United Nations University
CRIS
Comparative Regional Integration Studies

UNU-CRIS Occasional Papers

0-2004/9

The Challenge of Security Governance in a Changed and Changing International System

Emil Kirchner and James Sperling*

*Emil Kirchner is Professor of European Studies and Jean Monnet Chair, University of Essex.
James Sperling is Professor of Political Science University of Akron.

The Challenge of Security Governance in a Changed and Changing International System

Emil Kirchner, University of Essex
James Sperling, University of Akron

Abstract

The emergence of the post-Westphalian state has altered the security environment facing the states of the Atlantic Community. It has cast into doubt not only the preexisting definition of a security threat, but the way in which states must act in order to counter those threats. The changes that have taken place and are taking place in the international system suggests have thrust upon the states of the Atlantic community a 'new' security agenda, which requires a redoubled effort to expand and consolidate the western system of security governance where possible. These changes require that the institutions of European security governance, particularly NATO, the EU, and OSCE, play the necessary role of interlocutor between the northern European 'civilian powers' and the United States, a preeminent 'normal power', if these states are to meet collectively the security challenges of the decades to come.

K*ey words*: Europe; security governance; NATO; EU.

Emil Kirchner is Professor of European Studies and Jean Monnet Chair, University of Essex. He is Executive Editor of the *Journal of European Integration*. He is coauthor of *Studies on Policies and Policy Processes of the European Union* (Beijing: Law Press Renmin University, 2003), co-editor of *Committee Governance in the European Union* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); and co-author of *Recasting the European Order: Security Architectures and Economic Cooperation* (Manchester University Press, 1997).

James Sperling is Professor of Political Science University of Akron. He is editor of *Germany at Fifty-Five: Bonn ist nicht Berlin?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004) and *Two Tiers or Two Speeds? The European Security Order and the Enlargement of the European Union and NATO* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); co-editor of *Limiting Institutions? The Challenge of Security Governance in Eurasia* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003); and coauthor of *Recasting the European Order: Security Architectures and Economic Cooperation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

The Challenge of Security Governance in a Changed and Changing International System

Emil Kirchner
James Sperling

Terrorism has seemingly become the central security concern of the United States since 11 September 2003. However, prior to that time, the United States along with its NATO allies were preoccupied with the tasks of peace-keeping and peace-making Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo, with the stabilisation of central and eastern Europe; and with the problem of integrating a dissolving fragile Russian Federation into the western system of security governance as a full and equal partner. Yet all of these tasks were a direct result of the cold war's end. The end of the cold war brought about five significant categories of change—in the structure of the international system, in geopolitical context, in the international economy, in the roles sought and expectations placed upon the European Union (EU), and in mutating ambitions of the United States-----that could be reasonably assumed to cause a change in the substance and style of the foreign policies of the states of the North Atlantic region.

The most comprehensive change in the structure of the international system was the end of the Yalta order, which subsequently mutated into a military unipolarity partially qualified by the military capabilities of the United Kingdom, France, Russia and China, and a more marked economic multipolarity.[1]

This change was reinforced by the consolidation of the post-Westphalian state, particularly the rising importance of international law and norms, the perforation of state sovereignty, the declining importance of the balance of power as a regulator of disequilibria amongst European states, and the emergence of multiple centres of authority beneath and above the state. Relatedly,

[1] Adrian Hyde-Price (2000, 76), for example, identifies the five defining characteristics of the Yalta system that evaporated by 1992: the 'decisive' role of the two extra-European superpowers in Europe; the construction of two opposing economic and military blocs; the division and truncation of Germany; the role of nuclear deterrence as the system stabiliser; and the existence of a small number of states outside this system of alliances. On the emergence of economic multipolarity, see Werner Link (2002, 156).

the new geopolitical context provides another category of potential change: the major European powers are now safe from a conventional military attack by any credibly defined major power; the North American powers remain unthreatened by a conventional attack and are increasingly looking towards the East and South for their economic and political alliances.

The globalisation of the international economy and the rise of economic regionalism are a third category of change. Economic globalisation has made the task of national governance increasing difficult, particularly when it comes to the problem of protecting the social contract from dislocations arising from increased competition, particularly from states outside the Atlantic economy (Roloff, 2002, 172-75). Globalisation is increasingly accompanied by the growing regionalisation of the global economy—NAFTA being only one manifestation of that development. An emerging economic tripolarity (North America, Asia, and Europe) can either be viewed as an incentive for greater multilateralisation of the foreign (economic) policies of these three poles of power or as a harbinger of greater competition between them (Roloff, 2002, 185ff; Link, 2002, 156-57).

. The deepening and widening of the EU have meant that 'domestic' policy arenas are increasingly subject to intergovernmental bargaining and a subsequent loss of flexibility when negotiating with its G-8 partner states. The American bilateral security guarantee extended to Europe and Canada during the cold war has also changed: neither Canada nor the other European allies face a direct threat by the Soviet Union or a deracinated Russian Federation; nuclear deterrence (and its role as a system stabiliser) has become a largely irrelevant as a day-to-day security concern; and American prerogatives attending its role as NATO's leader have eroded----a point underlined by the Franco-German coalition of the unwilling at the UN and the Canadian decline of the American invitation to participate in the invasion of Iraq.

These five categories of change, in combination with the emergence of the post-Westphalian state, have altered the security environment facing the states of the Atlantic Community. It has cast into doubt not only the preexisting definition of a security threat, but the way in which states must act in order to counter those threats. The changes that have taken place

and are taking place in the international system suggests have thrust upon the states of the Atlantic community a 'new' security agenda, which requires a redoubled effort to expand and consolidate the western system of security governance where possible. These changes require that the institutions of European security governance, particularly NATO, the EU, and OSCE, play the necessary role of interlocutor between the northern European 'civilian powers' and the United States, a preeminent 'normal power', if these states are to meet collectively the security challenges of the decades to come.

Diffusion and the new security agenda

These changes in the international context for the G-8 states has made more difficult the task of security governance, particularly since the existing system of security governance is ill-equipped to cope with the new categories of security threat facing the states of prosperous Europe. The long-lived distinctions between the 'high' and 'low' politics of international affairs and between domestic and foreign policy have been increasingly rendered obsolete by the changed context of state action and changing nature of the state. The long-lived distinction between the 'high' politics of diplomacy and the 'low' politics of commerce had largely obscured the now transparent interdependence between these two fields of action (Hoffmann, 1998, 210-16). Moreover, the line between foreign and domestic policy has become so blurred that the distinction has lost much of its conceptual force (Zimmerman, 1973; Hanrieder, 1978). The emergence of new arenas and sources of conflict—weak state structures, ethnic conflict, criminalised economies, environmental threats—and new technologies that render state boundaries increasingly porous—particularly cyberspace and the internationalisation of commerce and capital—have broadened the systemic requirements of security in terms of welfare rather than warfare (Buzan, et al., 1998; Sperling and Kirchner 1998; Kirchner and Sperling, 2002).

The new security agenda raises two important questions: Why have these new security threats risen to prominence in the post-cold war period? Do the states outside the ambit of the Atlantic community pose a putative threat either to the systemic or milieu goals of the Atlantic states or to the societal integrity of those states individually and collectively? Put differently, do

the security threats arising in Eurasia be treated as the relatively simple problem of identifying state-to-state threats that unequivocally represent a state-centric security calculus where the state is both the subject and object of analysis?

The most promising conceptual category of response to these questions focuses on the altered structure of the European state system and the changing nature of the European state. The emergence of new categories of security threat strongly suggests that security is no longer subject to a policy calculus contingent upon specific dyads of states. Threats can no longer be simply disaggregated into the capabilities and intentions of states; primacy can no longer be attributed to the state as either agent or object. A definition of security restricted to the traditional concern with territorial integrity or the protection of ill-defined but well understood 'national interests' would exclude threats to the social fabric of domestic or international societies or threats emanating from states with imperfect control over their territory, weakened legitimacy, or persistent interethnic conflicts. Moreover, the growing irrelevance of territoriality and the continuing importance of jurisdictional sovereignty have left states vulnerable to these new categories of threat: national responses are no longer adequate, yet the division of political space into states jealously guarding their sovereignty inhibits collective responses to these diffused threats. The sovereignty norm of the Westphalian system, therefore, has placed a barrier to formulating effective responses to the new security threats—even in an Atlantic security community populated by states that are reflexively multilateral.

