Prof. Emil J. Kirchner

University of Essex

NATO-EAPC FELLOWSHIP

FINAL REPORT ON
A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
ESDP OBJECTIVES AND CAPABILITIES

The period since the end of the cold war has witnessed a great theoretical debate

concerning the conditions for peace and stability in Europe. Balance of power and

alliance theories together with realist assumptions have been on trial in the aftermath of

the cold war, especially in relation to the continuation and expansion of NATO and the

European Union,[1] The possible emergence of a European-wide security framework has

led to new theoretical and conceptual orientations such as constructivism,[2] security

communities,[3] and security governance.[4] These approaches and concepts are beneficial to

---

[1] In 1990, John Mearsheimer called for a new balance of power in Europe and predicted that NATO and the EU would fade. See his 'Back to the future: instability in Europe after the Cold War', International Security, 15:1 (1990), 5-56. A similar view is presented by Kenneth Waltz in 'The emerging Strucutre of International Politics', International Security, 15:2 (1993), 44-79. For a general criticism of balance of power and alliance theories see William C. Wohlforth, 'The Stability of a Unipolar World', International Security, 24:4, (1999), 5-41. With regard to alliance theory and NATO expansion see Stuart Croft, 'Rethinking the record of NATO enlargement', in Andrew Cottey and Derek Averre (eds.), New security challenges in postcommunist Europe: Securing Europe's East (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 26-42

[2] See Alexander Wendt, Social Theory of International Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); John Gerard Ruggie, Constructing the World Politiy: Essays on International Institutionalization (London: Routledge, 1998); Martha Finnemore, National Interests in International Society (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996); Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink,, 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', International Organization, 52:4 (1998), 887-917; and Ted Hopf, 'The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory', International Security, 23:1 (1998), 171-200.

[3] Actually this is not a new, but rather a revised conceptualization. See Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (eds.), Security Communities (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998). For an earlier development of this concept see Karl Deutsch, et al., Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

[4] Representative studies include James N. Rosenau and Ernst-Otto Czempiel (eds.) Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); James

the study of European security in a number of ways. They help to: shift the emphasis from a purely rationalistic or objective interest of states to other characteristics such as institutions, ideas, culture and identity;[5] move beyond the state–centric approach by employing multi-level and multi-actor analysis, e.g. regional and sub-regional actors; and broaden the definition of security through the incorporation of non-military aspects.[6]

The concept of security governance holds particular promise for studying developments in European security. Building on a considerable body of literature on governance studies in domestic, European Union, and international policy making,[7] security governance employs a broad notion of security, which includes internal (state) conflict, organized crime and environmental degradation, and relates to the increasing number and diversity of actors engaged in European security. It highlights the inability of states or governments to provide security across multiple levels and dimensions through existing unilateral or multilateral institutions, and suggests that problems arising from differences in the needs and interests of states as well as limited resources have favoured the increasing differentiation of security policy-making and implementation.[8]

The study on security governance in Europe has so far witnessed two distinct features. Firstly, it has concentrated mostly on the requirements of security governance and the geographic parameters, e.g. questions of inclusion and exclusion through membership in NATO and the EU. Secondly, there has been a tendency to stress the military aspects of

---

N. Rosenau, Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Oran Young, Governance in World Affairs (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999); Robert O. Keohane, 'Governance in a Partially Globalized World', American Political Science Review, 95:1 (2001), 1-13; and Mark Webber, 'Security governance and the "excluded" states of Central and Eastern Europe', in Andrew Cottey and Derek Averre (eds.), New security challenges in postcommunist Europe: Securing Europe's East (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 43-67.

[5] For further details see Peter Katzenstein (ed.) The culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

[6] See James Sperling, 'European security governance: new threats, institutional adaptations', in James Sperling, ed., Limiting Institutions? The Challenge of Security Governance in Eurasia, forthcoming.

[7] For a good overview of studies on governance at the sub-national, national and international level see Elke Krahmann, 'The Emergence of Security Governance in Post-Cold War Europe', Working Paper 36/01 (2001) published by the ESRC "One Europe or Several?" Programme.

[8] Ibid, p.7.

security, and the (lead) role of NATO in European security. [9] Less emphasis has been given to the working and coordinating mechanism of security governance, the content and implications of the non-military aspects of security, and the contribution of the EU towards European security.

Undoubtedly, NATO has made great strides in the last ten years in changing its internal as well as external image through the adoption of a new military strategy, the transformation from collective defence to collective security through, for example, peace keeping activities; and the links with Central and Eastern European states via the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the Partnership for Peace, the Foundation Pacts with Russia and the Ukraine, and actual enlargement. It was also able to invoke Article 5, and to expand NATO's self-defence obligation to cover terrorist attacks by 'non-state actors'.

What is unclear however is whether these adaptations enhance or diminish NATO's role in either European security or global security?

An answer to this question depends heavily on which type of security threat NATO is envisaged to respond to. As will be shown below, empirical evidence indicates that the EU is considered to be more relevant than NATO with regard to a range of perceived security threats. In part this is due to the advantage the EU has in being able to employ multiple instruments (financial, trade, diplomatic, political and military) rather than the largely single military tools held by NATO. Moreover, even when it comes to the deployment of military means, NATO's role may be stronger in peacekeeping activities (as its engagements in the Balkans and Afghanistan demonstrate) than in those of peace enforcement (as became apparent in the Afghan and Iraqi conflicts). Limitations to peace enforcement exercises are linked to Defence Secretary Rumsfeld's famous dictum that the task determines the coalition rather than the coalition determines the task. From a US point of view, both the difficulties of consensus building encountered in the Kosovo

---

[9] See, for example, the contributions by Mark Webber and Stuart Croft in Andrew Cottey and Derek Averre (eds.) New security challenges in postcommunist Europe: Securing Europe's East (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 1-25.

conflict of 1999 (war by committee) and the preference for unilateral action, or pre-emptive strikes, after the event s of 11th September 2001, have exposed the limitations of NATO on peace enforcement missions. NATO's protracted unanimous decision-making structure will be put under further stress with enlargement, as well as with the incipient membership of Russia.

