

Leading actors of the free world

- A Comparison of EU and US Security Strategies -

Abstract

The European Security Strategy (ESS) developed in 2003 and the National Security Strategy of the United States of America (NSS) was issued in 2002. In this thesis these two documents are compared and analyzed with reference to the securitization theory. The comparison focus on identified threats and how they aim to refute them.

The choice of documents is partly based on, them being the first security strategies developed in the post-9/11 world, the terrorist attacks that consequently changed the focus for security strategy.

Both documents make similar observations of the world and the possible threats. The manners in which the threats are defined however differ and consequently so does the means presented to refute them. The ESS doesn't mention war in the struggle against terrorism; instead define a 'fight against global terrorism'. The NSS, however, as the initiator of the term, identifies a 'war on terror'. This reflects how the two documents are used differently as political tools, and further reveals a divide in security culture of soft and hard power between the EU and US.

Keywords: European Security Strategy (ESS), National Security Strategy of the United States of America (NSS), securitization, European Union (EU), United States of America (US)

Words: 9597

List of Abbreviations

CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy (EU)
COPRI	Copenhagen Peace Research Institute
CSS	Critical Security Studies
ESS	European Security Strategy
EU	European Union
NSS	National Security Strategy of the United States of America
US	United States of America
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
USMA	United States Military Academy

Table of content

1	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Question and purpose	4
1.2	Method	4
1.2.1	Definition of concepts	5
1.3	Theoretical framework	5
1.4	Material	6
1.5	Limitations	6
2	Security Strategy.....	7
2.1	The European Security Strategy.....	7
2.1.1	A Secure Europe in a Better World.....	7
2.2	The National Security Strategy of the US.....	9
2.2.1	A new strategy of preemption	9
3	Theoretical framework – Security.....	11
3.1	What is security?.....	11
3.1.1	Concept of International Security	12
3.1.2	Objective vs. Subjective view of security	12
3.2	Defining security threats – securitization.....	13
3.2.1	Critique of securitization.....	14
4	Analysis.....	15
4.1	Differences and similarities.....	15
4.2	Threats identified.....	16
4.2.1	ESS	16
4.2.2	NSS.....	17
4.3	Comparing threats identified in the ESS and NSS.....	18
4.4	Means identified.....	19
4.4.1	ESS	19
4.4.2	NSS.....	20
4.5	Comparing means identified in the ESS and NSS	21
5	Conclusions.....	23
6	List of References.....	25

1 Introduction

Foreign policy is made by structures and actors. However, there are different approaches to which role structures and actors play in the actions taken as a result of foreign and security policy. In the real world different actors, domestic and international, on the global arena all take part in the formation of foreign policy (Carlsnaes 2008:90).

The United States (US) and the European Union (EU) are two different actors with two distinctive security policy doctrines. The US is quantitatively much stronger than the EU in military terms. However in the economic realm they are compatible. The EU has challenged the US as the great moral power, and has presented a new set of norms and values for international security relations. The US has the ideal of spreading freedom whereas the EU promotes human rights and the rule of law (Wagnsson 2008: 2-3).

In the year of 2003 the European Council adopted the European Security Strategy (ESS). This document outlined an explicit perspective on security policy, being part of defining strategic threats and challenges as an actor on the global arena. The High Representative, Javier Solana, was appointed by the European council to develop the strategy which was entitled “A Secure Europe in a Better World”.

The ESS is in conformity with the National Security Strategy of the United States (NSS). The NSS document is prepared periodically by the President’s office for the Congress. It contains the explicit national security concerns of the United States and how the administration plans to deal with them.

However, in spite of many similarities between the strategic views and interests of the two actors, there are important differences. A joint apprehension amongst many scholars is that a gap exists between the two actors’ international security strategic cultures. The answer to what the gap is, wherein the difference lies, remains however a debated subject. One perception is that the similarities between the two documents show a tendency of growing transatlantic security cooperation between the EU and US (Berenskoetter 2005:71-72).

Another apprehension is a difference in EU and US perspectives, regarding power in security policy. The EU, leaning towards the Kantian perspective of perpetual peace, focusing on transnational cooperation, negotiation and further rely on international law. Whereas the US is taking the Hobbesian perspective of not entirely trusting international law, instead relying on the military as being the main source of security (Kagan 2002: 1).

The aim of this thesis is to compare the two official key documents of security strategy, and focus on the difference and similarities in the perception of threats and furthermore how they aim to refute them. This is important as they are both

main actors in the global world and by comparing the two documents, interesting observations could further the understanding of what the potential gap might be.

1.1 Question and purpose

The purpose of the thesis is to compare these two key documents of security strategy in terms of what the EU and US respectively perceive as threats and how they intend to refute them. The research is a case study of the EU and the US's security strategy.

With the background presented above my layout and question is as follows:

- What are the main similarities and differences between the European Security Strategy 2003 (ESS) and the National Security Strategy of the United States 2002 (NSS) in terms of the way in which they identify threats and means to handle them?

1.2 Method

The choice of method is a qualitative case study and the thesis aim is to attain an insight and understanding of the differences between the EU and the US documents. More specifically, the perception of threats and how they aim to address them. In summary, to reach possible explanations deploying the theoretical framework, and to understand the context and process in which the two documents originate from and how they differ (Lundquist 1993: 104-105, Teorell – Svensson 2007: 264-266).

Furthermore the thesis falls under the category of a text analysis, using a hypothetical-deductive method; empirical observations followed by formulating a theoretical hypothesis and the implications that are connected with this (Teorell – Svensson 2007:99-100). This is valid because the two documents will be analyzed followed by applying the theoretical framework and interpret them with specific reference to the perception of threats and how they aim to refute them.

A clear definition of the concept *threat* will be carried out. The operational definition of the concept is imperative in relation to the theoretical framework that will be used and to the question posed to make it valid for this particular research (Teorell – Svensson 2007:38-40).

An important key question is what the authors' intended meaning of the two documents might be. As it is an official document it will be scrutinized by the world. In other words it is important to bear in mind what type of message the sender intend to give. It is also significant to bear in mind how the message is perceived by the intended recipients. In this case other important actors on the global arena, the EU and US, and what their intended message in the two official documents might be (Teorell – Svensson 2007:101-103).

