



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Department of Political Science

STV103
ht 2005
Tutor: Magnus Jerneck

Soft and Hard Power?

A Comparison of the EU and the US Foreign Policy Actions

Emma Casserlöv
Emilia Perna

Abstract

The European Union is often portrayed as a soft, civilian power. In this thesis we question this view of the Union, by comparing it to the United States of America; usually described as a hard power user. We compare the foreign policy actions of the EU and the US in the seventeen conflicts of 2004. With the help of K. J. Holsti's division of strategies to exercise power we create our own tool for analysis by dividing the actions into hard and soft power.

Our analysis of the material suggests that the EU and the US are not very different actors after all. The results show that it is not accurate to describe the EU as a soft power as it often acts with hard power. Probably the truth about EU as an international actor lies somewhere in between the idea of the soft 'civilian power' and the hard 'military power'.

Key words: Foreign policy, the EU, the US, soft power, hard power.

Characters: 81 668

Table of contents

1	Are Americans from Mars and Europeans from Venus?	1
1.1	Material and Method	2
1.2	Disposition	2
2	Foreign Policy	3
2.1	Definition	3
2.2	The European Foreign Policy	3
2.3	How to Research Foreign Policy Actions.....	5
3	EU and US Foreign Policy Actions in Major Armed Conflicts.....	9
3.1	Algeria	9
3.1.1	The European Union.....	10
3.1.2	The United States.....	10
3.1.3	Discussion	10
3.2	Burundi	11
3.2.1	The European Union.....	11
3.2.2	The United States.....	11
3.2.3	Discussion	12
3.3	Chechnya	12
3.3.1	The European Union.....	12
3.3.2	The United States.....	13
3.3.3	Discussion	13
3.4	Colombia.....	14
3.4.1	The European Union.....	14
3.4.2	The United States.....	14
3.4.3	Discussion	15
3.5	India, Kashmir.....	15
3.5.1	The European Union.....	15
3.5.2	The United States.....	16
3.5.3	Discussion	16
3.6	Iraq.....	17
3.6.1	The European Union.....	17
3.6.2	The United States.....	18
3.6.3	Discussion	18
3.7	Israel	18
3.7.1	The European Union.....	19
3.7.2	The United States.....	19
3.7.3	Discussion	20
3.8	Myanmar/Burma	20
3.8.1	The European Union.....	20
3.8.2	The United States.....	22
3.8.3	Discussion	22

3.9	Nepal.....	22
3.9.1	The European Union.....	22
3.9.2	The United States.....	23
3.9.3	Discussion.....	23
3.10	Peru.....	23
3.10.1	The European Union.....	24
3.10.2	The United States.....	24
3.10.3	Discussion.....	24
3.11	The Philippines.....	26
3.11.1	The European Union.....	26
3.11.2	The United States.....	26
3.11.3	Discussion.....	27
3.12	Rwanda.....	27
3.12.1	The European Union.....	27
3.12.2	The United States.....	27
3.12.3	Discussion.....	29
3.13	Sri Lanka.....	29
3.13.1	The European Union.....	29
3.13.2	The United States.....	30
3.13.3	Discussion.....	30
3.14	Sudan.....	30
3.14.1	The European Union.....	31
3.14.2	The United States.....	31
3.14.3	Discussion.....	32
3.15	Turkey.....	32
3.15.1	The European Union.....	32
3.15.2	The United States.....	33
3.15.3	Discussion.....	33
3.16	Uganda.....	33
3.16.1	The European Union.....	33
3.16.2	The United States.....	34
3.16.3	Discussion.....	34
3.17	The War against Al-Qaida.....	34
3.17.1	The European Union.....	34
3.17.2	The United States.....	35
3.17.3	Discussion.....	35
4	A European Journey to Mars?.....	36
5	Conclusions.....	39
6	References.....	41

1 Are Americans from Mars and Europeans from Venus?

Americans generally see the world divided between good and evil, between friends and enemies, while Europeans see a more complex picture. When confronting real or potential adversaries, Americans generally favour policies of coercion rather than persuasion, emphasizing punitive sanctions over inducements to better behaviour, the stick over the carrot. Europeans insist they approach problems with greater nuance and sophistication. They try to influence others through subtlety and indirection. They are more tolerant of failure, more patient when solutions don't come quickly. They generally favour peaceful responses to problems, preferring negotiation, diplomacy, and persuasion to coercion (Kagan 2002).

It is often claimed that the US and the EU are two very different types of international actors. Kagan expresses this by saying that the Americans are from Mars and the Europeans from Venus (2002). He is far from alone to formulate the difference between the Europe and the US as a difference of exercise of power. The US is in favour of "hard" power, whereas the EU is pictured as a civilian power, using "soft" foreign policy instruments. There is no doubt which side Kagan is on, as an American conservative. But even the ones favouring the European way claim that there is a difference. Parag for example means that the EU through massive use of soft power has made the hard power out of fashion (2004:67).

In some cases the difference in use of power is obvious, like the differing treatment of the "rogue states" (Iran, Iraq, North Korea) by the US and the EU (Smith 2003:16). And some scholars mean that as long as the EU is not a military might, it has no power in the real Hobbesian world (Gordon 1997).

We are interested in if the EU and the US really differ that much in foreign policy actions. There are lots of scholars claiming that there is a wide difference but we have not found any systematic comparisons of it. It is taken for granted that whereas the US reacts to crises with coercion, the EU response is one of declaratory statements and persuasion.

This is where our research begins. The purpose of this thesis is to find out whether it is true that there is such a wide difference between EU and US foreign policy actions. By comparing how the EU and the US have acted towards the countries with major armed conflicts in 2004, we hope to be able to provide an answer to the question; **Is it correct to describe the European Union as a soft power and the United States as a hard power, when it comes to foreign policy?**

1.1 Material and Method

We have chosen to concentrate on CFSP activities when assessing the EU policy actions towards third countries; we discuss this more thoroughly in the next chapter. As a result our research material consists mainly of primary sources, such as Presidency statements, declarations, joint actions and sanctions of the European Union, as well as speeches by Javier Solana, the High Representative of CFSP.

When it comes to the US material, we have primarily searched the homepage of the US Department of State and the White House page, where material on US policy towards third countries can be found. All economic and trade sanctions in force are to be found on the US Treasury homepage.

We have also used a lot of news-related material, country reports and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) Database when getting basic knowledge of the conflicts. The Uppsala Conflict Database has provided us with useful material as well.

Secondary material such as academic works has formed a theoretical framework for our research; ideas of scholars like Holsti and Nye have guided us in our study.

By studying this material we are making a comparative analysis of the foreign policies of European Union (CSFP) and the United States. By not just focusing on one case – which might be misleading – we have chosen to systematically compare the EU and US policies towards the major armed conflicts of 2004. It seemed appropriate to focus on major armed conflicts as they are likely to produce some kind of reaction from both the EU and the US.

1.2 Disposition

Our thesis consists of four chapters. In the next part, chapter two, we discuss and introduce our definition of foreign policy; what it consists of and how the complex foreign policy of the EU is understood in this thesis. In addition we discuss how foreign policy can be studied according to some scholars, and define what we mean by hard and soft power.

Chapter three is the core of this paper; the study of the European Union and US foreign policies in the major armed conflicts of 2004. In this chapter we shortly describe the conflicts and discuss both the EU and the US position towards these conflicts.

Finally in chapter four and five, we discuss and analyse the possible differences in soft and hard power usage, as well as represent our concluding remarks.

2 Foreign Policy

To be able to carry out a foreign policy analysis, it is vital for us to answer some questions. What is foreign policy; is it possible to compare the CFSP with the foreign policy of the United States and what kind of policy instruments can be used and studied?

2.1 Definition

It is hard to try to find an unambiguous description of the concept 'foreign policy'. Cohen and Harris have described the problem fittingly:

There is a certain discomfort in writing about foreign policy for no two people seem to define it in the same way, disagreements in approach often seem to be deep-seated, and we do not yet know enough about it to be able to say with confidence whether it may be differentiated from all other areas of public policy' (Carlsnaes 2002:334)¹

Cohen and Harris underline the problem of the plural nature of the EU very well.

We see foreign policy in accordance with Smith, who understands the concept of foreign policy widely, meaning the activity of developing and managing relationships between the European Union and other international actors. Foreign policy therefore promotes the European Union values and interests (Smith 2003:2). The actions of the state, or the EU, are consequently central when studying foreign policy.

2.2 The European Foreign Policy

While the US foreign policy can be seen as state-centric and based on the more traditional models of foreign policy, the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) is something unique and has to be discussed more thoroughly before doing a comparison.

The CFSP decision-making is intergovernmental. Thus the CFSP has no direct use of Community instruments and the decision-making has developed outside the Community structures. This has made the CFSP practice one of non-binding declaratory diplomacy, common statements, declarations and *démarches*. The European Council sets the overall policy guidelines and stipulates the objectives

¹ Originally Cohen & Harris 1975:318

of the CFSP. Common positions and joint declarations, which are important sources of our research, are decided upon by the General Affairs Council (Marsh & Mackensteen 64f).

Ginsberg reminds the scholars of international relations of the fact that comparing and assessing the EFP as if the EU was a state is a “slippery slope”. He continues, “such a criterion for comparison is bound to result in the conclusion that the EU fails miserably as an international political actor because it does not have all the assets and sovereignty associated with statehood, including resort to military force” (2001:12). It is therefore a complex and unique policy domain to research, as the European Union can be seen as something in between states and international organisations.

It may seem problematic to talk about foreign policy when it comes to the EU, since it is not a traditional nation state but a completely new sort of player in the international system. As Maria Strömvik puts it; “The reluctance among analysts to assign to the phenomenon the epithet of *foreign policy* seem to depend on the commonly held view that there is very little of a full-fledged ‘EU foreign policy’ of the type that would be expected from a typical nation state. Giving it names which include the word diplomacy is thus often, at least implicitly, a suggestion that the CFSP is little more than typical diplomatic relations between states” (2005:8f). But the fact *is* that the CFSP is active in many ways which makes it more than just a diplomatic cooperation. What can be questioned though is the influence of the CFSP compared to for example the US foreign policy (Strömvik 2005:9). A capacity-expectations gap is said to exist, which means that the European Union is expected to do more than it currently does.

However, that is a question of efficiency and influence, which we are not interested in measuring here. We are interested in the foreign policy outputs, the actions, not the effects. In that way we think that the EU and the US are fully comparable, as there are enough similar and comparable patterns in the range of instruments that they use (White 1989:5). This makes our study motivated.