At the same time the US presses for NATO interventions against international terror and the spread of weapons of mass destruction on a global scale. For their part the Europeans complain about a lack of consultation and participation in the formulation of US global strategy.[10] Beneath these complaint are growing differences in security threat perceptions (causes, and consequences of security threats, and whether NATO's command structure should shift from a geographic to a functional focus) between the US and Europe, which affect NATO's readiness.[11] Whether and how the establishment of a 20 000 strong Rapid Reaction Force, announced at the 2002 NATO summit in Prague, (to become operational by 2005), will mitigate or exacerbate the problem of divergence remains to be seen.

Yet, whether partly by default or partly by effective engagement in, for example, the Balkan conflicts, NATO has remained the premier security institution. Default because there is no alternative to US leadership. The major European powers are too divided to play the role of lead nation and too weak to play the role of pacifier.[12] So far the EU has found it difficult to translate ESDP aims into practice, or to mount significant military actions. However, the growing EU external role in norm-setting[13] and compliance; in aid

---

[10] S. Sloan and P. van Ham, 'What future for NATO?, Centre for European Reform, Working Paper, October 2002

[11] For a more elaborate view on NATO's future see Ivo H. Daalder, 'Are the United States and Europe heading for divorce?', International Affairs 77:3 (2001), 553-567; F. Heisbourg and R. de Wijk, 'Debate: Is the fundamental nature of the transatlantic relationship changing?, NATO Review, Spring 2001; and S. Sloan and P. van Ham, 'What future for NATO?, Centre for European Reform, Working Paper, October 2002; Charles Krauthammer, 'Re-Imagining NATO', Washington Post, May 24, 2002; Jeffrey Gedmin, 'The Alliance is Doomed', Washington Post, May 20, 2002.

[12] For an elaboration of the role of a pacifier see David Yost, 'Transatlantic relations and peace in Europe', International Affairs, 78,2 (2002) 277-300; and Rob de Wijk, 'What is NATO', in Rob de Wijk, Bram Boxhorn and Niklas Hoekstra, eds. NATO after Kosovo (The Hague: Netherlands Atlantic Association, Netherlands Institute of International Relations, Clingendael, and the Royal Netherlands Military Academy, 2000, pp. 3-4

[13] These involve adherence to the so-called Copenhagen criteria and the *acquis communautaire* for new members.

and development programmes; and in external policies (CFSP and ESDP), is enabling the EU to challenge some of NATO's security functions, such as peacekeeping, and to erode its presently held pivotal role in the establishment of a European-wide security governance.

It is not the task of this paper to speculate on whether the EU will become more important than NATO in European security governance. Rather, through the aid of a number of security governance functions, the paper seeks to examine: (1) which of the two is deemed most relevant in dealing with specific types of threats, and whether a division of labour among the leading security institutions is emerging; and (2) whether coordination, especially on issues of military engagement, is becoming easier rather than more problematic among the lead security organisations. Underlying these aims is the assumption that for European security governance to be effective it needs a sharing and coordinating mechanism. As the economic market cannot be left simply to the "unseen hand" of demand and supply, and needs frameworks and regulations provided either by states or international organisations for a proper functioning, a similar argument can be made for security governance.

Proponents of security governance accept the heterogenous and sometimes conflicting nature of interests, but imply that in so far as coordination is necessary, it is perceived to be best left to the actors themselves (self-government because of issue specific). In this line of thought actors themselves recognize the need to share their capabilities, e.g. NATO-ESDP, or NATO, to offer military structures for OSCE and UN missions. However, as Krahman points out, while these arrangements prevent duplication and allow for accumulation of specialist expertise and capabilities, they contribute to the fragmentation of security governance in Europe[14] Whilst recognizing that there is a problem with coordination, which became particularly evident in the Bosnian and Kosovo crises, students of security governance have so far paid insufficient attention to this issue.

---

[14] Elke Krahmann, 'The Emergence of Security Governance in Post-Cold War Europe', p. 16

This paper will explore the aspect of coordination, and will apply the concept of security governance to a wider spectrum of security threats than has hitherto been the case. This will be done partially through the application of security governance functions (conflict prevention, peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peace keeping) and the use of a pilot study of security experts in Europe and the United States on the perceptions of security threats (identification of types and likelihood of occurrence) and institutional response (degree of institutional suitability according to type of threat).

Initially, we will expand on the concept of European security governance and illustrate why it can be regarded as a useful tool in the study of European security. We will then provide some background of a pilot study on security threats and institutional relevance, and complement these with studies, derived from available literature, on the suitability of the EU, NATO and nation states with regard to twelve types of security threats. This will be followed by an analysis of how the lead security organizations contribute to a range of security governance functions, and how they coordinate their activities within the system of European security governance.