The key characteristic of the Westphalian state is its 'territoriality'. Described by John H. Herz as a 'hard shell' protecting states and societies from the external environment, territoriality is increasingly irrelevant, especially in the Atlantic community. These states no longer enjoy the luxury of a 'wall of defensibility' that leaves them relatively immune to external penetration. Even though Herz later changed his mind about the demise of the territorial state, 'his argument on the changed meaning and importance of territoriality was clearly valid' (Hanrieder, 1978, 1280-81; Herz, 1957). This change in the nature of state—if indeed it has occurred—not only forces us to change our conception of power, but also our conception of threat; namely, it requires a

reorientation from the long-standing preoccupation with the military-strategic dimension of security to its more novel and intractable manifestations, like transnational terrorism.

As the boundaries between the state and the external environment have become increasingly blurred, it leaves open the possibility that the new security threats may operate along channels dissimilar to the traditional threats posed to the territorial state. The 'interconnectedness' of the post-Westphalian state system was facilitated and reinforced by the success of the post-war institutions of American design (March and Olsen, 1998, 944-47). On by-product of that post-war design, European economic and political integration, was anticipated by the open and undefended border between the United States and Canada. Geography, technological innovations, the convergence around the norms of political and economic openness, and a rising 'dynamic density' of the Atlantic political space have progressively stripped away the prerogatives of sovereignty and eliminated the autonomy once afforded powerful states by territoriality (Ruggie, 1986, 148). These elements of the contemporary state system appear to have linked the states of the Atlantic community—not to mention the U.S. and Canada—together irrevocably. The encroachment of these changes upon the rest of the world—by design and accident—now transforms domestic and foreign policy disequilibria outside the Atlantic community into security threats.

This porousness of national boundaries has made it more likely that 'domestic' disturbances—particularly those that are either economic or environmental in origin---are not easily contained within a single state and are easily diffused throughout the international system. The postulated ease with which domestic disturbances are transmitted across national boundaries *and* the difficulty of defending against those disturbances underline the strength and vulnerability of the contemporary state system: the openness of these states and societies along an ever expanding spectrum of interaction provides greater levels of collective welfare than would otherwise be possible, yet the very transmission belts facilitating that welfare also serve as diffusion mechanisms hindering the ability of the state to innoculate itself against disturbances within any subsystem. The concept of diffusion is highly suggestive in this context (Most and Starr, 1980; Siverson and Starr, 1990; Goertz, 1994, pp. 75-81).

The different elements of the new security agenda are spread by at least four readily identifiable diffusion mechanisms: the growing dynamic density of the international system, flawed or underdeveloped civil societies or political institutions of democracy; geographic propinquity; and the ubiquitousness of cyberspace. Cyberspace, for example, has helped erase national boundaries and signified the potential irrelevance of geographic space. It still escapes effective state control and provides the perfect instrument for non-state and societal actors seeking to destabilise any particular state or aspect of a society. Geographic propinquity and the erosion of effective interstate barriers to migration mean that domestic disturbances outside the Atlantic community, ranging from ethnic strife to the criminalisation of national economies or state structures, could be externalised in any number of ways—destabilising migratory flows or the continuation of civil conflict on foreign soil, to name only two.

It is the growing dynamic density of the international system generally in conjunction with the established dynamic density of the Atlantic security space that provides the most pervasive and nettlesome mechanisms of diffusion. The dynamic density of the Atlantic security space gives this state system its distinctive character, particularly the erosion of meaningful national boundaries and the progressive loss of state control over the decisions of individuals, markedly within the sphere of the economy. The very transmission belts of economic prosperity---largely unrestricted capital markets, high levels of trade, and the absence of exchange controls---also provide the mechanisms for facilitating the criminalisation of national economies, for initiating the erosion of the authority and legitimacy of weak states in transition, and for generating exogenous shocks to national economies that states can no longer effectively control.

National authorities in the Atlantic area can no longer discharge their responsibilities by simply maintaining territorial integrity and ensuring economic growth. The broadening of the security agenda has increased the tasks and difficulties of governance, while the transformation of the European state has made it increasingly difficult to define and defend against the new security threats. Security threats now require a joint rather than unilateral resolution as the immediate post-war stabilisation debacle in Iraq shows. Security threats can not be simply disaggregated into

the capabilities and intentions of states. Rather, security threats have acquired a system-wide significance that demands an alternative conceptualisation of the security dilemmas facing states and the institutional responses to them.

The challenge of security governance

The challenge of security governance is *the* policy problem confronting the states comprising the Atlantic community. The postwar security governance system encompassing the Eurasian landmass was engendered by a stable crisis produced by the bipolar distribution of power and the alliance system it spawned. Conflicts between the two superpowers, the United States and Soviet Union, were played out in the deadly logic of nuclear deterrence, limited wars along the periphery of Asia, and proxy wars in Africa and Latin America. The ideological manicheaism and structural rigidity of the postwar period has now yielded to structural fluidity and ill-defined civilisational disputations.

The postwar system of countervailing power created by NATO and the Warsaw Pact unraveled with the latter's dissolution and the progressive transformation of NATO from a military alliance with an Atlantic perspective into a pan-European political organisation with an increasingly residual military role. The challenge of security governance for the West reflects neither the transformation of NATO into a political organisation nor the nascent emergence of a Euro-American security community extending eastward and encompassing the Russian Federation. The challenge *is* located in the absence of and difficulty of constructing an effective system of governance encompassing the whole of Eurasia and North America.

Security governance has received increasing attention since 1989 (Rosenau and Czempiel, 1992; Rosenau, 1997; Young, 1999; Keohane, 2001; Webber, 2002). Its rising conceptual salience is derived in large measure by the challenges presented by the 'new' security agenda. Security governance has been defined as 'an international system of rule, dependent on the acceptance of a majority of states (or at least the major powers) that are affected, which through regulatory mechanisms (both formal and informal), governs activities across a range of security and security-related issue areas' (Webber, 2002). This definition of security governance is largely

consistent with those analysts who insist that institutions are mechanisms employed by states to further their own goals (Koremenos, Lipson and Snidal, 2001); that states are the primary actors in international relations and that some states are more equal than others (Waltz 1978; Gilpin, 1981); that power relationships are not only material but normative (Checkel, 1998; Hopf, 1998); and that states are constrained by institutions with respect to proscribed and prescribed behaviour (Martin and Simmons 1998; March and Olsen, 1998). This broad conceptual definition of security governance allows scholars to investigate the role institutions play from any number of methodological or epistemological perspectives. As important, it allows us to ask if the necessary conditions exist for the successful eastward or southward extension of the Atlantic security community or if the dynamics of the state system outside the Atlantic area are incompatible with it. It leaves open the possibility that the Atlantic system of security governance can be extended as well as the prospect that the states outside it will embrace instead the logic of anarchy and manifest its byproducts, the balancing of power and great power perfidy.

Both Robert O. Keohane and Robert Jervis have addressed the requirements of security governance in the contemporary international system (Keohane, 2001; Jervis, 2002). Jervis has argued that the western system of security governance produced a security community that was contingent upon five necessary and sufficient conditions. The first two concern beliefs about war and the cost of waging it. The first requires national elites generally to eschew wars of conquest, and war as an instrument of statecraft, at least with one another; the second requires that the costs of waging war outweigh any conceivable benefits, material or other. The next two conditions require the embrace of political and economic liberalism. The first requires national elites to accept that the best path to national prosperity is peaceful economic intercourse rather than conquest or empire in order to eliminate the rationale for war and economic closure. The second calls for the existence of democratic governance domestically in order that the practise of compromise, negotiation and rule of law characterises relations between states. The final condition stipulates that states be satisfied with the territorial status quo, a condition that mitigates the security dilemma (Jervis, 2002; Schweller 1994; Zacher 2001).