1.2.1 Definition of concepts

The two actors in this thesis are the EU and US. Well aware of the EU not being only *one* actor, but a compilation of the Member States, in this thesis the ESS will be considered as an externalization of the joint security strategy policy of the EU.

A well carried out operational definition lessens the possibility of a validity problem. Nevertheless, an intensive research tends to have a trade-off problem with reliability instead. Difficulty lies in obtaining a high validity and good reliability simultaneously (Teorell – Svensson 2007:58–59).

Below follows a definition of technical terms that is frequently used throughout the thesis, in order to avoid misapprehensions in meaning.

- **Security:**

The term security can entail and cover different sets of issues. In this thesis, it encompasses a wider definition of the term and thus includes various sectors of the society, not just the military sector. A security issue entails that extraordinary means need to be taken in order to block the threatening development. Not necessarily because a real existential threat exists but when presented as such a threat (Buzan 1998: 21-22).

- **Threat:**

The definition of threat entails the relation it (the threat) has to the referent object, i.e. what/who is threatened, and the situation where an impending danger is present (Buzan 1998:36).

1.3 Theoretical framework

The research is a theory consuming study in which the case settles in the centre. The analysis model that the case will be structured and analyzed according to is that the question will be answered with reference to an already existing theoretical framework (Esaiasson 2007:121-122).

The theoretical framework intended for this essay is developed by the so called Copenhagen School¹; Ole Waever, Barry Buzan and Jaap de Wilder. Emerging at the Conflict and Peace Research Institute (COPRI)² of Copenhagen; the securitization theory was developed to enhance the traditional concept of security (Eriksson 2007:96, Emmers 2007:110-111).

The theory is process oriented and focuses on: securitizing actor (who), on what issues (threats), referent objects (for whom), why, with what results and under what conditions (Buzan 1998:32).

¹ Not to be mistaken with the CSS (Critical Security Studies), developed by amongst others Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams. A theory with more of a social constructivist approach to security studies (Mutimer 2007:56-58).

² Danish name: Center for Freds-og Konfliktforskning

The choice of theory is based on the interesting approach to the perception of threats and how it would shed a fruitful light on the two official documents intended to be analyzed in this thesis. Different definitions of possible threats and how they are presented consequently change the way in which the public accepts them as possible threats, according to the theory of securitization. Different perceptions of threats further entail different ways of addressing them.

This thesis attempts to provide a comparison, deploying the theory of securitization as analytical framework, by examining similarities and differences between the key documents; which threats are identified and by which means they tend to refute them.

1.4 Material

The two documents, the ESS from 2003 and NSS from 2002, have been chosen for mainly two reasons.

First, as the documents are the first of their kind after the terrorist attacks of 9/11 in 2001 that consequently changed the prospects and focus for security strategy. Second, the ESS was the first document of its kind issued by the European Union. The NSS, however, is considered to be one of the most reformulated National Security Strategies since the beginning of the Cold War (Gaddis 2002:50). The latter, with a reformulation of security policy encompass a change in US strategy which is interesting to bear in mind for the analysis of similarities and differences in the two documents, as the ESS was developed a year later.

The two official documents are primary material, which is important as information has not been lost along the way, or in any way fabricated. Secondary material, such as articles, books and evaluations of the two documents have also been of important use in the thesis.

1.5 Limitations

When studying the similarities and differences, the case study research is based only on the two official documents, leaving out the preparatory work leading up to the final drafts of the official documents.

Furthermore the subdocuments, including the strategies solely for Combating Terrorism or Weapons of Mass Destruction have neither been used in this research. However it could be an alternative case of research, only focusing on for example strategies concerning international terrorism; the European Union Counterterrorism Strategy and the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism.

2 Security Strategy

In this chapter the ESS and NSS will be presented. First, by giving a brief background to European security strategy, followed by the strategy document developed by Javier Solana in 2003. Thereafter follows the background to US security policy and the strategy document presented by the George W. Bush administration in 2002.

2.1 The European Security Strategy

The Security policy approach of the EU is a sum of the member states foreign policies. More often than not, foreign policy is acknowledged as something exclusively privileged of states. The policy competence of the EU is divided into three pillars. The second pillar contains political and security relations with other states and international organizations³. Each member state still follows national foreign policies. However, they have made commitments to convene on the European level (Aggestam 2008:361–362, Andersson 2008:132-133). The fact that 27 Member States⁴, each with national interest and priorities of their own, constitute the EU, poses a coherence challenge regarding the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP).

However the first step towards a more coherent EU was the approval of the European Security Strategy (ESS) by the European Council, in December 2003. The ESS serves first and foremost two functions. First, it provides a common frame of reference for long-term strategies as well as for current political problems for the EU. Second, the document further provides a shared foundation for negotiations with other countries and organizations on issues of strategic importance (Andersson 2008:136).

2.1.1 A Secure Europe in a Better World

The ESS was developed for mainly three reasons; first, the need for a framework that could help resolve internal differences within the EU became strikingly prominent in the wake of the Iraq crisis. Second, security integration is driven by

³ Since December 2009, The Lisbon Treaty is fully ratified by all 27 member states, and is now in force. Consequently new regulations regarding foreign policy of the European Union is in force.

⁴ In 2003 the EU had 15 Member States.

the shared understanding that EU should be a key actor in security matters (Wagnsson 2008:90). Third, the ESS was a response to the NSS and to bring Brussels and Washington together, in order to advance the transatlantic relationship (Everts - Keohane 2003:175–176). In the words of Javier Solana in the speech “Europe and America: Partners of choice” May 7 in 2003, the title itself implies a rather strong relationship, and the idea of this transatlantic relationship runs through the speech.