Security Threats and Security Governance

Most of the existing approaches on the study of security, including those on international regimes and security communities, apply a state-centric approach**.** This is somewhat surprising given that most conflicts in the last ten years have been within states rather than states against states. As Buzan et al point out, the concept of security not only relates to the preservation of state boundaries, but also to the protection of societies and individuals within states.[15] Accordingly, security for Buzan is the ability of states and societies to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity.[16] While threats to the territory of the states are primarily identified in military terms, societies and

---

[15] Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, Jaap de Wilde, Security. A New Framework for Analysis (Boulder, Col.: Lynne Rienner, 1998).
[16] Barry Buzan, People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991).

individuals face a multitude of dangers ranging from the inadequacies of political and social structures, to environmental degradation.[17]

The concept of security governance employs a broad notion of security, which includes internal conflict, transnational crime and terrorism. It argues that as the scope of security threats expands, the tendency of states or governments to withdraw from provision of public services in favour of multilateral or public-private policy making (mostly because of cost saving exercises) will spread to the security sector. The large number of new bilateral and multilateral security institutions that have emerged in Europe since 1990 are viewed as evidence of this spread. These institutions are seen as capable of resolving conflicts and of facilitating cooperation.[18] Both individually and collectively they are seen as systems of rule through which state and non-state actors can organize their common or competing interests in individual, national, regional and global security. Membership and relations among these systems of rule are complex and overlapping, and so are their functions and obligations.[19] In contrast to government, governance does not (substantially) depend on central authority in policy making or rule enforcement. As James Rosenau points out, governance is 'a system of rule that is as dependent on inter-subjective meanings as on formally sanctioned constitutions and charters.[20]

Security governance shares characteristics with international regimes and security communities. International regimes are defined by Krasner[21] as 'sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge in a given area of international relations'. According to Adler and Barnett,[22] security community consists of ' a region of states whose people maintain dependable expectations of peaceful change'. For Adler and Barnett the existence of a

---

[17] Elke Krahmann, 'The Emergence of Security Governance in Post-Cold War Europe' p. 6

[18] See Oran Young, International Governance: Protecting the Environment in a Stateless Society (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), p. 15)

[19] Elke Krahmann, 'The Emergence of Security Governance in Post-Cold War Europe , p. 1

[20] James Rosenau, 'Governance, Order, and Change in World Politics', in James N Rosenau and Ernst-Otto Czempiel (eds.), Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics (Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 4

[21] Stephen Krassner (ed.) International Regimes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983, p. 2)

[22] Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (eds.), Security Communities, p. 30

security community in Western Europe has enabled Europe since 1990 to avoid competitive balancing behaviour.[23]   Similarly, according to these authors, the fact that Central; and Eastern European (CEE) states share many cultural, historical and political characteristics with the West is significant in their wish to join NATO and the EU. Like security community, security governance espouses a sense of shared understanding.

The concept of security governance differs from international regimes and security communities in that it denotes more fluid and flexible arrangements. It can be described as the aggregate of a series of overlapping arrangements governing the activities of all, or almost all, the members of international society (or a regional subsystem of it) over a range of separate but reinforcing issue areas[24], including such temporary arrangements as the development of the Euro-fighter-aircraft.[25]   In line with this conceptualisation, security governance can be defined as an intentional system of rule, dependent on the acceptance of states and non-state actors (or at least the major actors) that are affected, which through regulatory mechanisms (both formal and informal), governs activities across a range of security-related issue areas.[26] In rationalist terms, compliance occurs because institutions address common problems in international life which states either have agreed to or perceive to be in their best interest, and are incapable of handling alone.[27]

Whilst this definition helps to conceptualise security governance, it provides insufficient detail on the regulatory mechanisms, the types of threats to which they apply, and which organisation or networks should be primarily responsible for designing regulatory

---

[23] Ibid , p. 40

[24] See Mark Webber, 'A Tale of a Decade: European Security Governance and Russia', European Security, 9:2 (2000), pp 31-60.

[25] Elke Krahmann, 'The Emergence of Security Governance in Post-Cold War Europe, p. 5.

[26] This is basically a modified version of the definition provided by Mark Webber in 'A Tale of a Decade',

[27] Robert Keohance, 'Governance in a Partially Globalised World', American Political Science Review , 95:1 (2001), 1-3; Celeste Wallander, Helga Haftendorn and Robert Keohane, 'Introduction', in Helga Haftendorn, Robert Keohane and Celeste Wallander (eds.), Imperfect Unions: Security Institutions Over Time and Space (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999),pp. 1-18; Lisa Martin and Beth Simmons, 'Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions', International Organisation, 52: 4 (1998); 729-57

mechanisms. Neither does it adequately specify the "range of security-related issue areas"
or provide a rank ordering of these.

In the following, an effort will be made to shed more light on the importance and types of
security threats, and the relevance of institutional response.

Security Threats and Institutional Relevance

A pilot study, undertaken in 1999,[28] identified twelve conceivable security threats to the
European security space: a biological/chemical attack; a nuclear attack; the
criminalization of economies; narcotics trafficking; ethnic conflict; macroeconomic
destabilization; general environmental threats; specific environmental threats;
cyberwarfare or cybervandalism against commercial structures; cyberwarfare against
defense structures; terrorism against state structures; and migratory pressures.

Ethnic factionalism/irredentism and migratory pressure emerged as the types perceived to
be the biggest threat to security. They received the highest scores for both 1999 and for
2010. Criminalisation of the economies and narcotics trade was second and
environmental damage and degradation was third. Terrorist activities against commercial
and state/defence structures came fourth, and biological/chemical/nuclear warfare was
fifth.