All five conditions are met in the Atlantic security community; they are generally lacking outside it. Keohane recognises this problem in his discussion of the barriers to global governance (Keohane, 2002). Keohane's expressed skepticism about constructing a system of global governance is instructive in the context of extending the Atlantic system of security governance. He identified three barriers to global governance. The first barrier is created by the cultural, religious, and civilisational heterogeneity of the international system, which probably prohibits the wholesale adoption of the European norms and principles animating the Atlantic system of security governance. European norms are as likely to be particular as they are universal. The second and related barrier is the absence of a consensus about beliefs and norms that would make the likelihood of extending the Atlantic system of security governance 'virtually nonexistent.' The third barrier to a global system of security governance is the absence of an institutional fabric that is both thick enough to meet the challenge of governance and consistent with indigenous (rather than European) norms and beliefs about the practise of statecraft and even national governance.

Both Jervis and Keohane expressed concern about the sustainability of the western systems of governance and the prospects for their eventual globalisation. Jervis asked the question: 'What are the implications of the existence of the security community for international politics in the rest of the world.' That query is not necessarily the most important. Rather, an alternative question presents itself: 'What are the implications of an anarchical international system for the Atlantic security community?' And that question raises several more: Will the effort to extend or impose western values and institutional forms produce a convergence or divergence of behaviour around the preexisting European norm, some normative compromise between the Occident and Orient, or a lapse into the corrosive competition inherent to international anarchy? Will a failed effort to extend the western system of security governance deligitimise it? Will the heterogeneity of the states occupying the geopolitical space of 'Eurasia' push all states towards a renewed embrace of the sovereignty norm and the system of alliances it inevitably engenders?

These questions are important because the evolution of international politics is not peripheral to the Atlantic security community and is central to its successful extension to the rest of

the international system. The post-war security order sponsored by the United States was a system of security governance suffused by three norms: democratic governance and conformity with the market, collective defense, and multilateralism (Sperling and Kirchner, 1997). These norms are largely alien to states outside the Atlantic area and complicates the task of consolidating the Atlantic system of security governance on a global scale. Moreover, as long as bipolarity characterised the European state system and as long as the requirements of nuclear deterrence and conventional balance dominated the security calculus, there was little debate among elites about the fundamental threat posed to Europe or how to meet that threat. The dissolution of the bipolar system after 1992 was conjoined by the dissipation of an explicit and palpable military threat to the states of the Atlantic community. Membership in the postwar system of security governance was 'coerced' by the exigency of the cold war; membership in that same system became voluntary after 1992. That change reintroduced the problem of striking a balance between independence and multilateralism in the security calculations of the states constituting the Atlantic system of security governance.

A Functional Approach to the Problem of Security Governance

The response by security institutions to the perceived security threats can be divided into four broad categories; all involved in the achievement of collective goals, (the establishment of peace and stability) the prescription of norms of interaction and constraints on the behaviour of states or non-state-actors. These are: (1) conflict prevention, (2) peacemaking and peace-enforcement, (3) peacekeeping, and (4) peace-building. Conflict prevention relates to situations in which a major conflict can be avoided and implies an emphasis on financial and technical assistance; economic cooperation in the forms of trade or association agreements, or enlargement provisions; nation building and democratisation efforts. Conflict prevention requires mostly a long term commitment. Peacemaking and peace-enforcement refers to instances where a major conflict has occurred and where the emphasis is on preventing escalation. Short-term measures are usually called for. Peacemaking, as understood here, is mostly linked with economical and political efforts, and range from economic sanctions to political

mediation/negotiations between the warring parties involved in a conflict. However, as such efforts have often proved to be ineffective they have to be linked with actual military interventions in the form of peace-enforcement. Peacekeeping refers to the engagement of troops for the purpose of "keeping" the agreed peace settlement after a major conflict, and peace-building is concerned with post-conflict reconstruction and the re-establishment of peace, preferably on a permanent basis. These activities are usually of a medium term nature.[2]

Obviously, there are overlaps among these three categories, but for analytical purposes they will be treated separately. These four broad categories can also be regrouped into pro-active and reactive measures and linked with the two main instruments used by the EU to solve conflicts, namely the economic/political and the military. The results are presented in Table 1 An examination of the four categories will in turn help to identify the areas where cooperation, coordination and a division of labour among the major security institutions is most needed or most appropriate. We will start with considering conflict prevention.

Conflict prevention. Conflict prevention may emerge from different sources and can engage a wide array of instruments. General prevention aims at tackling the root causes of potentially violent conflicts such as economic inequality and deficient democracy, as well as exclusive state-and nation building strategies. By contrast, special prevention employs specific measures aimed at a specific conflict at a specific stage (Zellner, 2002). It is accepted that economic development, reducing economic disparity, and reducing poverty are important precursors to building stability and preventing

Table 1

Stage of EU entry into conflict in Europe or the periphery of Europe

Instruments to solve conflict	Pro-active (Anticipatory)	Reactive (Reactionary)

[2] For a more elaborate description of these three security categories (Commission on Conflict Prevention, 2001; Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik/Conflict Prevention Network, 1999; van Tongeren, van de Veen, and Verhoeven, 2002; Hill, 2001; Howell, 2003).

Economic/ Political	Financial and technical assistance Economic co-operation Enlargement Nation building and democratisation measures Political mediation Economic sanctions	Financial and technical assistance Economic co-operation Enlargement Nation building and democratisation measures
	Targets: using all or some of the above six measures in a conflict prevention manner CEE states –2004 members EE states, e.g. Ukraine, Russia Caucasus/Central Asia North Africa/Middle East	Targets: using all or some of the above four measures in a post-conflict or peace-building fashion Balkan states
Military	Preemptive policing Example: stabilising the city of Mostar in Bosnia	Peace intervention, e.g. Macedonia 2001 Peacekeeping, e.g. Macedonia and possibly Bosnia Civilian police operations, e.g. Bosnia

the escalation of violence in volatile areas (Eavis and Kefford, 2002, 9). Economic, financial/technical, and political efforts can be particularly effective when dealing with organised crime, narcotics trafficking, macroeconomic destabilisation, environmental problems (including nuclear safety), migratory pressure, and low level ethnic conflicts. Indirectly, they may also help to contain the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the activities of international terrorist organisations. When compared with crisis management situations, conflict prevention measures appear mundane, less dramatic and often medium to long term oriented. A host of organisations, ranging from NGO and financial/technical organisations to the EU, NATO and the OSCE are involved in conflict prevention measures. These organisations combine to "entrench particular forms of behaviour among their participants by prescribing rules of entry, norms of interaction and constraints on behaviour" (Keohane, 1988, 385). However, with an ability to combine such a wide range of activities, the EU plays a lead role in conflict prevention, as demonstrated below.

In the European context, the EU combines economic cooperation (e.g. the Euro-agreements), with financial/technical assistance (e.g., the PHARE, TACIS and Balkan programmes) [3], political dialogue (e.g. the dialogue with the Russian Federation)[4], enlargement conditions (Smith 1998), Partnership and Cooperation Agreements,[5] and explicit stabilisation association agreements, in Macedonia and Croatia, for example. [6] With regards to accession countries, the EU can link these activities effectively with EU policies, evident in the fields of environment and justice and home affaires, including Europol. To show this more clearly, after 11th September, the EU adopted a common position on the war against terrorism, it agreed on a common definition of terrorist offences and on a Europe-wide arrest warrant (abolishing cumbersome extradition procedures), due to take effect from 1st January 2004. Attempts have also been made to overcome problems concerning visa and immigration regulations, to establish an EU-wide fingerprint database for asylum seekers, to freeze suspected al Qaeda financial assets, and to introduce limits on association rights for groups that claim to be religious but may actually be terrorist support networks (Delpech, 2002, 5). Furthermore, the EU has established a Policy

[3] For example, of almost $15 billion disbursed in development assistance to the Balkans between 1993 and 1999, the European countries and the European Union spent $6.9 billion and $3.3 billion respectively. The EU and the and the European NATO allies also provided between 1990 and 1999 $20 billion of the approximately $35 billion aid to CIS states (French 2002).

[4] At the EU-Russia summit of October 2000, the two partners agreed on a *Joint Declaration on Strengthening Dialogue and Cooperation on Political and Security Matters in Europe* (European Commission, 2000), which called for regular consultation on defence matters and discussions on modalities for Russia's contribution to future EU crisis management operations. However, according to Dov Lynch (2003, 67), this dialogue "has produced few, if any, meaningful joint foreign policy positions."