Some differences between the US and EU capabilities in its relations with the rest of the world are obvious. The most obvious difference is that the US has a greater possibility to use its military force, *unilaterally*, in conflicts. The threat of force and use of force, in the traditional meaning, are sanctions which only can be deployed by the US. It has to be remembered though, that the European Union has a more important collective presence in military domain than is often suggested. EU countries form an important majority of NATO members (19 out of 26) and EU dialogue, co-operation and co-ordination with NATO is significantly increasing (Marsh & Mackensteen 2005:53). The European Union’s use of force is complicated though, with the lack of functioning military instruments and an effective co-ordination application of foreign policy tools (ibid. 54f).

European foreign policy is much more than just the CFSP as the “EU produces foreign policy within all three pillars, as well as ‘across’ them – in that decisions involve policy instruments from one or more pillars” (Smith 2003:2f.). The Commission, for example, conducts all economic external relations. But as it is impossible to look at all the foreign relations within the EU-machinery in a paper of this length, we choose to concentrate on the CFSP statements and the actions

taken within the CFSP. It is, after all, only within the frames of CFSP that a *common* foreign policy is formulated and it is here that the political, diplomatic and security-related questions are discussed.

2.3 How to Research Foreign Policy Actions

Now that we have defined foreign policy in general and European foreign policy in particular, we need to know how to research foreign policy actions. As we are going to make a comparative analytical research of how the foreign policy of the European Union and the United States is exercised in a set of conflicts, we need to know what to compare. The focus will be on the formulation of the policies. We are therefore not researching why the European Union or the US have taken a certain position in some questions, or the result of those positions; that would make our study far too extensive.

Brian White writes that a 'foreign policy analysis must involve going beyond a description of policy past and present to asking why states behave in the way that they do and investigating how foreign policy is made' (1989:5). Our paper is not a foreign policy analysis in this strict meaning, as we are primarily interested in finding out whether the US and the EU foreign policy differ from each other. Our study should rather be placed into the field of comparative foreign policy studies. Nevertheless, like a foreign policy analysis, we have our focus on two actors and the ways in which they relate to the international environment. Accordingly, we are trying to research whether these two actors act similarly; whether the US can justifiably be described as the hard power and the European Union as the soft one (*ibid*).

A great deal of the foreign policy literature concentrates on the foreign policy behaviour and how to explain it but our approach is more straightforward and empirical. Whereas many foreign policy discussions concern outcomes, the external political impacts of the European foreign policy, we want to research the outputs, the policy *actions*.

An important question to ask when analysing foreign policy behaviour is; what does foreign policy actually consist of? What kind of instruments do states use to influence other states? To our help we will use Holsti's division of foreign policy techniques. Holsti has divided the ways to influence in six main groups; *persuasion, the offer of rewards, the granting of rewards, the threat of punishment, the infliction of non-violent punishment and force* (1995:125f). We have used this division with small adjustments, by comprising two groups into one. As it is hard for us to actually measure if any reward has been granted or not, we have made no difference between them. When analysing our material we will divide actions into the following categories:

1. **Persuasion.** This means in short initiating or discussing a proposal with another. An example of this would be a European Union Presidency Declaration encouraging or protesting against some

- developments in a conflict, without explicitly holding out the possibility of punishments or rewards.
2. **Offering and granting of rewards.** International actors such as the EU and the US might promise a conflict party something if they comply with their initiatives.
 3. **The threat of punishment.** Here we have taken into account Holsti's division of both (1) positive threats, such as boycott, embargo, tariffs and use of force, and (2) threats of deprivation, where the EU and the US threaten to withdraw foreign aid or in other ways reduce already achieved benefits.
 4. **The infliction of non-violent punishment.** These types of sanctions might escalate to more serious actions. They can include imposing of the positive and negative threats listed above, or breaking of the diplomatic relations and organizing blockades (such as for international movement of assets). We have also counted the listing of terrorist to this group as it fits best under "breaking of diplomatic relations".
 5. **Force.** In this category we include not only military intervention but also indirect military support, like open supply of weapons, to one of the warring parties. We have also chosen to include peacekeeping military operations in this category.

In order to compare which kind of power is mostly used by the US and the EU we must divide the actions listed above into hard and soft power.

It is not easy to define the concept of soft power, as disputes over the issue are widespread between international scholars. The EU is however often described as a soft or civilian power. Joseph Nye was the first to talk about soft power in a Foreign Policy article in 1990. He defines soft power as a power based on intangible or indirect influences such as culture, values, and ideology; it is the ability to make others do something by persuading them instead of using instruments such as military coercion or economical carrots and sticks (Nye 2003:74f.). Hanns W. Maull on the other hand describes a civilian, soft power, as a non-military actor; a mainly economic player (Carlsnaes 2004)

As we see, the conception of soft power has been given different meanings by different scholars. In this paper we perceive soft power as *positive* foreign policy techniques – persuasion and offering and granting of rewards. Carrots are soft policy instruments, sticks are not.

Hard power in its hardest form is military coercion. We could also define hard power by saying that hard power is what soft power is not. And soft power is not generally understood as *coercion* through military, economic (for example aid, bribes and sanctions) or diplomatic power (Nye 2003:74f.). By using this simple categorisation, we can divide Holsti's foreign policy instruments into soft and hard power only with small adjustments.

If soft power is understood as a combination of the definitions by Nye and Maull, we can easily classify the foreign policy techniques as either hard or soft powers. *Persuasion* falls simply under the category soft power, reminding most of

Nye's idea of the persuading ability. *Offering and granting of rewards* follows the economical *positive* techniques described by Maull, such as offering carrots, and we thus classify it as a soft power technique.

As we move on to hard power, *the threat of punishment* and *the infliction of non-violent punishment* are here classified as hard power measures as they are both negative foreign policy techniques. Tariffs, quotas, boycotts, embargoes, blacklisting, freezing of assets or suspending aid can be seen as examples of negative foreign policy action. Though this listing is not comprehensive, it lists some of the most common instruments of coercion (Holsti 1995:168-170). As it is not possible in this study to take all economic coercions and economical movement between the US, the EU, and conflict countries into consideration, we are bringing up those sanctions expressly declared in administrative statements, such as European Council Presidency Declarations.

Force is probably the most difficult category to define. What exactly is use of force? Is it just when the military intervenes in an enemy country? We have chosen to classify supplying of weapons to either of the warring parties by an outside country as use of force as well. We have also chosen, after much thinking, to include peace-keeping missions (when it includes military presence) in this category. We are well aware of the fact that this is not unproblematic or uncontroversial. In some sense we take a standpoint here. The EU is often pictured as a "civilian power" and its military operations as peacekeeping, civilian force. But can such a clear-cut division be made? Karen E. Smith points to this difficulty; while peacekeeper troops may not be armed, they are still trained also to kill. This indicates the vanishing difference between peacekeeping and peacemaking. We have therefore understood peacekeeping as force, as Smith argues that it can't be even "primarily civilian in nature" (Smith 2005). Smith also reminds us of the fact that the peacekeeping missions have changed in nature, from traditional peacekeeping to more ad hoc operations and more robust forms of intervention (ibid).

3 EU and US Foreign Policy Actions in Major Armed Conflicts

In this chapter we are presenting the conflicts one by one and comparing the actions taken by the EU and the US. We are concentrating on the conflicts of 2004, when 19 major armed conflicts were going on in 17 locations. The Philippines and Sudan were suffering from two diverge conflicts. It was many times hard to separate whether the statement was directed at one conflict or the whole country. Therefore we have chosen to treat the conflicts of Sudan and the Philippines as two cases instead of four. Only three of the conflicts had been going on for less than ten years – the war against Al-Qaida and the conflicts in Darfur and Iraq.

To start with, we want to clarify the concept of major armed conflict. We have used the definition and conflict database of SIPRI, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, which conducts research on conflicts and cooperation in the field of international peace and security. According to SIPRI's definition, a major armed conflict is a conflict with at least 1000 battle-related deaths in any one year of the conflict. It is also a "contested incompatibility which concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths" (SIPRI, "Major Armed Conflicts").

In the rest of the chapter we are, conflict by conflict, comparing the EU and US attitude towards conflicts of the year 2004.

3.1 Algeria

During the last decades, Algeria has been coloured by political conflict between the Algerian government and Islamic groups. The violence has continued from 1992 when the army interrupted the elections in which FIS (Front Islamique du Salut) got a majority of votes. After the elections were interrupted, FIS was declared an illegal organisation and Algeria declared to be in a state of emergency. During a political ban FIS developed an armed wing, AIS (Armée Islamique du Salut). Confrontations between Islamist groups and military junta have led to over 150 000 victims during the last decade (Flashpoint –Algeria).

3.1.1 The European Union

The European Union has in its declarative statements underlined the need for a lasting peace and reconciliation and most of all a greater respect for human rights, leading to a prosperous and secure society (Presidency Declaration 101005). *Persuasive* CFSP statements are to be found from the year 1995 onwards. The European Union has continuously underlined the importance of political and economic reform process in the country. As a carrot it has also stressed the possibility of a deeper economic relation between EU and Algeria, within the frames of Euro-Mediterranean co-operation (Bulletin EU 9-1997).

This co-operation agreement, the EU-Algeria Association Agreement, was finally signed in 2002. The Agreement is aiming towards political consultations and striving for fighting together against terrorism. It also underlines the European Union's support for Algeria in its economic reform and social development as well as in human rights (Council Decision 120402).

3.1.2 The United States

During the conflict the United States has made some declarations about its will to support the development of the stability in the region (Press Statement 180805). The United States has trusted in the *use of force*, when it abandoned its arms embargo against Algeria in 2003. US government openly began to supply the military junta with military equipment in its fight against Islamic rebels (Uppsala Conflict Database – Algeria).

The US has actively developed the cooperation between the Algerian and US militaries. The cooperation has expanded to the first formal joint military dialogue, in 2005. For example military education and training programs are organised by the US for Algerian military personnel training (U.S. Department of State - Algeria 05/11)

3.1.3 Discussion

The EU and the US have generally published very few statements concerning the political situation in Algeria. Both actors have chosen to support the undemocratically chosen military junta of Algeria. While the European Union has been mainly deliberate and declarative in its few CSFP statements, the US have actually taken force into use by supporting the Algerian government with military equipment. In Algeria's case the European Union can be seen as the soft power, whereas the US acts the hard role by supplying weapons and military cooperation.

3.2 Burundi

Burundi has been unstable since its independence in 1961. The country has been plagued by conflicts between dominant Tutsi minority and Hutu minority. It is estimated that 200, 000 people have been killed since 1993, when Burundi's first democratically elected president was assassinated. Many more live as refugees in the neighbouring countries (CIA World Factbook 2005 - Burundi). The National Liberation Front, FNL, is the last rebel group refusing to sign the peace treaty.

