MEDRESET

مِدا ريست

MEDRESET Policy Papers

No. 8, April 2019

Problematizing Effectiveness and Potential of EU Policies in the Mediterranean

Münevver Cebeci

This project is funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020
Programme for Research and Innovation under grant agreement no 693055.

Problematizing Effectiveness and Potential of EU Policies in the Mediterranean

Münevver Cebeci[1]

Abstract

This report aims at combining the research results of the previous Work Packages (1–7) of the MEDRESET project with a view to evaluating the effectiveness and potential of EU policies. It does so through an analysis of the EU's framing of the Mediterranean and how it is perceived by its Southern and Eastern Mediterranean (SEM) partners, how the key stakeholders depict the region as such, and how these conceptions and perceptions of the Mediterranean are reflected in their interaction in substantive issue areas, on the geopolitical and sectoral level. The major argument of this report is that the EU's depoliticizing, technocratic and securitized approach towards the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean erodes the Union's credibility, detracts from its effectiveness and seriously limits its potential in terms of providing bottom-up policies geared towards promoting democracy, human rights and the rule of law, prioritizing development, favouring youth employment and gender equality, and creating an open, inclusive and integrated Mediterranean region. The findings of the WPs 2–7 proved that the arguments put forward by WP1 were accurate and the research conducted through interviews with key stakeholders and bottom-up actors in the region and in Europe demonstrated that they also regard the EU's approach towards the region as highly Eurocentric, interest-driven, top-down and thus unequal/asymmetric, as well as depoliticizing, technocratic and highly securitized.

Introduction

This report is mainly written to assess the effectiveness and potential of EU policies. Nevertheless, it does not take "effectiveness" as a term indicating how well and to what degree the EU achieves its goals regarding the region, as our research in MEDRESET has proved that the EU pursues asymmetric/unequal, top-down, Eurocentric, interest-driven, technocratic, depoliticizing policies in the Mediterranean prioritizing security and stability over democracy, human rights and the rule of law – the major values and norms on which the EU is built and which it is supposed to promote, as stated in Articles 2 and 3(5) of the Treaty on the European Union (European Union 2016). Any analysis of effectiveness, defined in such terms, would mean reproducing the EU's constructed "ideal" self and legitimizing its policies. To the contrary, MEDRESET's aim is to reset the EU's constructions of the Mediterranean (and thus itself) and argue for inclusive, flexible, bottom-up policies based on the principle of equality of the partners on both sides of the Mediterranean. This report thus argues that the effectiveness and potential of EU policies have so far been defined through the same Eurocentric parameters of analysis that resulted in the reproduction of the same policies with slight cosmetic changes in the EU's discourse, and that what is needed, instead, is an approach that defines effectiveness in terms of a relationship among equals, finding bottom-up solutions to problems common to

1 Münevver Cebeci is Associate Professor at the European Union Institute, Marmara University, Istanbul.

the region and desecuritizing relations between the two sides of the Mediterranean.

The MEDRESET project adopted a decentring methodology with the aim of resetting the EU's conception of and policies on the Mediterranean. The major strength of the project is its unprecedented methodological approach: it involved in-depth interviews with the stakeholders (both official and civil society) not only in Europe but also and especially in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean as well as in other countries with a stake in the region. What the MEDRESET project offered is unprecedented in the sense that in an attempt to compare and contrast the findings of WP1 (on the EU's constructions of the Mediterranean and its policies based on these constructions) and the findings of WP3–WP7 (on how the EU and its policies are perceived in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, in general and in various sectors – political ideas, water and agriculture, energy and industry, migration and mobility – in particular); 697 interviews were conducted in the region (WP3–WP7).[2] The MEDRESET project has thus filled a gap in the literature on Euro-Mediterranean relations as the literature was mainly Eurocentric and was rather inadequate in reflecting how the EU and its policies are perceived in the region. This report thus draws on the findings of these interviews together with the interviews conducted in EU-Europe with officials and civil society representatives to redefine the EU's effectiveness in engaging the Mediterranean.

1. Constructions of the Mediterranean

MEDRESET WP1 reports underline that the Mediterranean is a constructed space and moreover is "a European construct" (Cebeci and Schumacher 2016: 2 and 2017: 4, Cebeci 2017: 4–5). On the other hand, despite their efforts to achieve region-building in the Mediterranean through the Barcelona Process, EU-Europeans themselves have constructed the Mediterranean as a "diverse space" that is unstable, prone to conflict and backward (Cebeci 2017). Research conducted in WP2–WP7 also found that stakeholders in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries and in key powers involved in the region define the Mediterranean as a diverse space, or as not a region at all (as in the case of key powers; see Ehteshami and Mohammadi 2017: 4). Nevertheless, what the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean stakeholders understand from this diversity is different from what the EU depicts.

The EU constructs the Mediterranean as a diverse space to reproduce its ideal identity vis-à-vis its imperfect Mediterranean others, to pursue its own interests and to legitimize its policies (Cebeci 2017). Research conducted in WP2–WP7 endorses this view in terms of the perceptions of the local stakeholders. Huber et al. (2018: 2) contend that there is an "increasingly looming presence of a sharp sense of separation, division and disparity" in the region. For the local stakeholders, this is mainly because of the inequality in the relationship between the Northern and the Southern and Eastern shores of the Mediterranean. Interviews conducted in this regard reveal that peoples in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean cannot take on a Mediterranean identity as such because of this unequal relationship (Huber et al. 2018: 7). Hamade et al. (2018: 4) contend that "people on the northern and southern and eastern shores of the Mediterranean do not necessarily perceive it in the same way" and that "lofty lyrics of a shared Mediterranean space did not figure prominently" in the interviews.

2 Of those interviewed 447 were men, 247 women and 3 non-specified. Interviews were conducted in Tunisia, Morocco, Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey, Iran, Israel, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Europe.

The EU's dominant – dictating – position in its relations with its Southern and Eastern Mediterranean partners and its tendency to pursue increasingly unilateral and bilateral policies is almost always underlined by the local stakeholders, throughout all the sectors that were analysed (political ideas; migration; energy and industry; water and agriculture). The interviewees made these statements in such a way as to express the differences and inequality between the two shores and how this affects their notion of the Mediterranean.[3] Furthermore, as the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) failed and the EU abandoned its region-building approach towards the Mediterranean, the latter has been reduced to a "space between Europe and a given SEM country"; producing a multiplicity of "'bilateral Mediterraneans', which, in terms of policies, translates into the 'bilateralization' of cross-Mediterranean relations" (Roman 2018a: 4). Such bilateralization and lack of "a macro-regional vision", coupled with a highly securitized approach, inevitably turns the Mediterranean into "an arena for control and risk-reduction policies rather than a space of opportunities, not only in the field of migration" (Roman 2018a: 5). This is especially so in the field of migration, but it can also be observed in the other fields such as energy and agriculture. With regard to agriculture and rural development, Hamade et al. (2018: 4) contend that both the European stakeholders and stakeholders in Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries have preferred bilateral relations between the EU and the partner country, "rather than a shared Mediterranean space that could be developed jointly".