An important political message of the document is how the traditional soft power approach needs to be complemented with the use of the versatile tool kit available to the EU. Not only the use of economic aid or diplomatic pressure, but also to politically use trade policies, aid and migration in order to further international law. The connection between EU’s instruments and policy aims has been poor. The protection of human rights and promoting democracy has been part of EU policy together with countering terrorism and WMD. Nevertheless, little has been done by the EU when a partnership fails to live up to such conditions. The ESS, however, clearly states that the EU must be prepared to combine the use of financial assistance and sanctions to encourage political reforms or better standards of governance (Everts - Keohane 2003: 177-178), this is illustrated in the quote below.

We want international organisations, regimes and treaties to be effective in confronting threats to international peace and security, and must therefore be ready to act when their rules are broken (European Council 2003: 9).

In summary, the EU is considered to be an effective global actor with reference to international trade and finance but in foreign affairs and on the international security arena it has failed to make a stand. With this background the ESS was presented⁵ and outlines five key threats (Andersson – Biscop 2008: 166-168);

1. strategic terrorism,
2. WMD,
3. regional conflicts,
4. state failure and
5. organized crime (European Council 2003: 3-4)

The threats identified are a mix of old and new, in other words a combination of unfinished crises and of post-9/11 international terrorism agenda.

⁵ The draft presented by Javier Solana in June 2003 was thoroughly discussed by diplomats, politicians and military people at three separate seminars in Rome, Paris and Stockholm before decided upon, organized by the European Union.

2.2 The National Security Strategy of the US

Since 1986⁶, a mandated annual report is presented to the Congress with details of the National Security Strategy of the US. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America issued in 20 September 2002 was the first security strategy by the Bush administration (O'Hanlon 2002:3).

Former administrations of the US; Reagan, Bush Sr. and Clinton have all issued National Security Strategies, but with disappointing results as they more or less have been restatements of the older existing positions, and also quickly forgotten. In contrast, the NSS presented by George W. Bush in September 2002 was the first issued after the 9/11 terrorist attacks and has furthermore stirred up a vigorous debate because of its comprehensive reformulation of the foreign policy (Gaddis 2002:53-54).

2.2.1 A new strategy of preemption

And our security will require all Americans to be forward-looking and resolute, to be ready for preemptive action when necessary to defend our liberty and to defend our lives (George W. Bush 2002: 3).

This quote is part of a speech given at West Point⁷ in 2002 by President George W. Bush where a framework of foreign policy was presented, more specifically how to deal with the post-11 September world. In the NSS issued a few months later this conceptual framework was more formally elaborated (Rhodes 2003:132).

We will cooperate with other nations to deny, contain, and curtail our enemies' efforts to acquire dangerous technologies. And, as a matter of common sense and self-defense, America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed. ... In the new world we have entered, the only path to peace and security is the path of action (George W. Bush 2002 cover letter to the NSS).

The preemption concept entails the so called rogue states that pose a danger to the US, whether linked to terrorist organizations or not, are threatened to be attacked by the US. The traditional definition of preemption is preventive action taken in the face of an impending attack, and this has been accepted as legitimate under international law. The concept of preemption in the NSS is, however, widened to cover preventive war, meaning that the use of force may be taken even though the evidence of an impending attack is absent, to ensure that serious threats towards the US do not grow over time. This broadening of the concept

⁶ The NSS was born through the Goldwater - Nichols Act of 1986, on Reorganization of the Department of Defense (Gaddis 2002:53).

⁷ West Point is The United States Military Academy, also known as USMA. Located in New York, Orange County.

preemption is twofold. First, it enables the US to deal with actors that cannot reliably be deterred. Second, the growing threat caused by the spread of WMD can easier be addressed (O'Hanlon 2002: 1-4).

Wherever we carry it, the American flag will stand not only for our power but for freedom. Our Nation's cause has always been larger than our Nation's defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace, a peace that favors human liberty. (...) And we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent (George W. Bush 2002: 2).

The quote above, from the speech at West Point given by George W. Bush, implies a rather clear vision of how America strive not only to protect its own nation but also to spread global peace that can only be built on human liberty and free societies.

Alongside the document of NSS Bush attached a cover letter, commenting on the strategy and its main objectives. These include how the peace is to be defended by fighting terrorists and tyrants, and by fostering good relations among great powers the peace will be uphold, and finally by encouraging free and open societies on every continent the peace will also spread (Gaddis 2002: 50-51).

An important observation to make is how the fighting of terrorists and tyrants go hand in hand with Wilsonian⁸ rhetoric of promoting free societies and the spread of peace around the world. To illustrate with an example, after 9/11 the US managed to gather a coalition of states in the fight against terrorism. To name a few of the countries in this coalition; China, Saudi Arabia and Egypt, observe that the values of freedom and liberty are not equally respected and valued in those countries. Which should be prioritized, fighting terrorists or the promotion of free societies? The NSS does not say, however indirectly points to the war against terrorism, by collaborating with societies that do not foster these values of freedom and liberty (Daalder 2002: 4-5).

The NSS in summary recognizes three main threats that are acknowledged as deadly challenges;

1. Terrorists with global reach,
2. Rogue states and
3. WMDs

Apart from these key threats, the document also comments on three other, the possible return of power rivalries and arms races, regional conflicts and poverty in developing countries, however these are not explicitly defined as threats.

⁸ The concept *Wilsonian* comes from the former American President Woodrow Wilson and specifically his Fourteen Points that he believed would create world peace if implemented. Wilsonian rhetoric is in the NSS 2002 used to stress the importance of justice, liberty and freedom (Haine 2003:109).

3 Theoretical framework – Security

The theoretical framework used in the thesis is developed by Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde and has been developed in subsequent writings, most notably however in *Security – A new framework for analysis* in 1998. It was presented as a response to the traditionalist view of security as restricted to one sector, namely the military. Furthermore it offers a process-oriented approach of securitization. Below the theoretical framework will be thoroughly presented in order to apply it to the analytical part of the thesis, namely the comparison of security strategies of the EU and US.

3.1 What is security?

There are mainly two existing views of security studies. The traditional objective threat analysis, which can be military and societal and even environmental depending on what is designated as a threat and what is concerned as the security of. The other, focusing on the societal side to security; how and who constructs the threat, who listens to it and how it is accepted as a threat. It focuses on the process behind the definition of a threat. It is a process that works in both directions. A de-securitization process is the process when something is no longer considered as a threat (Buzan 1998:1-5). In other words the process of securitization is a result of political and social discourse functioning as a catalyst in what is considered as a security issue and what is not (Sheehan 2005:3).

