

**Final Conference in Collaboration
with MERCURY and EU4SEAS**

7 October 2011

Deliverable N°7.10

Month 33



EU-GRASP

Changing Multilateralism: the EU as a Global-regional Actor in Security and Peace, or EU-GRASP in short, is an EU funded FP7 Programme. EU-GRASP aims to contribute to the analysis and articulation of the current and future role of the EU as a global actor in multilateral security governance, in a context of challenged multilateralism, where the EU aims at “effective multilateralism”. This project therefore examines the notion and practice of multilateralism in order to provide the required theoretical background for assessing the linkages between the EU’s current security activities with multi-polarism, international law, regional integration processes and the United Nations system.

Partners

EU-GRASP is coordinated by the United Nations University – Comparative regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS). The other partners of EU-GRASP are based worldwide and include: University of Warwick (UK), University of Gothenburg (Sweden), Florence Forum on the Problems of Peace and War (Italy), KULeuven (Belgium), Centre for International Governance Innovation (Canada), University of Peking (China), Institute for Security Studies (South Africa) and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev (Israel).

Additional information available on the website: www.eugrassp.eu

Disclaimer

All views and opinions are those of the authors.

EU-GRASP Coordination Team: Luk Van Langenhove, Francis Baert & Emmanuel Fanta

Editorial Assistance: Rik Vanhauteghem

United Nations University UNU-CRIS

72 Poterierei – B-8000 – Bruges – Belgium

Email: fbart@cris.unu.edu or efanta@cris.unu.edu

Additional information available on the website: www.eugrassp.eu

© 2011 by Peyron, Aspinwall, Vaquer and Van Langenhove. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without permission of the authors. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 225722.

Table of Contents

Summary of the interventions from the panel	5
Panel 1: Understanding Multilateralism – The Evolving Research Agenda	7
Summary of the interventions from the panel	8
Summary of the discussants on the panel	11
Comments	15
Panel II: The Union in Action – The EU and the Practice of Multilateralism.....	17
Summary of the interventions from the panel	18
Summary of the discussants on the panel	21
Comments	23
Panel III: The EU as a Global Actor – a view from outside.....	25
Summary of the interventions from the panel	26
Summary of the discussants on the panel	31
Comments	34
Panel IV: Looking to the Future – Policy Options for the EU.....	37
Summary of the interventions from the panel	38
Summary of the discussants on the panel	42
Comments	44
Conclusions: Global Europe Conference	47
Summary of the interventions from the panel	48

Report on the conference

Opening:

Global Europe Conference¹

Kristin de Peyron

Head of Division, Multilateral Relations, European External Action Service

Mark Aspinwall

Coordinator MERCURY, University of Edinburgh

Jordi Vaquer

Coordinator EU4SEAS, Director CIDOB, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs

Luk Van Langenhove

Coordinator EU-GRASP, United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional
Integration Studies

This report is a summary of the opening session of the "Global Europe Conference", organized by the three European projects on Multilateralism, EU4Seas, EU-GRASP and MERCURY, in Brussels on 7th October 2011. The projects gratefully acknowledge the support of the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme.

¹ The conference can be watched online on the following link:
<http://scic.ec.europa.eu/str/index.php?sessionno=403ea2e851b9ab04a996beab4a480a30>

Summary of the interventions from the panel

Kristin de Peyron (Head of Division, Multilateral Relations, European External Action Service) agreed with many of the issues mentioned in the Policy Brief presented by the three 7th Framework projects entitled “*The EU and Multilateralism: Ten Recommendations*”. She highlighted the fact that multilateralism forms part of the European Union’s DNA. As suggested in the Brief, steps are being taken to advance European policy interests in a number of areas of particular interest to the EU. These are both forward-looking and strategic.

The EU has a number of shared interests with the UN, and while the EU has since the 3rd May 2011 been given the ability to act and speak in the General Assembly, it must not be forgotten that the EU’s strength is the sum of the European apparatus as well as the Member States.

The Union enjoys good relations with numerous other multilateral organisations such as the African Union, the Council of Europe etc. and should continue to encourage such collaboration.

Mark Aspinwall, (Coordinator Mercury, University of Edinburgh) thanked everyone for their attendance and went on to outline the work of Mercury. MERCURY is a consortium of academic partners from the University of Edinburgh, the University of Cologne, Charles University Prague, IAI Rome, Sciences-Po Paris, SIPRI Stockholm, the University of Cambridge, Fudan University and the University of Pretoria. The project was formed to critically examine the European Union’s contribution to multilateralism by analysing its institutional and legal framework for external relations, its relations with key partners in key regions, and its interactions in global fora. The project also carries out outreach and communication, networking, capacity-building and cooperation with other consortia. MERCURY is continually working on outreach in order to identify growing numbers of stakeholders and strategically engage them.

Jordi Vaquer, (Coordinator EU4Seas, Director CIDOB, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs) explained that EU4Seas looks at the impact of EU policies on cooperation in the Baltic, Black, Caspian and Mediterranean Basins. In order to do this, over 350 interviews were carried out with local stakeholders in order to get local opinions on the impacts of the EU’s policies in areas such as politics and security, environmental and maritime issues, energy and transport issues as well as the Four Freedoms. These interviews, and over 35 scientific papers, were the basis of 13

policy papers, written by academics and practitioners, which give concrete recommendations to policy makers. The consortium is made up of partners from the University of Iceland, the Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions, IAI Rome, the International Centre for Defence Studies Tallinn, the International Centre for Policy Studies Kiev, the Middle East Technical University Ankara and the Centre for National and International Studies Baku.

Luk Van Langenhove, (Coordinator EU-Grasp, United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies) mentioned that the project on Changing Multilateralism: The EU as a Global-Regional Actor in Security and Peace, also known as EU-Grasp, aims to deepen the understanding of the role of multilateralism and how the EU is involved therein. It analyses intra-European, bilateral, regional and global interactions and uses discourse analysis to study what the EU is doing in each area. The project has started work on foresight workshops in order to come up with ideas on future roles of the EU in foreign security policy. It has also come up with the concept of Multilateralism 2.0, where the thesis put forward is that the emergence of new multilateral actors, the development of new playing fields and new concepts of multilateralism are leading to a more open system and that the EU is partly a driver of this change. The general analysis of EU-Grasp looks at the willingness or ambitions of the EU, its capabilities or resources and to what extent it is accepted by others. The consortia is made up of the United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies, the University of Warwick, the University of Gothenburg, the Florence Forum on the Problems of Peace and War, KULeuven, Centre for International Governance Innovation Canada, Peking University, Institute for Security Studies South Africa and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Israel.

Panel 1: Understanding Multilateralism – The Evolving Research Agenda

Chair

Angela Liberatore, *DG Research, European Commission, Brussels*



Speakers

John Peterson, *Director of Research MERCURY, University of Edinburgh*

Stuart Croft, *University of Warwick*

Oriol Costa, *Autonomous University of Barcelona*



Discussants

Alberta Sbragia, *University of Pittsburg*

Emil Kirchner, *University of Essex*

This report is a summary of the first session of the "Global Europe Conference", organized by the three European projects on Multilateralism, EU4Seas, EU-GRASP and MERCURY, in Brussels on 7th October 2011. The projects gratefully acknowledge the support of the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme.

Summary of the interventions from the panel

John Peterson (Director of Research MERCURY, University of Edinburgh) explained that the scope of multilateralism is a very grey and contested area. The definition given by Bouchard & Peterson (Conceptualising Multilateralism) is: *Three or more actors engaging in voluntary and (essentially) institutionalised international cooperation governed by norms and principles, with rules that apply (by and large) equally to all states.*

When studying multilateralism, apart from analysing how it has evolved in time and space to see if we really are approaching a Multilateralism 2.0, one also needs to take certain conditions into account: 1) rules; 2) inclusiveness and; 3) voluntary – minimally institutionalised. If we consider multilateralism to be a European phenomenon, we should ask ourselves whether or not it is really new.

The US take on multilateralism has changed very little since Barack Obama took office – there has actually been a great deal more continuity than change. A new research project starting in February 2012 called Transworld will study the Transatlantic partnership, whether multilateralism is on the decline and whether or not the EU is still a partner of the US, amongst other issues.

If we consider the idea of multilateralism in an increasingly multipolar world, one wonders whether multilateralism will stand up to the increasing number of challenges against Western values. China is considered a wild card in the evolution of multilateralism and it is yet to be seen if the EU will be able to remain relevant if it does not manage to centralise its many diffused voices. **John Peterson** finally questions whether ‘international organisation’ could be turned into a verb.

Stuart Croft (University of Warwick) outlined the concept of Multilateralism 2.0 as a transition from a closed to a more open system. Since the end of the Cold War, the quantity and quality of multilateral organisations has increased manifold. There is a growing interconnectivity between policy domains, a growing importance of non-state actors, and individuals are playing an increasingly dominant role in multilateralism thanks to social media, the increasing numbers of NGOs etc. Multilateralism 1.0 only considered States as important actors, whilst the 2.0 version has a plethora of actors. While we are not quite at the 2.0 stage, we are certainly getting there.

Security Governance is another issue that has been studied at EU-Grasp, principally in terms of threats. Emil Kirchner (2007) presented security governance as an ‘*international system of rule that*

involves the coordination, management and regulation of issues by multiple and separate authorities, interventions by both public and private actors, formal and informal arrangements and purposefully directed towards particular policy outcomes'. Security can also be socially constructed, based on our interests. As we securitize more issues such as climate security and cyber security, and as the range of possible partners' shifts, one sees that whole networks are shifting into a more complex, 'liquid' form. Three conclusions can be drawn from this: security issues will continue to get more complex; the increasing number of issues framed by security speak make them harder to control and; the key focus should be on networks of the future.