On the other hand, securitized policies of the EU have increasingly led to a perception of the Mediterranean as a closed space and EU-Europe as fortress Europe. This is clearly reflected in the interviews with the local stakeholders, especially in Tunisia and Turkey, where the interviewees claimed that "the Mediterranean used to be an open space, where people and goods circulated freely" but the EU's "restrictive border and migration policies" have transformed "it into a closed space" (Roman 2018a: 5). This surely has a lot to do with the security perceptions and interests of the EU's member states, which brings the question of coherence to the fore in the EU's relations with its Mediterranean partners.

2. The EU's Fragmented Approach the Mediterranean: Problems of Coherence at the Horizontal and Vertical Levels

Research conducted in WP2–WP7 of MEDRESET demonstrates that it is mostly the EU's member states that undermine the EU's image in and policies on the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean. This refers to vertical incoherence: i.e., the incoherence between the EU and its member states. Two major findings in this regard are that member states are more visible than the EU in the region and that the EU cannot display unified actorness mainly because of its member states' diverging interests and preference for bilateral relations with the countries in the region.

3 Roman (2018a: 4) asserts: "When framing migration-related issues, South-Med stakeholders do not conceive the 'Mediterranean space' as it is conceived in the European mainstream discourse. A concept of the Mediterranean as a single, unified space encompassing European, North African and Middle East countries does not seem to exist. SEM interviewees do not consider their home countries as part of a unified 'Mediterranean space'; rather, the stakeholders' narratives disclosed a concept of the Mediterranean that is very much linked to Europe."

Parks and Gülöz Bakır (2019: 40) contend that the "perception of the EU in the Tunisian elite discourse indicates a clear division between the member states and the EU as an institution, which was stressed by almost all respondents". They further argue that in the Tunisian case "the EU is viewed as 'a composition of different voices'" (Parks and Gülöz Bakır 2019: 40). They also cite two interviewees from the region who express that "the EU is not one voice; member states have different aspects in their relations to Tunisia" and that "it is important to distinguish [between] the EU and Europe" – "once we say Europe, it mainly means France and Italy" (Parks and Gülöz Bakır 2019: 40). On the other hand, Tunisian stakeholders refer to France, Italy, and Spain as the major countries which get more engaged in their country when compared to the other EU member states (Parks and Gülöz Bakır 2019: 40).

In certain policy areas, such as agriculture, energy and migration, the distinction between the EU and its member states becomes the more apparent. For instance, Aboushady et al. (2019: 4) contend that the EU is "challenged by the policies of EU member states that are acting autonomously in the field of energy, as is the case for Germany, Spain and Italy". On the other hand, inconsistencies between the EU and its member states are mainly observed in their "asylum, readmission and legal migration policies" with regard not only to differences in policy but also to follow-up of EU policies by member states (Roman 2018a: 8–9 and 2018b: 7–8). Interviews with Lebanese stakeholders have displayed that despite the EU's common European asylum system, its member states would "tend to apply inconsistent (or even conflicting) policies" when they were "faced with a perceived migratory 'emergency'", as was the case in the mass flow of refugees[4] in 2015, when some member states "adopted welcoming policies, while others closed their borders" in accordance with the dynamics in their internal politics (Roman 2018a: 8).

EU member states' interests also dominated the EU's approach to the Arab uprisings, which was mainly criticized for initial hesitancy and caution to see whether the autocratic regimes would survive.[5] Behr (2012: 78–9) contends that in the wake of the Arab uprisings, "the EU's common institutions were regularly sidelined by the member states and were unable to function as a catalyst for a common policy". The "diverging attitudes of the member states" on the uprisings led to significant disparities and lack of consistency in the EU's response (Dark 2018: 10). Italy and France were the major countries which initially extended support to authoritarian regimes in Egypt and Tunisia, respectively, whereas Britain was quick to support the uprisings in Egypt.[6]

Horizontal incoherence, on the other hand, is related to divergence among the policies of the EU as well as among their implementation at the institutional level. Hamade et al. (2018: 21) contend that in the agricultural sector, the "multiplicity of programmes, scopes, objectives, names and stakeholders" involved in various EU policies is usually seen as a problem on the receiving side of the Mediterranean, as they "[result] in a duplication of work that increases coordination costs, [contribute to the EU's] representation as bureaucratically rigid, and [complicate] its collaboration with local stakeholders in [Southern and Eastern Mediterranean] countries". Although Hamade et al. specifically point to the agricultural sector, their argument

4 Note that this report deliberately refrains from employing the term "refugee crisis" in order not to problematize and securitize "the refugee"; in full awareness that the problem is not "the refugee" but the conditions that make him/her take refuge in another country.
5 See, for example, Khalifa Isaac (2013b) and Wouters and Duquet (2013).
6 See, for example, Behr (2012: 79) and Khalifa Isaac (2013a).

can actually be extended to the other fields that are addressed by the MEDRESET project, as the WP2–WP7 findings concerning the other sectors also display similar problems. For example in the energy sector, the lack of a general strategy is especially visible, as "bilateral ties prevail" (Bianchi et al. 2018: 4), and the EU tends to pursue various projects which lack coordination.[7]

Migration and mobility is another important sector where "lack of coordination among different EU institutions, as well as among different departments within the same institution (as in the case of different DGs within the European Commission)" (Roman 2018a: 8) can be observed. Interviews with local stakeholders in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries substantiate this argument, as one interviewee asserted: "The problem of any EU policy in the area of migration is that the EU does not speak with one voice only; within the EU there are lots of voices, which correspond to different EU institutions, and to different member states" (Roman 2018b: 13). Another interviewee, a representative of an international non-governmental organization, also said that "they may get different feedback depending on which [Directorate General] they talk to" in the European Commission and that "differences between EU institutions may concern also their more general perspective and discourse on migration":

> In some EU institutions people may have a more nuanced perspective on migration, they may use a less securitized discourse, avoiding the rhetoric of a 'migratory emergency' affecting Europe; they may have a more realistic view on the size of Mediterranean migration flows compared to migratory movements in Africa or compared to people who enter Europe legally and overstay their visa. This is the case of the [European External Action Service]. (Roman 2018b: 13)[8]

The significant shift from the intensively multilateral approach of the EMP to a predominantly bilateral approach (both by the EU and individually by its member states) today can also be regarded among the factors that detract from the coherence of EU policies and contribute to the lack of a general strategy in the EU's approach towards the Mediterranean. For example, in the industrial sector, "the EU does not have one comprehensive framework for cooperation with the region in the field of FDI [foreign direct investments], […] instead, [Southern Mediterranean Countries] such as Egypt have concluded bilateral FDI agreements with EU countries separately" (Aboushady et al. 2019: 6). Referring to interviews both with EU representatives and local stakeholders, Roman (2018a: 4) contends that "the shift from a multilateral to *a purely bilateral approach* […] has led to an increasing fragmentation of the non-EU political space" (emphasis added), aggravating the lack of South–South cooperation, "especially when it comes to migration issues". In this regard, some civil society actors also criticized the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean governments for their preference for bilateral relations:

> On the one hand, SEM countries tend to accept and uncritically perpetuate the European framing of cross-Mediterranean relations as purely one-to-one (following the model of the EU's Neighbourhood Policy); on the other hand, each SEM country perceives its general situation and its national interests as individual, particular and

7 See, for example, Aboushady et al. (2019).
8 It should be noted at this point that one of our interviewees in WP1 (Interviewee 6), a former high-ranking EU official, also referred to the lack of a geopolitical approach towards the region, also pointing to the differences between the EEAS and the European Commission as a problem in this regard.