In conclusion, it is the latter perception of security studies, focusing on the constructivist operational method, on which the theoretical framework of the thesis focuses on.

A distinction between wide and narrow security studies sprung from the discontent with the narrowing of the field of security studies imposed by the military and nuclear obsessions of the Cold War. Since the end of the Cold War however the concept of security as mainly military was reduced and broadened to encompass other sectors as environmental and societal that increased in prominence. Thus, the wider security discourse includes the broader version and comprehends more than just military issues (Buzan 2003:356).

Since the thesis will analyze the security strategy of the EU and the US it will have a heterogeneous approach, meaning that different types of actors integrating across sectors.

3.1.1 Concept of International Security

In the book *People, States and Fear*, published in 1991⁹, Buzan emphasized that the concept of security not only involves the idea of national security. Instead of only identifying security to military issues, the fact that threats affect people in everyday life in all sectors of the community, the political, societal, economic and environmental was high lightened and focused on. The level at which security should be addressed on was questioned, as of before not only on the national level but also the individual as well as the international level (Sheehan 2005:46-47).

The concept of security includes what it covers but also the process in which a threat is identified and securitized. International security further entails either something posing a concrete threat in reference to the military sector, e.g. several tanks about to enter a nation's border. But it can also entail various other situations depending on if the political, economic, societal or environmental sector is being considered. International security is valid when and if an existential threat is posed to an object, e.g. a state. Such a security threat would justify and legitimize the use of force in order to adress them (Buzan, 1998:21–23).

It becomes a posing threat when presented as such and not necessarily because of a real existing threat. International security is closely connected to power politics; however this is not always bound to the state, terrorism is a prominent example of this (Sheehan 2005:12).

3.1.2 Objective vs. Subjective view of security

An objective approach to security would imply that a real threat actually exists. A subjective approach however would involve that something is perceived as a threat. A threat for one state is a friend of another state and it depends on how the issue is securitized and whether it is accepted as a threat (Buzan 1998:29-30).

Terrorism is an example as it is widely accepted as an objective threat, the evidence is clear, with Americas "global war on terrorism" following the terrorist attacks of 9/11. It was successfully constructed as a global threat and accepted as such; the result was a shift in security definitions and priorities in many countries (Buzan 2006:1101-1104). Some people might argue that the real threat is the negative influence that we are inflicting on the environment, how that is in fact a real objective threat and that terrorism is only a distraction.

⁹ 2nd edition

3.2 Defining security threats – securitization

Securitization is regarded as an extension of politicization. In the perception that public issues, non-politicized¹⁰ as well as politicized¹¹, can be securitized, with reference to that it is presented and perceived as an existential threat which requires measures beyond the bounds of normal political procedure. It varies greatly what states politicize, for example; Iran politicizes religion, and former USSR securitized culture, whereas others either politicize or securitize neither religion nor culture (Buzan 1998:23-24).

To securitize an issue entails, what previously was not considered to be a security issue by the society, to rethink and prioritize differently in what and how the securitized issue should be solved. It also leads to greater political attention when an issue is being securitized, as it often involves access to problem solving resources of various kinds (Sheehan 2005:52-53).

To understand securitization one must consider discourse and political constellations. The securitization move is when an issue is presented as an existential threat to a referent object, and it is securitized if and only if it is accepted and perceived by the public as a threat. In the process of securitization the core issue lies in for whom an issue is securitized and furthermore in relation to whom. This all comes down to the politics built up surrounding the securitized issue itself. Furthermore, it becomes an issue that needs to be prioritized in front of others and is presented as an existential threat and international security issue. (Müller 2002:382-383).

De-securitization is the reverse process of securitization. It involves the process in which the securitized issue shifts from out of emergency mode and into the bargaining process of the political sphere (Emmers 2007:112-113).

The securitization framework thus entails a three stage process. First, an actor has to express an issue as an existential threat. This in isolation does not mean that an issue is securitized, it is the securitizing move. It is however a securitized issue when the audience accept it as a threat. The second stage is consequently the acceptance by the public that the interpretation by the securitizing actor that the threat is sufficiently dangerous and extraordinary measures need to be taken to overcome the threat. The third and final stage of securitization is the mobilization of resources to overcome the threat (Collins 2005: 570).

In summary, securitization not only provides the definition for what a security issue is (an existential threat), it also examines who initiates the securitizing move, and also the need for the public to accept this interpretation of a potential threat in order for it to become a security issue, and finally how it is to be refuted.

¹⁰ A nonpoliticized issue = “the state does not deal with it and it is not in any other way made an issue of public debate and decision” (Buzan 1998:23).

¹¹ A politicized issue = “the issue is part of public policy, requiring government decisions and resource allocations or, more rarely, some other form of communal governance”(Buzan 1998:23).

3.2.1 Critique of securitization

It is of high importance not to ignore the possible misuse of securitization and the abuse of power that might follow. The process can easily be misused to legitimize and authorize the military or certain security forces in civilian activities. Emerging democracies, in particular, perhaps in countries where the division between the military and civilian authority is vague.

In a post 9/11 context it is also legitimate to high-lighten the issue of not curbing civilian liberties in the name of security. As the growing number of issues recognized as threats, securitizing actors in well established democracies can use a securitizing act to restrain civil liberties, in the name of the defense of civil liberties. In undemocratic societies, however the majority of the public does not have the means to speak out of possible misuse of securitization (Emmers 2007: 114-115).

Another critique of the theory is that it is Euro-centric. The theory emphasizes the societal notion of security in favor of the state as the referent object. This notion is derived from the perception of borderless societies that are said to exist in Europe as a result of political and economic integration. With this said, left unsaid is whether corresponding of similar sense of community in other regions of the world (Emmers 2007: 116).