Oriol Costa (Autonomous University of Barcelona) took a different approach to the issue of multilateralism by examining how the EU is influenced by multilateral institutions and how the EU performs in international institutions. He started by looking at the literature on the relationship between the EU and multilateralism. The preference of the EU for multilateralism has been part of the discourses by policy makers since the 2003 Strategy on effective multilateralism. It shapes the relationship it has with Latin America, sustainable development, China etc. The general view is that the EU needs multilateralism as it is too weak otherwise and it is a structural part of the EU discourse. There is also literature on the EU receiving a top-down influence from states or institutions. A branch of literature also looks at how States built the EU but now the EU impacts on them, resulting in Europeanization. So why can't there also be an influence on the EU?

There is a need to alter the 'domestic balance' and help domestic policy entrepreneurs within the EU. This is because international institutions can change the objectives of domestic actors in terms of socialization and learning or can alter the distribution of power with material and symbolic resources. This may make it easier for pro-international institution actors to get their preferred policies adopted by policy makers. The actual variation of influence, however, depends on the strength of international institutions, based on how robust their institutional setting is or how stringent their limits on state behaviour are. Furthermore, within the EU, the policy entrepreneur might put his point across by getting international organizations issues onto the agenda and building a winning coalition able to get the policy adopted.

It can thus be concluded that multilateral institutions do have a significant influence on the EU. There is a bias based on case selection, but it is indeed more significant than on the US for example. Stronger institutions do not systematically have stronger influences on the EU however. Some institutions that aren't even at the negotiation stage, such as the landmines issue, have strong

influence despite being a weak institution. There is no gate keeper as regards impacts on the EU. There may be some Member States that don't want certain international norms endorsed, such as access to justice in environmental matters. Neither the Commission nor relevant Member States control the consequences of such actions – they may be undesired and unintended. Furthermore, there is no clear pattern of winners or losers. International organisations do not systematically empower the same actors, ie. the Commission is not the only winner of such an influence. The only pattern that might emerge is that some mid-level, issue-specific, trans-governmental, trans-institutional networks, such as policy communities, are the only ones to be systematically empowered.

Further research to explain the openness of the EU could consider international norms as reference points for intra-EU debates; how the EU gives recognition in exchange for the endorsement of international institutions; international institutions as drivers of EU integration and as stages for *actorness*. The EU should be a particularly pro-multilateral actor in *new* issues and in issues in which *actorness* and internal competences are less well-established.

Summary of the discussants on the panel

Alberta Sbragia (University of Pittsburg) pointed out that a key assumption in multilateralism is that there was a 'Golden Age' of multilateralism with the formation of the Bretton Woods institutions, WTO, World Bank etc. However, these were based on a limited number of states (similar to the current list of OECD members) and the Communist world was in no way involved. The Non-Aligned Movement had an emphasis on avoiding being drawn in by the US or the Soviet Union, so it is important to remember that there were numerous countries not involved in multilateral organisations at all. This has only become possible since markets became accepted.

The role of markets was not automatically accepted by everyone before the 1990s, and the likes of India, China and Russia have undergone structural changes which were a prerequisite to the construction of multilateralism as we know it today. Multilateralism cannot simply be created - the structural conditions for it have to be favourable.

The US is both an economic and a security actor. This duality shapes the world view of American actors. That duality leads the US to have different choices, different dilemmas and different burdens placed on it by outside actors (other states) when compared with the EU. The EU remains more of an economic actor than a security actor in general. The US duality is particularly important in East Asia. The more Asian States become economically linked, the more the issue of security is highlighted. That never happened with Europe. During the Cold War, Asian States generally had to align themselves with one side or the other. This gave them the impression that the Cold War was an East-East conflict. This idea is rather alien to Western scholars. China, Russia and the US all had their allies in Asia. Just for information: India and China have had armed conflict, Russia and China have backed different states, and Vietnam invaded Cambodia. These issues don't tend to be talked about in IR literature or EU-Asia literature. India, Pakistan and China are nuclear powers, and the US recently had to negotiate with them regarding a nuclear exchange, which greatly worried **Prof. Sbragia**.

These sorts of conflicts and issues are simply unknown in the European context. The contrast between Europe and Asia from the US point of view is very deep. The US was the largest known investor in Europe and supported the EEC and the GATT. Furthermore, the US provided a security blanket and was the key actor in NATO. These were the sort of structural conditions in Europe. In Asia, internal geopolitics intersects with geo-economics in very different ways from the EU. In Europe, both overlapped, but not in Asia.

The tensions imbedded in the intersection of security and economics for the US defines American multilateralism. This tension and intersection is a structural condition facing the US. In general, one could say that the more powerful China gets in Asia, the more Asian states look to Washington.

The US is an actor in a very complex, structurally-defined environment in Asia, which is why there is not much of a difference across Presidencies. Both Obama and Bush, and any future President were and are faced with the same structural conditions. Who is President will matter to some extent, but they will all face the same tensions: over the South China Sea, the never-ending tension between India and Pakistan (both nuclear powers and both important to the US), security treaties with both South Korea and Japan and the complex relationship with Vietnam which has a historically-based fear of China. All of these issues distinguish the American dilemmas in this context from those of the EU.

Emil Kirchner (University of Essex) congratulated the three research groups. The projects complement each other, and besides tracing the historical evolution of multilateralism, they deliver definitional, conceptual and empirical qualifications that are very much needed. The conceptual clarifications on multilateralism and their case studies are well-chosen. The projects span narrower-regional issues with the EU4Seas project and touch the global-world perspective with EU-Grasp. They might have too much of a normative bent however, highlighting what multilateralism ought to be rather than explaining what the future of multilateralism could be like. The EU discussion is generally internal, and doesn't always link to outside projections.

The normative bent is particularly clear in the Luk van Langenhove paper on Multilateralism 2.0. The proposed changes put forward in this novel and intellectually stimulating paper bring with them new potential for increased efficiency and legitimacy of multilateralism. The paper states that the multilateral system is moving from a closed to an open system, however **Emil Kirchner** takes issue with that in the following comments:

- 1) China is a crucial EU trade partner, and it is important to pay attention to Chinese intentions on multilateralism. Because of a growing clash of interests between market opinion (EU) and modernization (China), EU trade relations with Asia are increasingly based on defensiveness and bilateralism as opposed to previous periods where there was a rhetorical commitment to openness and multilateralism. This is where he makes the change, as the paper originally stated that we are moving from one to the other. This will have negative

implications for global governance in trade, and promotes the pursuit of competitive interdependence based on politics of differentiation and exclusion rather than multilateralism and multilateral solutions. The energy policy could also be mentioned here, as mentioned in EU4Seas, as China and India are growing consumers thus both potential competitors.

- 2) Another detrimental factor to this openness and increased efficiency is the growth of regionalization and its uneasy interaction with processes of globalization in public and private governance. This can be seen in bilateral economic trade areas that are now fashionable with a range of partners, as for example, the EU and South Korea. Michael Smith points out that there is little prospect in advancing global trade governance if by that we mean this comprehensive and institutionalised regulation of global trade. This uneasiness and the obstacles are not helped by the development of the G20 which is arbitrary and an adhoc consultation arena, and does not provide the rule-based multilateralism that the world needs.
- 3) A third reason for less openness, and possibly less legitimacy, is multipolarity. The present institutions were largely created during the 20th Century and largely sponsored by the US. At the beginning of the 21st Century, the EU declared itself as interested in sponsoring effective multilateralism. However, in the emerging international order, two sponsors might be insufficient, especially when the policies made are often contested by the emerging powers such as the BRICs.

The future of multilateral institutions for global governance seems bleak from this perspective. We currently find ourselves in a situation of alignments where confusion and complexities prevail, hence caution is needed before we talk of a more efficient, legitimate and open global multilateral system.

So what's to happen in the future? The three projects were partly supposed to tackle that issue on that, but only EU-Grasp made an explicit attempt to build future scenarios. The results of this will be for future analysis.

Angela Liberatore had put two questions to the panel: one of a conceptual/empirical nature and the other in terms of case studies, whether graphically- or institutionally-based. In neither case has there been a breakthrough, although there have been clarifications. The issue of the plurality of opinions over what constitutes multilateralism has still to be fully resolved. What about value-

added? There does not seem to be an agreed theory or a common framework. There are only references to networks and epistemic communities. EU-Grasp took a constructivist approach with discourse analysis. But we have to be careful of representing a view of the EU that does not really represent reality.

It may be interesting to look at the multiple actors and multiple settings of public and private spheres in order to provide a common framework. More attention needs to be paid to the origin, maintenance and continuity (or discontinuity) of different forms of multilateralism, rather than solely concentrating on effectiveness as is done throughout the three projects. Here, he's thinking about the eclectic and selective ways that China and Russia approach multilateralism. Finally, EU-Grasp has touched on an important issue by looking at the role of citizens and citizenship involvement. The relationship between globalisation and citizens should be studied further and in a more systematic way. Globalisation and multilateralism deserve equal attention.

Comments

Alain Ruche (EEAS) stated that there is a need for speed analysis. If there is so much talk of securitization, what can we do to de-securitize issues? It seems that the EU has lost its innovative pulse, although this should be an added value of the Union. Researchers need to think outside of the box to help policy makers be more innovative.

Tim Shaw (University of the West Indies) mentioned the importance of the link between transnationalism and Diasporas as they also affect security and de-security.

Lorenzo Fioramonti (University of Pretoria) questioned whether multilateralism was really an EU innovation. We should consider how others, such as China consider multilateralism. The EU tends to think that we only need to know what we mean by multilateralism, rather than taking in other views as well.