> often in conflict or competition with those of its neighbours. (Roman 2018a: 4–5)[9]

3. Visibility of EU Policies

A very common finding of WP2–WP7 has been that the EU's policies have not been visible to the local populations so far, and the locals would even mistake other organizations or EU member states for the EU when naming certain policies. For example, analysing EU–Lebanon relations, Goulordava (2018: 8) found:

> For the most part, the interlocutors were not sure of exact EU policies, but did have some notions or information. In general, the EU was seen as "invisible" within Lebanon, with any EU projects that do occur in the country being unknown to the larger public. Only a very small cohort were able to provide a detailed account on how these policies materialized into their everyday life and work. Policy goals and aims were frequently associated with economic and cultural exchange as well as the strengthening of human rights in the neighbourhood countries.[10]

This means that although the local populations could recall the EU with regard to human rights and in general economic and cultural terms, in specific fields such as industry, energy or agriculture they were not aware of its role. In a discussion with MEDRESET WP5 partners, it was underlined that in the agriculture and water sector, most stakeholders referred to the UN or EU member states (such as Germany and Belgium) as the major actors providing them with development aid, whereas the EU was hardly mentioned. Hamade et al. (2018: 15) contend:

> With regard to the EU's visibility as an actor, several respondents, particularly in Tunisia, were not aware of the EU's cooperation with their country […]. Indeed, the EU's support was reported as not being visible enough, and EU efforts were attributed to the UN or more generally the international community.

Dark (2018: 10) similarly asserts: "The level of awareness concerning ENP [European Neighbourhood Policy] initiatives was low in some of the surveyed countries such as Lebanon and Egypt, where the respondents spoke more generally of their perceptions of the EU."

The EU's policies have also remained invisible in the energy sector. Aboushady et al. (2019: 10) contend that "despite the many instruments, in most cases local respondents were unable to name even one of the energy policies, platforms or initiatives that the EU has put in place in the region". Similarly, interviewed stakeholders in Morocco, Lebanon, Egypt and Tunisia "were mostly unable to provide a clear picture of the EU's policy instruments targeting the industrial sector" (Aboushady et al. 2019: 8). With regard to the Moroccan industrial sector, Moisseron and Guesmi (2018: 30) argue that "the ultimate recipients of the [EU] programmes are not always aware that they are benefiting from European aid, and so they remain largely unknown and invisible". On the other hand, despite several funds made available to them by the EU,

9 It is a fact that it does not suffice to have readmission deals with the EU *per se*, as competence over this issue lies with the national governments and Southern and Eastern Mediterranean governments also prefer to have bilateral relations with EU member states (Roman and Pastore 2018: 21).
10 As also quoted in Huber et al. (2018: 15).

Tunisian stakeholders were also "unable to identify EU industrial policy in the region in an isolated way" (Aboushady et al. 2019: 8).

In both Moroccan and Tunisian cases, EU programmes in the industrial sector have been invisible because the funds go through the governments of these countries, and the governments are supposed to be allocating the funds to local institutions (Aboushady et al. 2019: 8). With regard to the agriculture and water sector, invisibility of the EU's policies was also attributed to the EU's direct engagement with the governments of the target countries (especially, the Ministries of Agriculture) and lack of direct relations with local agencies, as contrasted with the US or other international actors (Hamade et al. 2018: 15). Bouzidi (2018: 21) argues that in the agricultural sector, the local stakeholders "consider that by focusing on a budget support instead of a project support strategy, the EU is completely absent and invisible on the field" because "the farmers' direct interlocutors are ministry agencies and not representatives of the EU". On the other hand, research by Hamade et al. (2018: 15) revealed that although the Belgian assistance programme Enable and the US programme USAID provided less assistance than the EU, they were "more accessible, thus more visible to local communities".

Lack of visibility is a crucial problem especially in terms of actorness. This means that although the EU produces significant policy output in terms of the technical assistance and funds provided to the countries in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean through multiple programmes in a wide range of sectors, in terms of the outcome (the impact on the ground, which pertains mainly to effectiveness) they remain invisible. It also means that the EU's actorness is limited in the region and susceptible to rivalry by other international actors that actually provide less than the EU but are more visible at the local level.

4. The Norms–Interests Dichotomy in the EU's Relations with its Southern and Eastern Mediterranean Partners

A crucial criticism directed at the EU with regard to its policies in the Mediterranean has to do with the EU's and its member states' support for authoritarian regimes (before and after the Arab uprisings) for the purpose of maintaining stability and security in the region, and especially for preserving the EU's economic and security interests. Especially after the Arab uprisings and the peak observed in refugee flows towards Europe in 2015, the EU has increasingly pursued policies which predominantly revolved around stopping irregular migration to Europe, and made bilateral refugee deals with Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries which mostly ignored the rights of the refugee as set by international law, acting against human rights and also empowering or legitimizing some authoritarian regimes. Roman (2018a: 12) asserts:

> The EU response to the 2015 'migration crisis' legitimized the idea that not fully respecting international legal standards could be justified for the sake of achieving control-oriented policy objectives […]. The bad example set by the EU also weakens the hand of local [civil society organizations], as they can no longer push their national governments based on the need to align with European standards.

The area of migration is a very good example of why the norms–interest dichotomy is not a false dichotomy as Manners (2015) claims. Civil society representatives in both Europe and the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries acknowledge that the EU has so far acted at

the expense of its norms in promoting its interests in the Mediterranean in this regard.

> Civil society stakeholders in [Lebanon, Egypt, Tunisia and Morocco] emphasized the fact that the EU has lost part of its credibility as a human rights champion and guardian, especially due to the establishment or strengthening of cooperation on migration management with dictatorships and countries with a bad human rights record. […] The objectives of democratization and increased human rights protection promoted by the EU after the Arab Spring have rapidly faded away. This is problematic not only because it affects the EU's credibility, but especially because it hampers the achievement of highly relevant objectives in terms of development and consolidation of rights-based and principled approaches in SEM countries. (Roman 2018a: 12)