[5] PACs concentrate on Southeastern Europe and the Caucasus, and have been taken up with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

[6] This linkage is evident, for example, in the *Commission's Country Strategy of 2002-2006* (European Commission, 2002) which highlights the duality in EU objectives with regard to the Russian Federation. On the one hand , 'the EU's cooperation objectives with the Russian federation are to foster respect of democratic principles and human right, as well as the transition towards a market economy.' The same documents states that the long-term objectives of the EU are a predictable and cooperative partner for security on the European continent' (European Commission, 2001). See also *EU-Russia Joint Declaration on Strengthening Dialogue and Cooperation on Political and Security Matters in Europe* (European Commission, 2000).

Planning and Early Warning Unit to enhance the capacity for monitoring post conflict situations and policy planning, a conflict prevention programme of action (European Council, 2001), and agreed on a Joint Action on the EU's contribution to combatting the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons.

Hence, in dealing with Central and Eastern European countries, the EU is in the unique position to link structural reforms with democratisation and security interests. The impact of these activities is set to increase levels of prosperity and to strengthen civil society in these countries. In turn this will contribute to a reduction of organised crime, including narcotic trafficking, terrorist activities, and ethnic conflicts, and will lead to rise in environmental standards, including the safekeeping of nuclear weapons in Russia or the safety of nuclear reactors. In addition, as enlargement continues, it will bring the EU in direct contact with the Caucasus, and closer to Central Asia. Given the prevailing high level of instability in this entire region the EU, is keen to reduce the risk of conflict spilling over into the Union.

Neither NATO or the OSCE can dispose of or combine activities in a similar manner, although both make important contributions to conflict prevention through the political and security dialogue. In NATO's case this involves mainly the Partnership for Peace, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), the Pacts with Russia and the Ukraine, the Mediterranean Dialogue[7], the links with the South East Europe Initiative, the Balkan Stability Pact, the Council of the Baltic Sea State, and the Brents Euro-Arctic Council. Through these programmes, as well as the enlargement criteria, NATO has encouraged its members (including prospective ones) to respect minorities, resolve disputes peacefully, and ensure civilian control of their military establishments (Talbot, 2002, 47). All these complement the NATO's long standing disarmament and confidence building efforts in Europe, e.g. the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe

The OSCE's instruments on conflict prevention consists of the Conflict Prevention Centre, the over one hundred long-term field missions, the Institution of High Commissioner on National Minorities, and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (Zellner, 2002). Some of

[7] The Mediterranean Dialogue, which includes Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia, was launched in 1994 in recognition of the fact that European security and stability is closely linked to that in the Mediterranean

these bodies are also involved in crisis management and post-conflict peacebuilding activities. The OSCE cooperates, (predominantly through the Charter for European Security), with a wide range of other IGOs and international and local NGOs

Another link organisation is the European Platform for Conflict Prevention, established in 1997. "The Platform – presently a network of more than 150 organisation working in the field of prevention and resolution of violent conflicts in the international arena- aims to provide comprehensive information and support for the conflict prevention and transformation activities of the different players in the field. It also strives to stimulate networking and improved coordination. Connecting local with international NGOs, practitioners, academics, donor agencies, policymakers, and media provides a useful vehicle for sharing experiences and vies from various perspectives." The European Centre for Conflict Prevention acts as the secretariat of the European Platform (van Tongeren, et al., 2002, xiv).

Moving beyond the European context, it is well recognised that poverty and a sense of hopelessness and injustice are breeding grounds for terrorism in many parts of the Islamic and third world. The host of EU Association Agreements[8] that give financial/technical aid and access to European markets can be seen as an aid to economic growth and political stability. In the case of the Association Agreement with the three Maghreb states, it can be considered as providing alternatives to Islamism in these countries (Hanelt and Neugart, 2001). Between 1993-2000, the EU and individual member states were the largest donor of financial and technical aid to the Palestinian Authority as well as to the Middle East peace process in general (Asseburg, 2003). Europe contributes 37 per cent of the United Nations' basic budget and 50 per cent of the UN's special programme cost (Pond, 2002, 224), and is responsible for 70 per cent of global foreign aid (Moravcsik, 2003).

The EU has been instrumental in setting international environmental standards and in establishing an International Criminal Court. With regards to the conflict prevention function, it can thus be said that while all the above institutions make significant contributions or reinforce each others activities, the EU, because of its degree of jurisdiction, economic scope,

[8] All the EU's associate agreements with third countries, including the Lomé and Cotonou conventions, contain clauses on respect for human rights, political pluralism and standards for good governance.

standard-setting facilities, diplomatic and (increasingly) military tools, stands out as the key actor on this function. As Michael Smith has suggested 'the EU has the economic capacity to reward and punish; it has the technical and administrative capacity to support and stabilise; and it has the capacity to negotiate in ways unknown to many of the other participants in European order' (Smith, 1997).

Peace enforcement. Peace enforcement exercises relate to actual conflict or crisis management situations, such as the various Balkan cases between 1992 and 2001, or the prolonged conflict between Israel and Palestine. Although the EU has tried to relate such conflicts with either economic sanctions[9] or diplomatic means[10] such efforts have invariably failed and their solutions have in several instances required military intervention. OSCE and UN efforts have not been more successful either.[11] Only in the March 2001 Macedonian conflict, with the evacuation of UCK insurgents and their weapons, where it worked in tandem with NATO, did the EU play a significant role in restoring peace and preventing the spread of armed conflict (Brenner, 2002, 55). By contrast, NATO, due to its newly re-vamped role of out-of-area engagement, demonstrated both relevance and effectiveness in dealing with the Balkan conflicts. Below is a brief examination on EU shortcomings in the field of peace enforcement; largely based on a combination of lack of political will, decision-making capacity, and acting (primarily military).

Although a common habit of thinking and an awareness of similar interests is growing among EU member states, there is still a lack of trust among the major EU states when it comes to security and defence considerations or intelligence sharing. Indeed, the rival historical and political interests of European states prevent the very definition of a common European security identity (Hix, 1999, 347), and induce European governments to regard the Union's security organisations as mere instruments towards achieving their own foreign policy goals. In other

[9] For example, as it tried with ex-Yugoslavia, Iraq and Zimbabwe.

[10] Examples here relate to EU efforts to mediate in the Iraq conflict (February 2003) and over the nuclear weapons/programmes in North Korea (2002) and Iran (2003).

[11] OSCE efforts in the Autumn of 1998, and UN efforts in the Cyprus dispute. EU and UN tried to negotiate agreements between the conflicting parties, e.g between Croats and Serbs over the Krajina and Eastern Slavonia regions, or in attempts to reach a solution at the International Conference on the former Yugoslavia (Vance-Owen plan and Owen-Stoltenberg Plan) with regards to the Bosnian conflict.

words, 'national' rather than 'collective' interests continue to dominate EU member's calculations in assessing the risks posed by, and the responses to, common security threats (Kirchner and Sperling, 2000, 25). EU enlargement will not make this task any easier. Already there are signs that the new partners will have a rather passive attitude vis-a-vis CFSP/ESDP issues (Missiroli, 2003). The collective action problems are evident in the limited remit of ESDP, which is to perform the 'Petersberg tasks' -that is, 'humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks; [and] tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking' (Western European Union, 1992, para.4, part II).

The required bodies and decision making structures for ESDP were belatedly established (1999-2002), e.g. the High Representative for CFSP, the Policy Unit, the Political and Security Committee, the European Union Military Committee, and the European Union Military Staff; all regrouped or attached to the Council of Ministers.[12] However, there is still an absence of a Council of Defence Ministers, a defence budget, or an agency to buy equipment. In addition, there is a reliance on unanimity voting in decision-making. Unless reforms can be introduced,[13] the latter will become more protracted as the EU moves from 15 to 25 members. Moreover, work between the Council of Ministers and the European Commission is not adjusted to constitute a coherent whole; rather they easily compete with each other on mandates and competencies (Rusi, 2001, 144).

EU military capacity is undermined by the existence of: (a) 15 armies, 14 air forces and 13 navies, all with their command structures, headquarters, logistical organisations, and training infrastructures; (b) too high a proportion of immobile ground forces; and (c) problems of interoperability between European forces.[14] The EU is insufficient in advanced information

[12] The newly created ESDP apparatus was employed for the first time to formulate a common approach and to concert diplomacy in the Macedonian crisis of 2001.

