisited for the EU's Eastern Neighbours", *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 60, No. 2 (March), p. 295-316.

Sauer, Tom (2005), "Military cooperation in the European Union. Case: Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg", *IIEB Working Papers*, No. 15 (February), http://soc.kuleuven.be/web/files/9/48/IIEBWP015.pdf.

Sauer, Tom (2007), "Coercive diplomacy by the EU: the Iranian nuclear weapons crisis", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 3, p. 613-633.

Scannell, David (2004), "Financing ESDP Military Operations", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Winter), p. 529-549.

Schreier, Fred (2012), "On Cyberwarfare", *DCAF Horizon 2015 Working Papers*, No. 7, http://www.dcaf.ch/Publications/On-Cyberwarfare.

Shackelford, Scott J. (2010), "Estonia Three Years Later: A Progress Report on Combating Cyber Attacks", *Journal of Internet Law*, Vol. 13, No. 8, p. 22-29.

Shepherd, Alistair J.K. (2009), "'A milestone in the history of the EU': Kosovo and the EU's international role", *International Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 3 (May), p. 513-530.

Simón, Luis (2010), "Command and control? Planning for EU military operations", *EU ISS Occasional Papers*, No. 81 (January), http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/planning-for-eu-military-operations.

Smith, Karen E. (2011), "Enlargement, the Neighbourhood, and European Order", in Christopher Hill and Michael Smith, eds., *International Relations and the European Union*, 2nd edn, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 299-323.

Smith, Michael, and Xie, Huaixian (2010), "The European Union and China: The Logics of 'Strategic Partnership'", *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, Vol. 6, No. 4, p. 432-448, http://www.jcer.net/index.php/jcer/article/view/277.

Spence, David (2012), "The Early Days of the European External Action Service: A Practitioner's View", *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 115-134.

Spence, David and Fluri, Philipp H., eds. (2008), *The European Union and Security Sector Reform*, London, John Harper.

Stewart, Emma (2008), "Capabilities and Coherence? The Evolution of European Union Conflict Prevention", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Summer), p. 229-253.

Styan, David (2012), "EU power and armed humanitarianism in Africa: evaluating ESDP in Chad", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (December), p. 651-668.

Svete, Uroš (2012), "European E-Readiness? Cyber Dimension of National Security Policies", *Journal of Comparative Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (January), p. 38-59, http://www.jofcp.org/download/click.php?id=7.

Thym, Daniel (2011), "The Intergovernmental Constitution of the EU's Foreign, Security & Defence Executive", *European Constitutional Law Review*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (October), p. 453-480.

Tonra, Ben (2011), "Democratic foundations of EU foreign policy: narratives and the myth of EU exceptionalism", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 18, No. 8 (December), p. 1190-1207.

Touzovskaia, Natalia (2006), "EU-NATO Relations: How Close to 'Strategic Partnership'?", *European Security*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (September), p. 235-258.

Trybus, Martin (2006), "The New European Defence Agency: A Contribution to a Common European Security and Defence Policy and a Challenge to the Community Acquis?", *Common Market Law Review*, Vol. 43, No. 3, p. 667-703.

Tulmets, Elsa (2005), "The Management of New Forms of Governance by Former Accession Countries of the European Union: Institutional Twinning in Estonia and Hungary", *European Law Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 5 (September), p. 657-674.

UK and France (2010), *Treaty between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic for Defence and Security Co-operation*, London, 2 November, http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm79/7976/7976.asp.

UK Government (2008), *The National Security Strategy of the United Kingdom: Security in an interdependent world*, London, 19 March, http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm72/7291/7291.asp.

UK Government (2010), *A Strong Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The National Security Strategy*, London, 18 October, https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-national-security-strategy-a-strong-britain-in-an-age-of-uncertainty.

Verhoeff, Emma C., and Niemann, Arne (2011), "National Preferences and the European Union Presidency: The Case of German Energy Policy towards Russia", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 6 (November), p. 1271-1293.

Vines, Alex (2010), "Rhetoric from Brussels and reality on the ground: the EU and security in Africa", *International Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 5 (September), p. 1091-1108, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2010/86_5vines.pdf.