To distinguish between the securitization act from the role of the securitizing actor is not done easily without caution. Since 9/11 many analysts have been widely present in media and in some cases even in contact with intelligence agencies. It can therefore be argued that such repeated interventions blur the separation between academic analysis and politics. It might also unintentionally transform the analyst into a separate and influential securitizing actor that is part of the securitizing move (Emmers 2007:117).

The underlying perceptions whether a threat really exists or not is less important than the fact that it might derive from the securitizing actors' own fears. With this follows the critique of the securitization being too subjectively focused, a misleading perception of possible threats. By way of example, during the Cold War, it was plausible possibilities of danger. It is important to consider threats as both the perceptions of threats but also the phenomena in which something is perceived as threatening (Knudsen 2001: 359-360).

4 Analysis

In this chapter the two strategies will be compared with reference to threats identified in the documents. Furthermore how they aim to refute them and by which means. In connection to securitization, what issues are considered to be existential threats and if they are accepted by its audience as such, by which means the EU and US respectively intend to answer these threats.

To begin with a more general comparison of the ESS and NSS will be carried out. In order to understand the difference it is important to comment upon where the two strategies originate from and also the different political contexts.

4.1 Differences and similarities

The ESS and NSS first and foremost have differences in formalities. The NSS is more than double the length of the ESS and consequently more elaborate and thoroughly fashioned. In comparison, the NSS comes across as more resolute and with an air of authority. Noted be, that the ESS is the first of its kind and more importantly a joint document reflecting the views of at the time 15 Member States of the EU.

Another point to stress is the political context that the strategies are written in; the post 9/11 world (2001), and in the wake of the invasion of Afghanistan (2001) and also the Iraq crisis (2003). With this noted, the documents are used as political tools with messages intended for audiences domestically as well as internationally. The ESS designed in the wake of the Iraq crisis, coming together in foreign policy and strategic views, acting as the union that it is, but also making a stand as a credible actor on the arena of security strategy. The NSS on the other hand developed in post 9/11 world and making a case of its 'war on terror' and the role of the US power in world politics, taking preemptive action. (Berenskoetter 2005:72-73).

Notwithstanding the ESS and NSS make similar observations of the world; the approach is rather different, emphasizing different themes. For one thing, they are written on different premises. The ESS is written as a strategic outlook for the Member States of the European Union. The introductory sentence to the document is "Europe has never been so prosperous, so secure nor so free" (European Council 2003: 1), in other words; commenting on Europe in relation to the rest of the world, but also its own vulnerabilities. The NSS in contrast is written for one country, a global hegemony. In the cover letter presenting the security strategy George W. Bush states "Today, the United States enjoys a position of unparalleled

military strength and great economic and political influence”, which reflects the American strength and position as a sole superpower.

Two elements make up the strategic concepts. First, the level of threat and second the means by which to refute these threats (Gnesetto 2003:23).

4.2 Threats identified

In this section threats identified in the ESS and NSS respectively will first be presented and commented upon, thereafter follows a comparison of the two documents.

Both documents are based on threats analyses, noted be with different focus. The ESS spotlight falls on how the global challenges have “increased European dependence – and so vulnerability – on an interconnected infrastructure in transport, energy, information and other fields” (2003:2). Whereas the NSS focus on emphasizing terrorism: “The enemy is terrorism—premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against innocents” (2002:3).

4.2.1 ESS

Taking these different elements together – terrorism committed to maximum violence, the availability of weapons of mass destruction, organised crime, the weakening of the state system and the privatisation of force – we could be confronted with a very radical threat indeed (European Council 2003: 5).

Key threats identified by the ESS are international terrorism, proliferation of WMD, regional conflicts, state failure and organized crime. An additional focus is commented upon the devastating scale of damage if terrorists acquire WMD, as ‘the most frightening scenario’ (European Council 2003: 3-4).

No ranking is made between the five identified threats. The new threats; international terrorism and WMD proliferation are however interconnected with the old risks; regional conflicts, state failure and organized crime. By way of example is the case of Afghanistan, a failed state hosting training camps for international terrorists, where the instability spill over outside the country.

An essence very present in the ESS is the issue of human rights and human security. With a look in the rearview mirror of the European history, the Second World War and the human massacres is just one example. The first casualties resulting from a state collapse or abuse, are direct or indirect, its people (Haine 2008:22-24).

With reference to securitization and if the key threats identified in the ESS pose as existential threats to the referent objects, i.e. the inhabitants of the EU, one could consider the old risks of organized crime, state failure and regional conflicts to constitute an indirect danger by providing an opportunity for international terrorism and also proliferation of WMD. This furthers the implications of

globalization and the increasing interconnectedness between old risks and new threats. To justify extraordinary measures to be taken the ESS states; “The risks of proliferation grow over time; left alone, terrorist networks will become ever more dangerous ... Conflict prevention and threat prevention cannot start too early” (European Council 2003:7). This reflects the seriousness of these threats and therefore the securitization move is justified, because if left alone ad-hoc action would be reacting too late, with the implication that the crisis already affected people’s lives negatively (Buzan 1998: 26).

4.2.2 NSS

We must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies and friends (White House 2002: 14).

The three primary issues identified as threats in the NSS, as noted in the quote above, are ‘terrorists with a global reach’, ‘rogue states’ and WMD. These three together are considered as possibly ‘deadly challenges’ that make up the more complex situation of today’s security environment according to the NSS (2002:13).

This three-part strategy now dominates the international agenda. The Iraq crisis and how it was handled, by way of example was justified by these three elements; proliferation of WMD, dictatorship and terrorism (Gnesotto 2002:23–24). This revolution in American security strategy of preemptive action is putting the security of the US above the concept of zero casualties together with the indefinite war on terrorism.

The NSS have an essence of spreading democracy, free trade and free markets and states that “the United States will use this moment of opportunity to extend the benefits of freedom across the globe.” (George W. Bush cover letter to the NSS 2002:4).

This is then linked to “what we have learned” from the events of 9/11, that a weak state like Afghanistan can pose as much danger to the US as a strong state. Poverty, weak institutions and corruption is concluded to be ingredients that make weak states susceptible to terrorist networks. In relation to securitization, this connection could be considered to indirect, be a way of justifying the war on terror, in other words, the war on terror encompasses the need of spreading democracy and freedom in order to prevent weak states to fall prey for terrorist networks.