[13] Attempts have been made to make use of such methods as "enhanced cooperation" or "constructive abstention". For example, the Amsterdam Treaty mentioned the use of "constructive abstention", and the Nice Treaty officially adopted the principle of "enhanced cooperation", but it remained unclear whether this would apply to CFSP/ESDP. The Intergovernmental Conference of 2004 might establish some clarity in this respect.

[14] In December 2002, it was announced that the EU plans to set up a military academy to train troops for the ERRF. It will take service personnel from the 15 existing EU states and the ten new

technology, air-and sea-lift,[15] air refuelling, and precision-guided munitions. A considerable part of these deficiencies relates either to under-spending[16] or uncoordinated military spending, e.g. waste of duplication and the inability to take advantage of the economies of scale, especially with regard to research and development. Overall, the EU lacks a security and defence planning and budgetary system. These deficits will not, for the foreseeable future, be overcome, in-spite of the fact that the EU is in the process of establishing a Rapid Reaction Force, through the allocation of national troops (65 000 in total) and military equipment.

Overall, NATO has a distinct advantage on peace-enforcement activities over the OSCE, the UN and, for the time being, the EU. If the UN or the OSCE want to evoke peace enforcement in situations of, for example, intense ethnic strive, they will either call on or delegate authority to NATO or the EU to carry out such activities. Of course, as seen in the Kosovo conflict, NATO has carried out peace enforcement tasks without a UN mandate. It remains to be seen to what the extent the EU will become active and effective in this field either through establishing autonomous military capacities and defence and security policies, or through close collaboration with NATO planning and military assets, as foreseen under the Berlin-plus accord.

Peacekeeping and peace-building. Peacekeeping (military forces in combat) and peace-building (institution building, democratisation and governance) tasks go hand-in-hand and are usually of a medium-term duration. In the European context, the major security organisations share in the implementation of these tasks. In the Balkan conflict, actual peacekeeping forces were led by the UN until 1996, through UNPROFOR, and then taken over by NATO through IFOR and SFOR (1998) to secure peace in Bosnia.[17] NATO was also in command of the peacekeeping forces

---

candidate countries (Rufford, 2002).

[15] For example, the US has 250 long-range transport planes and the Europeans have 11. There are plans to overcome the gap on strategic airlift by modernising the fleet with the A400m carrier, but by the beginning of 2003 there were still serious problems with finance by some of the participating EU countries (Dempsey, 2002).

[16] Taken all together, the European members of NATO will spend only around $150 billion on defence in 2003, compared with some $380 billion for the US. Whereas the US budget represents a 20 percent increase over the year 2000, European defence spending has (with the exception of the British) fallen by more than 25% since 1987 (Dockrill, 2002, 5).

[17] The UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) which was charged with demilitarising the region of ex-Yugoslavia and organising the return of refugees had failed to prevent Croatia to retake the

in Kosovo (KFOR) and Macedonia. However, the European countries provided more than 60% of the 20 000 troops in Bosnia, the 37 000 in Kosovo, as well as *all* the troops in Macedonia. The work of the peacekeeping forces is complemented by the peace-building activities of the OSCE, the UN and the EU. For example, the OSCE Office of High Representative is in charge of the civilian aspect in the rebuilding of Bosnia), the United Nations run an Interim (civilian) Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), and are active through their UNHCR, and the EU is charged with aiding the economic development of Kosovo. A EU police mission (EUPM) has replaced the UN International Police Task Force in Bosnia beginning of 2003, to train, monitor and assist the Bosnian police in law enforcement duties. There were also strong indications that EU would replace NATO command in Bosnia and Macedonia by 2004/05.

The best example of how peacekeeping and peace-building work side-by-side and how various organisations interact with each other to provide military, civilian and economic assistance is the Stability Pact for the Balkans. This Pact was initiated by the EU, and is supported by over forty nations, regional bodies, and international organisations, all working in partnership, and operates under the auspices of the OSCE. It has three working principles: democracy building and human rights violations; building infrastructure to rehabilitate society; and promoting reform of the security sector for more accountable, transparent rules of law enforcement. In addition to this Pact, the EU offers stabilisation and association agreements, which combine the opening up of local markets, technical assistance and political dialogue.

Although, the concern in this paper is primarily with European security governance, impacts on European security from further a field, especially the Middle East, can not be excluded, and deserve at least brief consideration. In the Middle East, the EU has deliberately kept its role nonpolitical, preferring EU trade concessions, investment, technical and humanitarian assistance, and after the 1993 Oslo Accords, it provided funding for the Palestinian Authority positions. Some of the economic and financial aid is directed to the peace process and to support the creation of effective, democratic Palestinian institutions (Ortega, 2003, 9). Through the "Barcelona Process" it has also provided a forum for discreet contacts between Israelis and Palestinians during the

---

regions of Krajina and Eastern Slavonia. It had no peace-enforcement possibilities and was trying to keep a peace that did not exist. Unlike UNPROFOR, IFOR and KFOR were mandated to use force to achieve their objectives

breakdown of their peace process. However, the failings of these efforts have been recognised in the remarks of Solana that the region should become a playing ground, not just a paying ground for the EU (Nonneman., 2003, 45).

Summer 2003 marked two interesting new developments, with the announcements of the EU and NATO to undertake peacekeeping activities outside the European orbit. In July 2003, 14,000 French-led EU troops were engaged, at the UN's request, in their first peacekeeping mission in Congo. Noteworthy was that the EU did not involve NATO and therefore did not make use of the "Berlin Plus" rules which allow the US certain control over EU-led peacekeeping in return for NATO planning and assets.[18] Importantly this engagement was also linked to Mr. Solana's new security doctrine, announced in June 2003, which calls for 'greater capacity to bring civilian resources such as police and judges to bear in crisis and post-crisis situations. NATO, for its part, seized control of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan in August 2003. This marked its first operation outside Europe in its 54-year existence.

It is to early to assess whether these developments will become new trends, although this appears more likely for NATO than the EU. Overall, the UN and especially NATO have played a major role in terms of peacekeeping activities in the Balkans,[19] however, EU is starting to increase its role in this field. All three organisations, together with the OSCE, play an important part in peace-building in the Balkans.

Security Governance: institutional autonomy versus inter-institutional cooperation

The review of the four security functions has illustrated the importance of the EU, NATO and the OSCE in terms of security governance in Europe, and the comparative advantages of each organisation in the three respective security functions. NATO is ill-equipped to breed solutions to the dilemmas of collective action posed by new security threats such as trans-national crime, cyberwarfare and terrorism.[20] In contrast, the EU system of governance has certain advantages in

[18] Because NATO works on unanimity, any one of these countries could veto the EU's "borrowing" of NATO assets. Already Turkey made use of the veto in 2001/2002. For further details on the Turkey issue and the "Berlin-Plus" arrangements (Missiroli, 2002).

[19] UN peacekeeping of course relates not only to the Balkans, but also to other parts of Europe and Central Asia, as, for example, with the UN-controlled buffer zone in Cyprus.

[20] As Philip Gordon (2002, 95) argues, "it is hard to see NATO countries agreeing to use the

this respect. The offer of membership, the financial and technical assistance programmes and the strictures of the *acquis communautaire* enable the EU to prevent or dampen the prospects for weak civil societies, corrupt state structures, or the criminalisation of economies. Reliance upon the EU system of governance also retains the possibility of integrating the military and the non-military components of the European security agenda.