Leila Alieva (Centre for National and International Studies, Baku), commenting on **Stuart Croft's** presentation, was disturbed by the increased pattern of securitisation that means a return to the mythological way of thinking about securitization patterns or that implies that we are living in an increasingly hostile world. The change in Administration in the US for her implied that there was a transformation of the connotation of security.

Alyson JK Bailes (University of Iceland) mentioned that if anything is left off the list of security issues it seems to imply that we don't care about it. Everything doesn't have to be considered in terms of hard power and non-state actors should be involved. A good example would be using independent firms and consultants to help with cyber security issues.

Chen Zhemin (University of Fudan) explained that China is interested above all in norms on sovereignty while the US seems to be more involved in security norms. He would like to see how each actor engages with others in this growing network of actors.

Christopher Hill (University of Cambridge) was glad that the work undertaken within the FORNET project (Foreign Policy Governance in Europe — Research Network Modernising, Widening and Deepening Research on a Vital Pillar of the EU) still remains available.

The Westphalian idea of States and therefore their influence in multilateralism is changing constantly. Despite this, balance of power thinking still exists to a certain extent. Some in the EU at times saw multilateralism as a way of casting a net over Gulliver (US).

Luk van Langenhove (United Nations University on Comparative Regional Integration Studies), in response to Emil Kirchner's comments, mentioned that openness in the Multilateralism 2.0 idea was on a systematic level.

Jordi Vaquer (CIDOB) stated the need to highlight the issue of legitimacy more. Because the EU is multilateral, we feel more legitimate than others in multilateral fora. Sovereign states in the EU support this.

Mark Aspinwall (University of Edinburgh) wondered what our purpose was in studying multilateralism. We must think about the issues and disseminate the results effectively to have an impact on EU officials.

Panel II: The Union in Action – The EU and the Practice of Multilateralism

Chair

John Peterson, *University of Edinburgh*



Speakers

Lorenzo Fioramonti, *University of Pretoria*

Jan Wouters, *Catholic University of Leuven*

Jaroslav Kurfürst, *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic*



Discussants

Vahur Made, *Estonian School of Diplomacy*

Mohamed Ibn Chambas, *Secretary General ACP Group*

This report is a summary of the second session of the “Global Europe Conference”, organized by the three European projects on Multilateralism, EU4Seas, EU-GRASP and MERCURY, in Brussels on 7th October 2011. The projects gratefully acknowledge the support of the European Commission’s Seventh Framework Programme.

Summary of the interventions from the panel

Lorenzo Fioramonti (University of Pretoria) was of the opinion that it is possible to have well-functioning multilateralism on a macro-global level, but that this may not necessarily be the case locally. An example could be the Great Lakes in Africa. The EU and other actors agreed to share the labour of conflict prevention in the region, but this has been hard to put into practice.

The diffusion of multilateral practices has made global governance more complex. The owner of the largest number of resources (knowledge, money, and people) tends to pre-package the results as they see fit. Multilateralism is based on norms and values, and yet if these are created by one actor, it would be hard to negotiate with them as they will come from a higher moral ground than the others. The BRIC countries have interests and the EU tells them and other to concentrate on having norms.

John Peterson (University of Edinburgh) wanted to commend **Lorenzo Fioramonti** on his paper on the post-Lomé-Cotonou negotiations between the ACP States.

Jan Wouters (Catholic University of Leuven) discussed the fact that the EU is linked intrinsically to the UN, as the UN is mentioned four times in the Constitution. However, since 2003, it has been aiming for effective multilateralism with the United Nations at its heart and has been specified in the European Security Strategy. However, in private, there is a lot of criticism of the UN as there is often too much bureaucracy, a lack of transparency and objectivity as regards the money that the EU gives to the UN etc., the latter which was highlighted in reports by both the Court of Auditors and the Parliament.

The *Improving Lives Report* highlights EU-UN work, but only shows the positive side of this relationship. It is not critical and it does not allow us to see if the Lisbon Treaty and the setting up of the EEAS strengthen the EU's international role and strategic impact. He would however answer that they do not.

The UN also needs the EU to a certain extent, most especially for financial support. However, the General Assembly Resolution of the 3rd May 2011 reaffirms that the General Assembly is purely inter-governmental and only States can be considered real members. The EU has been given a special observer status, despite the fact that it gives about 55% of the UN's development aid.

Trade is an external competence of the EU in theory, and yet most of the trade competencies are given to DG Trade. This leaves Catherine Ashton's team with a limited role within trade, despite the Lisbon Treaty in theory giving Ms. Ashton more power.

The EU needs to bring its house in order, and improve connections with its Member States in the international arena. The Commission and the Council should not be on opposing sides in any negotiation, as was made clear during the Stockholm incident in June 2010 in negotiations on mercury. At present, external representation of the Union is still contentious because the list of shared competences is so extensive.

The EU needs a new overall strategy on multilateralism especially when dealing with the UN and the UN family. Is the EU sufficiently present in the Security Council? It seems that Catherine Ashton is not very often given the floor to talk in place of the Member States. The IMF has no Euro zone seats either.

There needs to be a general improvement of the EU's participation in multilateral fora.

Jaroslav Kurfürst (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic) considers multilateralism a source of legitimacy within the EU. It was born from intergovernmentalism in the Union and its CFSP is now being centralized by the EEAS. 'Effective multilateralism' is very complicated to achieve. When one thinks about it, it's just an extension of tribal traditions, people coming together to make a common decision.

Selective multilateralism exists. There are all-inclusive formats (with the 27 Member States, the Commission and the Council all being represented), but more exclusive formats such as the G8 or the G20 function with only a selection of states represented, thus diminishing the level of legitimacy of the fora. This can no longer be considered global governance.

In the past, the rotating presidency of the EU allowed every country, big or small, the opportunity to set the agenda. The Lisbon Treaty however has cancelled that out. Bigger countries now often make the decisions for others. Mid-size countries were accustomed to having an opinion on everything, but now they may find it hard to participate in all areas. Through their embassies abroad, they may have more work, but they are generally present.

In the 2003/4 a multipolar world was the option of choice as there were EU visionaries saw it as a way of emancipating the Union from US. However in a multipolar world as an organizing principal

for international affairs, the EU is not quite ready. We need to clearly define national interests and be able to react quickly to events. A better principle for organizing global affairs would be to try to encourage democracy and be innovative with this, using the US, Japan etc. as its ally in that case.

Summary of the discussants on the panel

Vahur Made, (Estonian School of Diplomacy) wanted to concentrate on the challenging nature of multilateralism on the EU. He thinks that multilateralism can not be considered as one phenomenon. There are a significant number of layers to be considered: macro, micro, global, regional, supra-regional and subregional. So what kind of player is the EU in this setting? The EU is particularly strong in regional multilateralism; however other multilateral practices present more challenges and threats.

On a macro level, global multilateralism functions in a context of institutional schemes established in different environments. In the 1950s, the EU integration project did not have the aim of global multilateralism. This might explain why the EU is a weak global player. From a global political or security perspective, the EU can be seen in an embryonic stage of multilateralism.

Europe was originally created with the idea of trade in mind, and could be considered a trade block, thus explaining why it is a forceful player in world trade. However, it is especially strong in trade taking as opposed to trade giving. While there may be EU states that are strong traders, the EU does not support Estonian trade to China, for example.

On a micro level, EU4Seas studied the effects of the EU on a subregional level. Having other competing regional settings in the Baltic, Black, Caspian and Mediterranean Seas is a problem for the EU. It wants to establish itself as a regional normative player and the question remains what to do with local multilateral organisations.

The EU's foreign policy success list is not very long, which does not boost the EU as a global player. The Neighbourhood Policy could be considered a success, but there is a lack of a unified vision as to how to push that policy further. The ambition of becoming a real multilateral player is problematic for the EU. Hopefully, the EEAS will bring us further in that direction, but it is hard to see how the EU could become a similar multilateral player to the US, China or Russia. Theoretical or conceptual tools are still lacking in order to place the EU in a context of one-country multilateral players. How should a heterogeneous body be merged into the same concert as much more homogenous bodies?

Mohamed Ibn Chambas (Secretary General ACP Group) analysed ACP and EU relations. 79 ACP countries (soon to become 80 with South Sudan) and 27 Member States have cooperated over the

years in a binding legal context, as outlined in the Lomé and then the Cotonou Agreements. There are three main axes for cooperation:

- 1) Political Dialogue based on articles 8 and 96 where issues of mutual interest and new challenges are discussed and highlighted;
- 2) Trade under the Economic Partnership Agreements, which was one way of trying to harmoniously integrate ACP countries in global trade. These have only been signed by the Caribbean for the time being, making implementation far from evident;
- 3) Development Finance in the framework of the European Development Fund (EDF). This is a combination of multilateral and bilateral approaches. There is a national window, with individual states signing agreements with the EU to improve individual needs. There is a regional window where regions agree with the EU to improve regional integration and trade infrastructure. And then there is the ACP for intra-ACP projects.

Article 96 may be invoked suspending countries from the EDF as a result of breach of norms if they find themselves in an unconstitutional context (eg. Fiji, Guinea Bissau, Eritrea). On-going dialogue is then useful in order to help these countries to restore their institutional framework and democratic governance.

Comments

Jordi Vaquer (Coordinator EU4Seas, Director CIDOB, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs) agreed that the EU needs to act swiftly and be able to make decisions quickly, but it is important that this is done in a reliable manner that provides continuity.

The fact that the EU does not have a seat in the UN does not mean we don't have a certain amount of power in the UN. The EU is the Member States and its institutions after all.

Is legitimacy really about how many states are involved? Assad's government is currently a voice for the Iranian people and Andorra has the same weight as China – how legitimate is that?