4.3 Comparing threats identified in the ESS and NSS

The securitizing actors are the EU and US respectively. The referent objects¹² are the citizens of the Member States of the EU, for the ESS, and for the NSS it is the citizens of the US. However, in both documents the protection of democratic values, one could interpret the global fight against terrorism as bridging a transatlantic partnership which focuses on the protection of the people respecting and living by these values.

With the background of globalization, interdependence has proven to be economic, political, and cultural as well as security aspects. A consequence of globalization is the tension between the winners; those who benefit from its positive effects and the losers; those who suffer from the negative effects. This growing interdependence results in security for one means also security for another (Biscop 2004:9-10).

As noted in the ESS; “In many cases, economic failure is linked to political problems and violent conflict.” (European Council 2003:2). And further in the NSS; “Ultimately the path of political and economic freedom presents the surest route to progress in sub-Saharan Africa, where most wars are conflicts over material resources and political access often tragically waged on the basis of ethnic and religious difference. “ (The White House 2002:11).

Security thus affects people’s everyday life in all sectors of the community and security issues should be addressed in every sector of the community, as emphasized in securitization (Sheehan 2005:46-47).

With the end of the Cold War and desecuritization of the Soviet, a different set of conflicts were triggered, inter as well as intrastate conflicts which had negative spillover effects. It was the civilian population within these conflicts that suffered greatly and a more blurred and undefined threat developed namely international terrorism. Underlying threats not as easily defined as the previously one sole military actor Soviet, was now organized crime, social and economic underdevelopment, lack of democratic institutions and respect for human rights (Biscop 2004: 9-10).

The ESS and NSS both stress that in the current globalized world threats are no longer as clearly divided in internal and external threats, this distinction is blurred. The advances in transportation and communication have made it easier for small groups and networks to organize and communicate on a transnational basis. Globalization does unite people but at the same time creates tension and conflicts. As shown by the quotations below:

In the ESS: “In an era of globalisation, distant threats may be as much a concern as those that are near at hand.” (European Council 2003:6).

And in the NSS “Today, the distinction between domestic and foreign affairs is diminishing.” (White House 2002:31).

¹²Referent objects = answering the question “it has to survive, therefore it is necessary to...” (Buzan 1998:36)

The ESS highlights ‘failed states’ as potential risk. The NSS on the other hand point out ‘rouge states’ as a possible risk. The difference in meaning herein is that failed states focus on the consequence of bad governance, that the state no longer can or does ensure secure governance or security. Whereas rogue states focus on the path of governing the state has chosen that does not comply with international norms and practices (Lindstrom 2005: 21).

Terrorism is nothing new in Europe and the ESS further makes this distinction and refers to the new kind of international terrorists, wanting to obtain WMD, in contrast to the traditional terrorist groups (European Council 2003:4). This modern international terrorism has new elements of religious factors and the revolutionary ideology, global agenda and mass casualties (Haine 2008:32-33).

The issue of terrorism is successfully securitized as an issue both within the EU and the US, however on different levels of immediacy, using different rhetoric.

4.4 Means identified

Means identified in the ESS and NSS will in this section be presented in a similar fashion as previously regarding the threats identified. This is followed by a comparison of the two documents regarding the means intended for addressing the key threats.

In many ways the similarities regarding what the two documents consider to be possible threats are prominent. However the formulation of these threats and possible risks are different and even though these may seem merely semantic they do affect what kind of means that are chosen to address them with (Lindstrom 2005:21).

4.4.1 ESS

Spreading good governance, supporting social and political reform, dealing with corruption and abuse of power, establishing the rule of law and protecting human rights are the best means of strengthening the international order (European Council 2003: 10).

The second chapter in the ESS, addresses the strategic objectives and is divided into three sections; addressing the threats, promoting security in EU neighborhood and an effective multilateralism as the foundation of international order.

The ESS further states that “Conflict prevention and threat prevention cannot start too early ... none of the new threats is purely military; nor can any be tackled by purely military means” (European Council 2003:6-7). This focus of preventing a possible conflict with not only military means runs through the document. More specifically for each threat, i.e. terrorism, failed states and regional conflicts, suggestions are outlined on how to face such multi-faceted situations require a mixture of response, not only military.

The importance of multilateralism and a stronger international society is highlighted to increase security and prosperity in this world facing global threats. According to the ESS the UN Charter is the framework for international relations and identifies the Security Council of the UN as the primary upholder of international peace and security (European Council 2003: 9).

Much noticed and discussed about in the ESS is the step away from only focusing on soft power, appreciating the need of a combination of soft and hard power, using all the tools available (Everts - Keohane 2003: 177).

Stated in the ESS as the greatest threat is the situation wherein a group of terrorists would acquire WMD and with reference the securitization this is commented upon as “In this event, a small group would be able to inflict damage on a scale previously possible only for States and armies” (European Council 2003: 4). This involves the securitization of WMD and terrorist groups and the danger of them put together, requiring conflict and threat prevention at an early stage.

4.4.2 NSS

Given the goals of rogue states and terrorists, the United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past. ... We cannot let our enemies strike first (White House 2002: 15).

The strategic agenda outlined in the NSS addresses the importance of not only preserving and protecting peace but also more specifically to spread and extend peace and freedom in order to obtain good relations between states. Consequently, the NSS states that “We will actively work to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world” (George W. Bush cover letter to the NSS 2002: 1, 4), emphasizing the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty.

In the NSS the intention of the security strategy is presented as “The U.S. national security strategy will be based on a distinctly American internationalism” (White House 2002: 1). This could be interpreted as whenever national security is concerned the friends and allies are encouraged to follow the leadership of the US (Toje 2005: 129).

The 9/11 attacks resulted in a more formal approach of belligerency. The ‘war against terrorism’ was a way of holding those responsible for 9/11, using every method considered appropriate, a continuing battle over time – against terrorists to uphold a better security (Jenkins 2003:212-220). Henceforth the US would from now on take preemptive action when needed to protect itself, as is stated in the quote above from the NSS.