3.2.1 The European Union

The European Union has been active in condemning the ethnic violence in Burundi and has offered the government its help; the CFSP has produced 19 declarations on the situation in the country between 2003 and 2005. The declarations urge the Burundian rebel groups to take part in the negotiations and ask the Burundian government to take measures against those responsible of war crimes (e.g. Presidency Declaration 060904). Those declarations are easily sorted as *persuasion* measures.

Another trend is also visible in the statements; the EU indirectly conditions its help: "The European Union also reconfirms its readiness to support actively Burundi in its reconstruction efforts, which remains severely hampered by the ongoing violence in the absence of an all inclusive peace agreement" (Presidency Declaration 270104). We consider this as another kind of foreign policy action; *promising and granting of rewards*.

The European Union has also helped Burundi's peace process by the Commission-lead Rapid Reaction Mechanism in 2003. It supported the African Union (AU) in its mission to monitor the Cease-fire Agreement signed by the Government and rebel groups (Rapid Reaction Mechanism: Burundi). As it was not a military peacekeeping mission, and the support from the EU mainly meant paying travel expenses and fees of the support staff, we do not consider this as use of force.

3.2.2 The United States

The US reaction to the conflict in Burundi has been quite similar to that of the European Union. But the attention directed to the country is less; in the years between 2002 and 2005 there are only seven press releases on Burundi, and just a couple of remarks. The declarations are mostly directed at the rebel groups, urging them to stop fighting and search for peaceful resolutions (e.g. Boucher 2003).

Like the EU, the US has supported the AU, but to a greater extent. They have provided five million dollar to South African troops in peacekeeping operations in

Burundi, and to the South African fleet for an operation in Burundi. We consider this as *use of force*, assisting local troops with equipment and money (Snyder 2003).

3.2.3 Discussion

As we have discussed before it is not always easy to judge whether an action should be counted as use of force, or not. In this case, on the limited information that is provided, we have concluded that the US contribution to the AU should be classified as use of force, while the EU action should not. In the case of Burundi, EU is the soft power while the US, as a provider to South African troops is the hard power.

3.3 Chechnya

The crisis of Chechnya today is a continuation of the Chechen war that began in 1999. Russia sees Chechnya as a part of the country, while some Chechen groups are fighting against Kremlin rule. Violence against civilians and indiscriminate killings has become everyday life in Chechnya.

During the course of the conflict, few serious efforts have been made to negotiate a solution to the conflict. Parties have met for official talks only a couple of times, but discussions have to date not been fruitful (Uppsala Conflict Database –Chechnya).

3.3.1 The European Union

The question of Chechnya has been described as a thorn in the side of the cooperation between the EU and Russia. The European Union condemned Russian actions in heated arguments in the Helsinki summit of 1999, in the beginning of the second Chechen war. From the beginning of the conflict EU has insisted that Russia should avoid using force and instead solve the conflict with the Chechens through political dialogue. The European Union has been a strong criticiser of human right violations in Chechnya (Presidency Statement 301299).

The war in Chechnya is today still one of the issues most frequently discussed at EU-Russia summits. In the beginning of the conflict the G8 and the EU threatened to isolate Moscow if the onslaught in Chechnya would continue (Traynor & O’Kane). Thus, the European Union has a history of criticizing some of Russian internal affairs, but no direct sanctions or other measures have been taken (Bendersky, 041004).

Despite the fact that the situation in Chechnya has not changed, the European Union wants to assist on a socio-economic recovery in the North Caucasus with

the acceptance of Russian authorities. This can be seen as a further sign of EU willingness to cooperate in the region (The EU-Russia Relations).

Generally, the CFSP Statements concerning Chechnya have been lame and decreased over the years. During 2000- 2005 there are only two CFSP common statements (e.g. Presidency Declaration 081003). After the G8's and the EU's *threat of punishment* in the beginning of the conflict, the policy of the European Union towards Chechnya has lately been restricted mainly to *persuasion*.

3.3.2 The United States

The US policy against Chechnya is a bit double-edged. On the one hand, the US is eager to underline its special relationship with Russia, which is an ally in the fight against terrorism ("Background Note: Russia") but on the other hand the US shows its concern about the Chechen war: "It is [sic!] very tragic conflict that has been going on for too long a period of time. We have encouraged the Russian government to seek a political solution and over the years that the conflict has been underway, we have continued to encourage political efforts to find a solution" (Powell 2004).

But the pressure put on Russia is not very hard as the Chechen war is seen as internal matter for Russia, and all the US can do is to encourage Russia to respect the human rights (Black 2003). The word encourage is often used, and makes us draw the conclusion that the US pressure on Russia is not very hard. Towards the Chechen terrorists the action is harder; many Chechen groups have been designated as terrorist groups under the Executive Order 13224 (ibid.). This is a clear example of an *infliction of non-violent punishment*.

3.3.3 Discussion

After the terror attacks in New York many western countries have been unwilling to criticize Russian actions in Chechnya. This can be seen in the statements of the EU and US as well.

To Brussels, political solutions to conflicts are preferred to military ones. The EU has condemned the use of violence in the conflict and strongly talked for a negotiated solution. Even though CFSP statements concerning Chechnya have not been given very often, the issue is often on the table in EU-Russia Summits. The most severe response to the continuing crisis seems however to be *the threat of punishment*, isolating the Russia from G8.

The US is more careful in its approach to Russia, but harder on the terrorist groups in Chechnya. The US has imposed sanctions against Chechen groups. Both the EU and the US has thus used hard power in this conflict.

3.4 Colombia

The Colombian 40 year civil war is mainly fought between groups striving for more land, as most of it is in the hands of the drug dealers and major land owners (Lehtonen 060900). Colombian society is highly segregated and poorer Colombians have provided a breeding ground for left-wing insurgents. The other end of the political spectrum consists of right-wing paramilitaries, funded by the mafia, set up to protect the landowners from left-wing rebels. Later on groups have become involved in the Colombian drug trafficking and kidnapping (BBC News 240505).

3.4.1 The European Union

The European Union has repeatedly declared its willingness to support a sustainable and peaceful negotiated solution to the conflict on different occasions (Presidency Declaration 300604). It has regretted the lack of the terrorist group FARC's willingness to make progress in the peace talks. Terrorist are also blamed for placing obstacles in the way of implementation of the European Union support programme announced in Brussels on 30 April 2001 and of bilateral cooperation projects (Presidency Declaration 300701). Another Colombian terrorist group, National Liberation Army, is also to be found on the EU terrorist list (Electronic List of Persons...). The EU response to the Colombian conflict has therefore been the infliction of *non-violent punishment*.

The European Union together with the UN have intensified their efforts to achieve a negotiated peace, but have not accepted military initiatives from the Colombian side. The EU states got divided in their attitude towards Colombian governments Plan Colombia. While Britain and Spain stood behind the plan, Belgium, Finland, Holland, Italy and Sweden were sceptical. Finally, the European Union stated that they do not believe there are purely military solutions available to solve the conflict. Sceptics accused that instead of fighting the demand for cocaine and money laundering, the civil war was going to be brought to its head with more weapons (Munive, 060900).

3.4.2 The United States

The United States has increased its military aid since year 2000 in this conflict, following Plan Colombia. The aim of the plan is to provide Colombian forces with training, equipment and intelligence to root out drug traffickers and to destroy cocaine crops (BBC News 240505). The most important part of the crops is cultivated in the southern parts of the country, which are controlled by the biggest rebel group, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, FARC

(Munive, 060900). The US interest in the problems is easily understood, as up to ninety percent of the cocaine on American markets comes from Colombia (BBC News 240505).

3.4.3 Discussion

Both the EU and the US consider the main rebel group FARC of Colombia to be a terrorist organisation (BBC News 270505). This is a gesture of hard power, an infliction of a non-violent punishment towards the terrorist organisation.

The European Union and the US have nonetheless gone their separate ways. While the European Union is mainly using non-violent diplomatic and economical incentives and non-violent hard power, the US has accepted the Colombian Government's plan to fight the rebel groups with *force*. As much as opposed by the Union, the military solution is now carried out instead of negotiated peace. Military "intervention" was nevertheless wanted by Colombian authorities.

In this question EU still wanted to continue in 'half hard' and soft manners, as the US were ready to go all the way.

3.5 India, Kashmir

The Kashmir dispute is said potentially to be one of the most dangerous conflicts in the world. Nuclear-armed India and Pakistan have had a long history of disputes over Kashmir. 1947 Kashmir was divided in two parts two thirds given to India and one third to Pakistan. The UN Security Council's resolution ordered that the Kashmiris themselves should have the final word whether they wanted to be part of Pakistan or India. Until today no referendum has been put in order, as India seems to be unwilling to give up the territory (BBC News 070405). Different groups are fighting for Kashmir independence or for a shift to Pakistani rule. At the present, it is said, the prevailing political tendency among the militants in Kashmir is pro-Pakistani and heavily religious (BBC News 060405).

3.5.1 The European Union

EU condemns the conflict in its declarations and encourages the parties India and Pakistan to continue the negotiations. Officially the European Union has, nevertheless, turned down a bigger role in the conflict (Presidency Declaration 111002). As the High Representative of the European Union Foreign Policy Javier Solana has put it:

Although the EU doesn't want a mediation task, we would like really these two important countries of the region de-escalate tension. The world at large and particularly the EU wish for the dialogue and de-escalation as early as possible [...] And from there on, we have been working on that peace process, which unfortunately still has not been resolved.

We will continue doing more. But for the moment, India and Pakistan, they want to resolve their concerns by themselves and I will respect that (Virk, 280202).

The European Union has been performing rather inactively in the Kashmir conflict. As the previous statement of Solana shows, the EU respects the two conflicting countries' will to solve the problem on their own.

The European Union has however stated its readiness to work with India and Pakistan and with others in the international community, to work on the crisis between the two countries and to encourage efforts to settle their differences through bilateral dialogue (Presidency Declaration 111002). The EU will therefore negotiate the India and Pakistani situation in accordance with the rest of the international community.

3.5.2 The United States

The United States' attitude towards the Kashmir conflict has not been a too active one either. The country speaks for an increased dialogue between India and Pakistan, underlining simultaneously the need for cooperation in order to fight international terrorism (White House Press Briefing 011105). The Kashmir regional militia is associated with al-Qaida (Bush 111105).

The US has historically used diplomatic means towards India and Pakistan, by putting financial sanctions on countries because of their nuclear weapon testing. Later these sanctions have been lifted, though (Hufbauer, Gary C.). The US also used hard diplomatic pressure against Pakistani leader Pervez Musharraf. Musharraf promised to try to decrease and control the amount of Islamic extremists fighting in Kashmir (Gupta & Leather).