Nicole de Paula Domingos, (Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques) had a question for **Lorenzo Fioramonti** regarding whether values should be negotiated as regards ideas?

Hanna Ojanen, (The Swedish Institute of International Affairs) re-stated that knowledge is a power resource that is unequally distributed, and it is important to know who defines what knowledge is relevant. Why has this not yet been changed? Can we not resolve this matter or do we not want to?

Lorenzo Fioramonti (University of Pretoria) stated that meaningful participation and multilateralism can only occur if the most powerful countries are not the main norm agenda setters.

We have knowledge, thus this is not something we are likely to give up or change. It is however being distributed slowly but surely as students who come to the US and/or EU bring their new-found knowledge back to their home countries and use this knowledge to negotiate with the US/EU.

Jan Wouters, (Catholic University of Leuven) mentioned that the Lisbon Treaty has abolished the rotating presidency. Article 17 gives shared competences and the President, the High Representative etc. have now been recognised by the UN, but a place needs to be made for them. Otherwise, the EU could be again seen as a kind of Holy Spirit with 27 apostles sitting in the UN, but we have probably gone beyond that stage now.

Andrea Moggi, (Global Issues division, EEAS) wanted to introduce the following into the discussion: the role of the European Parliament, application of the subsidiary principle in foreign policy and global issues more relative to narrow issues such as the international position of the EU and that of the Member States. Governance issues are related to our position in the multilateral system. However, horizontal linkages still need to be improved in the EEAS such as the relationship between global issues and the multilateral division, strategic planning and strategic communication. Also, our relations with the rest of the Commission need to be improved. Guidance and orientation is being given to the Commission in carrying out foreign activities so that there is coherence. The EEAS was only created on 1 January 2011, and Madame Ashton is very active in external action including the Arab Spring, the Ukraine etc.

Lorenzo Fioramonti (University of Pretoria) believes that any internally divided system should not necessarily be multilaterally weak. We are stuck with too few definitions of multilateral concepts. The EU does not necessarily need a very united Europe, as, if it has only one voice (having spent a long time negotiating that voice), it may be too bullish on the international arena and no longer be able to negotiate. Thus its apparent weaknesses may be actual strengths in certain fields and vice versa.

Jan Wouters, (Catholic University of Leuven) has sympathy with the EEAS as it is a good innovation and it is young, thus it does need time to get established. However, where is the strategic thinking? The BEPA doesn't really fulfil this role of strategic thinking any more. The Institute of Security Studies will also consider its future with the EU. The institutions that are supposed to carry out strategic thinking for the EU should club together better. They were not able to foresee the Arab Spring for example. The reactions were also rather weak. Resources for strategic thinking need to be pooled. All of the institutions need to be more cooperative. However this may be hard under the offensive of certain Member States against the post-Lisbon machinery of external relations. The fact that Member States can continue to speak out because they have shared competences with the EEAS needs to be solved, as it raises numerous issues. What does article 17 mean when they represent the Commission? These themes need to be resolved internally by frankly talking to one another and should not be exposed to the rest of the world.

Panel III: The EU as a Global Actor – a view from outside

Chair

Andy Cooper, *Centre for International Governance Innovation*

Speakers

Chen Zhemin, *Fudan University*

Joel Peters, *Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Virginia Tech*

Meliha Altunisik, *Center for European Studies - Middle East Technical University*

Discussants

Ian Lesser, *German Marshall Fund Brussels Office*

David Zounmenou, *Institute for Security Studies Pretoria*



This report is a summary of the third session of the “Global Europe Conference”, organized by the three European projects on Multilateralism, EU4Seas, EU-GRASP and MERCURY, in Brussels on 7th October 2011. The projects gratefully acknowledge the support of the European Commission’s Seventh Framework Programme.

Summary of the interventions from the panel

Andy Cooper (Centre for International Governance Innovation) pointed out that Canada is closely linked to multilateralism. The EU has put a lot of good work in on issues such as multilateralism as can be seen with the three programmes. EU4Seas, working on sub-national groups provides an intricate component in terms of multilateralism very close to Canada's heart. In the morning sessions, there was a distorted view on the G20 as it is not only a concert but it fits closely into the idea of multilateralism 2.0: Bill Gates has discussed financial transaction taxes; there is a Business 20; civil society is involved through Oxfam realigning its strategy to the G20.

Chen Zhemin (Fudan University) presented a Chinese view of the EU as a global actor. Starting with a bilateral perspective, Zhemin explained that official and academic discourse, as well as public opinion polls, were analysed in order to gauge Chinese reactions to the EU. There were high expectations of the EU from 1995 to 2005 after the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, with the continuous advancement of European integration. Furthermore, there was progressive development of Chinese-EU relations with the formation of an EU-China axis, and both promoted the UN-role and multilateralism in reaction to the US foreign policy at the time. Chinese universities even started studying European studies as opposed to Member State studies.

In 2003 the Chinese government presented their first ever policy paper on the European Union which shows the EU's importance at the time. At the same time, 66% of the Chinese people preferred a European influence rather than an American influence in the world, which is higher than the world average and indeed higher than the European opinion itself.

China considered the EU as an asymmetrical multi-pillar actor, with economic, political and nascent military power. It is a multi-mechanism complex actor where supranationalism and intergovernmentalism coexist in the system. The many players involved in the EU cause difficulties in policy coordination and consistency. China thought that EU was to become more powerful and play a more important world role.

In recent years, since the Lisbon Treaty, it had been hoped that there would be an improvement in EU *actorness*. Real changes have been rather disappointing however. The EU has been involved in the financial and then Euro crisis, while China has been rising well economically and this implies a sense of a change in the bilateral relationship.

In 2010, Professor Yang Zieman divided the world into four groups – the defending group (US), gaining group (China & emerging groups), losing powers (Europe) and weak group (other developing countries). Despite Moravcsik's theory on 'Europe as a Second Superpower', it does seem that Europe is facing a long-term decline.

In economic terms, the EU is China's biggest trading partner since 2004 and has become its biggest export market since 2007, surpassing the US. The EU has outstanding presence in the main financial institutions but faces many problems: the current economic crisis, a weak real economy, the rise of the rest. This has given rise to a more symmetrical relationship with China.

The Chinese view the US as the world's leading economic power, rather than themselves, while most European countries consider China the leading power. The Chinese view the US as its most important bilateral partner, while Europe has dropped from 20% down to 7.3% from 2009 to 2010. Is this a short term shift or does it indicate a longer term change?

The Chinese agree that the EU is a soft or normative power; however they differentiate between the internal power and the policy dimension. Internal policy is more attractive than external, and once European institutions are exported, they tend to make the Chinese uncomfortable. There is a global drop in favour of the view of the EU (BBC Pew Poll), and this drop is reflected in China as well.

The Chinese premier denied the G2 concept in Europe, and has continued to work closely with the EU. However, growing Chinese concerns include the risk of the EU's economic downturn, the EU's normative foreign policy which causes frictions over domestic issues within China and some friction over external EU interventions. There has also been a European inability to form consensus on key issues as well as a certain level of inflexibility on common policies such as was seen at the Copenhagen Conference in 2009.

The EU is still an important player with the combined weight of the institutions and its Member States but there is an increasingly equitable relationship now with China. Indeed, faced with inaction on the EU level, China is likely to invest more efforts in strengthening ties with the Member States individually.

Joel Peters (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Virginia Tech) gave an overview of how Israel views the EU as a security actor. In short, Israel has a negative view of the EU. However, in long, this

is a lot more nuanced. Israel and Europe relations are often viewed as being in crisis, mainly because of the European position on the Peace Process.

1) Concerning Israel's view of the EU as a security actor: Based on Robert Kagen's book 'Power of Weakness', where there are two camps (Mars and Venus), Israel would be in the Mars camp and views the EU in Venus. Europe is seen to lack capacity to act on the global stage as its foreign policy instruments that certain Member States do have. The EU promotes multilateralism in the Middle East but it doesn't seem to be really committed to the regional security cooperative dimension. The failure of the Barcelona Process due to the Peace Process is seen as a cop-out. Europe also lacked hard security in the Balkans. More recently, with the robustness of the response to Libya and Syria and the issue of nuclear weapons in Iran, Israel has noticed changes in the EU's reactions to security issues.

Israel views NATO very positively, and it sees it as a primarily European actor. Israel would even be interested in future membership of NATO.

2) Concerning Israel's view of the EU as an actor in general: There is a strong network of political and economic links between Israel and the EU. All parties advocate membership of the European Union and NATO for Israel. Over 70% of Israelis would be interested in joining the European Union (although this figure drops when they are told what that actually entails.)

3) Concerning Israel's view of European participation in the Peace Process: Whatever the EU announces as regards the Peace Process, the Israeli reaction is likely to be anger and upset. The Peace Process can be divided into three categories – conflict containment, conflict management and conflict resolution. Europe has generally been in the conflict resolution section, whereas Israel is generally in the other two. However, when there is convergence between Europe and Israel's role, Israel tends to look to Europe on conflict resolution. When this also converges with the United States, there is triple convergence which provides for more successful conflict resolution. Israel is uncertain as regards Europe's capacity to be able to play the role it wants to play – peacekeeping, diplomacy etc.

Meliha Altunisik (Center for European Studies - Middle East Technical University) looked at how Turkish policy makers view the EU as a multilateral actor in the Middle East, a region where the EU has interests and where Turkey is becoming an increasingly important actor. Turkey has a hybrid identity as regards Europe, as it's an outsider like China and Israel, but it's been in the

accession process since 2004. Did Turkey-EU relations promote multilateralism in Turkey's foreign policy in the Middle East and to what extent is EU engagement with Turkey considered in the context of multilateral foreign policy?