US policy on terrorism is formed and driven by the course of events; responding to events that require action. In accordance with the securitization process, the Al Qaeda attacks resulted in a shift in security definitions and priorities. Where the Al Qaeda network and its ideology are considered as a threat to western civilization and are accepted as such. For as long as terrorist attacks occur and pose as a threat, the result will be a continuation of the securitization

process of ‘the war against terrorism’, a process initiated by the US. An escalation of terrorist attacks would strengthen the securitization process and legitimate countermeasures taken in order to overcome it. The opposite; a reduction of terrorist attacks would thus weaken the perception of it as a threat and consequently also the securitization process, no longer considered to be a prioritized security issue (Buzan 2006:1106-1107).

4.5 Comparing means identified in the ESS and NSS

The threat based analyses in what the ESS and NSS respectively perceive as key threats have many similarities as shown in previous section. The main difference between the two documents are rather found in how they aim to refute and address these threats in achieving their respective strategic goals.

In the ESS the way forward to address key threats is noted as follows;

Our security and prosperity increasingly depend on an effective multilateral system. We are committed to upholding and developing International Law (European Council 2003: 9).

Focus is on emphasizing the need of effective multilateralism and acting together on the global arena in order to reach a better result, which is what Europe in the end is; interstate relations and the rule of law (Everts 2001:10).

In the NSS the way forward in addressing the key threats is somewhat more resolute;

While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of selfdefense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country (White House 2002: 6)

Focus is more of a unilateral approach, nevertheless still recognizing the need for acting together with the international community. Still, a hint of skepticism is identified in the US attitude towards multilateral solutions.

With the semantic difference in formulating threats in the two documents, one example is the previously mentioned distinction between ‘failed states’, as defined in the ESS and ‘rogue states’, defined by the NSS. The difference in addressing these risks and possible threats are that ‘failed states’ most likely require carrots in order to help with stabilization, such as economic aid or peacekeeping operations. On the other hand, ‘rouge states’, the use of sticks, such as isolation is more a likely option for addressing this possible threat (Lindstrom 2005: 21).

Another example is that ‘the war against terrorism’ is shining with its absence in the ESS. The opposite, as the US was the initiator of the concept, it is present in the NSS.

Commented upon in the ESS is how the turmoil of the first half of the 20th century in Europe is left behind and has given way for peace and stability (Gnesotto 2002:25). Instead, the ESS refer to ‘the fight against global terrorism’,

commented by Javier Solana in 2003 that 'war' suggests mainly military means and a rather clear outcome. A fight against terrorism as an alternative emphasizes the non-military means as more successful instruments, addressing the causes of terror (Solana 2003a:1). With this said the difference in definition follows the difference in way in which it is chosen to be addressed, the ESS largely focusing on civilian tools and the NSS focusing on mainly military means.

The securitizing move regarding the invasion of Iraq was successful within the US however unsuccessful within the EU. In the US it was justified by linking the regime of Saddam Hussein with international terrorists and WMD. The legitimacy of the securitization however was scarred by the constant bad news reported from the US-led invasion of Iraq. Questions whether to stay or leave Iraq, neither a very good option for the Iraqi people, brings another question to mind whether this could possibly weaken the securitization of the war on terrorism as it is connected and associated with bad decisions and perhaps sometimes counterproductive measures (Buzan 2006: 1113).

5 Conclusions

In analyzing the ESS and NSS, regarding the perception of threats and how they aim to refute them, the thesis has shed light on similarities as well as differences. The main similarity between the ESS and NSS documents is that they are threat-based analyses, making rather similar observations of the world, but with different focus.

In comparing the historical background, focusing on the political context they originate from, they differ. The ESS being the first security strategy developed as a joint document for, at the time, the 15 Member States. The NSS, however, in the wake of 9/11 reformulating the security strategy of the US and making a case of taking preemptive action. Both strategies stress that with globalization the distinction between internal and external threats is no longer clear cut.

In the similar observations of the ESS and NSS, concerning the identification of threats, they however define the threats differently. This reflects a difference in attitude and approach that consequently differs the way the threats are to be addressed and by which means.

By way of example, the ESS identifies *failed* states as a threat, which entails a state that as a consequence of bad governance no longer can guarantee security or secure governance. In order to help stabilize the country, soft power is the most likely tool of choice, for example peacekeeping operations and economic aid. The NSS identifies similar type of threat; however define it as *rouge* states, which rather suggest states that are guilty of bad governance and does not comply with international norms. To address this kind of threat, hard power is a more probable choice of action.

Terrorism is another example of how the two documents differ in the approach taken as to address this threat. The ESS never mentions the *war* against terrorism; instead it refers to the *fight* against global terrorism, suggesting that more focus is put on the non-military means in addressing the causes of terrorism. Whereas the NSS identifies that a global war on terrorism is present and that the time frame is indefinite. The securitization of terrorism was however successful in both the EU and US, despite using different rhetoric. This could be a reflection of the possible gap in security cultures, between the two actors EU and US. The ESS is more likely to use civilian tools when addressing the root cause of a possible threat and creating stability. Whereas the NSS is more prone to use military means in order to protect the nation, the norms and values of the free world. There is an asymmetry in the actions taken by the US and Europe's rather lack of action that have an effect on the global security arena.

In the shadow of the future, bridging for possible future research is now that the US has a new administration, with President Barack Obama, that effectively used the word *change* in his campaign. The EU has also experienced change, with

regard to the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty that consequently changed the institutional design of the Union.