South Asia's importance in general has risen after 9/11. The US and Pakistani cooperation in the fight towards international terrorism as well as the US relations with India have developed in recent years. The US role seems to be trying to reduce tensions between the parties by *persuading* tactics (ibid.). In general the US declarations encourage a dialogue and confidence building as well as fight against terrorism in the Kashmir region. And similar to the EU the US also respects the nuclear countries' will to solve their own disputes.

3.5.3 Discussion

Both the EU and the US have underlined their respect to India's and Pakistan's will to bilaterally solve the problems. On the other hand they have stated their wish to listen and help parties through the international community. The conflict in Kashmir certainly is problematic. Here we are discussing two nuclear countries, which both claim their rights in a very sensitive issue, the future of Kashmir. This might be one reason why both the EU and the US have used soft power; declarative and *persuasive* methods towards the conflict parties.

3.6 Iraq

The current conflict in Iraq is a result of the latest Iraqi war (the US-led invasion). The conflict has continued after the removal of President Hussein from power, as regime loyalists, terrorist groups and foreign warriors have continued fighting. One of the major groups partly causing the current conflict is the Shi'a led Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SCIRI), fighting for the rights of the Shi'a majority. The group has been in opposition during the Hussein's Sunni favoured regime, but after his defeat SCIRI and its factions became more active and have attacked both civilians and government forces (Uppsala Conflict Database –Iraq).

3.6.1 The European Union

The European Council renewed its common position on embargo towards Iraq on July 2003. Such sanctions as sales of weapons, some restrictions on trade in cultural goods, freezing of funds were reinforced (Council Common Position 2003/495/CFSP).

The role of the European Union in Iraq has been that of a strong supporter of a peaceful process from the very beginning of the war. The EU was strongly supporting the Resolutions of the UN (Presidency Statement 141102). Despite the opposition to a US-led invasion to Iraq in many European countries, the European Union has taken a more positive stand in its contribution to the peaceful recovery and democracy building in the country.

The European Union as a whole is more known for its contributions to the reconstruction of Iraq. The EU for example hosted a conference leading to the establishment of the International Reconstruction Facility for Iraq and is the largest single donor of humanitarian assistance in Iraq. The European Union has also represented a long term strategy for Iraq; “The European Union and Iraq – a Framework for Engagement”. This programme discusses mainly the assistance on economical, humanitarian and further societal development issues (European Union Factsheet 05/07).

The European countries have been involved in many aspects of the effort to bring stability, democracy and prosperity to Iraq, but we see it is questionable to speak of a clear common policy. After the uprising of conflict in 2004 CFSP statements have been as common as non-existing, even if several rebel groups are banned as terrorist organisations.

The European Union commitment is blamed for being inefficient and unpredictable. The European Union common policy is mainly words as longstanding commitments of the EU are difficult to foresee. The EU itself seems to be keen on keeping up the impression of the EU's military assistance as well, as almost half of its member states have contributed forces to Iraq (Youngs, 10/04).

3.6.2 The United States

In January 2002, the US President Bush linked Iraq to the “axis of evil”. After this a lot has happened. On November 30th 2005 Bush presented a program called the “National Strategy for Victory in Iraq”. It is answering the critics who claim that the US plan to leave and let the people of Iraq solve the problems themselves. Contrary to these arguments the US is in this strategic paper guaranteeing a long term interest to make Iraq a peaceful nation with no connections with international terrorism (White House 301105). In the plan the Bush regime has declared its will to conclude the chapter it started in Iraq and that the American forces will ‘remain in Iraq as long as necessary, and not a day more’ (National Strategy for Victory in Iraq, 2005).

3.6.3 Discussion

The policies of the European Union and the United States have differed in the question of the continuing conflict in Iraq. The European Union could not possibly have operated in the Iraqi question as the US did. This is not just a question of different attitudes and approaches towards the world politics, but also a question of capacity. The United States has a far stronger military capacity to stay and manage conflicts, not to mention a more *united* policy. The European Union has clearly had problems to form a common position in this question.

It is clear that the United States has been the uppermost hard power user in the whole Iraqi conflict. Even though the European Union was divided in the question of Iraqi war, many member countries and the EU as a whole have been active in the reconstruction area, some offering more military assistance than others. The European Union itself recognizes in CFSP statements its policy as a common EU contribution, which we want to question. As a conclusion it is possible to state, that the US *force* contributions can be seen more unilateral, comprehensive and definite. Even though the European Union countries have used force and the EU talks of the community effort, outputs are somewhat weaker than the US’. The European Union has nevertheless been a hard power user by *inflicting a non-violent punishment* on Iraq.

3.7 Israel

The conflict between Israelis and Palestinians has been going on for decades and has roots almost 2000 years back in time. Many efforts have been made to establish peace in the region, with little success. The latest effort by “The Quartet” of the UN, the US, the EU and Russia is called “the Road Map for Peace”. The Israeli retreat from Gaza was a part of the Road Map (“Israel Conflict Summary”). As the roots of this conflict are very old, it is also very complicated and Europe and the US have been involved for a long time.

3.7.1 The European Union

The European Union is deeply involved in the peace process between Israel and Palestine, with a two-state solution as the goal (Solana 2005). The cooperation between the Union and Israel and Palestine is extensive; they are both partners in the EU's Neighbourhood Policy. The EU is the largest donor to Palestinians and is the most important trade partner for Israel ("The EU – Committed to the Middle East Peace Process"). European support in the area is strong; the latest contribution to the peace process is monitoring the Rafah passage between Israel and Egypt (Council Joint Action 2005/889CFSP).

CFSP statements and meeting protocols show that the Union is not afraid to criticise either Israeli or Palestine authorities. Their criticism against the state of Israel concerns their settlement activities, claiming that this has nothing to do with Israel's security needs, and their practice of extra-judicial killings ("Third Meeting of the Association Council EU- Israel Luxembourg").

When it comes to Palestinian action, the EU makes clear that terrorism is not tolerated: "The European Union reaffirms that the fight against all forms of terrorism is paramount in the quest for a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East" (Presidency Declaration 200803). The EU has also inflicted economic sanctions against targeted terrorist groups, like the Palestine Liberation Front and Palestine Islamic Jihad (Council Decision 211205). This could not be viewed as anything else but as an *infliction of non-violent punishment*. It could be questioned if the EU operation at the Rafah passage should not be interpreted as a use of force. However, it does not affect the result, as the EU already use hard power in the conflict.

3.7.2 The United States

Although the US and the EU work together for Middle-East Peace, there is a rift in their approach. On the State Department's homepage it is stated that "[c]ommitment to Israel's security and well being has been a cornerstone of U.S. policy in the Middle East since Israel's creation in 1948, in which the United States played a key supporting role" ("Background Note: Israel"). This can be seen in the US' support to the Israeli Army; the US provides approximately 2 billion dollars a year in security assistance (ibid.). We consider this as *use of force*; supplying of weapons. While the Europeans see both partners responsible for the fighting, the Americans picture the conflict as an Israeli fight for survival, and since the September 11 in 2001, the global fight against terrorism has united Israel and the US. The dialogue with Israel is very friendly, the US recognises Israel's right to use force on Palestine territory in self-defence. To hold back the terrorists should be the main objective for international intervention (Black 2005). The US has placed many Palestinian organisations on its list of restrictive means against terrorists and terrorist organisations, for example the PFLP and PLF ("What You Need To Know About U.S. Sanctions").

3.7.3 Discussion

To conclude the view expressed by the EU: both Israelis and Palestinians are employing unacceptable means in the ongoing conflict. The conflict should be solved through negotiation and mediation, and result in a two-state solution. The US also works for a two-state solution but they stress the security of the Israelis, especially after 9/11.

Dialogue and cooperation is the main instrument used, by both parties. But they have both inflicted *non-violent punishment*; economic sanctions against the militant Palestinian groups. The difference in treatment is seen in their view of the conflict, and in the apparent US support of the Israeli military which we consider as *force*. Both actors have used both soft and hard power in the conflict, and it is interesting to notice that all the hard power has been directed at the Palestinians.

3.8 Myanmar/Burma

Myanmar became independent in 1948 and has been ruled by military authorities since 1962. The present military regime is the State and Peace Development Council, SPDC, which seized power in a bloody coup in 1988. The main oppositional party NLD won the 1990 general elections, with the effect that their leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, was put in house arrest and many others from the opposition became imprisoned. Aung San Suu Kyi is still in arrest and the world is troubled about her and the country's state as violations of human rights are very common in Myanmar ("The EU's relations with Burma/Myanmar").

3.8.1 The European Union

The European response to Myanmar's violations of human rights has been extensive. The CFSP Statements directed at Myanmar are many; 26 between 2003 and 2005. But the EU has done more than just declaring its discontent. In 1996 the EU Common Position on Burma/Myanmar was adopted. It confirmed earlier imposed EU sanctions and introduced new ones. The strongest EU sanctions against Myanmar today are: Arms embargo, visa ban, export ban on equipment that could be used for internal repression of terrorism, freezing of funds and ban on financing of Burmese state-owned companies ("The EU's relations with Burma/Myanmar"). All of these sanctions are examples of *infliction of non-violent punishments*.

3.8.2 The United States

Only our sanctions on Iraq are tougher (Crane 2003).

The quote above reveals the US' position towards Myanmar. The United States has imposed many sanctions on the country in order to push for democratic reforms, these sanctions include arms embargo, bans on new investment and imports, targeted asset freeze, prohibition on the export of financial services to Myanmar and the provision of financial assistance to the government, visa restrictions and suspension on all bilateral aid ("What You Need To Know About U.S. Sanctions Against Burma"). And the US is eager for others to follow its example; "The United States will continue to urge other nations to use sanctions and diplomacy to press the junta to release all political prisoners and to allow all political parties to operate freely [...] No other country joined the United States in adopting bans on investment and imports, or a prohibition on the export of financial services" ("Conditions in Burma and U.S. Policy...").

3.8.3 Discussion

The EU and the US have acted similarly with hard power; *inflicting non-violent punishments* on Myanmar. The US has gone a step further than the EU, however, in adopting bans on investment and imports.

3.9 Nepal

The conflict in Nepal stands between the government and the Maoist guerrilla which has become popular with the rural population. The situation has grown worse in recent years, with many confrontations between the government's forces and the guerrilla troops. Both the government and the rebel troops have been accused of violating human rights (Plan Sweden).