Turkey's view of the EU in the Middle East has been affected by how it views itself in the region. Furthermore, the view has evolved since Maastricht when the EU made the claim of being a global actor. The first period to be analysed is the immediate post-Cold War era to the Helsinki summit in 1999. Turkey got involved in the Middle East during that time due to the Gulf War, the Kurdish issue and the increase of political Islam, all seen as threats to Turkey. Hard security instruments were used to come to terms with these threats. At that time, the EU was not considered an actor in the Middle East.

From 1999, when Turkey was awarded candidate status, the EU obviously became a more important actor for Turkey, and one of its arguments was that Turkish membership would increase the EU's global *actorness*. Turkey also emphasized the alignment of its foreign policy with the EU, using soft power tools, multilateral diplomacy and negotiated solutions to conflicts, economic interdependence.

From 2005, when the accession negotiations started, there was a decline in relations. Relations since then have stagnated, maybe heading towards collusion. Turkey wanted to attain a more assertive role for itself in the Middle East, thus diverged from its earlier policy, becoming increasingly independent. In fact, EU harmonization was no longer even a goal. In its efforts to become a regional power, Turkey tried to gain the acceptance of its neighbouring states, engage the region diplomatically and economically, and to move beyond the region, making a critique of the global order and suggesting ways of redefining it by using a more ethical approach . A certain amount of competition also started with Turkey and some EU countries. Post-Lisbon Europe has no negotiation tools in place for the continued discussions with Turkey.

Turkey was initially taken off guard by the Arab Uprising, but feels that it has put in the diplomatic work in those countries over the years and is well located to deal with the Arab context. There is regional competition with Egypt and Iran, resulting in an increased perception of threats. This has resulted in any increased use of hard power which has domestic implications, as the increased role of the military allows the AKP to put more emphasis on hard power. Within this context, the Middle East provides both opportunities and challenges to Turkey. This has resulted in a need for more

coordination and cooperation with its traditional partners. It has worked more closely with the US but not with the EU.

In conclusion, Turkey does not perceive the EU as a global actor in the Middle East. It has viewed European attempts to include it in Mediterranean initiatives as a way of avoiding membership. The EU has not perceived Turkey as a real partner in the Middle East either, and has not engaged Turkey in institutional cooperation. And yet, Turkey-EU relations have affected Turkish foreign policy tools towards the Middle East, which alone should encourage a renewed partnership.

Summary of the discussants on the panel

Ian Lesser (German Marshall Fund Brussels Office) explained that members of the American policy spectrum want to see more Europe in the world, but they are often frustrated as they see Europe's inability to act decisively. Europe's centrality is also called into question. The GMF's Transatlantic Trends survey for 2011 shows that, when Americans were asked whether Europe or Asia was more important to their national interests, the large majority said Asia. The generation that saw Europe as an affinity partner seems to be dying out, probably because Europe is now a settled place that won't provide America with a lot of shocks. Asia also seems to be trendy among the young.

The economic aspect of relations is very important because the US and the EU are still at the core of financial interaction in the world, although that's not always the perception. The recent crisis shows that what happens in Europe really does affect the US and there can be shocks in Europe.

As regards defence, the burden sharing debate is rather old. Basically, Americans, who spend a huge amount on defence, would like to see Europe do more. However, with the current crisis, most informed people know this won't happen now, and indeed, the US is making its own cuts.

Geography does matter. The Libya experience shows that Europe can reach, is capable and has a more enduring interest in reacting than the US. The Balkans or North Africa is another example.

David Zounmenou (Institute for Security Studies Pretoria) explains the African perspective of Europe. First of all, there are five challenges, both old and new:

- 1) There is a perception that Europe is being squeezed out of Africa. China generally rules there. There is increased South-South cooperation and trade. The birth of the BRICs and IFSA has furthered the discussion around Europe's privileged position in Africa.
- 2) Europe appears as a Trojan horse with a neo-colonial agenda. South African behaviour in Cote d'Ivoire and Libya has increased the popularity of this idea. It is becoming central to South African foreign policy and is now at the heart of the AU. It is hard to see how solid or valid that is at the moment.
- 3) Contested political conditionality used to promote democracy in developing countries in Africa. There are still controversies around what type of democratic assistance is to be provided and whether democracy is genuinely being promoted.

- 4) There are some institutional weaknesses within the EU. The absence of consensus within a multilateral setting is an important point, but in the context of Africa, if the EU does not have consensus on a particular issue, it provides the platform for an African leader to disregard regional efforts to address a particular concern.
- 5) There is a perception that EU could dump Africa, although he's not too sure how likely that is.

There are some positive trends however. Africa, and the general AU perspective, still sees the EU as a key strategic partner. This is for historical reasons, as, although we might not like it, the colonial history really does play a role. Geography is also important, as Africa's proximity to Europe easily makes provision of commodities easy. Africa could serve as an important area for norms development in terms of global governance.

In spite of the hype around China, the BRICs and IFSA, the EU really remains the most important development partner in Africa. Looking back over the past few years, FDI from the EU to African regions reaches a significant 40%.

Economically, and from a Northern African perspective, it is a good moment to consolidate relations between the EU and Africa.

In peace-keeping/conflict management, there is a very interesting relationship between the EU and Africa. The AU peace and security architecture (APSA) would not be where it is today without European contributions. Africa is moving towards an Africa Standby Force in three regions of the continent. European peace-keeping operations in Sudan, the South African Republic or DRC are valid points to believe that this relationship will continue.

A point that was already mentioned by **Dr.Ibn Chambas** in the morning that's worth repeating: in terms of conflict management, the early involvement of the EU provides the support that the regional economic community and sub-continental organisations need to make their point. Looking at Nigeria, Guinea or Côte d'Ivoire, leaders have understood that there is not an option of amending the constitution to hang on to power, denying the expression of the will of the people after free and fair elections.

Democratic Assistance is one area where the EU is expected to play an important role. African leaders look at new technology to rig elections. When citizens can't trust the ECOWAS or the AU, they look to the EU in order to see how free and fair elections actually were.

In order to improve relations, a continued dialogue needs to be given importance, especially with the strategic partnership between the AU and the EU. It is important to continue identifying key partners at the bilateral and multilateral level in order to understand the key priorities for each arrangement. Finally, colonisation is there – it cannot be denied. We can however walk around history and aim to improve the life and conditions of the people of Africa

Comments

Sonia Lucarelli (Forum for Peace and War, University of Bologna) has been working on the external images of the EU and over the years the vision of Europe as a civilian or normative power is no longer discussed.

The data demonstrates that people around the world know very little about the European institutions, as do the Europeans themselves. We tend to criticise the EU for double standards, for a gap in rhetoric and performance, for a lack of unity etc. and the message seems to have arrived – the Union took note of the criticism (and continues to do so) as can be seen in the Lisbon Treaty.

We need to look at the interaction of images of the world and ourselves as mutually constitutive factors. The framework to do this research with the best results is in multilateral settings. Here, individuals that have a better grasp of the others involved can be interviewed. There does not need to be a global discussion and you can tell a story of mutual interaction and how this shapes mutual perceptions.

David Cameroux (Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques) was struck by the lack of discussion on Strategic Partnerships, which are supposed to be party of the EU's foreign policy. Does this suggest:

- a) that they are unimportant?
- b) that they are a contradiction in terms because there is no joint strategy ?
- c) that they are just a good house keeping label/seal of approval?
- d) that they are a similar policy to the ones carried out in Siam at the end of the 19th Century – if everyone has a special partnership, then no one has a particularly special partnership?

Lorenzo Fioramonti (University of Pretoria) thinks that Strategic Partnerships are a little like political polygamy. If you are married to everyone, the strength of your marriage will suffer.

If we are thinking of a world with Multilateralism 2.0, we should not have a purely state-centric approach. We should consider that other players also affect multilateral processes. In each respective area and country, do the panellists see more promising prospects, allowing the EU to be more effective in Durban or Doha?

Christopher Hill (University of Cambridge) wonders where Chinese diplomats and scholars get their information on the EU from. Do they use academic analysis, discussion analysis or reports from their ambassadors in Brussels and the Member States? What's the balance of priorities?

It is understandable that one thinks of EU-African relationships in the frame of colonialism, but it's a bit unfair on some of the countries not involved in colonialism. Is there a distinction for those that were not involved such as the Scandinavians, Ireland or Greece?

Meliha Altunisik (Center for European Studies - Middle East Technical University) in answer to the question on non-state actors. In the Turkish context, it is not just about the foreign policy issue – there is a lot of history, accession etc. involved. The disaffection at state level is reflected in public opinion, and polls show decreasing interest in EU Membership which started as a frustration with the prolonged Membership process, and continues with the recent economic crisis in Europe and how the problems in Greece have been handled. Turkey thinks it may actually be better off alone, although some opinion makers are still emphasizing the importance of EU membership for the democratization process. There is a divergence of opinions, but in general, compared to 10 years ago, there is less interest.

Joel Peters (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Virginia Tech) mentioned that the expectation-capability gap implies that there are great expectations that Europe should be doing more about the Peace Process. If the Institutions listened to these issues, he's not sure civil society did.

Strategic Partnerships are not on offer to Israel. However, they might like to have a broader strategic dialogue, moving the context of EU-Israeli relations from the specificity of economics or the Peace Process to a broader element, although not a return to the Barcelona-style discussions either. As mentioned before, joining NATO or Europe could be seen as possible.