6 List of References

Secondary sources

- Aggestam, Lisbeth 2008 “New actors, new foreign policy: EU and enlargement” in Smith, Steve – Hadfield, Amelia – Dunne, Tim [ed] *Foreign Policy Theories, Actors, Cases*. Oxford University Press, 359-376
- Andersson, Jan Joel. 2008. “The ESS and the Continuing search for coherence” in Biscop, Sven – Andersson, Jan Joel [ed] *The EU and the European Security Strategy – Forging a Global Europe*. Routledge: London, 122-138
- Andersson, Jan Joel – Biscop, Sven. 2008.”Conclusion” in Biscop, Sven – Andersson, Jan Joel [ed] *The EU and the European Security Strategy – Forging a Global Europe*. Routledge: London, 166-173
- Berenskoetter, Felix Sebastian. (2005) “Mapping the Mind Gap: A Comparison of US and European Security Strategies”. *Security Dialogue* 36 (1): 71-92
- Biscop, Sven. (2004) “The European Security Strategy Implementing a Distinctive Approach to Security” Published by the Royal Defence College (IRSD-KHID), Brussels In: *Sécurité & Stratégie*, Paper No. 82, March 2004
- Buzan, Barry. (2006) “Will the ‘global war on terrorism’ be the new cold war?” *International Affairs* 82: 6 (2006) s. 1101-1118
- Buzan, Barry – Waever, Ole. 2003. *Regions and Powers. The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Buzan, Barry – Waever, Ole – de Wilder, Jaap. 1998. *Security – A new framework for analysis*. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Carlsnaes, Walter 2008 “Actors, Structures, and foreign policy analysis” in Smith, Steve – Hadfield, Amelia – Dunne, Tim [ed] *Foreign Policy Theories, Actors, Cases*. Oxford University Press, 85-100
- Collins, Alan. (2005), “Securitization, Frankenstein’s Monster and Malaysian Education”, *Pacific Review*, 18/4: 565-86
- Daalder, Ivo – Lindsay, James M – Steinberg, James B. (2002) “The Bush National Security Strategy: An Evaluation”. *Policy Brief no. 109*. Washington DC: Brookings Institute [8pp]
- Emmers, Ralf. 2007. “Securitization” in Collins, Alan [ed] *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 109-125
- Eriksson, Johan. 2006. ”Konstruktivism” i Gustavsson, Jakob – Tallberg, Jonas [red] *Internationella Relationer*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 87-102

- Esaiasson, Peter – Gilljam, Mikael – Oscarsson, Henrik – Wängnerud, Lena. 2007. *Metodpraktikan: konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*. 3. [rev.] uppl. Stockholm: Norstedts juridik
- Everts, Steven. 2001. "Unilateral America, Lightweight Europe? Managing divergence in transatlantic foreign policy", working paper. London: Centre for European Reform.
- Everts, Steven & Daniel Keohane, 2003. 'The European Convention and EU Foreign Policy: Learning from Failure', *Survival* 45(3): 167–186
- Gaddis, John Lewis. 2002. "A Grand Strategy of Transformation". *Foreign Policy* 133:50-57.
- Gnesetto, Nicole. 2003. "EU, US: Visions of the world, visions of the other" in Gustav Lindstrom [ed] *Shift or Rift – Assessing US-EU relations after Iraq*. Paris: Institute for Security Studies, European Union, p. 21-42
- Haine, Jean-Yves. 2003. "Power without restraint? Back to realities" in Gustav Lindstrom [ed] *Shift or Rift – Assessing US-EU relations after Iraq*. Paris: Institute for Security Studies, European Union, p. 105-126
- Haine, Jean-Yves. 2008. "The European Security Strategy coping with threats. Is Europe secure?" in Biscop, Sven & Andersson, Jan Joel (red.) *The EU and the European security strategy: forging a global Europe*. London: Routledge, p. 21-41
- Jenkins, Brian Michael. 2003. "The US response to terrorism and its implications for transatlantic relations" in Gustav Lindstrom [ed] *Shift or Rift – Assessing US-EU relations after Iraq*. Paris: Institute for Security Studies, European Union, p. 207-230
- Kagan, Robert. 2003. *Of Paradise and Power. America and Europe in the New World Order*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf
- Kagan, Robert, 2002. 'Power and Weakness', *Policy Review* 113; available online:
http://www.policyreview.org/JUN02/kagan_print.html, Retrieved: 2009-12-11
- Knudsen, Olav. F. (2001) "Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing Securitization". *Security Dialogue* 32(3): 355–368
- Lindstrom, Gustav. 2005. "EU-US Burdensharing: Who does what?" Chaillot Paper no. 82, September 2005, European Union Institute for Security Studies.
- Lundquist, Lennart 1993. *Det vetenskapliga studiet av politik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Mutimer, David. 2007. "Critical Security Studies: A Schismatic History" in Collins, Alan [ed] *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 53- 74
- Müller, Harald. 2002. "Security Cooperation" in Carlsnaes, Walter - Risse, Thomas - Simmons, Beth A. (red.) *Handbook of International Relations*. SAGE page. 369-391
- O'Hanlon, Michael E. - Rice, Susan E – Steinberg, James B. (2002) "The new national security strategy of preemption". *Policy Brief no. 113*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute [8pp]
- Rhodes, Edward. (2003). "The Imperial Logic of Bush's Liberal Agenda". *Survival*. 45(1): 131-154

- Sheehan, Michael (2005). *International security: an analytical survey*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner
- Teorell, Jan – Svensson, Torsten 2007. *Att fråga och att svara*. Malmö: Liber
- Toje, Asle. (2005) “The 2003 European Union Security Strategy: A Critical Appraisal” *European Foreign Affairs Review* 10: 117–133
- Wagnsson, Charlotte 2008. *Security in a greater Europe – the possibility of a pan-European approach*. Manchester University Press

Primary sources

- Bush, George W. 2002. President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point United States Military Academy West Point, New York, June 1, 2002
<http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/06/print/20020601-3.html>
Retrieved 2009-12-11
- European Council. 2003. *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*. Brussels: European Council;
<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf>
- Solana, Javier 2003. ”Europe and America: Partners of choice”. Speech by Javier Solana, High Representative for the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy at the annual dinner for the Foreign Policy Association in New York, May 7, 2003. http://www.europa-eu-un.org/articles/en/article_2316_en.htm,
Retrieved 2009-12-11
- Solana, Javier 2003a. “Leading the Fight Against the Causes of Terror”, interview with Javier Solana published by the *European Voice*, 3-9 April 2003;
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/sghr_int/75439.pdf
- White House. 2003. *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington DC: White House.
<http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2002/index.html>