Surely, this obvious preference for interests over the norms and values that the EU aims to promote is not limited to the field of migration management and is a general problem that can be observed in the EU's engagement with the Mediterranean in almost every field. The EU's response to the Arab uprisings was also problematic in this regard, as mentioned above. Dark (2018: 10) contends that "the EU's response to and involvement in the Arab uprisings was viewed negatively by many elites in the Mediterranean" because despite the expectation that the EU would support democratic transitions in Arab countries as a "normative actor", it could not take up the opportunity in this regard. European policies have had a negative impact on EU relations with its southern neighbours. Huber et al. (2018: 2) argue that "the EU continues to work with authoritarian regimes and thereby becomes complicit in the denial of democracy and human rights to citizens of the Southern Mediterranean". The MEDRESET interviews with local stakeholders demonstrate that "while the EU supports human rights organizations, it does not back up their work by exerting pressure towards political power" (Huber et al. 2018: 16). An interviewee claimed that the EU "works with civil society along 'safe lines' (culture, gender, etc.), but when it comes to the real issues, [it] sides with the authorities and the status quo" (Huber et al. 2018: 16–7). This means that when the EU conveys the image of (and actually self-identifies as) a normative power, it raises the expectation that it will genuinely support democracy, the rule of law and human rights. However, on the ground in the Mediterranean, the EU never lives up to these expectations, jealously preserving its own interests, and promoting norms and values selectively only when they do not interfere with its own interests or those of its member states.[11] In this regard, a series of MEDRESET interviews with European civil society actors and local stakeholders have manifested and once again endorsed the argument that the EU is increasingly seen as an interest-driven actor in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean,[12] and one that prioritizes security and stability over democracy and human rights in the region.[13]

11 Hyde Price (2006: 226–7) claims that the EU shapes its neighbourhood according to its member states' economic and strategic interests and this means that some member states use the Union to exert "hegemonic power" collectively. On the other hand it should be noted that sometimes the EU's promotion of norms and values also does not match "domestic needs or interests" (Dark 2018: 9).

12 "The EU's activities in the Mediterranean are increasingly being seen as only benefitting the EU" (Hamade et al. 2018: 24).

13 As a matter of fact EU officials also acknowledge this. For example, both Stefan Füle, the then European Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy, and José Manuel Durão Barroso, the then President of the European Commission, admitted that EU-Europe "was not vocal enough in defending human rights and local democratic forces in the region"; falling "prey to the assumption that authoritarian regimes were a guarantee of stability in the region" – i.e., trading "democracy for stability" (European Commission 2011a and 2011b, respectively).

5. The EU's Securitized Approach towards the Mediterranean

The research that conducted in MEDRESET WP1 is based on the argument that the EU has a securitized understanding of the Mediterranean which is predominantly reflected its policies (Cebeci and Schumacher 2016, 2017). Securitization as employed here refers to "a process which starts with a speech act – the definition of something as a threat – and requires the acceptance of an audience (a group of people) to become successful"; to be "followed by a rhetoric of emergency which serves to mobilize the people and make them accept certain exceptional measures that they would not accept under 'normal' conditions"; and it further "requires, and thus leads to, the final use of extraordinary measures which usually involve the breaking of 'normal' political rules of the game, including limitations on fundamental rights and freedoms" (Cebeci and Schumacher 2016: 5).[14] Securitization thus pertains "to the state of exception where everything else is subordinated to the logic of security", and, a securitized approach to the Mediterranean would, thus, mean the "conception of the region based on geopolitical considerations and threat perceptions, as well as exceptional measures" (Cebeci and Schumacher 2016: 5).

Research conducted in WP3–WP7 demonstrates that the EU's securitization of the Mediterranean is commonly criticized by the local stakeholders, severely detracting from the EU's credibility.[15] Dark (2018: 10) states that "in Morocco and Tunisia, the two frontrunners of the ENP programme, the interlocutors described the ENP as 'a policy of defence' which was perceived as unable to address root causes of social and economic instability in the region" and that "the perception of the EU's security policies and response to the migration crisis in its southern neighbourhood is overwhelmingly negative".[16] Nevertheless, the EU "continues to securitize migration and other issues at an accelerating pace" (Huber et al. 2018: 2). Roman (2018a: 7) argues that the instruments and initiatives the EU employs in the framework of the EU external migration policy (including Mobility Partnerships, European readmission agreements, Visa Facilitation Agreements, etc.) which are geared towards "irregular migration, border control and effective returns", trading "legal migration, short-term mobility and development" for "stemming migration flows", and "which are clearly informed by *a security-oriented approach*, are seen as bringing only short-sighted, partial and temporary solutions, because in practice they do not (sufficiently) broaden regular ways of reaching Europe" (emphasis added).

14 Note that Cebeci and Schumacher (2016: 5) cite Wæver (1995) in making this definition.

15 Other powers that have a stake in the Mediterranean, such as the US, Russia and China, also have a geopolitical approach towards the region. The US has a securitized approach, primarily in parallel with Israeli interests, but also based on energy-security concerns, whereas Russia's approach is also security based in terms of pursuing its historical geostrategic interests in the Mediterranean space. On the other hand, China's approach still seems to be rather trade-based. The reason why only the EU's credibility, and not that of other powers, is highly debated is that these powers do not have a claim to be representing and projecting universal norms and values in the region whilst pursuing their own security and trade interests. For more on the approach of these other key powers towards the Mediterranean, see Ehteshami and Mohammadi (2017).

16 "Many Elite Survey responses noted the EU's increased emphasis on border control, stability and migration deterrence particularly in the aftermath of the Arab uprisings and the enlarged presence across the region of violent non-state actors, notably the Islamic State. This has led many countries to speculate on the ideological direction of the Union's future policies in the Mediterranean, which is described 'securitizing' at present" (Dark 2018: 10–11).

As a matter of fact, the mobility partnerships and refugee deals mark a new type of relationship between the EU and its Southern and Eastern Mediterranean partners, where the partners had the chance to have more say in the making of these deals, which could lead to the argument that the inequality in the relationship has decreased to a certain extent. Nevertheless, it soon became clear that this was not the case and the EU was rather reluctant to fulfil its commitments (especially with regard to visa liberalization or facilitation); although it expected its partners to abide by the deals (and they did). Referring to mobility partnerships "as a new form of partnership-based cooperation in the field of migration and asylum", Roman (2018a: 7) contends that although they were "seen as useful instruments for policy dialogue, interinstitutional coordination and information exchange" by the local stakeholders, "so far they have brought only limited tangible benefits to South-Med countries, especially in terms of mobility and labour migration opportunities". This also means that the EU and its Southern and Eastern Mediterranean partners had a different view of these deals and partnerships, and that the EU acted with a security logic, aiming to make its partners stop migration flows rather than keeping the promises that it made towards them in these arrangements. Referring to this difference, Roman (2018b: 9) quotes a European interviewee as saying: "What partner countries are really interested in obtaining, labour migration opportunities, is really not at the core of Mobility Partnerships." This reveals that although the mobility partnerships "could potentially promote a more comprehensive and balanced approach to migration" (Roman, 2018b: 9) combining "the priorities of SEM countries with priorities of European countries, in practice they end up replicating a Eurocentric *security-oriented logic* and being managed unilaterally by the EU and its [member states]" (Roman 2018a: 7, emphasis added).

The research in WP3–WP7 has shown that the general perception of local stakeholders with regard to EU-Europe's securitization of migration in the Mediterranean is that the EU's response which mainly revolves around "restrictive policies, […] closing [of] borders and [limitations] on the freedom of movement" (all extraordinary measures which involve the breaking of the normal political rules of the game in Wæver's [1995] terms) has changed "the Mediterranean from a space of exchange into a wall" (Roman 2018a: 11). The local stakeholders also hold the view that "Europe's phobia of migrants" is not fact-based, "as nowadays the largest mobility in the world is South–South" (Roman 2018a: 11).