There is a consensus among the survey respondents that states are more likely to achieve
their security goals within, rather than outside, multilateral institutions. NATO and EU

---

[28] This study was based on government documents, the academic literature, and the survey data response
of forty-two leading European and North American security experts to an extensive questionnaire. The
individuals surveyed for this project were security and defence policy experts drawn from academia,
research institutions, political foundations. The questionnaire was developed by the author in 1999 for a
project on European security financed by the European Commission. Three different (and progressive)
questionnaires were discussed with 70 security experts at meetings in Brussels, London, and Washington,
DC in the Spring and Summer of 1999. Respondents were asked for their perceptions with regards to two
time periods: 1999 and 2010. The results of this study were published in Emil J. Kirchner and James
Sperling, 'The New Security Threats in Europe: Theory and Evidence', European Foreign Affairs Review,
7;4 (Winter 2002), pp. 423-452.

are viewed as the primary security institutions and secondary roles are attributed to the UN, international financial institutions, the OSCE, and specific multilateral fora such as Interpol. NATO is the clear institution of choice to meet the challenges posed by the threat of biological or chemical attack, nuclear attack, and cyberwarfare against defence structures. The EU is the clear institution of choice to meet *all* other security challenges facing the state of the Atlantic Community. National responses to these challenges are largely dismissed as irrelevant. Only in the cases of cyberwarfare against defense structures and terrorism are national responses considered useful, and even then they are regarded as the only third or fourth best solutions to the problem. While the EU and NATO are clearly seen as the institutions best equipped to meet these security challenges, there is no clear second-best institution to cope with these problems (see Table 1).

[Table 1 about here]

As this table shows, there is a strong correlation between high ranking security threats and the EU as the foremost institution to respond to these threats. The EU is listed as the first port of call to deal with the six highest ranking security threats; obtaining, for example, a 70 per cent rating on the threat emanating from the criminalisation of economies. NATO comes second for one of these six types, third for two, and a distant fourth for three of these threats. Other institutions, such as the OSCE, the UN, the IMF and Interpol, score higher on some of these threats than NATO. This is a reminder that focusing solely on NATO or NATO plus the EU neglects other important institutions which are involved as security providers. However, NATO is seen as the undisputed number one institution when it comes to the military issues of nuclear attacks, and biological and chemical warfare. The EU is placed second and third on these issues.

These findings offer a number of suggestions for the study of security governance. Firstly, they reaffirm the need for a broad definition of security threats that includes military as well as non-military security aspects. Secondly, they indicate that there is an interrelationship between different types of security threats. In other words, the occurrence of a particular type of threat is often linked with the arrival of others. Thirdly,

they assign a prominent role to the EU in terms of response to security threats. Fourthly, they implicitly point to the need for a better division of labour and greater coordination and cooperation among the leading security organizations: NATO, EU, OSCE and UN. While existing studies on security governance have emphasized the first of these four suggestions, insufficient attention has been paid to the other three aspects. In the following, these four aspects will be examined in more detail, with particular emphasis on numbers three and four.

Reference to non-military problems reopens the contentions of whether they are a security problem per se[29], or in fact causes of more traditional security problems? Much of the debate surrounding this issue relates to an objective definition of security. One way to get around this hurdle is to adopt the term of 'securitisation'. This signifies a process by which particular issues are "taken out of the sphere of every day politics" by specific groups or particular state elites, and defined as security problems.[30] In this respect security is not considered as a direct consequence stemming from a threat but as the result of the political interpretation of the threat. Therefore security is analysed as the reaction of a political action towards an existing or perceived threat. Securitisation is thus a merely political process and is different from a threat that can be caused by various factors (economic, social, military etc.)

While there is no satisfactory answer as to whether non-military aspects are security problems per se, or causes of more traditional security problems, there is generally agreement that the nature of security threats is changing, and that threats since the end of the Cold War have become more complex and far-reaching. Instead of facing a single, predominantly military threat capable of wiping out the entire nation (and the world), we are faced with a myriad of threats, smaller in magnitude and harder to see and counter. This phenomenon was tragically visible in the terrorist attacks of 11 September. An attack which demonstrated that networked terrorism has become de-personalised and de-

---

[29] D. Baldwin warns that if security is equated with a catch-all concept that embraces all of humanity's problems, it loses a clear analytical focus. D. Baldwin, 'The concept of security', Review of International Studies, 23 (1997), 17-18

regionalised; highlighting that terrorist threat is global and can not be reduced to individual actors. However, there is a link to failed states. One lesson of September 11 is that if failed states are allowed to fester, they can become sanctuaries or even agents for terrorists networks, organized criminals and drug traffickers. When states, like Afghanistan or Iraq, fail, their neighbours and often the global community are faced with refugee flows, ethnic or civil conflict, and political disintegration. However, realisation of the changing security environment is not new. As the NATO Council already noted in 1991, the "Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, disruption of the flow of vital resources and actions of terrorism and sabotage."[31] NATO repeated the point in its 1999 Strategic Concept, this time moving "acts of terrorism" to the top of the list of risks.[32] These shifts of risks weaken the distinctions between different kinds of security – national and regional, military and economic, internal and external – but indicate a link between different types of security threats. As Hall and C. Fox[33] illustrate, it is no longer possible to separate terrorism from money laundering or organized crime from drug trafficking. For example, refugees and asylum seekers not only pose internal security concerns but may encourage xenophobia and conflict, as traditional work opportunities appear threatened. At the same time, mass movement may bring with it the possibility of infectious diseases affecting both people and livestock. On the other hand, migration can be exacerbated by environmental instability arising from climatic change. Similarly, the emergence of cyber-terrorism can be considered as constituting a dangerous threat to economic and social life in Europe. Most biotechnology research and development is dual-use in nature and can potentially be misused by terrorists and 'rogue states'. It is therefore impossible to "wage against one [threat] to the exclusion of the other".[34] After September 11 internal security is as important as external security. This is particularly relevant for the EU with regards to enlargement.

---

[30] K. Krause, 'Theorizing security, state formation and the "Third World" in the post-Cold War world', Review of International Studies, 24:1 (1998), p. 134.

[31] The Alliance New Strategic Concept, North Atlantic Council in Rome, November 7-8, 1991, para. 12

[32] The Alliance Strategic Concept, North Atlantic Council in Washington, DC, April 23-24, 1999, para. 24.

[33] Robert Hall and Carl Fox, 'Rethinking security', Nato Review 2001/02;8.