To **Lorenzo Fioramonti**, the problem of multilateralism for Israel is that it's a kind of 'us against them' scenario as the Palestinian conflict would be given centre place and other dialogues about multilateralism wouldn't really exist. Israel requested a Sub-Committee on International Organizations in the EU-Israel Action Plan, reflecting changes within Israel. This implies that it's not Mars or Venus, it's somewhere in between. However, that Committee has no real flesh, which is an opportunity missed. Maybe in 10 years time this question would be more pertinent.

Chen Zhemin (Fudan University) responded to the sources of government policy making. In China, they still very much rely on delegate reports, but there are also some government-affiliated think tanks that can give support in that area, such as the Shanghai institute. Also, there are regular discussion groups with leading professors in foreign affairs studies and members of the foreign ministry. Every now and again, university colleagues might also be sent to the Chinese representation in the EU for about three years to write reports from an IR perspective.

China has Strategic Partnerships with the EU, but they don't seem to have been implemented. Nevertheless, they both want to keep the title of the partnerships there in case there are any substantial achievements in the next EU-China Summit.

David Zounmenou (Institute for Security Studies Pretoria), when thinking about the relationship with the EU, says you can't hate a cow and like its milk. Some leaders that have lost legitimacy feel that by reviving the anti-colonial thesis, they will gain legitimacy (Zimbabwe, South Africa or Côte d'Ivoire for example).

Ian Lesser (German Marshall Fund Brussels Office) said that the US has Strategic Partnerships with everybody and he doesn't really know what they mean. If you take NATO, finance etc into account, Europe really is a Strategic Partner aswell.

The critique of Europe in the States gets tougher the further you go from the State Department, such as in the think tank or finance world.

Andy Cooper (Centre for International Governance Innovation) concluded by thanking the panel, the projects and indeed the Commission and the EEAS for all their work in multilateral relations with outside countries.

Panel IV: Looking to the Future – Policy Options for the EU

Chair

Esther Barbé, *Autonomous University of Barcelona, IBEI*



Speakers

Wolfgang Wessels, *University of Cologne*

Sonia Lucarelli, *University of Bologna*

Alyson JK Bailes, *University of Iceland*



Discussants

Luis Peral, *European Union Institute for Security Studies*

This report is a summary of the fourth session of the “Global Europe Conference”, organized by the three European projects on Multilateralism, EU4Seas, EU-GRASP and MERCURY, in Brussels on 7th October 2011. The projects gratefully acknowledge the support of the European Commission’s Seventh Framework Programme.

Summary of the interventions from the panel

Esther Barbé (Autonomous University of Barcelona, IBEI), who chaired the panel, mentioned that it seems that the idea of Europe and multilateralism has come to a breaking point and thus looking at the future policy options is a useful but most probably unsatisfactory exercise. The future-looking exercise was recently undertaken in the *Europe 2030 Report* that was chaired by Felipe Gonzalez and delivered in May 2010. Two main ideas come out of the report. Firstly, the EU as an external actor is being increasingly marginalised. How can the EU avoid becoming the Western peninsula of the Asian continent? Also, the Union has to bargain with emerging and existing powers.

Javier Solana, in his last academic speech as High Representative held at Harvard University, mentioned that we are currently in a multipolar situation without multilateralism. Europe is and wants to be a power. This neorealist discourse by Solana and in the report resulted in the questions posed to the panel: What sort of power does the EU want to be and for what purpose?

Sonia Lucarelli (University of Bologna) explained that she had spent the previous day with members of the EU-Grasp team working on the Foresight package wherein they examine the variables that could affect the future of the EU. They proposed possible scenarios that looked at issues such as demographic and economic trends, ownership/access to technology, governance issues etc, and how they will affect the Europe of the future. There could be a de-globalisation trend in the future as a protectionist reaction to fear. Poles might move toward big cities rather than states. However their most relevant scenarios discussed the numbers and types of actors likely to be present in the future:

- The rise of China as a unipolar power was considered and what implications this could have on multilateral settings. They concluded that there would be no change for the UN as such, but there would be a reinterpretation of norms. The idea of Responsibility to Protect would also need reconsidered and there would surely be an increased role for non-state actors. The role of multilateral governance would not change as such, but certain actors would be denied access to dialogue.
- Another relevant scenario was the rise of numerous emerging powers such as China, India, Brazil, Nigeria and Iran. In this case, no polarity would emerge and there would be more importance placed on the issue of regional governance rather than global governance. As

the agendas for global and regional governance diverge, there would be an increase in tensions leading to possible anarchy.

None of the scenarios analysed suggested how to gain increased legitimacy or the perfect balance between flexibility and firmness. The European Union, in all of these scenarios, had different functions depending on the scenario. It would not fair well in the case of a dispersed system with big cities as powers. If big corporations were to be the main powers, remaining relevant would also be a major challenge. The EU thus needs to work on engagement, credibility (via consistency) and legitimacy in order to continue being relevant.

Alyson JK Bailes (University of Iceland) analysed the challenges that Europe may face in the future and how it could overcome them. The post- and schizo- identities of Europe provide both opportunities and challenges to the Union. It has a post-modern identity, post-Westphalian strategy and a post-industrial economy. It could be considered weak (based on what it is) but good (relatively democratic and good in the sense of what it does). However, one could also look at that the other way around. The European Union is an unprecedented entity with no road-map to follow.

It is also somewhat schizoid, being multinational, with multisectoral governance and a multiple personality due to its interests and values. It is not a traditional power, yet it allows for great diversity for choices among nations. It has a normative quality, but it is not simply an ethical or normative power as it consists of nations that have certain interests, some of which are selfish interests.

So what should its behaviour be in the world? Unlikely to become a hegemony, its choice rests in the balance between being good (preserving the privileged position we have already reached, surviving at the level we already are) and doing good (making the world more like us). That strategy is difficult as it will have to adapt in response to changing circumstances and will have to remain coherent. The future of the EU is thus the challenge of constant adaptation and change management, with a lack of coercive tools to manage that change.

The issue of bilateral versus multilateral relations was also looked at. When dealing with national powers, it is important not to have a closed vision of multilateralism, presuming that only our version is good. There was no mention during the day of multilateral organisations on our borders such as the CIS, the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation etc. While they may not be organised as we would like them to be, they may have a certain constraining effect on members which could be good

for the world in general. The idea of 'weak' multilateralism with few binding agreements and no secretariat may be the best way to include non-state actors, especially in regions where nations are exploring how they could come together or in regions where there are a lot of national differences.

Does having the Euro make sense as a survival strategy for Europe? It doesn't seem a good idea at the moment, but if that is our chosen strategy, we need to make it work.

In order to survive as a 'good' actor, we need to do some good in the world. Our foreign policy should reflect our interests, maybe in the broader sense of what sort of global behaviour we want in the future.

Our non-ideal features include the fact that we do 'rough' things at times, through NATO or as nations. Whilst these are currently done outside the EU, we are still associated with those actions and maybe in the longer term we should consider doing them within the EU and thereafter reconciling them. In the short term this is not a good idea however.

The hardest part in defining our relationship with the rest of the world is knowing who we are and what Europe is. Based on this, we should know what we want to do in the world and how we should go about doing it.

EU public attitudes are fairly supportive of external policies but their priorities are still EU challenges – economic issues, crime etc. It is important, finally, not to create our unity by appealing to an outside threat, which has not been the case in the EU until now, but has been used by nations etc. in the past.

Wolfgang Wessels (University of Cologne) has drawn a number of conclusions from the project. Multilateralism is still growing: EFSF, ESM are still being built, with a collection of seven people working to save Greece and the world! The G20 is also important. The EU is very active in multilateral fora, with increasing numbers of meetings per year.

He analysed the term 'effective multilateralism' in particular, created after the US intervention in Iraq, and included in the Security Strategy and the Lisbon Treaty (Art.21). The latter shows the EU as an example that exports multilateral values worldwide. The ideological background to this implies that we think we are better than the others, but every power has this vision to some extent. The doctrine of effective multilateralism could be read as us having norms that we want to export to the rest of the world. It may also be read as a signal of decline of the EU – if you are not strong

enough, you need partners for strength. Finally, it might simply be a nice story to tell the European citizens – we work well with others.

The EU has many definitions of power – normative, silent world power, civilian power etc, but what we really need to look at is the market power of the EU. We might not be as weak as we actually think. How should we mobilise the power we do have and for what? It is often used in a non-civilian manner, for example, economic sanctions on Libya, Syria etc.

One problem is that we look at ourselves from a certain climate and moment in time, thus making certain projections. We need to be careful about trying to predict the future. It would be better to create institutions and policies to fight against unseen developments or surprising external shocks, within multilateral frameworks and also bilaterally.

Engagement remains highly important and the EU should remain active in the multilateral context. It is better there than in a crisis. There must be a balance of power between Member States and European institutions to be efficient. Consensus is an important point of legitimacy that is also very important.

There are many versions of multilateralism. Effective multilateralism still exists but he's not sure as to how far this should be a guiding principle for the future.

Summary of the discussants on the panel

Luis Peral (European Union Institute for Security Studies) started with the idea of identity. For the first time in the integration process, there is a clear pattern of winners and losers in the EU. The Union always thought it would make things better for everyone. European identity may be threatened as there are no good reasons for solidarity anymore. Winners are becoming free riders that don't need help any more and losers are losing faith in the process. This crisis represents a divide within the EU. We need to solve this issue before deciding who we are.

Then we could consider who we are as a security actor. In the research community, we have to avoid crafting a language that doesn't match with reality. Regarding the idea of the EU as post-Westphalian: the EU includes its Member States, so where does that leave those very Westphalian entities?

If we think of Libya: it was necessary to apply the Responsibility to Protect, but there was no sign of civilian crisis management by the EU. We have a broad concept of security, but the main question is who is in charge? We cannot allow the military to be in charge when it comes to humanitarian intervention if we want to be post-Westphalian. As a civilian actor, we need to behave according to those rules.