The EU's security-oriented approach to the Mediterranean is not limited to migration only and can be seen in a variety of areas where security cooperation is imposed as a condition to provide trade benefits or development aid. This can even be seen in the agricultural sector. Hamade et al. (2018: 7) argue: "There is a danger that developmental aspects of EU policies on agriculture and rural development are reduced to their usefulness for security policies". A series of MEDRESET stakeholder interviews in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries have also revealed that the interviewees "perceived an increased securitization of related EU policies" (Hamade 2018: 7).

The negative impact of securitization on the development policies of the EU is also underlined by Roman (2018a: 11), who refers to Moroccan and European civil society actors' claim that "some European funding instruments (e.g., the EU Trust Fund for Africa) which are meant to support socio-economic development in countries of origin and transit, are instead used to finance border control, migration management and securitizing policies". Roman (2018a: 11) further argues that "this securitization of the migration-development nexus is criticized as it goes against the goal of tackling the root causes of migration".

Another significant negative consequence of the EU's securitization of the Mediterranean has been the support provided to authoritarian regimes for the sake of stability in the region as well as energy security and preventing migration. Most of the mobility partnerships and refugee deals were made with authoritarian governments, consolidating their power in their countries and legitimizing their acts. Bilgin (2016: 221) argues that "the Southern Mediterranean countries are becoming enforcers of European security policies vis-à-vis their own citizens and other immigrants in transit to the EU" and the "South Mediterranean leaders have also made use of the context of the 'global war on terror' to pursue their own security agendas at the expense of their citizens' security". MEDRESET interviews with local stakeholders have also returned similar findings, endorsing Bilgin's views. Roman (2018a: 12) underlines civil society actors' criticism of "instrumentalization of migration, international protection and humanitarian aid through these issues being turned into matters of political and financial bargaining by countries on both sides of the Mediterranean", contending that the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries "are aware of the European need for third countries' cooperation and use it to obtain the best quid pro quo, and to advance their own economic and political interests".

Security is a negative value as it involves the breaking of normal political rules of the game and imposing limitations on fundamental rights and freedoms (Wæver 1995: 57). The overtly securitized approach of the EU towards the Mediterranean thus works at the expense of the norms and values that it is supposed to promote in its foreign policy according to Article 3(5) of the Treaty on the European Union (European Union 2016), resulting in unilateral, top-down, technocratic and depoliticizing practices on the part of the Union. Roman (2018a: 10) draws attention to the "ineffectiveness of the EU's Eurocentric and security-oriented policies" in this regard, and, referring to the interviews conducted with local stakeholders, she states that "these policies have a negative impact on human security and rights protection, and affect both the EU's credibility as a human rights champion and the development of a sound rights-based approach to migration and asylum in [Southern and Eastern Mediterranean] countries". Surely, a top-down, unilateral, technocratic, and depoliticizing approach is also reminiscent of the colonial practice. MEDRESET interviews have also demonstrated that some local civil society stakeholders also hold a similar view, and predicate, for example, the EU's governance of migration in the Mediterranean as "a post-colonial domination relationship" (Roman 2018a: 10).

6. The EU's Technocratic Approach to the Mediterranean: Selectivity and Lack of Knowledge of and Sensitivity towards Local Conditions and Needs

Kurki (2011: 216) defines technocracy as "a discursive set of ideals for governance, which emphasise the virtues of depoliticisation, harmonisation, rationalisation and objectification of policy-making and evaluation, and which promotes the role of technical experts in policy-making over substantively 'political' or 'democratic' public actors". In her view, technocracy takes objective, expert knowledge, rational calculations and decisions, and efficiency as its basis and prioritizes the role of technical experts in policy making and implementation (Kurki 2011: 215). Cebeci (2016: 123) argues that the EU's "technocratic approach is based on vague definitions, classifications, benchmarks, etc." and "hardly pays attention to particular political and societal needs of the target societies". Our WP1 research has argued along similar lines that the EU's approach to the Mediterranean is highly technocratic (Cebeci and Schumacher 2016, 2017).

Research conducted in WP2–WP7 also endorsed our findings in WP1. This means that the local stakeholders in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, as well as some European civil society actors, also claim that the EU's policies are technocratic. For example, with regard to the energy sector, Moisseron et al. (2017: 16), citing Kilpeläinen (2013), contend that "the academic and policy debate on the development of renewable energy in the South East Mediterranean (SEM) region tends to be focused around technical and financial feasibility issues, completely neglecting social and environmental concerns", and it also "does not take into account how SEM countries perceive EU energy policies in the Mediterranean, which would help to establish 'sustainable and equal relations'" between European and Southern and Eastern Mediterranean Countries.

Similar views are expressed by the local stakeholders with regard to the agriculture and water sector as well. Hamade et al. (2018: 14) found that the EU's cooperation with national and local stakeholders in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries was regarded as being composed of and thus "impeded by heavy, unclear and complicated contractual procedures, which sometimes conflicted with national governments' priorities or procedures". Hamade et al. (2018: 24) also refer to a "consensus among the studied countries that the EU's contractual procedures are complicated, unclear and sometimes even contradict central government procedures". This, by definition, refers to a technocratic approach which hinders the EU's effectiveness, as its "often rigid and inflexible" approach usually erodes the smaller institutions' willingness to work with the Union (Hamade et al. 2018: 24).[17] Citing the interviews with local stakeholders made by Chaaban et al. (2018: 19) and Bouzidi (2018), Hamade et al. (2018: 14) state that the EU is thus "not quick to respond and adapt to unforeseeable and changing local situations" and that "the EU's much criticized securitized, depoliticized and technocratic approach remains the rule".

With regard to the EU's development policies in general, the picture is no different. Huber et al. (2018: 2) assert that the EU "continues to promote a development model which has not been able to provide for the daily needs of people in the South". Dark (2018: 14) also endorses this view when she argues that "the EU's economic development instruments – such as the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA/ALECA), which aims to bring economic benefits to the partner country including duty-free access to the European market and a better domestic investment climate" mainly impose EU norms and standards not paying "adequate attention" to issues "such as informal economy, social polarization, youth unemployment as well as regional disparities and lack of good governance".

The EU's programmes/policies to engage civil society organizations in the region also suffer from its technocratic approach and cannot stimulate the desired change towards the empowerment of civil society. An important part of this relates to the EU's selective approach towards civil society as it mostly prefers to correspond and work with co-opted professionalized civil society actors. This leaves it uninformed about the local locals' needs and preferences. Thus, technocracy in the case of civil society becomes a matter of lack of participation,[18] sufficient knowledge of the local dynamics and sensitivity towards local needs.

17 On the other hand, EU instruments are also seen as those "favouring big agricultural holdings but not really helping smaller farms" (Hamade et al. 2018: 8).
18 This also refers to depoliticization, which is elaborated on in the next section.

Dark (2018: 13) contends:

> Respondents raised issues such as inability to access aid funding – also in the area of civil society – due to EU-imposed bureaucratic hurdles placed on local governments, universities and civil society groups. The lack of technical knowledge also negatively affects these institutions' capacity to negotiate with the EU and its strongly technocratic apparatus.