Wagner, Wolfgang (2005), "From vanguard to laggard: Germany in European security and defence policy", *German Politics*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (December), p. 455-469.

Wallensteen, Peter (2012), *Understanding Conflict Resolution*, 3rd edn, London, Sage.

Walsh, James I. (2006), "Intelligence-Sharing in the European Union: Institutions Are Not Enough", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (September), p. 625-643, http://www.jamesigoewalsh.com/jcms.pdf.

Weiss, Tomáš, Mikhelidze, Nona, and Šlosarčík, Ivo (2013), "Multilateral as Envisaged? Assessing European Union's Engagement in Conflict Resolution in the Neighbourhood", in Caroline Bouchard, John Peterson and Nathalie Tocci, eds., *Multilateralism in the 21st Century. Europe's Quest for Effectiveness*, London and New York, Routledge.

Wessel, Ramses A. (2003), "The State of Affairs in EU Security and Defence Policy: The Breakthrough in the Treaty of Nice", *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 265-288, http://academia.edu/2994007.

Wet, Erika de (2009), "The Governance of Kosovo: Security Council Resolution 1244 and the Establishment and Functioning of EULEX", *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 103, No. 1 (January), p. 83-96.

Whitman, Richard G., and Juncos, Ana E. (2012), "The Arab Spring, the Eurozone Crisis and the Neighbourhood: A Region in Flux", *The JCMS Annual Review of the European Union in 2011*, Special issue of the *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 50, Supplement 1 (September), p. 147-161.

Whitman, Richard G., and Rodt, Annemarie P. (2012), "EU-Brazil Relations: A Strategic Partnership?", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (February), p. 27-44.

Wiessala, Georg (2009), "Duality - Dialogue - Discourse: Some Perspectives on Human Rights in EU-China Relations", in Georg Wiessala, John Wilson and Pradeep Taneja, eds., *The European Union and China: Interests and Dilemmas*, p. 83-102.

Wolff, Sarah, Wichmann, Nicole, and Mounier, Gregory (2009), "The External Dimension of Justice and Home Affairs: A Different Security Agenda for the EU?", *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (January), p. 9-23, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07036330802503817.

Zagari, M.P.M. (1992), "Combating terrorism: Report to the committee of legal affairs and citizens' rights of the European Parliament", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Winter), p. 288-300.

Zimmermann, Doron (2006), "The European Union and Post-9/11 Counterterrorism: A Reappraisal", *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (March), p. 123-145.

The Project

In an era of global flux, emerging powers and growing interconnectedness, transatlantic relations appear to have lost their bearings. As the international system fragments into different constellations of state and non-state powers across different policy domains, the US and the EU can no longer claim exclusive leadership in global governance. Traditional paradigms to understand the transatlantic relationship are thus wanting. A new approach is needed to pinpoint the direction transatlantic relations are taking. TRANSWORLD provides such an approach by a) ascertaining, differentiating among four policy domains (economic, security, environment, and human rights/democracy), whether transatlantic relations are drifting apart, adapting along an ad hoc cooperation-based pattern, or evolving into a different but resilient special partnership; b) assessing the role of a re-defined transatlantic relationship in the global governance architecture; c) providing tested policy recommendations on how the US and the EU could best cooperate to enhance the viability, effectiveness, and accountability of governance structures.

Consortium

Mainly funded under the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme, TRANSWORLD is carried out by a consortium of 13 academic and research centres from the EU, the US and Turkey:
Istituto Affari Internazionali, *Coordinator*
German Marshall Fund of the United States
University of Edinburgh
Free University of Berlin
Fondation Nationales des Sciences Politiques
Sabanci University of Istanbul
Chatham House
European University Institute
University of Siena
Charles University of Prague
University of Mannheim
TNS Opinion
American University of Washington

Advisory Board

Shaun Breslin, University of Warwick
Zhimin Chen, Fudan University, Shanghai
Renato G. Flores Jr., FGV, Rio de Janeiro
Ranabir Samaddar, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Centre
Dmitri Trenin, Carnegie Moscow Center
Stephen Walt, Harvard University

WWW.TRANSWORLD-FP7.EU