[34] Ibid.

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 organizations 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.[35] 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".[36] However, it should be emphasized 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.[37] 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,[38] 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.[39]

---

[35] See for example, Michael Brenner, Europ'e New Security Vocation, McNair Paper 66, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, 2002, p. 71

[36] See Christopher Hill, 'The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role', Journal of Common Market Studies, vol. 31, no.3, (September 1993), 305-328.

[37] See for example, Robert Kagan, 'Power and weakness', Policy Review, Summer 2001.

[38] For a collection of the core documents on the European Union's common foreign and security policy see Maartje Rutten, 'From St- Malo to Nice, European defence core documents core documents', Chaillot Papers, No. 47, published by the Institute for Security Studies, Paris, May 2001; and Maartje Rutten, From Nice to Laeken: European defence core documents', Chaillot Ppapers, No. 51, published by the Institute for Security Studies, Paris, April 2002;

[39] James Rosenau, Change, Complexity and Governance', p.171

The response by security institutions to the perceived security threats can be divided into three 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 conflict prevention, peacemaking and peace-enforcement, and peacekeeping and 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 demoratisation 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-enforcements. 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. [40] Obviously, there are overlaps among these three categories, but for analytical purposes they will be treated separately. An examination of these 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

---

[40] For a more elaborate description of these three security categories see Communication from the Commission on Conflict Prevention (European Commission, COM [2002] 211 Final, 11 April 2001; Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik/Conflict Prevention Network (eds.) Peace-Building and Conflict Prevention in Developing Copuntries: A Practical Guide, CPN Guidebook (Draft Document), Brussels: Ebenhausen 1999; 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/London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002); Christopher Hill, 'The EU's Capacity for Conflict Prevention', European Foreign Affairs Review, vol.6, (2001), 315-333; Patrick Howell, 'Policy Assessment Framework to Evaluate the Operational Capability of the European Union's Rapid Reaction Force', Paper presented at the European Union Studies Association 2003 Conference, Nashville, Tenn., March 2003.

1. 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.[41] It is accepted that economic development, reducing economic disparity, and reducing poverty are important precursors to building stability and preventing the escalation of violence in volatile areas.[42] Economic, financial/technical, and political efforts can be particularly effective when dealing with organised crime, narcotics trafficking, macroeconomic destabilization, 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 organizations. When compared with crisis management situations, conflict prevention measures appear mundane, less dramatic and often medium to long term oriented. A host of organizations, ranging from NGO and financial/technical organisations to the EU, NATO and the OESC, are involved in conflict prevention measures. These organizations combine to "entrench particular forms of behaviour among their participants by prescribing rules of entry, norms of interaction and constraints on behaviour".[43] 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[44] and Balkan

---

[41] See Wolfgang Zellner, 'The OSCE: Uniquely Qualified for a Conflict-Prevention Role', in Paul van Tongeren, et al., Searching for Peace in Europe and Euasia, pp. 18-19.

[42] See Paul Eavis and Stuart Kefford, 'Conflict Prevention and the European Union: A Potential Yet to be Fully Ralized', in Paul van Tongeren, et al., Searching for Peace in Europe and Euasia, p. 9.

[43] See Robert Keohane, 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', International Studies Quarterly, 32 (1998), p. 384.

[44] Both PHARE (dealing with Central and Eastern European states) and TACIS (concerned with Commonwealth of Independent States) share similar aims: providing financial and technical assistane to support the transition to a market economy, and providing institutional support to aid the growth of a democratic society; both share links with a wide range of NGO's.

programmes) [45], political dialogue (e.g. the dialogue with the Russian Federation) [46],

enlargement conditions, Partnership and Cooperation Agreements,[47] and explicit

stabilisation association agreements, in Macedonia and Croatia, for example. [48] 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, and to introduce limits

on association rights for groups that claim to be religious but may actually be terrorist

support networks.[49] Furthermore, the EU has established a Policy Planning and Early

Warning Unit to enhance the capacity for monitoring post conflict situations and policy

planning, a conflict prevention programme of action,[50] and agreed on a Joint Action on

---

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

[46] 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, which called for regular consultation on defence matters and discussions on modalities for Russia's contribution to future EU crisis management operations. See 30 October 2000, www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations. However, according to Dov Lynch, this dialogue "has produced few, if any, meaningful joint foreign policy positions. Dov Lynch, Russia faces Europe, Chaillot Papers, No. 60, Institute for Security Studies, May 2003, p. 67.

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

[48] This linkage is evident, for example, in the Commission's Country Strategy of 2002-2006 of 27 December 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.'(Country Strategy Paper 2000-2006, National Indicative Programme, 2002-2003, Russian Federation, European Commission, 27 December 2001, Brussels. See also, the EU-Russia Joint Declaration on Strengthening Dialogue and Cooperation on Political and Security Matters in Europe (30Oct 2000, Paris, www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations).

[49] Therese Delpech, 'Four Views of 9/11', Internationale Politik, Transatlantic Edition, 3/2002, vol. 3, Fall Issue, p. 5.

[50] See Results of the Swedish Presidency (final version), Göteborg European Council: Presidency conclusions (Swedish Presidency) www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth160601_en.pdf 15-16 June 2001,Göteborg www.cu2001.se/.

the EU's contribution to combating 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 Joint Partnership Council (EAPC), the Pacts with Russia and the Ukraine, the Mediterranean Dialogue[51], the links with the South East Europe Initiative, the Balkan Stability Pact, the Council of the Baltic Sea State, and the Brents Euro-Artic 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.[52] 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

---

[51] 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

[52] See Strobe Talbott, 'From Prague to Baghdad', Foreign Affairs, Nov/Dec 2002;47

Commissioner on National Minorities, and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.[53] Some of 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

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[54] which 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.[55] 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.[56] Europe contributes 37 per cent of the United Nations' basic budget and 50 per cent of the UN's special programme cost; the US donates 22 percent and 17 percent, respectively.[57]

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

---

[53] For a more elaborate description of the activities of these bodies see Wolfgang Zellner, 'The OSCE: Uniquely Qualified for a Conflict-Prevention Role', in Paul van Tongeren, et al., Searching for Peace in Europe and Euasia, pp. 15-25.