Lack of knowledge of EU languages on the part of grassroots civil society organizations is also part of this problem, as EU funds require professionalized paperwork which can increasingly be done through consultancy firms based in Europe. So, two problems occur: lack of knowledge of EU languages at the grassroots level, and lack of financial sources to hire consultancy firms to apply for EU projects.[19]

The EU's selective approach in its dealings with civil society is also problematic because the civil society organizations it works with are co-opted, professionalized civil society organizations that are mostly Eurocentric and do not have full knowledge of grassroots needs. Dark (2018: 13) argues that although "the perception of the EU's civil society instruments" is generally positive in the region, the common concern raised at the local level is that civil society organizations "selected by the EU to receive funding support do not generally have knowledge of the local population or even national context and [are] therefore ineffective change-makers, as clearly observed in Tunisia and Lebanon". The EU is also criticized for intensively working with European organizations that lack knowledge of the local dynamics in the target countries. Parks and Gülöz Bakır (2019: 51–2) cite two local interviewees who contend that "neither the EU nor the member states are willing to widen their network of Tunisian [civil society organizations as] they have a selective stance", that "the EU grants are offered to certain groups, who do not know Tunisia well" and that "European NGOs are opening branches in Tunis, but they should prioritize others already present in the country".[20]

Problems with local participation in the EU's policies are not confined to the realm of engagement with civil society actors. They can also be observed in other sectors such as agriculture. Hamade et al. (2018: 22) argue that "most of the shortcomings of the EU's projects can be attributed to their non-participatory approaches", and they associate this with the "lack of understanding of local needs". The lack of participation is also intensively observed with regard to women's empowerment in the agricultural sector, "as the support the EU provides often fails to address the needs of these women" because of "the EU's absence in the field and its failure to both develop strategic target policies and to conduct evaluation and impact reporting on all projects and aid granted to [Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt and Lebanon]" (Hamade

19 "An interesting example came out during the fieldwork in Tunisia, where civil society actors claimed that because EU dialogue programmes are mostly conducted in English or French, it is hard to effectively attract the Arabic-speaking local population into such activities" (Dark 2018: 13).

20 Roman (2018a: 7) also contends: "Civil society actors in both countries lamented that a large share of EU funds is allocated to European or international NGOs operating in Lebanon or Turkey, rather than to local CSOs. Indeed, only a limited number of local CSOs – in general those having previous experience in EU projects and an international profile – manage to get involved in European projects, while smaller grassroots CSOs continue to be largely excluded from EU funding, despite their embeddedness in local contexts. […] In addition, EU projects tend to hire foreign consultants rather than local experts, although the latter may have a stronger knowledge of the national and local context."

et al. 2018: 10). Hamade et al. (2018: 10) further assert that in the case of Tunisia, although the EU's programmes do "feature gender dimensions", the Union "does not ensure their implementation".

A crucial part of the problem with local participation is "ambiguous criteria for funding, as well as the rigidity of the EU's application and correspondence procedures" that "[hinder and discourage] public organs from applying for funding" (Hamade et al. 2018: 9). On the other hand, the EU's tendency to work with and through the governments of the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries also engenders problems concerning local participation (and also adds to depoliticization, when the local locals cannot display any agency in this regard). Referring to Bouzidi (2018) and Chaaban et al. (2018), Hamade et al. (2018: 9) contend that "the EU's financial support is usually given to the ministries of finance, such that other public institutions have to request the assistance of that ministry" and that EU financial assistance could be more effective if directly allocated to local institutions with "a larger autonomy".

As stakeholders in Lebanon and Turkey assert, EU projects with regard to migration, asylum and refugees suffer from "inefficient use of resources, overlapping of projects and over-emphasis on certain contexts and target populations" (Roman 2018a: 6). These deficiencies stem from:

> (i) the EU's insufficient knowledge of local needs and poor understanding of the local context and political-institutional dynamics; (ii) insufficient engagement with and involvement of local stakeholders (especially locally embedded grassroots actors) in project design and funding allocation; and (iii) lack of coordination with other actors involved as funders or implementers (other international donors, IOs, national governments, NGOs, etc.). (Roman 2018a: 6)

This means that the EU's lack of understanding of local needs and dynamics, coupled with and aggravated by its technocratic approach, causes ineffectiveness and general discontent with the Union's policies in the region. This is also due to a lack of sufficient knowledge about the local dynamics. With regard to the industrial sector, Aboushady et al. (2019: 14–5) argue that there is "a lack of willingness and awareness on the EU side about the actual problems met by different market players (lack of competition, disconnection between industrial and trade policies, and an EU focus on trade issues only)", and furthermore, as underlined by local stakeholders, "that European policies and the projects created by Europe are" either "poorly evaluated" or even "when evaluations are made, they are not sufficiently disseminated".

The EU's policies regarding development in the agricultural sector are also criticized "for their inadequate design", due to a "lack of knowledge of the concrete needs and gaps of the agriculture sector" in Lebanon, Tunisia, Egypt and Morocco (Hamade et al. 2018: 9). Hamade et al. (2018: 9) argue that "the EU has been reported to neglect baseline and needs assessments and evaluations, which leads to its failure in addressing the most pressing challenges". The neglect of local needs and related technocracy has especially come to the fore in the interviews with local stakeholders in Lebanon, where, for example, members of a permaculture association "required access to larger consumer markets to sell their products, but were instead given technical training on agricultural practices through EU-funded initiatives that do not help them sell their products" (Hamade et al. 2018: 9).

On the other hand, "the lack of oversight over the EU's projects" and "enforcement mechanisms" has also been criticized by local stakeholders (Hamade et al. 2018: 23). Hamade et al. (2018: 23) contend that "this is particularly the case with women's cooperatives and associations, which have expressed discontent with the ineffectiveness and the lack of impact of the EU's projects that concern gender inequality". On the other hand, the local stakeholders have also underlined "the lack of sustainability" in EU projects, "as funds are discontinuous and their allocation is not based on a long-term strategic perspective", and as there is a "mismanagement of funds and insufficient monitoring and assessment mechanisms" in addition to "uneven distribution of funds, both in geographical and sectoral terms, as well as against refugee-exclusive assistance" (Roman 2018a: 6).

7. The EU's Depoliticizing Approach towards the Mediterranean: Unilateralism, Top-down Policies, and Lack of Participation of Local Non-governmental Stakeholders

The EU's technocratic and securitized approach to the Mediterranean fuels its depoliticizing approach which leaves little room for political agency. An important part of this depoliticization comes from the EU's selective approach in engaging civil society actors as it tends to cooperate with co-opted professionalized civil society (an issue already underlined in the previous section). Interviews with stakeholders in the region lead Dark (2018: 13) to argue that "the EU is pursuing a technocratic and selective approach in its relations with [civil society organizations], seeing them only as service delivery agents, and not actors of political and social change". This clearly demonstrates that the EU does not attach any agency to the locals in this regard, totally ignoring their potential in creating political and social change. This surely means depoliticization. It should be noted at this point that some European officials interviewed for the MEDRESET project even depicted civil society organizations as "service providers" (Huber and Paciello 2018: 10). One interviewee, for example, stated that "for the EU, CSOs are 'fundamental for a plural society and can also be important social services actors'" and that "one of the key criteria for working with a group is that they 'provide good services'" (Huber and Paciello 2018: 10). On the other hand, another interviewee asserted that "the EU works with religious groups 'but always on the basis of the services they can provide'" (Huber and Paciello 2018: 11). This clearly shows how "the EU's depoliticized/securitized approach produces/reproduces neoliberal subjects" as argued in WP1 (Cebeci and Schumacher 2016: 6).