3.9.1 The European Union

The CFSP statements on Nepal are many; the EU is worried by the situation. Most of the statements urge Maoist rebels to drop their weapons and enter negotiations (e.g. Presidency Declaration 080502 and 160503) but they often also address the Government of Nepal, telling it to avoid taking actions which could hurt civilians (Presidency Declaration 080502 and 030205). The statements often refer to international norms and human rights, and call for cooperation with the UN (Presidency Declaration 030205).

What has been described above are means of persuasion. The EU has relied on diplomatic and persuasive methods when it comes to Nepal, addressing both the Government and the Maoists.

3.9.2 The United States

On the 31st of October in 2003, the Communist Party of Nepal was added to the list of blocked terror groups, all Maoist assets have been blocked and transactions and dealings with the Maoists forbidden (Office of Foreign Assets Control). The US clearly perceives the CPN as a terror threat, if the Maoists gain power it “could destabilize the wider region, and Nepal could quite easily turn into a failed state, a potential haven for terrorists like that which we have transformed in Afghanistan” (Camp 2003). The US has done more than *inflicted non-violent punishments*; it has also supplied the Nepalese Government with weapons, and has provided military training (Camp 2003). We consider this as *use of force*. It is clearly expressed that the US stands behind the Nepalese Government in its fight against the Maoists (Malinowski 2003).

3.9.3 Discussion

In the case of Nepal it is clear that the US has acted harder than the EU has. While the EU relies on dialogue with both partners, the US cooperates with the Nepalese Government in combating the terrorists. The US pictures the Maoists as terrorists and a threat to the “free world” and has imposed economic sanctions against them and provided them with military training and equipment. In other words; the EU uses solely *persuasion* whereas the US also uses the *infliction of non-violent punishment* and even *the use of force*.

3.10 Peru

Structural reforms of the 90’s were expensive to the society in terms of social indicators; they lead amongst all to increased authoritarianism and state-led corruption (Peru Country Strategy Paper). From the year 1989 the conflict has escalated between the government and the rebellious Sendero Luminoso and between the government and Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) (Uppsala Conflict Database-Peru). Some Sendero Luminoso columns have continued to conduct periodic attacks, including indiscriminate bombing campaigns like the one against the US embassy in 2002 (US Department of the Treasury -Peru).

3.10.1 The European Union

The European Union has used some economical incentives towards Peru in the year of 2000, as the Commission took the decision to freeze any new co-operation initiative while continuing the ongoing projects. This was done in order to guarantee a positive political transition after the elections and to bind the new government to follow the development path. In another Peruvian conflict (Peru-Ecuador) the Commission has also rewarded positive outcomes in economic terms. In the Peace agreements between Peru and Ecuador the Community financed the reconstruction of Piura-Guayaquil road, which was hoped to further contribute to the regional integration (Peru County Strategy Paper).

CFSP statements about the situation in Peru are as common as non-existing. Still, European Union has included Sendero Luminoso to its lists of terrorists, which can be seen as an *infliction of non-violent punishment*, hard power (Council Decision, 211205).

3.10.2 The United States

Peru is one of the major illicit drug-producing and drug-transit countries. The support and statements of the US government mostly stress this issue; there are no central statements concerning the conflict. Like the EU, the United States also supports the launch and works of the Peruvian Truth Commission. (Country Program: Peru 080502) Sendero Luminoso can also be found as a terrorist grouping in the pages of Council of Foreign Relations. (Council of Foreign Relations – terrorism)

3.10.3 Discussion

The Peruvian conflict has received rather little interest from both the European Union and the US in diplomatic terms. Both actors concentrate on economical help to get the Peruvian society on its feet and by so doing, decreasing the inequality. The low number of casualties in recent years has probably weakened the interest of western powers to interfere in the conflict. Even the US state department, which lies in the home hemisphere, has not released more than nine press releases and two remarks on the issue during the years 2002-2004. Even though the problems of Peruvian society have not been discussed in the EU or the US, both have added SL to its list of terrorist and by so doing, used hard power in the conflict.

3.11 The Philippines

The Philippine government is fighting with diverse rebel groups and two of the 19 conflicts researched are located in the Philippines. The most important rebel groups consist of two Islamic groups. The first is the Moro National Liberation Front, MNLF and its offspring Abu Sayyaf, seeking an independent Islamic state in Mindanao, and the other a communist group and its military wing, New Peoples Army, struggling for a Marxist state. Abu Sayyaf has been said to have international connections with Al Qaeda (Feickert 2005).

3.11.1 The European Union

The European Union has welcomed the news of progress in peace negotiations, and supports the efforts of the Philippine government in the fight against terrorism. Consequently, New People's Army is added to its list of terrorist, using the *infliction of non-violent punishment*. Surprisingly, the groups Abu Sayyaf and MNLF are not to be found on this list (Council of the European Union, 160305). The EU has also reaffirmed its readiness to help the new administration in addressing the priorities for the country's development (Presidency Declaration 230803).

3.11.2 The United States

The United States has alternatively offered diplomatic and financial support for the peace process in the Philippines. The Bush Administration's presence in the conflict is based on the so-called *second front against terrorism* in the Philippines. The Philippine Government has welcomed the help against the fight on terrorism. The US and the Philippines have intensified military training, military civil affairs and humanitarian projects. In 2003, the United States designated the Philippines as a Major Non-NATO Ally (US Department of State 05/09).

The US military operations in the Philippines are part of the US-initiated Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). The military component of the operations is said to be only one aspect in this endeavour. Also diplomatic, intelligence, law enforcement and financial help are used to fight terrorism (Feickert 2005).

Although the Philippine constitution limits the US military participation in operations in the Philippines, the US presence in the region has been firm. US involvement has been criticised to complicate the insurgency dilemma by leading to US antipathies in Islamite rebels. Nevertheless program for combating terrorist group Abu Sayyaf is hoped to give a strong message of united counterterrorism fight in Asia (Feickert 2005).

3.11.3 Discussion

The United States has taken a more powerful role in the Philippine conflicts than the EU has. As the Philippine government welcomed the help against the continuing terrorism on the island, the US government was ready to step in providing *force*. For the US the Philippines form an important part of a bigger puzzle – the combat against international terrorism. Abu Sayyaf is alleged to have connections with Al Qaeda, which has led to a more profound US interest in Southeast Asia (Feickert 2005).

3.12 Rwanda

Post-colonial Rwanda has been torn by ethnic conflicts between Hutus and Tutsis. The civil war culminated in the terrible genocide in 1994. Rwanda is still very unstable and in 2004 there was fighting between the rebel group FDLR (Democratic Liberation Forces of Rwanda) and Rwandan troops. The FDLR made an incursion into the Democratic Republic of Congo and Burundi in 2004 (Uppsala Conflict Database – Rwanda).

3.12.1 The European Union

The FDLR incursion into the neighbouring countries was met with a few statements expressing the EU's concern for the development and calling for the United Nations Organisation Mission in the Congo to intervene immediately (Presidency Statement 100504). The Council urged all the states in the region to contribute for regional stability (Council of the European Union 140604). And Javier Solana invited to a structured political dialogue between the EU and Rwanda, to help improve democracy and human rights in the country (Solana 100304). All of these steps taken are clear examples of soft actions, means of *persuasion*.

3.12.2 The United States

A similar reaction came from the United States after the instabilities in 2004: “We share Rwanda's concern about the threat posed to Rwanda's security, and that of the Congo and Uganda, by armed groups in eastern Congo” (Boucher 031204). The US has arranged meetings between Rwanda, Congo and Uganda to solve the regions' problems (ibid.).

3.12.3 Discussion

The events in Rwanda in 2004 produced a similar reaction from both the EU and the US. Both actors called for more dialogue and cooperation in the region; a clear display of soft power.

3.13 Sri Lanka

During the British colonial power Tamil labour force was imported from southern parts of India to Sri Lanka. Later, ethnical and cultural differences and aspirations to power have lead to increasing ethnic tensions and civil war, with the Tamils claiming an independent Tamil state (Eelam). After the ceasefire agreement of 2002 there have been several serious violations (BBC News 271105). Especially the killing of the Sri Lankan Foreign Minister has been a severe blow to the peace process (BBC News 130805).

3.13.1 The European Union

The European Union has assisted in the conflict with humanitarian relief operations (Sri Lanka: Country Strategy Paper 2002-2006). The European Union has also strongly supported the Cease Fire Agreement in statements. In a special program it has supported the rehabilitation of electricity lines to improve movement of people between the former conflict zones (BBC News 130805). Thus, the European Union has offered rewards to the parties of conflict if the conflict can be solved in a good manner. If the cease fire agreement between the government and the LTTE would hold and the peace talks can continue, the EU has pointed to the possibility of larger rehabilitation operations (Sri Lanka: Country Strategy Paper 2002-2006). Even though the EU is not acting as the most active peace facilitator in the conflict, it is trying to use its strong economical backbone and economical incentives to attract parties to the continuing peace negotiations.

The European Union has also condemned the actions of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and demanded all parties to commitment and responsibility The Union has used strong words towards LTTE:

The European Union is actively considering the formal Listing of the LTTE as a terrorist organisation. In the meantime, the European Union has agreed that with immediate effect, delegations from the LTTE will no longer be received in any of the EU Member States until further notice. [...] The European Union has also agreed that each Member State will, where necessary, take additional national measures to check and curb illegal or undesirable activities (including issues of funding and propaganda) of the LTTE, its related organisations and known individual supporters (Declaration 12669/1/05 REV).

The European Union's statement can be seen as a *threat of punishment* towards LTTE, as the possibility to get in to the negotiation table is prominently smaller for an organisation considered as a terrorist group. In many individual countries the LTTE is already proscribed as a terrorist group, even though it still cannot be found on the official EU list (BBC News 130805). In February 2001, for example, Britain labelled LTTE as terrorist under its new anti-terrorism law (BBC News 271105). The LTTE has seen the negative reaction from the EU side as a severe blow to its efforts to bolster the group's image internationally (News from Russia 280905).

The EU policy in Sri Lanka is mainly based on declarations, offering economical rewards and diplomatic threats; no direct actions have been taken – also the threat of banning LTTE has so far been just a threat. In general the EU has used both hard and soft power in this conflict.

3.13.2 The United States

The United States have also given their declarative support for Sri Lanka's pursuit of peace. President Bush has promised help in assessing how the US can best work together with Sri Lanka in order to gain lasting peace in the region (Press Briefing by Ari Fleischer). Both the European Union and the United States have stated their support to Norway as a facilitator (Joint Statement of the Sri Lanka Donor Co-chairs). The US has also been a hard power user by condemning the LTTE as a terrorist organisation.