However, in spite of these potential advantages in foreign and security policy, the EU suffers from too much rhetoric and too little action when it comes to dealing with international crisis situations. There are many instances where the EU has failed to be an effective international partner, such as the conflicts in Bosnia and Kosovo. It has somewhat rectified this picture with the joint and EU-NATO intervention in Macedonia, the uniformly solid backing of the U.S. after the attacks of 11th September, and the willingness for peacekeeping and peace-building engagements in the Balkans, Afghanistan and the Congo. There now also exists structures and (planned) capabilities at EU level in terms of the European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF), the Civilian Police Force, and the various committees which have been set up to facilitate decisions on a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) (Andreani, Bertram, and Grant, 2001). Nonetheless, it has some way to go to be an effective actor in international crisis situations and to establish the necessary collective capacity, especially with regard to military expenditures, air and sea logistics, and modern warfare technology. Whether the EU will indeed establish such a capacity is unclear, as different views abound within EU member states, both existing and prospective, on the ESDP's future. Four different perspectives can be identified, which are not mutually exclusive, but which have nonetheless distinct features. These perspectives are conditioned by systemic political developments, like the end of the Cold-War, and by internal EU developments. The first perspective can be described as "self-centered", where the emphasis is on representing the EU as a successful model of peace and stability, and where the stress is on extending theses virtues, either through conflict prevention or peacekeeping and peace building measures to Central and Eastern Europe. The second perspective can be named as "external

---

Alliance for such anti-terrorist matters as law enforcement, immigration, financial control, and domestic intelligence anytime soon". However, it is important to mention that NATO has established a number of counter-terrorism instruments such as a mobile lab for analysing nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) weapons; a prototype NBC response team; and a virtual "Centre of Excellence" for NBC weapons (Stevenson, 2003, 85).

projection", as it goes beyond the Euro-centric orientation, and includes peace-enforcement, peacekeeping or peace-building tasks not only in Europe but also in the periphery of Europe (e.g. the Caucasus or the Middle East) and elsewhere on the globe. However, it conceals tensions among its members between the pursuit of autonomous actions and reliance on NATO or US military planning and assets. The third and fourth perspectives highlight more explicitly the tensions between trans-Atlantic cooperation and EU self-reliance.

Whether a given member state favours one of the four-mentioned perspectives over the other, depends on factors such as a prevailing or desired degree of pacifism, defence budgets, commitment to EU political integration, and collaboration with NATO or the US. The EU-centric perspective has Kantian tenets (extending zones of peace from Western to Central and Eastern Europe) and a "civilian power" orientation.[21] It was conceived during the cold war, and extended into the post-cold war period for reasons of perceived self-success in trans-nation building, peace dividends, NATO's primacy in security terms, and the acceptance of US leadership. This view was re-confirmed through CFSP at Maastricht and Amsterdam, and prevailed until 1998, when, because of circumstances in the Bosnian conflict and a change of administration in the U.K., a new perspective was introduced. The so-called St Malo agreement between Tony Blair and Jacques Chirac went beyond the civilian power conception, but left a nagging ambiguity between the pursuit of EU autonomous actions in security and defense and the reliance on NATO and US military assets, planning and leadership. Although the "self-centred" perspective is waning, it still holds some sway in, for example, Germany or some neutral countries such as Austria, Ireland and Finland, that object to the EU having a strong military muscle. It is also a view that the neo-cons or the Bush administration favour in their characterisation of a "weak" or "misguided" Europe. The EU-centric perspective has Kantian tenets (extending zones of peace from Western to Central and Eastern Europe) and a civilianpower orientation.[1] It was conceived during the cold war, and extended into the post-cold war period for reasons of perceived self-success in trans-nation building, peace dividends, NATO's primacy in security terms, and the acceptance of U.S leadership. This view was re-confirmed through CFSP at Maastricht and Amsterdam, and

[21] For a fuller treatment of the concept "civilian power", see Knude Kirste and Hanns Maull (1996).

prevailed until 1998, when, because of circumstances in the Bosnian conflict and a change of administration in the U.K., a new perspective was introduced. The so-called St Malo agreement between Tony Blair and Jacques Chirac went beyond the civilian power conception, but left a nagging ambiguity between the pursuit of EU autonomous actions in security and defense and the reliance on NATO and US military assets, planning and leadership. Although the self-centred perspective is waning, it still holds some sway in, for example, Germany or some neutral countries such as Austria, Ireland and Finland, that object to the EU having a strong military muscle. It is also a view that the neo-cons or the Bush administration favour in their characterization of a weak or misguided Europe.[1] The St Malo accord called for a more prepared and engaging EU in security and defence. Surprisingly it was adopted by all 15 member states and remains an important EU policy aspiration in the shape of ESDP, though, the events and fall-out of 9/11 have overshadowed this aspiration. The more prepared and engaging approach included peace-enforcement, peacekeeping or peace-building tasks, either in the periphery of Europe (e.g. the Caucasus or the Middle East) or elsewhere on the globe. This "ambitious" perspective found its main expressions through ESDP in the Helsinki and Nice summits and enabled the establishment of the Rapid Reaction Force, the allocation of some military equipment by EU and European NATO member states, and the creation of ESDP decision-making instruments. But the introduction of these features also exposed limitations on a range of "hard power" aspects due to the unwillingness of EU member states to mount major defence outlays, streamline their military forces or engage in significant collaborative military procurement projects. Moreover, in addition to exposing its military limitations and continued military dependence on NATO and the US, the EU was also confronted with rigid US (Clinton administration) stipulations as to how ESDP could operate, through the famous three d's of no de-coupling (no European caucus within NATO), no duplication of major NATO military assets and no discrimination against non-EU NATO European members (Shake 2002; Missiroli 2002). Hence, whilst this perspective is supported to a

22

23 For example, the U.S. State Departments' Richard Haas argues that " Europeans are confusing what works in Europe with what works in the rest of the world", and "Europe often treats the rest of the world as if it were a candidate for EU enlargement". Quoted by Stephen Fidler, Washington 'dove' frustrated by Europe, The Financial Times, 10. 3. 2003

greater, rather than a lesser, degree by all EU member states it is based more on the intention for greater external projection than on the actual means for achieving it. It conceals ambiguities over whether: (a) the EU should significantly build up a security and defence capacity, rather than rely on NATO or US planning and military assets; (b) an enhanced capacity should be either subordinate to NATO or US influences or depend on NATO planning and some additional military assets; and (c) an enhanced capacity should have its own military planning facilities and carry out "autonomous" actions free of US influence.

These ambiguities were further exposed with the US announcement in 2002 to pursue pre-emptive strikes against so-called rogue states, and its handling of the Iraq conflict, which resulted in the formation of two additional perspectives: a more reinforced and distinct transatlantic perspective and a more pronounced EU self-reliance perspective.

At the heart of the reinforced trans-Atlantic perspective is the extent to which EU member states seek to identify with or support US policies towards so-called rogue states associated with Weapons of Mass Destruction and the sponsorship of international terrorism. Another facet of this perspective seeks to use ESDP as a tool for gaining more influence in either NATO or US decision-making. Although a view more confined to UK after the events of 911, other EU member states, existing and prospective, aligned up with this position over the handling of the Iraqi conflict. This shifting of opinion was clearly expressed in the support statement of military action by nine European countries, and the so-called Vilnius letter of ten European countries. This resulted in a temporary fracture within the EU, which was further exacerbated by Rumsfeld's characterisation of "old" and "new" Europe, and his suggestion that the mission must determine the coalition, rather than the coalition must not determine the mission. Given such "shifting alliances", which by their very nature tend to be "opportunistic" and "temporary", it will leave all choices of initiation and coordination with the US It may also tempt the US to of into a "divide and rule" practice, by encouraging, enticing or rewarding certain European states from entering, what Rumsfeld euphemistically calls, the "coalition of the willing".[24] Not only would this diminish the status of NATO, it would also affect the notion of partnership within NATO, and could lead to

[24] Javier Solana has explicitly expressed concern over such "disaggregating" attempts by urging the US to deal with Europe as a whole rather than "cherry-pick" individual allies because they agree with Washington (Black, 2003).

"coalitions of the obedient". Equally, were the US to interfere with the Berlin-plus mechanism and not consent to the borrowing of military assets, it would affect EU-led military missions.

However, ESDP is not only a product of external circumstances or US ties. Nor is it simply a policy instrument with certain objectives and tasks, e.g. whether ESDP should be seen as part of a wider EU attempt to balance the preponderance of US hegemony (largely the French position). For some countries, it also represents an important building block in the political construction of the EU. It therefore serves both a practical defence function and an institutional development function (Brenner, 2002, 4 and 41). The combination of external influences such as the split over the Iraqi military engagement and the commitment to enhance political union, led France, Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg, in April 2003, to press for a stronger, more flexible and more self-reliant EU security and defence capacity. The more flexible notion sought to invoke the principle of enhanced cooperation, enabling a group of countries to press ahead with further integration, with the consent of others, unprepared to join in the initial phase. Although such a development can affect the cohesion, external projection, and effectiveness of the EU, it has proved helpful in the past with the Schengen accord and the Euro. This development was strengthened by the Congo engagement, the first deployment far beyond the European continent, which gave the EU an opportunity to test itself as a global player and to operate without NATO or US "first refusal".