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

[55] See Christian-Peter Hanelt and Felix Neugart, 'Euro-Med Partnership', Transatlantic Internationale Politik, vol. 2, no. 4 (2001), pp. 79-82.

[56] See Muriel Asseburg, ' 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, Institute for Security Studies, Paris, July 2003, 12.

[57] Elizabeth Pond, The Rebirth of Europe, 2nd Edition, (Washington: The Brookings Institution Press, 2002), p. 224.

EU, because of its degree of jurisdiction, economic scope, standard-setting facilities, diplomatic and (increasingly) military tools, stands out as the key actor on this function.

2. 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, the UN and the OSCE, have tried to relate such conflicts with either economic sanctions[58] or diplomatic means[59] such efforts have invariably failed and their solutions have in several instances required military intervention. 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.[60] 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).

Political will: 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,[61] and induce European governments to regard the Union's security organisations as mere instruments towards achieving their own foreign policy goals. In other words, 'national' rather than 'collective' interests

---

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

[59] 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), 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.

[60] See Michael Brenner, Europe's New Security Vocation, McNair Paper 66 (Washington: Institute for National Strategic Studies, and National Defense University, 2002), p.55.

continue to dominate EU member's calculations in assessing the risks posed by, and the responses to, common security threats.[62] 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.[63] 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'[64]

Decision-making capacity: 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.[65] 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,[66] 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.[67]

---

[61]See Simon Hix, The Political System of the European Union (New York: Palgrave, 1999), p. 347.

[62] See Emil Kirchner and James Sperling, 'Will Form Lead to Function? Institutional Enlargement and the Creation of sa European Security and Defence Identity', Contemporary Security Policy, vol. 21, no. 1, (April 2000), p.25.

[63] Antonio Missiroli, 'EU Enlargement and CFSP/ESDP', Journal of European Integration, vol. 25, no. 1March 2003), pp. 1-16.

[64] Western European Union, Council of Ministers, Bonn, 19 June 1992, 'Petersberg Declaration', para.4 of part II. This Declaration was adopted in the Amsterdam Traty of 1996.

[65] Te 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.

[66] 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.

[67] Alpo Rusi, 'Europe's Changing Security Role', in H. Gärtner, A. Hyde-Price and E. Reiter eds., Europe's New Security Challenges (Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner, 2001), p. 144.

Military capacity: 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) [68] problems of interoperability between European forces. The EU is insufficient in advanced information technology, air-and sea-lift,[69] air refueling, and precision-guided munitions.[70] A considerable part of these deficiencies relates either to under-spending[71] 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.

---

[68] 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 candidate countries. Nicholas Rufford, 'First for Brussels army', Sunday Times, 15 December 2002.

[69] 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 modernizing 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. See Judy Dempsey, 'US-European capability gap grows', Financial Times, 20 November 2002.

[70] The Eurofighter project will create more capacity, but states to not pool from it.

[71] 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. See Saki Dockrill, 'Does a Superpower Need an Alliance?', Internationale Politik, Transatlantic Edition, vol. 3, no. 3 (Fall 2002), p. 5

3. 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.[72] NATO was also in command of the peacekeeping forces 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 on 1.1.2003, 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. The 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.

---

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

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 therefore brief consideration be devoted to this issue. 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.[73] Through the "Barcelona Process" it has also provided a forum for discreet contacts between Israelis and Palestinians during the 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.[74]

The Summer of 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 in their first peacekeeping mission in Africa. 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.[75] Importantly this engagement was also linked to Mr. Solana's new security doctrine, 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, took control of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan in August 2003. It is to early to assess whether these developments will become new trends, although this appears more likely for NATO than the EU.

---

[73] Martin Ortega, 'The European union and the crisis in the Middle East', Chaillot Papers, No. 62, Institute for Security Studies, Paris, July 2003, p. 9.

[74] Quoted by Gerd Nonneman, 'A European view of the US role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict', in Martin Ortega, The European union and the crisis in the Middle East', Chaillot Papers, No. 62, Institute for Security Studies, Paris, July 2003, p. 45.

[75] 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 see A. Missiroli, 'EU-NATO Cooperation in Crisis Management: No Turkish Delight for ESDP, Security Dialogue, Vol. XXXIII, no. 1 (2002)), pp. 9-26.

Overall, the UN and especially NATO have played a major role in terms of peacekeeping activities in the Balkans,[76] although the 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.

Conclusion

The review of the three security functions has illustrated the importance of the EU and NATO in terms of security governance in Europe. It has also shown the comparative advantages of each organisation in the three respective security functions. As shown, the EU is better equipped to deal with conflict prevention than with peace intervention functions. In contrast, NATO has a greater capacity in dealing with peace intervention than with conflict prevention.