Whatever the Union is or may be, the main question is, do we really have policy options? We need to concentrate on the constraints and limits to see what actual policy options are open to the EU.

Luis Peral gives us some policy statements that react to these limits.

To tackle internal problems:

- Increasing social turmoil in the European countries, particularly in connection with diminishing living standards in some of them, may lead to a renationalisation of EU policies and ultimately to a weakening of European solidarity and thus the capacity of the Union to be an international actor.
- If the economic and financial crises undermine some Member States to sustain the Welfare State and an inclusive social model, the EU will progressively lose influence as a normative power.

These internal problems have external consequences.

Looking at the constraints posed by the international arena:

- The United States may turn inward-looking or may look towards Asia, thus the EU may have to rely on its own resources and its political resolve to face the uncertainties of a polycentric world.
- Nationalistic trends in third countries will make international negotiations and settlements more difficult for the European Union, while the exacerbation of those nationalistic trends may challenge its identity as a civilian power.

As mentioned by the Indian Ambassador in Delhi recently, we need to build on our weaknesses. Are we ready to do that or are our ambitions so fantastic that we can't reply to others' requests? The Mediterranean may be the most obvious solution to overcome the crisis in the next 10-15 years. The EU may be inspirational, but this is not enough. This is not just a question of money. All European policy advisors need to be thinking how to engage the Mediterranean, how to help, how to relate to them, how to open our policies as they try to build their democracies.

Comments

Graham Avery (European Policy Centre) thought that the Policy Brief presented was very good, but wondered to whom it was addressed and would it actually get there? Sending it to High Representative Ashton would be recommendable.

Lorenzo Fioramonti (University of Pretoria) explained that, according to Paul Volery, one of the problems of our times is that the future is no longer what it used to be. Regionalism has always been presumed to be a great thing and the quantity of regional institutions was studied in the past. The crisis has now put winners and losers back onto the scene and thus makes us question regionalism for who and for what. The same can be said about multilateralism. For the future: what is multilateralism and for whom will it be important?

Jordi Vaquer (CIDOB) was surprised that there was such a gloomy view of multilateralism and Europe. That is not the feeling he got from reading over the project papers when he was writing the Brief. There are five reasons for optimism:

- 1) There is a demand for more Europe from citizens, from abroad and from Member States.
- 2) There's also a demand for more multilateralism by all the powers (declining and emerging). New powers want more rules, not less.
- 3) The EU should not only look inward. As could be seen in **Alyson Bailes'** presentation, we are still looking outward despite the gloomy times we live in, which shows our general commitment to global issues.
- 4) Barriers to better performance are very petty. They are not convincing. There should be less whining by the Commission/Council about irrelevant things.
- 5) "If you're not at the table, you're on the menu". The EU is good at bringing everyone to the table. We engage with everyone on quite a regular basis.

Emil Kirchner (University of Essex) pointed out that the 1970s held numerous obstacles and challenges and the EU was able to overcome them. It will again. The glass is more half full than half empty. Russia should also be given more attention, but the question remains as to whether it's more of a partner or a competitor.

Alain Ruche (EEAS), posed the question as to how we can broaden the scope for our thinking relating to the future? Three ideas towards this theme:

- 1) What would be the impact of a new structure of world views and mindsets at world level on a new version of multilateralism?
- 2) We have been adjusting to the external world conditions over the past number of years, but we have to adjust our internal way of thinking.
- 3) What would be the impact of a more creative dimension on economic and political activities? Collaboration rather than competition would be better.

Chen Zhimin (Fudan University) agreed that the world outside was changing but the internal EU is also changing. The Chinese are hoping that the EU can fix the debt crisis, and when they look at how this could be solved, it is within a new strength in the euro zone framework. This means that the current governance system managed at European Union level might be diluted and a new pillar might be created. Is that something that has been thought about and in that case, what are its external implications?

Luis Peral (European Union Institute for Security Studies) stated that trends are changes in reality. This does not mean the trends will actually happen.

To **Lorenzo Fioramonti**: we are moving towards new forms of soft regionalism. The States are trying to diversify their relations by building new transregional alliances. The EU is rather rigid within that model.

To **Jordi Vaquer**: the EU is losing attraction as a model and we need to be aware of this current trend. We seem to have less capacity to take our own options. It is not about being pessimistic or optimistic. It is about the fields in which we can do work. So how do we start working and in which area?

Alyson JK Bailes (University of Iceland) thinks that multilateralism is good for peace as it breeds awareness of interdependence. It also provides rules of behaviour as a minimum communication and predictability. That does not mean there are common values involved. Countries can learn about interdependence and avoid conflict without having a formal multilateral structure if that's what the world teaches them. The G2 have mostly learned those lessons. We should not presume our way is the best way. We have to be optimistic about all the versions of multilateralism.

Sonia Lucarelli (University of Bologna) to **Luis Peral**: we don't have time to decide who we are as our identity is shaped on the basis of interactions with the external world. Optimism or pessimism is not the issue - it's how curious you are. Curious people tend to be more optimistic.

Wolfgang Wessels (University of Cologne) explained that we need to know the actual factors that affect us. Perceptions affect actions. We need to have a safe confidence. To **Chen Zheming**: The efforts to reinforce the Euro might lead to a more differentiated Europe. He expects that everyone wants to sit at the table and remain there.

Angela Liberatore (DG Research) promised that a strategy would be found for the policy recommendations to reach the hands of Catherine Ashton, her cabinet and the rest of the Union.

Thanks also to **Francis Baert (UNU-CRIS)**, **Sarah Cooke O'Dowd (CIDOB)**, **Mor Sobol** and **Caroline Bouchard (University of Edinburgh)** for their work on the organisation of the conference.

Conclusions: Global Europe Conference

Speaker

Karen Fogg, *Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies*



This report is a summary of the closing session of the “Global Europe Conference”, organized by the three European projects on Multilateralism, EU4Seas, EU-GRASP and MERCURY, in Brussels on 7th October 2011. The projects gratefully acknowledge the support of the European Commission’s Seventh Framework Programme.

Summary of the interventions from the panel

Karen Fogg, (Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies) felt that the conference was very worthwhile in general. The first session showed that there is general agreement around the concepts and results of the study on multilateralism and there should be less need for theorizing in the future. We are all talking about complex, varied types of processes, multi-level, multi-actor, highly evolving, with certain degrees of institutionalisation and we need flexibility when dealing with these. She agreed that partners in multilateralism need resources such as knowledge, money, people, but also imagination.

The issue of security governance cannot be treated frivolously and needs more work. We also need to decide how to conceptualise global public goods within the security language. Human security no longer has meaning in policy speak. The securitisation of everything affects how things are prioritised and managed, and increases the general perception of threats.

We need to keep the idea of norms versus interests in mind. If we are interest oriented, will we need to justify human rights because it is in our interest? If so, we are not defending a normative approach, that is, the integrity of UN convention. That beckons the question 'where does that leave us'?

Effective multilateralism is an EU concept and we should distinguish it from how we see multilateralism in general. It seemed to her that effective multilateralism used to mean whether or not the EU achieved speaking with one voice, even if it was lowest common denominator. Now, we are looking more at the actual effectiveness of multilateralism or the effectiveness within multilateral institutions, thus looking at results and outputs. The EU aspires to a rule-based international order. Sectoral agencies tend to get eclipsed by the Security Council at times. The WTO gets some attention, but the ILO, WHO, FAO etc., organisations that take care of international global goods, tend to be left out. And yet the EU's interest should be in promoting an international set of parameters for these global goods.

In session two, about current practice, the good news seemed to be hidden, especially that which happens within international agencies. **David Zounmenou** raised a number of good examples of the EU in Africa which is pleasing, as people rarely sing good news about the EU in Africa.

The Lisbon Treaty worries her particularly, especially the issue of coherence. The EU has a greater challenge of achieving coherence than any of the Member States, as many policy areas have a strong foreign element that is now generally dealt with in Brussels as a common policy. Lisbon failed to see the external dimensions of common policy.

As regards Catherine Ashton, she is not just the President of Foreign Affairs, the Ambassador for the EU and the head of the EEAS, but she is also the Vice-President of the Commission in charge of external relations. The latter is very hard to do without any deputies or any service related to that. The notion of coherence in Lisbon tended to mean bringing together ESDP, when in practice the issue is much more ambitious.

Food security is an issue of absolute priority for most countries in the South. The coordination, conceptualisation and strategy needed to deal with issues affecting food security such as price volatility, land, climate change etc. with the Non-Aligned Group within the UN can affect how we deal with Human Rights, amongst other things.

At the moment, the Commission is dealing with the accession of Turkey, Lady Ashton with the Mediterranean and Mr.Fühle with the ENP, but who is linking all of these issues in the EEAS working groups? The three projects' main results were produced prior to the entry of force of Lisbon and they may need to be revisited.

In session three, different visions were given of the EU as a global actor. We still need a dialogue with the outside about multilateralism. The EU is bad at questioning and listening in its political dialogues about how China, Russia, South Africa, Brazil and others see the issue of a rule-based international order. Future EU policies should be devised by listening to these other actors. Already in a 2007/8 policy paper there was talk of integrating the key interests of the EU in bilateral dialogues to see how they would be better tackled at multilateral level.

In the last session, we were talking about the financial crisis and the impact of this on the credibility of the EU abroad. We need to go beyond this and talk about the UK approach to the EU and the infectiousness of Euro-scepticism in the European system. This is not a small issue and requires a robust discourse on interdependence.