However, given its military importance, it would be difficult to envisage an effective core group without the participation of the UK. This participation seemed to have become more assured through the so-called Berlin accord between Blair, Chirac and Schröder in September 2003. Accordingly, "the EU should be endowed with a joint capacity to plan and conduct operations without recourse to NATO resources and capabilities". It aims at cohesion, e.g. participation by all 25 member states, but allows a circle of interested partners to act on their own.[25] Blair apparently accepted this development as long as it would not undermine NATO, or the position of NATO as the bedrock of European defence. In turn, Chirac and Schröder conceded that the envisaged permanent EU planning "cell" of military and other officials should be housed at NATO's Shape

[25] According to the draft treaty prepared by the European Convention, a core group can be brought together by at least a third of the member states.

headquarters. What remained unclear was whether the UK had dropped its earlier demand that all EU should members have a veto on member countries' decisions to conduct joint operations, and whether countries like Austria, Finland, Ireland and Sweden would consider enhanced cooperation as not too exclusive.

These linkages among security threats require extensive scope in policy response. Operating over a wide range of civilian policy domains and some military means, the EU has a obvious advantage over other multi-lateral organisations or non-state actors. The EU possess more numerous and varied instruments of influence than NATO, especially at the level of conflict prevention, therefore having a comparative advantage over NATO in managing potential conflict situations (Brenner, 2002, 71). But how much of the perceived EU advantage has been or is likely to be translated into concrete results? Scholars such as Christopher Hill question the EU's capacity in the foreign and security field and point to a "capability-gap" (Hill, 1993). However, it should be emphasised that studies highlighting capacity limitations of the EU, often tend to apply this to a narrowly defined area of CFSP or ESDP, namely the military capacity of the EU (Kagan, 2001). This downplays EU capacity unnecessarily and neglects the importance of the EU to combine military and civilian as well as diplomatic, economic, and trade instruments. It is not attempted here to review the various attempts the EU has made since 1999 in establishing ESDP, [26] neither is it the case to dwell extensively on both the actual or potential shortcoming of ESDP. Rather the emphasis will be on how the various security institutions or their member states have responded, or provided solutions, to the range of security threats identified in the above empirical study. This endeavour is linked with the aims of governance which, according to Rosenau, are about the maintenance of collective order, the achievement of collective goals, and the collective processes of rule through which order and goals are sought (Rosenau, 1997).

Conclusion

The causes of security threats or conflicts and the means to overcome them are diagnosed differently between Americans and Europeans (Kirchner and Sperling, 2002). Whereas Europeans incline to seek the antidote for pre-modern, dysfunctional, and failed states in the long-term development and education, Americans direct their attention towards what they identify the axis of

[26] For a collection of the core documents on, see Maartje Rutten, 2001 and 2002.

evil, i.e. states involved in the production or distribution of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. While the US emphasises the element of force in dealing either with terrorists, 'rouge' states or failed states, Europe tends to concentrate on conflict prevention, pre-conflict resolution and post-conflict reconstruction; favouring diplomatic dialogue, political accommodation and positive economic incentives to address the potentially destabilising behaviour of so-called "failed states". Whereas the European tend to address security problems in a reactive fashion and approach security management from a long-term perspective, the Americans tend to worry more about the short-term security risks, and take a much more pro-active policy choice. Whereas the Americans seek to respond to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear as well as chemical and biological, and to terrorist activities anywhere on the globe, the European countries largely have a regional perspective, and confine their concerns primarily to the consolidation of the EU and to its enlargement. While Europeans prefer multi-lateral solutions, the Americans have an antipathy towards multilateralism (seen as constraining US power) and favour unilateral actions, as for example in the establishment of a missile defence programme. The divergence in views is paralleled by a growing gap in military spending between Europe and the US, and affects the relationship both strategically and psychologically. Fears it will affect interoperability of European with US forces within NATO and thus undermine cooperation and possibly US commitment to NATO.

The potential for European-American cooperation in the development of a security governance system that reaches beyond the transatlantic area is beset by confrontational aspects in that relationship: each seems determined to maintain (in the US case) or to reach (in the European case) either a leading or independent position with respect to the other. On the US side this can be observed through efforts on missile defence, disproportionate outlays in military expenditures, technological advancement, and lack of intelligence sharing. On the European side, there are attempts to forge its own strategy and style, to develop its own know-how and capabilities in peace keeping, to integrate the use of force with soft power instruments, and to accept confrontation with the US when necessary. Whilst Europeans should pay some attention to the issue of interoperability and duplication, it is also important for the Americans to realise that reducing Europe's dependence doesn't reduce its desire to work with the US Given that the assets that the

EU is most likely to need are also in short supply in US forces, Kori Shake sensibly suggests that the EU should focus on equipment and technology that would improve on the tasks it can do, such as peace keeping - even if this involved duplicating US assets. In her view, at the tactical level, the EU peacekeeping missions are likely to require unmanned aerial vehicles as well as Airborne Early Warning and Command (AWACs) aircraft. EU countries could save money by pooling the cost of developing these systems, and then run them as EU squadrons, just as NATO has its own AWACs aircraft. Provided that these EU units were also available to NATO, they should pose no political problems. Such a move would increase Europe's military options in a crisis and make it less dependent on the US, and could reduce the burden on heavily taxed US military assets.

As the above review indicates, while most EU countries, present and prospective, favoured since 1999 the external project perspective, the dilemma was whether this should be implemented through either a reinforced trans-Atlantic or an EU self reliance perspective. The self-reliance perspective gained in prominence in 2003, but to succeed it needs to overcome the residual reservations expressed in the self-centred perspective, and more importantly to accommodate important sentiments expressed in the reinforced trans-Atlantic perspective. Such an accommodation will also have to include improved EU-NATO coordination and cooperation.

Bibliography

Andreani, Gilles Christoph Bertram and Charles Grant, *Europe's Military Revolution*, London: Centre for European Reform, 2001.

Asseburg, Muriel, 'From declarations to implementation? The three dimensions of European policy towards the conflict', in Martin Ortega, ed., *The European union and the crisis in the Middle East, Chaillot Papers, No. 62*, Paris: Institute for Security Studies, July 2003, pp. 47-52.

Black, Ian, 'US warned not to try to split EU', The Guardian, 9 May 2003.

Brenner, Michael, Europe's *New Security Vocation, McNair Paper 66*, Washington, DC: Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, 2002.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1998.

Checkel, Jeffrey T., 'The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory', *World Politics*, vol. 50, no.2, 1998, pp. 324-48.

Delpech, Therese, 'Four Views of 9/11', *Internationale Politik*, vol. 3, no 3, 2002, pp. 3-8.
Dempsey, Judy, 'US-European capability gap grows', Financial Times, 20 November 2002.

Dockrill, Saki, 'Does a Superpower Need an Alliance?', *Internationale Politik*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2002, pp. 9-12.

European Commission, *Communication from the Commission on Conflict Prevention*, Brussels: European Commission, COM [2002] 211 Final, 11 April 2001.

European Commission, *Joint Declaration on Strengthening Dialogue and Cooperation on Political and Security Matters in Europe*, 30 October 2000. Accessed at http://www.europa.eu.int/ comm/ external _relations.

European Commission, *Country Strategy Paper 2000-2006, National Indicative Programme, 2002-2003, Russian Federation*, Brussels: European Commission, 27 December 2001.
European Commission, *EU-Russia Joint Declaration on Strengthening Dialogue and Cooperation on Political and Security Matters in Europe*, Paris, 30 October 2000. Accessed at: www.europa. eu.int/comm/external_relations.

European Council, *Presidency Conclusions*, Göteborg European Council (Swedish Presidency), 5-16 June 2001,Göteborg. Accessed at: atwww.europa.eu.int/futurum/document/other/ oth 160601_ en.pdf.

French, Julian-Lindley, *Terms of engagement: the paradox of American power and the transatlantic dilemma post-11 September, Chaillot Papers, No. 52*, Paris: Institute for Security Studies, May 2002.

Gilpin, Robert, *War and Change in World Politics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
Koremenos, Barbara Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal, 'The Rational Design of International Institutions', *International Organization*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2001, pp. 761-99.