NATO is ill-equipped to breed solutions to the dilemmas of collective action posed by new security threats such as transnational crime, cyberwarfare and terrorism.[77] In contrast, the EU system of governance has advantages in this respect. The offer of membership 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.[78] A reliance upon the EU system of governance also holds open the promise 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

---

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

[77] As Gordon argues "it is hard to see NATO countries agreeing to use the Alliance for such anti-terrorist matters as law enforcement, immigration, financial control, and domestic intelligence anytime soon". Philip Gordon, 'NATO is not dead or doomed, but the Allies should use the Prague Summit to assure its healthy future', The National Interest, Number 69 (Fall 2002), p. 95

effective international partner, like the conflicts in the Gulf, Bosnia and Kosovo. It has somewhat rectified this picture with the joint EU-NATO intervention in Macedonia, the uniformly solid backing of the U.S. after the attacks of 11th September, and the widespread willingness for military engagement in Afghanistan. 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).[79] 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 become a more effective actor in military matters depends partly on the priority the EU intends to give to military as against non-military matters in the fight against international terrorism, and partly on the U.S. preference for either unilateral or multi-lateral military means, like NATO, for the same purpose. A number of scenarios, although interrelated, can be envisaged to have implications on NATO's future role. A high priority on non-military means by the EU could not only impede steps to enhance its military capacity, but also affect the contributions to NATO by some of the EU states, and undermine relations with the U.S. On the other hand, by prioritising both non-military and military means, the EU could increase its effectiveness in crisis management instances, strengthen collaboration with NATO (either through joint actions or complement its military capacity through the borrowing of military assets and planning facilities) and promote its claim for equal status with the U.S. in transatlantic affairs. However, were the U.S. to insist on unilateral military action and largely neglect NATO in the fight against international terrorism, this could not only weaken NATO directly, but could also result in a strengthening of an independent EU military capacity, which indirectly could reinforce the decline of NATO.

---

[78] For further analysis of this point see Dan Reiter, 'Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy', *International Security*, 25:4, 41-67.
[79] See Gilles Andreani, Christophe Bertram and Charles Grant, *Europe's Military Revolution* (London: Centre for European Reform, 2001).

Extent of Threat Perception and Institution best prepared to address Threat (1999) (N=42)					
Threat		Institutions rank-ordered from 1st to 4th			
Type	Ratings *	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Ethnic conflict	75%	EU (39%)	NATO (31%)	OSCE (19%)	UN (12%)
Migratory pressures	67%	EU (54%)	OSCE (17%)	NATO (15%)	UN (15%)
Specific environmental threat	45%	EU (54%)	UN (21%)	OSCE (14%)	NATO (12%)
Narcotics trafficking	45%	EU (56%)	0SCE (13%)	INTERPOL (13%)	NATO (11%)
Criminalisation of the economy	44%	EU (70%)	OSCE (15%)	NATO (13%)	UN (2%)
Macro-economic instability	41%	EU (53%)	IMF (21%)	UN (12%)	NATO (8%)
Terrorism against the state	37%	EU (43%)	NATO (24%)	OSCE (13%)	National (13%)
Cyber-warfare against state/defense structures	37%	NATO (45%)	EU (33%)	National (12%)	OSCE (7%)
Cyber-warfare against commercial structures	36%	EU (36%)	NATO (17%)	UN (17%)	OSCE (11%)
General environmental threat	22%	EU (48%)	UN (21%)	OSCE (18%)	NATO (8%)
Nuclear attack	22%	NATO (63%)	UN (18%)	EU (14%)	OSCE (5%)
Biological/chemical attack	12%	NATO (43%)	EU (27%)	UN (18%)	OSCE (12%)

*Denotes the percentage of respondents rating the type of threat occurring as 'moderate', 'probable' and 'high', as against a rating of 'low'.

Source: the table was compiled from the data presented in Emil J. Kirchner and James Sperling, 'The New Security Threats in Europe: Theory and Evidence', European Foreign Affairs Review, 7;4 (Winter 2002), pp. 423-452.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andreani, Gilles., Bertram,Christoph., and Grant, Charles., *'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 Ortega, Martin. (ed.) , The European union and the crisis in the Middle East, Chaillot Papers, No. 62, Institute for Security Studies, Paris, July 2003, 12.

Adler, Emanuel. and Barnett, Michael. (eds.), *'Security Communities'* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Baldwin, D. 'The concept of security', *Review of International Studies*, 23 (1997), 17-18

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

Buzan, Barry. *'People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era'* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991).

Buzan, Barry. Waever, Ole and Wilde, Jaap de. *'Security. A New Framework for Analysis'* (Boulder, Col.: Lynne Rienner, 1998).

Croft, Stuart. 'Rethinking the record of NATO enlargement', in Andrew Cottey and Derek Averre (eds.), *New security challenges in postcommunist Europe: Securing Europe's East* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 26-42

Daalder, Ivo H. 'Are the United States and Europe heading for divorce?', *International Affairs* 77:3 (2001), 553-567

Delpech, Therese. 'Four Views of 9/11', *Internationale Politik*, Transatlantic Edition, 3/2002, vol. 3, Fall Issue

Dempsey, Judy., 'US-European capability gap grows', *Financial Times*, 20 November 2002.

Deutsch, Karl. et al., *'Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

de Wijk, Rob. 'What is NATO', in Rob de Wijk, Bram Boxhoorn and Niklas Hoekstra, (eds.) *'NATO after Kosovo' (*The Hague: Netherlands Atlantic Association, Netherlands Institute of International Relations, Clingendael, and the Royal Netherlands Military Academy, 2000)

Dockrill, Saki., 'Does a Superpower Need an Alliance?', *Internationale Politik*, Transatlantic Edition, vol. 3, no. 3 (Fall 2002)

Finnemore, Martha. *'National Interests in International Society'* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996

Finnemore, Martha. and Sikkink, Kathryn. 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', *International Organization*, 52:4 (1998), 887-917

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

Gedmin, Jeffrey. 'The Alliance is Doomed', *Washington Post*, May 20, 2002.