3.13.3 Discussion

As a foremost fighter against terrorism the US has raised the question of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and their role in the international terrorism. Still the role of the both world actors has been somewhat restricted and based on the declaratory soft power and *infliction of non-violent punishment*.

3.14 Sudan

Sudan is suffering from two different conflicts. One escalated in southern Sudan in 1983 as the Sudan People's Liberation Army/Movement (SPLA/M) started to fight for a unified democratic Sudan with religious freedom. The movement has later split into several factions. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement which was signed on 9 January 2005, put an end to 22 years of conflict.

As the government negotiated with SPLM/A, another conflict broke out in the Darfur region of western Sudan. In Darfur the government-supported Arab militia, Janjaweed, has been killing citizens of black African origin (Uppsala Conflict Database – Sudan).

3.14.1 The European Union

The Council has stated that it is ready to support the African Union operations and its peace negotiations in Darfur, and to take part in an enhanced operation. The Council also decided to carry out proper measures, including sanctions, against Sudan's government and other parties of the conflict if clear development could not be seen in the direction of the European Council and the UN Security Council's demands (EU Council Press announcement 130904).

The European Union has also implemented restrictive measures against Sudan, such as restrictions on admission of persons who infringe UN arms embargo or human rights, freezing of funds and economic resources of persons who infringe UN arms embargo - applying as of April 2005 - or human rights and embargo on arms and related material (Sanctions or restrictive measures in force 05/11).

The EU has responded to the crisis in Darfur by strongly backing up the efforts led by the African Union. It has among many things provided equipment and assets as well as provision of additional military observers, training of African troops and observers and strategic and tactical transportation. The EU has also offered support to police (CIVPOL) and support for the training of CIVPOL personnel. The help to the African Union is carried out in cooperation with partners and major contributors of the international community, notably UN, US, Canada, Norway and NATO (EU Council Secretariat Fact sheet 05/10).

Sudan has been often discussed in the CFSP statements, but it has been criticised that there is a clear absence of EU presentation in southern Sudan (Lewis 2004:20).

3.14.2 The United States

The history of US suspicions about Sudan's role in international terrorism and President Bush's accusations towards the Sudanese authorities for genocide operations in Darfur have strained the relations between the countries. But the United States still has an important role in pressuring both sides into peace negotiations, and at the moment President Bush is trying to improve the ties with the government of Sudan (Sudan Tribune 221005). This could be interpreted as contradictory, as Sudan still can be found on the list of the countries which assist international terrorism.

As stated above, the United States has also reacted to Sudan's crisis by sending military troops to the war torn country. Strong support for the African Union and a political solution has been stated (Ereli 2005). The United States has also offered economical incentives by promising to lift its long-term sanctions on Sudan if the war would end (BBC News 080705).

3.14.3 Discussion

The EU and the US have acted in the crisis of Darfur with rather similar methods. Both have waived the flag of economical incentives for the warring parties, as well as provided military assistance to the country. Sanctions in several areas have also taken place concerning Sudan, both in the EU and in the US. However, most interestingly, both the EU and the US have taken part in the conflict in military manner: the EU supplying weapons and training and the US by military presence. The United States is though said to have operated in Sudan in a more wide-ranging manner. For example, it continued its operations in southern Sudan as the EU draw its assistance away (Lewis 2004: 20f). Both actors have nonetheless used hard power, force, in Sudan, as well as soft power in form of economic initiatives.

3.15 Turkey

Since 1974, when Abdullah Öcalan founded the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), Kurds have fought for an independent Kurdistan against the Turkish state. The PKK has evolved through the years and is since 2003 called KONGRA-GEL; People's Congress of Kurdistan. The fighting was most intense in the middle of the 1990's, but increased in 2004 with 166 battle-related deaths (Uppsala Conflict Database - Turkey).

3.15.1 The European Union

There are no Presidency statements on Turkey that concern the fighting with the Kurds in the years 2003-2005, or mentioning the Kurds' situation in Turkey. However, the Turkey – EU cooperation is very extensive outside the CFSP area, and the EU has very good opportunities to influence Turkey in the right direction. Since Turkey became an official candidate country in 1999, it must adapt to the EU requirements, and big steps in the human rights area have been taken. The conditions for the Kurds have this way improved (BBC News 041005).

The only statement to be found that concerns the Kurds' situation is a speech in which Javier Solana welcomes the first broadcasting of Kurdish language programs on Turkey's state television (Solana 090604).

The EU has taken measures against the KONGRA-GEL, however, by including the organisation on the list of anti-terror measures. This means that the EU has *inflicted non-violent punishments* towards the organisation (Council of the European Union 160305).

3.15.2 The United States

The US makes clear that it considers the KONGRA-GEL to be a terrorist organisation and that it cooperates with Turkey to bring the terrorists to justice (“Turkey: Allegation of...”). It is clear that the US sees Turkey as an important ally in the war against terrorism.

Naturally, the US has taken measures against the KONGRA-GEL as it is considered to be a terrorist organisation, by designating it to the Executive Order 13224 (“What You Need To Know About U.S. Sanctions”).

There has been no reaction to the situation of the Kurds in Turkey in recent years; the focus is on the fight against terrorists.

3.15.3 Discussion

The CFSP reaction to the fighting with the Kurds and the Turkish treatment of the Kurds is weak. But as the EU cooperation with Turkey is very wide and covers many aspects of the Union it is perhaps a bit misleading to just look at the CFSP activities to understand the relationship. The EU treats the KONGRA-GEL as a terrorist organisation, the same does the US. This means that they have both *inflicted non-violent punishments* against the organisation. The US, however, focuses more on the fight against terrorism and does not address the situation of the Kurds.

3.16 Uganda

Since its independence Uganda has seen a lot of violence. The country is now subject to fighting between various groups; rebels, militias and government forces. Refugees have fled the LRA (Lord’s Resistance Army) into neighbouring countries as Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Kenyan villages have also been attacked by the LRA in 2004 (CIA World Factbook – Uganda).

3.16.1 The European Union

There are not any CFSP statements on the situation in Uganda in 2004. But on a General Affairs Council meeting it is stated that: ”The Council condemned the vicious massacre of 91 civilians on 21 February in Barlonya, northern Uganda, carried out by the ‘Lord’s Resistance Army’. The use of artillery, assault rifles and rocket-propelled grenades on camp of displaced civilians was an outrage. The Council has requested EU Heads of Mission in Kampala to report on the situation” (Council Meeting 230204).

This is the only document to be found which concerns the fighting in Uganda, and it is clear the EU has used merely *persuasion* in the conflict.

3.16.2 The United States

The United States declares its great concern of the crisis which has resulted from the actions of LRA and makes clear that they will “continue to work closely with the Ugandan Government, other governments and international agencies to alleviate the suffering, and to bring the brutal rebellion by the LRA and its leader Joseph Kony to a swift and permanent end” (Boucher 121104). They also point out the special relationship between the US and Uganda, and encourages president Museveni’s economic reforms and his efforts to end human rights abuses. It is also stated that Uganda is an ally in the global war against terrorism (Background Note: Uganda).

3.16.3 Discussion

The EU and US reactions have been similar – and even though the U.S. emphasize the fight against terrorism, they have not put the LRA on the terror list. They have both used *persuasion* as the primary policy tool.

3.17 The War against Al-Qaida

Since the September 11 in 2001 a new, diffuse type of conflict has been going on. On one side stand the United States and its coalition partners – on the other the terrorists and countries that support them. After 9/11 the main military action between the US and Al Qaida has been in Afghanistan (Uppsala Conflict Database - United States of America).

3.17.1 The European Union

The European Council declared, at a special meeting on September 21 in 2001, that “terrorism is a real challenge to the world and to Europe and that the fight against terrorism will, more than ever, be a priority objective of the European Union” (Council Meeting 210901).

The sanctions in force against Al-Qaida and persons related to them are; embargo on arms and related material, embargo on certain services (for example military training) and freezing of funds and economic resources (Council Common Position 2002/402/CFSP, Council Regulation No 881/2002).

Although many of the member countries of the European Union participated in the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan, they did not do this as a part of the EU cooperation. Even after the war, many of the member countries have participated militarily, as a part of the NATO-commanded International Security Assistance Force. The EU-led presence in Afghanistan after the war has also been profound but does not involve any troops. The Union works in Afghanistan to

promote the Bonn Agreement and see to its implementation, restore the stability and promote democracy among many things (“EU’s Relations with Afghanistan”).

3.17.2 The United States

The US military action in Afghanistan after 11 September 2001 led to the overthrow of the Taliban regime, and American military is still present in the region. Except for this obvious example of *use of force*, the US has imposed economic sanctions against terrorist organisations, including the Al-Qaida. The Executive Order 13224 is the most important document on countering terrorism, it blocks the property and prohibits transaction with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism (“What You Need To Know About U.S. Sanctions”).

The American Government has clearly stated that “Although there are numerous terrorist organizations of concern in the world today, the top priority of our efforts has been on the al-Qaida organization” (Black 2004).

3.17.3 Discussion

The EU has, like the US, inflicted *non-violent punishment* on Al-Qaida and has helped to rebuild Afghanistan after the war; but has not participated in the war launched by the US. They are both hard actors in this conflict, but the United States has acted harder as they have used military *force*.

4 A European Journey to Mars?

After the extensive work of collecting and evaluating the material on the conflicts, which sometimes has been more demanding than we thought, we now stand in front of another intriguing task. It is now that we are going to answer the question; is the EU justifiably described as the soft power, and the US as the hard one?

To make conclusions possible we have put our findings together in the table below.

Country	The EU action	The US action
<i>Algeria</i>	Soft	Hard – Force
<i>Burundi</i>	Soft	Hard – Force
<i>Chechnya</i>	Hard – Threat of punishment	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment
<i>Colombia</i>	Hard – Threat of non-violent punishment	Hard – Force
<i>India</i>	Soft	Soft
<i>Iraq</i>	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment	Hard – Force
<i>Israel</i>	Hard - Infliction of non-violent punishment	Hard – Force
<i>Myanmar</i>	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment
<i>Nepal</i>	Soft	Hard – Force
<i>Peru</i>	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment	Hard – infliction of non-violent punishment
<i>The Philippines</i>	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment	Hard – Force
<i>Rwanda</i>	Soft	Soft
<i>Sri Lanka</i>	Hard – Threat of non-violent punishment	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment
<i>Sudan</i>	Hard – Force	Hard - Force
<i>Turkey</i>	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment
<i>Uganda</i>	Soft	Soft.
<i>The war against Al-Qaida</i>	Hard – Infliction of non-violent punishment	Hard – Force

As it becomes clear from the table, we have chosen to define the actor as a hard power user in conflicts where it has used one of the hard power methods. From the table we can read out that the EU has used soft power means only in six conflicts, and hard power in eleven. The US has used soft power means in three conflicts, and hard power means in fourteen. Hence, we can draw the conclusion that the US to a higher degree uses hard power, and that the EU uses soft power

more often than the US. It also becomes clear that the EU has used hard power in almost two thirds of the cases. This is an intriguing finding.