Goertz, Gary, *Contexts of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Gordon, Philip 'NATO is not dead or doomed, but the Allies should use the Prague Summit to assure its healthy future', *The National Interest*, No. 69, 2002, pp. 91-8.

Hanelt, Christian-Peter and Felix Neugart, 'Euro-Med Partnership', *Internationale Politik*, vol. 2, no. 4, 2001, pp. 79-82.

Hanrieder, Wolfram F., 'Dissolving International Politics: Reflections on the Nation-State', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 72, no. 4, 1978, pp. 1276-87.

Herz, John H. 'The Rise and Demise of the Territorial State', *World Politics*, vol. 9, no. 4, 1957, pp. 473-93.

Hill, Christopher, 'The EU's Capacity for Conflict Prevention', European Foreign Affairs Review, vol.6, (2001), 315-333.

Hill, Christopher 'The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 31, no.3, 1993), pp. 305-328.

Hix, Simon, *The Political System of the European Union*, New York: Palgrave, 1999.

Hoffmann, Stanley, *World Disorders: Troubled Peace. in the Post-Cold War Era*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

Hopf, Ted, 'The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory', *International Security*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1998, pp. 171-200.

Howell, Patrick, 'Policy Assessment Framework to Evaluate the Operational Capability of the European Union's Rapid Reaction Force', paper presented at the European Union Studies Association Conference, Nashville, TN, 2003.

Hyde-Price, Adrian, *Germany & European order: Enlarging NATO and the EU*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Jervis, Robert, 'Theories of War in an Era of Leading Power Peace', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 96, no. 1, 2002, pp. 1-14.

Kagan, Robert 'Power and weakness', *Policy Review*, no. 113, June-July 2002. Accessed at: http://www.policyreview.org/JUN02/kagan.html.

Keohane, Robert, 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 4, 1988, pp. 379-96.

Keohane, Robert O., 'Governance in a Partially Globalized World', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 95, no. 1, 2001, pp. 1-13.

Kirchner, Emil and James Sperling, 'The New Security Threats in Europe: Theory and Evidence', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2002, pp.423-52.

Kirchner, Emil and James Sperling, 'Will Form Lead to Function? Institutional Enlargement and the Creation of a European Security and Defence Identity', *Contemporary Security Policy*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2000, pp. 23-45.

Knude Kirste and Maull, Hanns, 'Zivilmacht und Rollentheorie', *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1996, pp. 383-412.

Link, Werner, 'Der internationale Wandel und die Europapolitik des vereinten Deutschland', in Heinrich Schneider, Mathias Jopp, and Uwe Schmalz (eds), *Eine neue deutsche Europapolitik? Rahmenbedingungen—Problemfelder—Optionen*, Bonn: Europa Union Verlag, 2002, pp. 153-71.

Lynch, Dov, *Russia faces Europe, Chaillot Papers, No. 60*, Paris: Institute for Security Studies, May 2003.

March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen, 'The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders', *International Organization*, vol. 52, no. 4, 1998, pp. 944-47.

Martin, Lisa L. and Beth A. Simmons, 'Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions', *International Organization*, vol. 52, no. 4, 1998, pp. 729-57.

Missiroli, Antonio EU-NATO Cooperation in Crisis Management: No Turkish Delight for ESDP, *Security Dialogue*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2002, pp. 9-26.

Missiroli, Antonio, 'EU Enlargement and CFSP/ESDP', *Journal of European Integration*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2003, pp. 1-16.

Moravcsik, Andrew, 'Striking a New Transatalantic Bargain', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 82, no. 4, 2003, pp. 74-89.

Most, Benjamin A. and Harvey Starr, 'Diffusion, Reinforcement, Geopolitics, and the Spread of War', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 74, no. 4, 1980, pp. 932-46.
Nonneman, Gerd, 'A European view of the US role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict', in Martin Ortega (ed.), *The European union and the crisis in the Middle East, Chaillot Papers, No. 62*, Paris: Institute for Security Studies, July 2003, pp. 33-46.

Ortega, Martin (ed.), *The European union and the crisis in the Middle East, Chaillot Papers, No. 62*, Paris: Institute for Security Studies, July 2003.

Pond, Elizabeth, *The Rebirth of Europe*, 2nd Edition, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution

Press, 2002.

Roloff, Ralf, 'Deutsche Europapolitik im Zeichen der Globalisierung', Heinrich Schneider, Mathias Jopp, and Uwe Schmalz (eds), *Eine neue deutsche Europapolitik? Rahmenbedingungen—Problemfelder—Optionen*, Bonn: Europa Union Verlag, 2002, pp.171-94.

Rosenau, James N. and Ernst-Otto Czempiel (eds), *Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Rosenau, James N., *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Rufford, Nicholas 'First for Brussels army', Sunday Times, 15 December 2002.

Ruggie, John Gerard, 'Continuity and Transformation in the World Polity: Toward a Neo-Realist Synthesis, in Robert O. Keohane (ed.), *Neorealism and its Critics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986, pp. 131-57.

Rusi, Alpo 'Europe's Changing Security Role', in H. Gärtner, A. Hyde-Price and E. Reiter (eds.), *Europe's New Security Challenges*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2001, pp. 113-24.
Rutten, Maartje, *From St- Malo to Nice, European defence core documents core documents', Chaillot Papers, No. 47*, Paris: Institute for Security Studies, May 2001.

Rutten, Maartje, *From Nice to Laeken: European defence core documents, Chaillot Papers, No. 51*, Paris: Institute for Security Studies, April 2002.

Shake, Kori 'Constructive Duplication: Reducing EU reliance on US Military Assets', Washington, DC: Center for European Reform, January 2002.

Schweller, Randall, 'Neo-realism's Status Quo Bias: What Security Dilemma?', *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1994, pp. 72-107.

Siverson, Randolph M. and Harvey Starr, 'Opportunity, Willingness, and the Diffusion of War', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 84,no. 1, 1990, pp. 47-67.

Smith, Michael 'Doing unto Others…? The European Union and Concepts of Negotiated Order in Europe', Inaugural Lecture at the University of Loughborough, 19 February 1997.

Smith, Karen, 'The Use of Political Conditionality in the EU's Relations with Third Countries: How Effective?' *European Foreign Affairs Review*, vol 2., no. 4, 1998, pp. 253-274.

Sperling, James and Emil Kirchner, 'Economic Security and the Problem of Cooperation in Post Cold War Europe', *Review of International Studies*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1998, pp. 221-37.

Sperling, James and Emil Kirchner, 'The Security Architectures and Institutional Features of Post-1989 Europe', *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 42, vol. 2, 1997, pp. 155-70.

Stevenson, Jonathan 'How Europe and America Defend Themselves', *Foreign Affairs* vol. 82, no. 2, 2003, pp. 75-90.

Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik/Conflict Prevention Network, eds., *Peace-Building and Conflict Prevention in Developing Copuntries: A Practical Guide, CPN Guidebook* (Draft Document), Brussels and Ebenhausen, 1999.

Talbott, Strobe, 'From Prague to Baghdad', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 81, no. 6, 2002, pp. 46-57.
van Tongeren, Paul,Hans van de Veen, and Juliette Verhoeven, eds., *Searching for Peace in Europe and Euasia: An Overview of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities* Boulder, Lynne Rienner, 2002.

Waltz, Kenneth, *Theory of International Politics*, New York, Random House, 1978.

Webber, Mark, 'Security governance and the 'excluded' states of Central and Eastern Europe', in Andrew Cottey and Derek Averre, eds., *Ten years after 1989. New security challenges in Central and Eastern Europe*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002, pp. 1-25.

Western European Union, Council of Ministers, *Petersberg Declaration*, Bonn, 19 June 1992.
Young, Oran, *Governance in World Affairs*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Zacher, Mark W., 'The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force', *International Organization*, vol. 55, no. 2, 2001, pp. 215-50.

Zellner, Wolfgang, 'The OSCE: Uniquely Qualified for a Conflict-Prevention Role', in Paul van Tongeren, Hans van de Veen, and Juliette Verhoeven, eds., *Searching for Peace in Europe and Euasia: An Overview of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner, 2002, pp. 15-25.

Zimmerman, William, 'Issue Area and Foreign Policy Process: A Research Note in Search of a General Theory', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 67, no. 4, 1973, pp. 1204-12.