The key policy concerns for the future will be climate change, economic stability and food security. They are three highly linked issues that need to remain on the top of our agendas in the long-term. Solutions to these concerns need to be found within multilateral frameworks with our partners. We

need to integrate, have central approaches, talk with the different actors on all levels, prioritise the areas where we can be most effective (in which institutions and at what levels), use market power and our trade instruments more creatively, listen and be more cooperative in equally based dialogues, and finally, invest in imagination. We need more thinking from outside the box in the aim of finding a virtuous circle that lifts us towards the best and most creative ideas rather than the least painful.

Angela Liberatore, (DG Research) concluded the conference and congratulated all the speakers, project teams and all participants.

Annex 1: Programme

Charlemagne Building, Lord Jenkins room, 170 Rue de la Loi. 1049 Brussels

09:00 REGISTRATION AND WELCOME COFFEE

09:30 OPENING

Kristin de Peyron, Head of Division, Multilateral Relations, EEAS

Dr. Mark Aspinwall, MERCURY

Dr. Jordi Vaquer i Fanes, EU4SEAS

Dr. Luk van Langenhove, EU-GRASP

10:00 PANEL 1: UNDERSTANDING MULTILATERALISM – THE EVOLVING RESEARCH AGENDA

Chair: Dr. Angela Liberatore, European Commission

Professor John Peterson, University of Edinburgh

Professor Stuart Croft, University of Warwick

Dr. Oriol Costa, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Discussants:

Professor Alberta Sbragia, University of Pittsburgh

Professor Emil Kirchner, University of Essex

11:30 COFFEE BREAK

12:00 PANEL 2: THE UNION IN ACTION – THE EU AND THE PRACTICE OF MULTILATERALISM

Chair: Professor John Peterson, University of Edinburgh

Professor Jan Wouters, Catholic University of Leuven

Dr. Lorenzo Fioramonti, University of Pretoria

Mr. Jaroslav Kurfürst, Head of the CFSP department at the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Discussants:

Dr. Vahur Made, Deputy Director of the Estonian School of Diplomacy and Head of Estonian Centre for Eastern Partnership

Dr. Mohamed Ibn Chambas, Secretary-General ACP Group

13:30 LUNCH

14:30 PANEL 3: THE EU AS A GLOBAL ACTOR – A VIEW FROM OUTSIDE

Chair: Professor Andy Cooper, Centre for International Governance Innovation, University of Waterloo

Professor Chen Zhimin, Fudan University

Professor Joel Peters, Ben Gurion University of the Negev

Professor Meliha Altunisik, Middle East Technical University, Ankara

Discussants:

Dr. Ian Lesser, Director of Brussels office of the German Marshall Fund of the US

Dr. David Zounmenou, Institute for Security Studies Pretoria

16:00 PANEL 4: LOOKING TO THE FUTURE – POLICY OPTIONS FOR THE EU

Chair: Dr. Esther Barbé, Autonomous University of Barcelona / IBEL, Barcelona Institute for International Studies

Professor Wolfgang Wessels, Universität zu Köln

Professor Sonia Lucarelli, University of Bologna

Professor Alyson JK Bailes, University of Iceland

Discussants:

Dr. Luis Peral, European Union Institute for Security Studies

17:30 CONCLUDING REMARKS

Karen Fogg, Associate Fellow, Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studie

Annex 2: Participants List

Abass	Ademola	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies
Alieva	Leila	Center for National and International Studies (Baku, Azerbaijan)
Altunisik	Meliha	Center for European Studies - Middle East Technical University
Anvroin	Patrick	Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions of Europe
Ar dovino	Simona	European Commission - DG RTD
Aspinwall	Mark	University of Edinburgh
Attinà	Fulvio	University of Catania
Avery	Graham	European Policy Centre
Baert	Francis	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies
Barbé	Esther	Autonomous University of Barcelona
Beuf	Armand	European Commission - DG RTD
Biedermann	Zsuzsanna	Institute for World Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Boas	Vanessa	The Centre for European Policy Studies
Bouchard	Caroline	University of Edinburgh
Brinar	Irena	University of Ljubljana

Byrne	Andrew	The Centre for European Policy Studies
Camroux	David	Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques
Christou	George	University of Warwick
Claudín	Carmen	CIDOB, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs
Colombo	Silvia	Istituto Affari Internazionali
Comelli	Michele	Istituto Affari Internazionali
Cooke	Sarah	CIDOB, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs
Cooper	Andy	The Centre for International Governance Innovation
Costa	Oriol	Autonomous University of Barcelona
Croft	Stuart	University of Warwick
Curtis	Michael	European Commission - SG
Danielson	Christian	European Commission - SG
De Jong	Sijbren	The Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
De Keulenaer	Hadewich	Foreign Affairs, Flemish Government
Della Giovanna	Marina	University of Namur
den Hertog	Leonhard	The Centre for European Policy Studies
De Paula Domingos	Nicole	Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques
De Peyron	Kristin	EEAS
Depo	Dana	University of Köln
Drieskens	Edith	The Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Edwards	Geoffrey	University of Cambridge
Fanta	Emmanuel	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies
Fioramonti	Lorenzo	University of Pretoria
Fogg	Karen	Leuven Center for Global Governance Studies
Spohr	Frederic	University of Köln
Gallardo Mola	Marta	Delegation to the EU of the Government of Catalonia
Gazizullin	Ildar	International Centre for Policy Studies
Genovese	Michele	European Commission - DG RTD
Gottwald	Marlene	The Finnish Institute of International Affairs
Hansson	Pia	Institute of International Affairs and Centre for Small State Studies
Haubrich-Seco	Miguel	The Centre for European Policy Studies
Haukkala	Hiski	University of Tampere
Helwig	Niklas	The Centre for European Policy Studies
Herolf	Gunilla	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
Hill	Christopher	University of Cambridge
Ibn Chambas	Mohamed	ACP Group
Isenia	Judeska	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies
J. K Bailes	Alyson	Institute of International Affairs and Centre for Small State

Studies

Kaljurand	Riina	International Center for Defence Studies
Kirchner	Emil	University of Essex
Klima	Julia	EMDESK
Koenig	Nicole	Istituto Affari Internazionali
Kranz	Jonas	University of Köln
Krassimir	Nikolov	EEAS
Kreilinger	Valentin	The London School of Economics and Political Science
Kunstein	Tobias	University of Köln
Kurfürst	Jaroslav	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic
Lesser	Ian	German Marshall Fund Brussels Office
Liberatore	Angela	European Commission
Lucarelli	Sonia	Forum for Peace and War (University of Bologna)
Made	Vahur	Estonian School of Diplomacy
Maes	Leonie	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies
Mailafia	Obadiah	SG ACP
Marques De Almeida	João	European Commission - BEPA
Mikhelidze	Nona	Istituto Affari Internazionali
Mogni	Andrea	EEAS

Niessen	Jan	Migration Policy Group
Nyomakwa-Obimpeh	James	The European Institute of Public Administration
Ojanen	Hanna	The Swedish Institute of International Affairs
Olljium	Alar	EEAS
Omarsdóttir	Silja Bára	Institute of International Affairs and Centre for Small State Studies
Peral	Luis	European Union Institute for Security Studies
Pérez	Francisco A	CIDOB, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs
Peters	Joel	Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Virginia Tech
Peterson	John	University of Edinburgh
Pirozzi	Nicoletta	Istituto Affari Internazionali
Raspotnik	Andreas	University of Köln
Reiners	Wulf	University of Köln
Romano	Giulia	Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques
Rosés Montesinos	Carlota	Barcelona Delegation in Brussels
Ruche	Alain	EEAS
Saenen	Bregt	Ghent University
Samp	Abdourakhmane	ACP Group
Sbragia	Alberta	University of Pittsburgh
Scherer	Franziska	Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt

Shaw	Tim	University of the West Indies
Shirazi	Rebecka	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
Siddi	Marco	University of Edinburgh / University of Köln
Slosarcik	Ivo	Charles University in Prague
Sobol	Mor	University of Edinburgh
Söderbaum	Fred	University of Gothenburg
SOLER i TOBELLA	Blanca	Barcelona Delegation in Brussels
Sólveig Elínardóttir	Jóna	University of Iceland
Spohr	Frederic	University of Köln
Steinicke	Stefan	Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik
Stroß	Simon	Trans-European Policy Studies Association
Tekin	Funda	University of Köln
Telo	Mario	The Université libre de Bruxelles
Torun	Zerrin	Center for European Studies - Middle East Technical University
Umezawa	Hana	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies
Ustun	Cigdem	Center for European Studies - Middle East Technical University
Van Langenhove	Luk	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies
Vanhauteghem	Rik	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies

Vaquer	Jordi	CIDOB, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs
Ventura	Laura	University of Köln
Weiss	Tomas	Charles University in Prague
Wessels	Wolfgang	University of Köln
Wouters	Jan	The Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Yugang	Chen	Fudan University
Zhimin	Chen	Fudan University
Zounmenou	David	Institute for Security Studies (Pretoria, South Africa)
Zwartjes	Marieke	The United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies

EU-GRASP

Changing Multilateralism: the EU as a Global-regional Actor in Security and Peace, or EU-GRASP in short, is an EU funded FP7 Programme. EU-GRASP aims to contribute to the analysis and articulation of the current and future role of the EU as a global actor in multilateral security governance, in a context of challenged multilateralism, where the EU aims at “effective multilateralism”. This project therefore examines the notion and practice of multilateralism in order to provide the required theoretical background for assessing the linkages between the EU’s current security activities with multi-polarism, international law, regional integration processes and the United Nations system.

EU-GRASP Deliverables
Contact: EU-GRASP Coordination Team
72 Poterierei – B-8000 – Bruges – Belgium
www.eugrasp.eu