If we only look at the use of *force*, it is obvious that the US is the uppermost hard power. Force is the most common foreign policy method used by the US, while the EU only uses force in one case. However, none of the cases where the US uses force are examples of traditional military intervention. The United States' use of force consists of supplying of weapons and peacekeeping missions. It is more difficult for the European Union to support military assistance; it lacks properly functioning military instruments and an effective co-ordination of foreign policy tools.

Consequently, the EU and the US are both hard power actors, but we cannot escape the dilemma of the European Union's incapability in the military sphere. The question is whether the experiences from for example Congo will lead to an increased use of force within the frames of CFSP.

Even though it is clear that the US is a *harder* power in comparison to the EU; the foreign policy methods used by the European Union cannot be understood as soft power. Threats and punishments cannot possibly be classified as soft power. We therefore want to repeat our question: Can the EU really be called a soft power, when it mainly uses hard power techniques?

We dare to state that the soft, civilian power EU is actually dead. What we have found out in our research is that the European Union and the United States are not situated as far from another as Mars and Venus. As Smith fittingly writes: “[the EU] finds itself, like almost every other international actor on the planet, somewhere along a spectrum between the two ideal-types of civilian and military power” (Smith 2005). Even though our study points to the clear fact that the United States is a harder power, it has additionally showed that the European Union is closer to being a hard than a soft power.

5 Conclusions

This study probed a central question discussed by many scholars; is it justified to describe the European Union as a soft power and the United States as a hard one? We hope that this study partly can answer the questions about the disagreements of the European Unions character. Most importantly this study has provided an empirical and comparative analysis in a research area that has been fairly unexplored.

The main conclusions we can draw from this study is that the European Union of today is a hard power. Firstly, it is a hard power without an unambiguous force, but the means it uses differ from a traditional soft power actor. The *threat of punishments* and *infliction of non-violent punishments* are as good as everyday practises in the field of the CFSP. In most of the conflicts the European Union can be found only a step behind the United States.

Secondly, the notion of the European Union as a soft power seems to rely totally on its lack of military capability. Understanding military force as the only hard power instrument is nevertheless a misleading interpretation of the concept.

A broad research like this, without any clear previous examples in the academic world, certainly has its shortages. First of all, there are several questions to answer before starting the research, many standpoints to take and analytical tools to create. We have, nevertheless, been guided by some theoretical frameworks and formulated a functioning categorisation. It is of course exciting to be able to present interesting results in a question that has been neglected, and we feel that we have at least started to investigate an area which requires further research. We think that this research field deserves a greater interest and hope that the continuing disputes about the nature of the European Union should produce more studies.

It has been challenging to study the European foreign policy, since it not only consists of the CFSP but is exercised in all the institutions. When concentrating only on the CFSP you take the risk of missing a great deal of the external policies of the European Union. This became evident for example in the case of Turkey. Nevertheless, we wanted to concentrate on what is actually *common* in the European policies.

Many questions about the hard and soft power usage of the two big actors of the world are still unanswered. In this study it has become clear that the European Union is not situated light years away from the United States; the EU certainly is more than just a soft power plus².

² The term is used by Haine, <http://journal.georgetown.edu/issues/ws04/hainelocked.pdf>.

6 References

- ”Background Note: Russia”. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/3183.htm>. December 13 2005.
- “Background Note: Israel”. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/3581.htm#relations>. November 30 2005.
- “Background Note: Uganda”. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2963.htm#relations>. December 29 2005.
- BBC News 060405. Who are the Kashmir militants? http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/4416771.stm. November 29 2005.
- BBC News 070405. Q&A: Kashmir dispute. [\http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/2739993.stm November 29 2005
- BBC News 240505. Q&A: Colombia's civil conflict. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/1738963.stm>. November 29 2005
- BBC News 270505. Profiles: Colombia's armed groups <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/4528631.stm>. November 29 2005.
- BBC News 080705. Q&A: Peace in Sudan. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/3211002.stm> November 25 2005.
- BBC News 130805. Q&A: Sri Lanka crisis. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/2405347.stm November 20 2005
- BBC News 041005. “Country Profile: Turkey”. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/1022222.stm. December 19 2005.
- BBC News 271105. Timeline Sri Lanka. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/1166237.stm. November 30 2005.
- Bendersky, Yevgeny 041004. "The Chechnya Factor in Russia-E.U. Relations" The Power and Interest News Report (PINR) http://www.pinr.com/report.php?ac=view_report&report_id=223&language_id=1. December 15 2005.
- Black, Cofer J., 2003. “Patterns of Global Terrorism”. <http://fpc.state.gov/fpc/20118.htm>. December 13 2005.
- Black, Cofer J., 2004. “al-Qaida: The Threat to the United States and Its Allies”. <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/rm/2004/31018.htm>. January 1 2006.
- Black, Cofer J., 2005. “The New Globalization: The International Terrorist Network and How it Works”. <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/rm/2004/32549.htm>. November 30 2005.
- Boucher, Richard, 2003. “Burundi Peace Accord Signed the Government of Burundi and the Largest Rebel Group Sign Political and Military Agreement”. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2003/25042.htm>. November 28 2005.

- Boucher, Richard, 121104. "Uganda: North Uganda and the LRA". <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2004/38150.htm>. December 25 2005.
- Boucher, Richard 031204. "Conflict in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo". <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2004/39387.htm>. December 19 2005.
- Bulletin EU 9-1997. Common foreign and security policy (5/11). <http://europa.eu.int/abc/doc/off/bull/en/9709/p103005.htm> December 20 2005.
- Bush, George W. 111105. President Commemorates Veterans Day, Discusses War on Terror. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/20051111-1.html>. November 29 2005.
- Camp, Donald, 2003. "Statement on Nepal". <http://www.state.gov/p/sa/rls/rm/18474.htm>. November 11 2005.
- Carlsnaes, Walter, 2002. "Foreign Policy", p.331-349 in Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T., Simmons, B. A. (ed.), *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Carlsnaes, 2004. Where is the Analysis of European Foreign Policy going? Fonet Working group. Danish Institute for International Studies in Copenhagen on 12-13 November 2004. <http://www.fonet.info/documents/FORNET%20Presentation%20Carlsnaes.pdf>. January 6 2006.
- CIA World Factbook 2005 - Burundi Introduction. http://www.theodora.com/wfbcurrent/burundi/burundi_introduction.html. November 23 2005.
- CIA World Factbook 2005 - Uganda. <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ug.html>. December 4 2005.
- "Conditions in Burma and U.S. Policy Toward Burma for the Period March 28-September 27, 2005." <http://www.state.gov/p/eap/rls/rpt/56905.htm>. November 28 2005.
- Council Common Position 2002/402/CFSP. "Concerning Restrictive Measures Against Usama Bin Laden, Members of the Al-Qaida Organisation and the Taliban and other Individual Groups...". http://europa.eu.int/eurlex/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/l_139/l_1392002020529en00040005.pdf. December 13 2005.
- Council Common Position 2003/495/CFSP. On Iraq and repealing Common Positions 96/741/CFSP and 2002/599/CFSP. http://europa.eu.int/eurlex/pri/en/oj/dat/2003/l_169/l_16920030708en00720073.pdf. December 4 2005.
- Council Common Position 2003/495/CFSP. On Iraq and repealing Common Positions 96/741/CFSP and 2002/599/CFSP. http://europa.eu.int/eurlex/pri/en/oj/dat/2003/l_169/l_16920030708en00720073.pdf. December 4 2005.
- Council Decision 120402. Euro-Mediterranean Agreement. http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/algeria/docs/assoc_art.pdf. December 20 2005.

- Council Decision, 211205. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_340/l_34020051223en00640066.pdf. December 26 2005.
- Council Joint Action 2005/889/CFSP. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_327/l_32720051214en00280032.pdf. December 15 2005.
- Council Meeting 210901. "Conclusion and Plan of Action of the Extraordinary European Council Meeting on 21 September 2001". http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/140.en.pdf. November 29 2005.
- Council Meeting 230204. "External Relations". http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/gena/79150.pdf. December 26 2005.
- Council of Foreign Relations – Terrorism. Questions and Answers. <http://cfrterrorism.org/groups/shiningpath.html>. January 6 2006.
- Council of the European Union 140604. "Press Release: General Affairs and External Relations". http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/gena/80951.pdf. November 21 2005.
- Council of the European Union 160305. "Combating Terrorism – Restrictive measures against certain persons and entities". http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/misc/84234.pdf. December 28 2005.
- Country Program: Peru 080502. <http://www.state.gov/p/inl/rls/fs/10026.htm>. December 1 2005.
- Council Regulation No 881/2002. "Imposing certain specific restrictive measures directed at certain persons and entities associated with Usama bin Laden...". http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/l_139/l_13920020529en00090022.pdf. December 13 2005.
- Crane, Lorne W., 2003. "Democracy, Human Rights and the Rule of Law in Burma". <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/rm/17791.htm>. November 28 2005.
- Declaration 12669/1/05 REV. Council of the European Union. Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union condemning the actions of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/86373.pdf.
- Electronic List of Persons and Entities Subject to Financial Sanctions . 231205. http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/cfsp/sanctions/list/version4/global/e_ctlview.html. January 8 2006.
- Ereli, Adam 2005. Signing of Southern Sudan Constitution. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2005/57777.htm>. December 12 2005.
- EU Council Press announcement, 130904. Foreign affairs. Document 12068/04. <http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/newsWord/fi/gena/81934.doc>. November 27 2005.
- EU Council Secretariat Fact sheet 05/10. Darfur - Consolidated EU package in support of AMIS II. http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/AMIS_II_October.pdf. November 30 2005.