In the very rare cases where the EU attaches some degree of political agency to the local civil society actors, it also pursues a selective approach. It is known that during and after the Arab uprisings for example the EU refrained from engaging with religious groups and trade unions. The EU's selective approach has also been criticized by Turkish civil society actors who underlined that the Union was "expected to adopt a more inclusive approach while engaging with the civil society in Turkey, without pursuing political and identity-oriented priorities" (Dark 2018: 13).

On the other hand due to the highly securitized nature of the EU's policies on migration, the locals were not given any say in this realm at all. As a matter of fact, neither the mobility partnerships nor the refugee deals were made subject to political discussion in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries. "Local stakeholders in Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey expressed criticism towards the lack of involvement of [local civil society actors] in migration policy-making and negotiations with the EU", and requested "more participatory policy instruments, more actively involving civil society and social partners on both shores of the Mediterranean" (Roman 2018a: 16). Hamade et al. (2018: 3) also argue that "prior to the Arab Spring, technocratic and depoliticized approaches to the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) were the norm" but "in the wake of the Arab Spring, the ENP was revised in 2011 and 2015 such that security and restrictive measures on migration have moved up the priority scale". This surely meant further depoliticization.

With regard to the agricultural sector, Hamade et al. (2018: 23) argue that the major reason for the local "respondents' general disappointment with the EU's support is that its assistance does not usually tackle the main issues that impede the development of the agriculture and water sectors in each of the four countries [Lebanon, Egypt, Tunisia and Morocco]". In their view, instead of approaching issues such as climate change, water scarcity and depletion, the EU pursues "an unsustainable agricultural model based on productivism and export, and land ownership"; thus, the EU's support mostly provides "temporary fixes to bigger problems requiring political action" rather than inducing effective change (Hamade et al. 2018: 23). This openly shows how political debate on crucial issues is moved to the backburner by the EU and its highly technocratic and securitized policies.

The EU's top-down and unilateral policies have also not left much space to the governments of the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries to open certain issues to public political debate. Hamade et al. (2018: 14) argue:

> Further consolidating the complaints by several stakeholders in all four countries is that a top-down approach orchestrated from Europe does not leave much decision power to central governments, let alone to local actors. A number of respondents in Lebanon and Morocco explained that their contextual knowledge, opinions and remarks were not taken into account in the design of policies. As an institutional actor in Morocco explained, the EU fails to consider dynamics within the national context...[21]

Roman (2018a: 10) also highlights the problems of the EU's asymmetric imposition of its policies on the governments in the region. Citing a MEDRESET interview conducted with a Moroccan NGO representative, she states that the EU's "solutions are not the result of peer-to-peer dialogue" and that "the North imposes its own solutions on the governments of the South" (Roman 2018a: 10). In her view, "such an approach is focused on European interests (either security- or economy-related) while neglecting [Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries'] priorities and needs" and this "results in a lack of ownership on the part of [Southern

21 "The partnership relationships between the EU and the target countries, as well as their effectiveness, were also debated. The EU, in some instances, was accused of imposing policies or programmes in a top-down and unilateral manner, without considering the beneficiaries' opinions and needs" (Hamade et al. 2018: 23). On the other hand, the EU was also criticized for going through the governments and "for not being present in the field and only acting through public institutions" (Hamade et al. 2018: 10).

and Eastern Mediterranean stakeholders], which risks impacting on policy effectiveness" (Roman 2018a: 10). Roman (2018a: 18) further contends that local stakeholders "share a common perception of EU migration policies as abusively and inappropriately restrictive, elaborated in a unilateral way and imposed through unbalanced power relations". She also asserts that "the EU's discourse is informed by two dominant frames – unilateralism and securitization – which translate into Eurocentric, securitizing and conditionality-based policies and practices" (Roman 2018a: 17).

As a matter of fact, some European civil society actors also criticize the EU for following a "technocratic and depoliticized script" in the ENP, especially with regard to the agricultural sector (Hamade et al. 2018: 11). Hamade et al. (2018: 11) further contend that the EU institutions "are careful 'not to rock the boat' and offend political or cultural sensitivities" in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries, and "controversial issues such as inequalities in land rights and socio-economic origins of gender inequalities are less likely to be discussed than market access and extension services". This also pertains to a selective choice in terms of the matters that are open to public political debate, where certain issues are never politicized.

On the other hand, when European civil society actors and analysts criticize the EU's top-down and unilateral policies they mostly do so through a Eurocentric approach as well, providing recipes for how the EU can and should better pursue its "civilizing mission" and its normative power. Roman (2018a: 18) contends that "many European scholars have analysed the unilateralism and securitization of the EU discourse from a critical perspective, but they usually do this based on a northern Mediterranean viewpoint and on Western critical thinking". This is exactly the point that shows the difference of the MEDRESET project, as Roman (2018a: 18) argues. Through in-depth research both in Europe and in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries (and through comprehensive interviews conducted on both sides of the Mediterranean) based on the argument that the EU pursues technocratic, depoliticizing and securitized policies in the region, the MEDRESET project has revealed that the EU has a top-down, increasingly bilateral and unilateral approach towards the Mediterranean. This approach ignores local needs, leading to ineffectiveness of its policies and seriously limiting the EU's potential in designing bottom-up, inclusive and flexible solutions to the region's problems (as defined by local locals and not by Eurocentric actors).

Conclusion

The major conclusion of this report is that the research performed in WP2–WP7 proves the argument of WP1 that the EU pursues a securitized, depoliticizing and technocratic approach towards the region which is also embedded in and reproduced by its Eurocentric construction of the Mediterranean. Beyond these arguments, the research conducted in WP2–WP7 reveals that the EU conducts top-down, unilateral and bilateral policies in the region which are marked by an obsessively security-centred approach within which local needs are ignored and no place is left for local agency.

The major argument of this report has been that the EU's technocratic, depoliticizing and securitized approach hinders its effectiveness in the region, thereby limiting its potential as an actor. However, effectiveness of EU policies are not defined in Eurocentric terms here, and a bottom-up approach that focuses on local needs is instead pursued in this analysis. It can

be concluded in this regard that if the EU continues to pursue its Eurocentric, asymmetrical (unequal), top-down, depoliticizing, technocratic and securitizing policies in the region, based on an imbalanced construction of the Mediterranean where EU-Europeans are seen as superior to their Southern and Eastern Mediterranean counterparts, then we will continue producing and reproducing reports on the EU's ineffectiveness and limited potential in the Mediterranean.