Gordon, Philip., 'NATO is not dead or doomed, but the Allies should use the Prague Summit to assure its healthy future', *The National Interest*, Number 69 (Fall 2002)

Hall, Robert. and Fox, Carl. 'Rethinking security', *Nato Review* 2001/02;8

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

Heisbourg, F. and de Wijk, R. 'Debate: Is the fundamental nature of the transatlantic relationship changing?, *NATO Review*, Spring 2001

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, (September 1993), pp. 305-328.

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

Hopf, Ted. 'The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory', *International Security*, 23:1 (1998), 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 2003 Conference, Nashville, Tenn., March 2003.

Kagan, Robert. 'Power and Weakness', *Policy Review*, Summer 2001

Katzenstein, Peter. (ed.) *'The culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics'* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

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

Keohane, Robert. 'Governance in a Partially Globalised World', *American Political Science Review*, 95:1 (2001)

Keohane, Robert. 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', *International Studies Quarterly*, 32 (1998)

Krahmann, Elke 'The Emergence of Security Governance in Post-Cold War Europe', Working Paper 36/01 (2001) published by the ESRC "One Europe or Several?" Programme.

Krause, K. 'Theorizing security, state formation and the "Third World" in the post-Cold War world', *Review of International Studies,* 24:1 (1998)

Krasner, Stephen. (ed.) *'International Regimes'* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983)

Krauthammer, Charles. 'Re-Imagining NATO', *Washington Post*, May 24, 2002

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

Martin, Lisa. and Simmons, Beth. 'Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions', *International Organisation*, 52: 4 (1998); pp.729-57

Mearsheimer, John J. 'Back to the future: instability in Europe after the Cold War', *International Security*, 15:1 (1990), 5-56.

Missiroli, A.. 'EU-NATO Cooperation in Crisis Management: No Turkish Delight for ESDP, *Security Dialogue*, Vol. XXXIII, no. 1 (2002)), pp. 9-26.

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

Nonneman, Gerd., 'A European view of the US role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict', in Martin Ortega, The European union and the crisis in the Middle East', Chaillot Papers, No. 62, Institute for Security Studies, Paris, July 2003

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

Pond, Elizabeth. *'The Rebirth of Europe'*, 2nd Edition, (Washington: The Brookings Institution Press, 2002)

Reiter, Dan., 'Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy', *International Security*, 25:4, 41-67.

Rosenau, James. 'Change, Complexity and Governance in Globalising Space', in Jon Pierre (ed), *'Debating Governance'* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002),pp. 169-200.

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

Rosenau, James. 'Governance, Order, and Change in World Politics', in Rosenau, James N. and Czempiel, Ernst-Otto. (eds.), *'Governance without Government: Order and Change in World'* Politics (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. 'Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization' (London: Routledge, 1998)

Rusi, Alpo., 'Europe's Changing Security Role', in Gärtner, H., Hyde-Price, A.,and Reiter, E., (eds.), *'Europe's New Security Challenges'* (Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner, 2001)

Rutten, Maartje. 'From St- Malo to Nice, European defence core documents core documents', Chaillot Papers, No. 47, published by the Institute for Security Studies, Paris, May 2001;

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

Sloan, S. and van Ham, P. 'What future for NATO?, Centre for European Reform, Working Paper, October 2002

Sperling, James. 'European security governance: new threats, institutional adaptations', in Sperling, James.(ed.), *Limiting Institutions? The Challenge of Security Governance in Eurasia*, forthcoming.

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

Talbott, Strobe 'From Prague to Baghdad', *Foreign Affairs*, Nov/Dec 2002;47

van Tongeren, Paul., van de Veen, Hans., and Verhoeven, Juliette. (eds.) *'Searching for Peace in Europe and Eurasia: An Overview of Conflict Prevention and Peace building Activities'* (Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002)

Wallander, Celeste. Haftendorn, Helga. and Keohane, Robert. 'Introduction', in Haftendorn, Helga. Keohane, Robert. and Wallander, Celeste. (eds.) *'Imperfect Unions: Security Institutions Over Time and Space' (*Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) pp. 1-18;

Waltz. Kenneth.' The emerging Structure of International Politics', *International Security*, 15:2 (1993), 44-79

Webber, Mark. 'A Tale of a Decade: European Security Governance and Russia', *European Security*, 9:2 (2000), pp 31-60

Webber, Mark. 'Security governance and the "excluded" states of Central and Eastern Europe', in Cottey, Andrew. and Averre, Derek. (eds.), *'New security challenges in postcommunist Europe: Securing Europe's East'* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 43-67.

Wendt, Alexander. *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999);

Wohlforth, William C. 'The Stability of a Unipolar World', *International Security*, 24:4, (1999), 5-41.

Yost, David 'Transatlantic relations and peace in Europe', International Affairs, 78, 2 (2002), pp. 277-300.

Young, Oran. *'Governance in World Affairs'* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999)

Young, Oran. *'International Governance: Protecting the Environment in a Stateless Society'* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994)

Official Documents:

The Alliance New Strategic Concept, North Atlantic Council, November 7-8, 1991, Rome

The Alliance Strategic Concept, North Atlantic Council, April 23-24, 1999, Washington, DC

Communication from the Commission on Conflict Prevention (European Commission, COM [2002] 211 Final, 11 April 2001

Commission's Country Strategy of 2002-2006 of 27 December 2002 (Country Strategy Paper 2000-2006, National Indicative Programme, 2002-2003, Russian Federation, European Commission, 27 December 2001, Brussels.

The EU-Russia Joint Declaration on Strengthening Dialogue and Cooperation on Political and Security Matters in Europe, www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations.
30. October 2000, Paris

Göteborg European Council: Presidency conclusions (Swedish Presidency)
www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth160601_en.pdf
15-16 June 2001,Göteborg

Western European Union, Council of Ministers, 'Petersberg Declaration', 19 June 1992, Bonn