- “EU’s Relations with Afghanistan”.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/afghanistan/intro/. January 1 2006.
- European Union Factsheet 05/07. EU support for Iraq.
<http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/Factsheet-Iraq-June2005.pdf>. December 5 2005.
- Feickert, Andrew 2005. Specialist in National Defence Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Trade Division. CRS Report for Congress: U.S. Military Operations in the Global War on Terrorism: Afghanistan, Africa, the Philippines, and Colombia.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/55823.pdf>. November 30 2005.
- Flashpoint – Algeria. World Conflicts Briefing.
http://www.flashpoints.info/countries-conflicts/Algeria-web/algeria_briefing.htm. November 28 2005.
- Ginsberg, Roy H. 2001. *The European Union in International Politics. Baptism by Fire*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Maryland.
- Gordon, Philip H., 1997. “Europe’s Uncommon Foreign Policy”, *International Security*, Vol. 22 No.3 Winter 1997-1998, p.74-100.
- Gupta, Amit; Leather, Kaia 210602. Kashmir: Recent Developments and U.S. Concerns. <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/13390.pdf>. December 20 2005.
- Holsti, Kalevi J, 1995. *International Politics – A Framework for Analysis*. 7th edition. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- Hufbauer, Gary C.11/98. Sanctions-Happy USA. Institute for International Economics. <http://www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb.cfm?ResearchID=83>. November 30 2005.
- “Israel Conflict Summary”, Uppsala Conflict Database
<http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=227>. November 29 2005.
- Joint Statement of the Sri Lanka Donor Co-chairs 010604. http://europa-eu-un.org/articles/fi/article_3542_fi.htm. December 6 2005.
- Kagan, Robert, 2002. “Power and Weakness”, *Policy Review*, No 113 June/July p.3-28. <http://www.policyreview.org/JUN02/kagan.html>. 10 December 2005.
- Lehtonen Kimmo, 060900. Kolumbian sisällissodan taustaa. KEPA, the Service Centre for Development Cooperation.
http://www.kepa.fi/kumppani/arkisto/2000_4/472. December 28 2005.
- Lewis, Scott 2004. Rejuvenating or Restricting Civil War – The role of external actors in the war economies of Sudan. Bonn International Centre for Conversion, Bonn.
<http://www.bicc.de/publications/papers/paper37/paper37.pdf>
- Malinowski, Michael E., 2003. “International Solidarity Against Terrorism”.
<http://www.state.gov/p/sa/rls/rm/24249.htm>. November 30 2005.
- Marsh, Steve; Mackenstein, Hans 2005. *The International Relations of the European Union*. Pearson Education Limited, Essex.
- Munive, Alex, 060900. Käydäänkö uusi kylmä sota kokaiinista? KEPA, the Service Centre for Development Cooperation.
http://www.kepa.fi/kumppani/arkisto/2000_4/470. November 29 2005.

- National Strategy for Victory in Iraq, 2005. National Security Council, November 2005.
http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/iraq_national_strategy_20051130.pdf
 December 26 2005.
- News from Russia 280905. Tamil Tiger separatists condemned E.U. ban
<http://newsfromrussia.com/world/2005/09/28/63951.html>. December 20 2005.
- Nye, Joseph S. Jr, 2003. "The Velvet Hegemon". *Foreign Policy* May/June 2003;136 p.74-75.
- Office of Foreign Assets Control. "Recent OFAC Actions".
<http://www.treas.gov/offices/enforcement/ofac/actions/20031031.shtml>.
 November 30 2005.
- Parag, Khanna, 2004. "The Metrosexual Superpower – The stylish European Union struts past the bumbling United States on the catwalk of global diplomacy". *Foreign Policy* Jul/Aug 2004 p.66-68.
- Peru County Strategy Paper.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/peru/csp/02_06_en.pdf.
 November 29 2005.
- Plan Sweden, Nepal.
<http://www.plansverige.org/wherewework/asia/nepal/landinfo/>. December 4 2005.
- Powell 2004. "Remarks at the Civil Society Event".
<http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/28550.htm>. January 8 2006.
- Presidency Declaration 300701. Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union concerning the mounting violence in Colombia.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/ACF31B.html.
 November 28 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 080502. "Declaration of the Presidency on behalf of the European Union in Nepal".
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/70450.pdf.
 December 10 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 111002. Declaration of the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on Assembly Elections in Jammu and Kashmir.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/72672.pdf.
 November 29 2005.
- Presidency Declaration, 200803. "Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the suicide attack in Jerusalem", 2003.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/77007.pdf.
 December 14 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 230803. Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on Philippines.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/ACF240A.html.
 November 29 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 081003. Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the presidential elections in Chechnya.

- http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/77530.pdf.
December 20 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 160503. “Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the opening of negotiations between the Government of Nepal and the Maoists”.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/75815.pdf.
November 20 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 270104. “Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the outcome of talks between the Government of Burundi and the FNL, held in the Netherlands”.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/78841.pdf.
November 15 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 300604. Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the occasion of the formal start of talks between the Government of Colombia and the AUC paramilitary groups.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/81293.pdf.
December 10 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 060904. “Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the establishment of an independent electoral commission in Burundi”.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/81853.pdf.
November 15 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 030205. “Declaration by the Presidency on behalf on the developments in Nepal”.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/83549.pdf.
December 12 2005.
- Presidency Declaration 101005. Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on Algeria's referendum on a Charter for Peace and National Reconciliation.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/86509.pdf.
November 29 2005.
- Presidency Statement 301299. Statement by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on Chechnya.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/14309.en9.htm.
December 15 2005.
- Presidency Statement 141102. Statement by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on Security Council Resolution 1441 (Iraq).
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/cfsp/73209.pdf.
December 6 2005.
- Presidency Statement 100504. “Declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the events of the last few days at the border between the Democratic Republic of Congo and the Republic of Rwanda”.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/80372.pdf.
November 19 2005.

- Press Briefing by Ari Fleischer 240702.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/07/20020724-8.html>.
 November 25 2005.
- Press Statement 180805. Presidential Mission of Senator Lugar to Algeria and Morocco. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2005/51218.htm>. December 20 2005.
- Rapid Reaction Mechanism: “Burundi/Support for the cease-fire in Burundi/2003”.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/cpcm/rrm/docs/2003/burundi-ceasefireobservermission.pdf. December 15 2005.
- Sanctions or restrictive measures in force 05/11.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/cfsp/sanctions/measures.htm.
 November 29 2005.
- SIPRI. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. ”Major Armed Conflict”. http://www.sipri.org/contents/conflict/MAC_definition.html.
 November 28 2005.
- Smith, Karen Elizabeth, 2003. *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, Karen Elizabeth, 2005. “Still ‘Civilian Power EU?’”. European Union Foreign Policy Unit Working Paper 1/2005.
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/intrel/pdfs/EFPU%20Working%20Paper%202005-1.pdf>
- Snyder, Charles, 2003. “The Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Great Lakes Region of Africa”. <http://www.state.gov/p/af/rls/rm/20245.htm>.
 November 28 2005.
- Solana, Javier, 100304. “Comments by Javier Solana, EU High Representative of the CFSP, after meeting Mr Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda”.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/declarations/79358.pdf.
 December 19 2005.
- Solana, Javier, 090604. “Javier Solana, EU High Representative of the CFSP, welcomes release of Leyla Zana by Turkish authorities”.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/declarations/80900.pdf.
 December 29 2005.
- Solana, Javier, 2005. “Javier Solana, EU High Representative of the CFSP, welcomes the outcome of the Sharm el-Sheikh Summit”.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/declarations/83639.pdf.
 December 15 2005.
- Sri Lanka: Country Strategy Paper 2002-2006.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/sri_lanka/csp/index.htm.
 November 27 2005.
- Strömvik, Maria, 2005. *To Act as a Union. Explaining the development of the EU's collective foreign policy*. Lund: Lund Political Studies.
- Sudan Tribune, 221005. Sudan-USA : High time to improve ties.
http://www.sudantribune.com/article.php3?id_article=12197. November 29 2005.

- “The EU – Committed to the Middle East Peace Process”.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/us/bush/mepp.pdf. December 14 2005.
- “The EU’s relations with Burma/Myanmar”.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/myanmar/intro/index.htm.
 December 16 2005.
- The EU-Russia Relations. The EU External Relations – Russia.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/russia/intro/index.htm. December 15 2005.
- “Third Meeting of the Association Council EU- Israel Luxembourg”, 2002.
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/er/72832.pdf. December 15 2005.
- Traynor, Ian; O’Kane, Maggie 171299. Russia faces isolation. Guardian Unlimited.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,3604,244602,00.html>.
 December 15 2005.
- “Turkey – Allegations of U.S. Officials Meeting with Members of the Kurdistan Worker’s Party (PKK)”. 2003.
<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2003/16832.htm>. November 30 2005.
- Uppsala Conflict Database -Algeria. Basic Search – Algeria.
<http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=2>. November 30 2005.
- Uppsala Conflict Database – Chechnya.
<http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=202>. December 28 2005.
- Uppsala Conflict Database -Iraq . Iraq vs. United States of America - General Information.] <http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=178>.
 December 4 2005.
- Uppsala Conflict Database - Peru – General Information.
<http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=146>. November 30 2005.
- Uppsala Conflict Database – Rwanda – Basic Search.
<http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=92>. November 29 2005.
- Uppsala Conflict Database – Sudan. Basic Search.
<http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=233>. November 29 2005.
- Uppsala Conflict Database – Turkey. Basic Search.
<http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=194>. December 29 2005.
- Uppsala Conflict Database – United States of America. Basic Search.
<http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/conflictSummary.php?bcID=210>. November 29 2005.
- U.S. Department of State – Algeria 05/11. Background Note –Algeria. Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/8005.htm> . December 20 2005.

- U.S. Department of State 05/09. Background Note: Philippines.
<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2794.htm>. November 30 2005.
- US Department of the Treasury-Peru. Background Information on Certain FTOs with Aliases Appearing as Potential Fundraising Front Organizations.
http://www.treas.gov/offices/enforcement/key-issues/protecting/fto_aliases.shtml . November 30 2005.
- Virk, Mobarik 280202. Polls not a solution to Kashmir problem: EU.
http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=story_28-7-2002_pg1_1 .
 November 29 2005.
- “What You Need To Know About U.S. Sanctions Against Burma”.
<http://www.treas.gov/offices/enforcement/ofac/sanctions/t11burma.pdf>.
 November 25 2005.
- “What You Need To Know About U.S. Sanctions”.
<http://www.treas.gov/offices/enforcement/ofac/sanctions/t11ter.pdf>. October
 30 2005.
- White, Brian, 1989. “Analysing Foreign Policy: Problems and Approaches”, p. 1-26 in Clarke, M., White, B. (ed.), *Understanding Foreign Policy. The Foreign Policy Systems Approach*. Aldershot(Hants): Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- White House Press Briefing 011105. McClellan, Scott.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/20051101-4.html>.
 November 30 2005.
- White House 301105. President Outlines Strategy for Victory in Iraq.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/20051130-2.html>.
 December 4 2005.
- Youngs, Richard 10/04. Europe and Iraq – From Stand-off to Engagement?
<http://fpc.org.uk/fsblob/331.pdf>. December 23 2005.