References

Aboushady, Nora et al. (2019), "Assessing EU–Mediterranean Policies in the Fields of Industry and Energy from a Bottom-Up Perspective", in *MEDRESET Policy Papers*, No. 7 (January), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13780

Behr, Timo (2012), "The European Union's Mediterranean Policies after the Arab Spring: Can the Leopard Change Its Spots?", in *Amsterdam Law Forum*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Spring), p. 76-88, http://amsterdamlawforum.org/article/view/268

Bianchi, Margherita et al. (2018), "Assessing European Energy and Industrial Policies and Investments in the Southern Mediterranean Region from a Bottom-up Perspective", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 34 (December), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13770

Bilgin, Pınar (2016), "Temporalizing Security. Securing the Citizen, Insecuring the Immigrant in the Mediterranean", in Anna M. Agathangelou and Kyle D. Killian, eds, *Time, Temporality and Violence in International Relations. (De)fatalizing the Present, Forging Radical Alternatives*, Oxon and New York, Routledge, p. 221-232

Bouzidi, Zhour (2018), "Role and Effectiveness of the EU Policies in the Fields of Water and Agriculture in Morocco: A Bottom-up Approach", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 23 (October), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13651

Cebeci, Münevver (2016), "De-Europeanisation or Counter-Conduct? Turkey's Democratisation and the EU", in *South European Society and Politics*, Vol. 21, No.1, p. 119-132, https://doi.org/10.1080/13608746.2016.1153996

Cebeci, Münevver (2016), "The EU's Constructions of the Mediterranean", in *MEDRESET Policy Papers*, No. 1 (June)

Cebeci, Münevver and Tobias Schumacher (2016), "Deconstructing the EU's Discourse on the Mediterranean", in *MEDRESET Methodology and Concept Papers*, No. 2 (October)

Cebeci, Münevver and Tobias Schumacher (2017), "The EU's Constructions of the Mediterranean (2003-2017)", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 3 (April)

Chaaban, Jad et al. (2018), "Examining Lebanese Stakeholders' Frames in the Fields of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development with Regards to the Effectiveness and Potential of European Trade and Assistance Policies in Lebanon", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 22 (October), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13646

Dark, Gülşah (2018), "EU Seen from the Outside: Local Elite Perceptions on the Role and Effectiveness of the EU in the Mediterranean Region", in *MEDRESET Policy Papers*, No. 5 (November), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13672

Ehteshami, Anoush and Ariabarzan Mohammadi (2017), "The Key Powers' Construction of the Mediterranean", in *MEDRESET Policy Papers*, No. 2 (September), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13440

European Commission (2011a), *Stefan Füle – Speech on the Recent Events in North Africa*, SPEECH/11/130, Brussels, 28 February, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-11-130_en.htm

European Commission (2011b), *José Manuel Durão Barroso – Partners in Freedom: The EU Response to the Arab Spring*, SPEECH/11/523, Cairo, 14 July, europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-11-523_en.htm

European Union (2016), *Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union*, OJ C 202, 7.6.2016, p. 13-388, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12016M/TXT

Goulordava, Karina (2018), "Lebanon-EU Relations and Ways Forward: Qualitative Research Findings with Key Stakeholders in Lebanon", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 12 (June), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13546

Hamade, Kanj et al. (2018), "EU Policies on Agriculture and Rural Development in the MENA", in *MEDRESET Policy Papers*, No. 4 (November), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13667

Harrami, Noureddine and Khalid Mouna (2018), "Migratory Management in Morocco – What Do the Stakeholders Think?", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 20 (September), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13622

Huber, Daniela, Asma Nouira and Maria Cristina Paciello (2018), "The Mediterranean: A Space of Division, Disparity and Separation", in *MEDRESET Policy Papers*, No. 3 (November), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13655

Huber, Daniela and Maria Cristina Paciello (2018), "Bringing Social Justice and Human Rights Back In", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 11 (June), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13540

Hyde-Price, Adrian (2006), "'Normative' Power Europe: A Realist Critique", in *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, p. 217-234

Khalifa Isaac, Sally (2013a), "The EU's Democracy-Stability Dilemma Persists in Egypt", in *E-International Relations*, 1 August, https://www.e-ir.info/?p=41431

Khalifa Isaac, Sally (2013b), "Rethinking the New ENP: A Vision for an Enhanced European Role in the Arab Revolutions", in *Democracy and Security*, Vol. 9, No. 1-2, p. 40-60

Kilpeläinen, Sarah (2013), "Energy Relations Between the European Union and North Africa", in *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 346-359, https://www.jcer.net/index.php/jcer/article/view/523

Kurki, Milja (2011), "Democracy through Technocracy? Reflections on Technocratic Assumptions in EU Democracy Promotion Discourse", in *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, Vol. 5, No. 2, p. 211-234

Manners, Ian (2015), "Sociology of Knowledge and Production of Normative Power in the European Union's External Actions", in *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 37, No. 2, p. 299-318

Moisseron, Jean-Yves and Khaled Guesmi (2018), "European Policies in the Industry Sector in Morocco: A Bottom-up Assessment", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 28 (November), hhttp://www.medreset.eu/?p=13721

Moisseron, Jean-Yves et al. (2017), "Assessing EU-Mediterranean Policies in the Fields of Industry and Energy from a Bottom-up Perspective", in *MEDRESET Methodology and Concept Papers*, No. 8 (October), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13461

Parks, Robert P. and Zeynep Gülöz Bakır (2019), "An Outlook on Tunisian Elite Stakeholders' Perspectives on the EU and Its Policy Preferences in Tunisia and the Mediterranean", in Aybars Görgülü and Gülşah Dark Kahyaoğlu, eds, *The Remaking of the Euro-Mediterranean Vision Challenging Eurocentrism with Local Perceptions in the Middle East and North Africa*, Bern [etc.], Peter Lang, p. 27-57, https://www.peterlang.com/view/title/71334

Roman, Emanuela (2018a), "Beyond Unilateral Securitization: What Civil Society Actors Want from Migration, Asylum and Mobility Policies in the Mediterranean", in *MEDRESET Policy Papers*, No. 6 (November), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13688

Roman, Emanuela (2018b), "Reversing the Perspective: How European Stakeholders React to Migration Policy Frames of Southern Mediterranean Counterparts", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 18 (July), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13591

Roman, Emanuela and Ferruccio Pastore (2018), "Analysing Migration Policy Frames of Tunisian Civil Society Organizations: How Do They Evaluate EU Migration Policies?", in *MEDRESET Working Papers*, No. 14 (June), http://www.medreset.eu/?p=13554

Wæver, Ole (1995), "Securitization and Desecuritization", in Ronnie D. Lipschutz, ed., *On Security*, New York, Columbia University Press, p. 46-86

Wouters, Jan and Sanderijn Duquet (2013), "The Arab Uprisings and the European Union: In Search of a Comprehensive Strategy", in *Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies Working Papers*, No. 98 (January), https://ghum.kuleuven.be/ggs/publications/working_papers/2013/98WoutersDuquet

MED RESET

مِد ريست

Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI)
Via Angelo Brunetti 9
I-00186 Roma

Tel. +39-063224360
Fax +39-063224363

iai@iai.it | www.iai.it

This project is founded by the European Union's Horizon 2020
Programme for Research and Innovation under grant agreement no 693055