European Union as a Normative Power in the aspect of Peacekeeping, Security and Conflict Prevention

Anna Popczyńska
2010-05-26

Contents

„The European Union, more so than many other international organizations, is already in a strong position to use its longstanding experience and considerable resources on the non – military aspects of crisis management. This is one area in particular where the EU can offer an added value".

Javier Solana, EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy

1. Introduction

The history of Europe is dominated by violent conflicts. It witnessed two World Wars which shaped the view and perception of XX century. Another type of conflict came afterwards, dividing Europe and the whole world into two competing blocs of completely different ideas of governance, societal and economical relations. Needless to say, European continent has suffered immensely from shortages in mutual trust between nation states. However, as peculiar and unbelievable as it can be, those experiences laid down a fundament for such an unique entity as the European Union (EU). Recently this entity became an international organization in legal terms with adoption of the Lisbon Treaty, commonly known as the Reform Treaty. Among many other principles, European Union underlines and devotes itself to values such as security, peacekeeping and conflict prevention which are therefore selected as one of the main objectives for the Union. Those principles in particular are not random. We have to bear in mind that after years of experiencing the most disastrous conflicts in the past, creating a European Community was an attempt to rebuild relations between France and Germany, two extremely significant states for the future of the continent. Nevertheless, what has developed even further could not have been predicted at the time of singing the first Community Treaties. Economical cooperation tightened mutual relations between nation states which are aiming at increasing overall prosperity and while doing that it was agreed upon security and peace being fundamental for any development. Therefore, dialogue and trust – building between nation states will enable Europe and the whole world to finally neglect war as a tool of achieving any sort of goals. Global security and peace became a major concern.

At the moment European Union is a crucial economical and political actor in the international arena. Due to the process of globalization and increasing interdependence between regions and states in the world, the EU acknowledges a responsibility for certain issues and problems in the global scale. Security and peace are one of them. However, EU's ambition is not only to respond to international community's call, but to set an example and to be a role model for the world. A role model of governance, prosperous society, secure and

peaceful community, an example of entity that cultivates certain values and principles. In order to grasp this phenomenon a new term has been popularized among political science scholars – normative power. The European Union is referred to as a normative power. I find it very innovative, especially if we make an effort and challenge Europe's normativeness against certain principles that the EU declares itself to. Taking into account European Union's institutional set – up and the fact that it consists of 27 sovereign Member States I would like to examine credibility of various political declarations, legal framework provided with the Treaties and pursued policies considering security, peacekeeping and conflict prevention objectives. My motivations for the choice of this particular topic are deriving from very recent adoption of the Lisbon Treaty which was referred to as a remedy for past inefficiencies and inconsistencies in EU's performance, particularly in external relations and foreign policy. Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) along with Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) constitute two principle instrument of Europe's presence and active participation in the global arena. However, at the same time subjected on various occasions to criticisms for lack of consistency and applicability towards global security concerns by international community – why is that the case?

In accordance to all the above, I will conduct a research in order to answer some of the indicated problems. My point of departure is to provide a theoretical background that will equip the author of this work in means to examine the research problem. I would like to explain the roots of CFSP which is in the centre of my research, as well as provide theoretical explanation for its development. Furthermore, I attempt to analyze presence of security and peace as values and principles in the European framework. Following the theoretical part comes a clarification of research method applied, along with specified research question. In the third part of my work I present gathered findings and facts. I elaborate on European Union's instruments and mechanisms used in order to contribute to global security, peacekeeping and conflict prevention. I perform analysis of achievements acquired and disadvantages that prevent the EU from being more effective in external relation's actions. In the last part of my work I present concluding remarks considering my findings and the general credibility and efficiency of the European Union in the area of global security, peacekeeping and conflict prevention.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Literature overview

Along with various developments that have occurred within European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy many analysis, studies and examinations appeared considering issues connected with external relations of the EU. First of all, while elaborating on CFSP in particular we might want to search for sources containing knowledge about foreign policy in itself. In addition to this, various publications exist that include theoretical analysis of the characteristics of EU's external policies. Karen E. Smith is one of the most prominent scholars that have contributed in this matter. Her book "*European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*" is a major work consisting of thorough analysis of the EU's evolution as an international actor. Additionally, she outlines objectives of foreign policy embedded in the Treaties and provides a reader with a clear examinations of policies that have been established in order to fulfil those goals, efficiency in implementing them, obstacles that occur as well as implications that follow. Another valuable source that provides us with more general analysis of the foreign policy is a book written by Brian White "*Understanding European Foreign Policy*". It is a broad, though consistent and coherent examination of EU's foreign policy evolution and development of the institutional set – up. With European Political Cooperation as a point of departure, through Europeanization process of nation foreign policies to creation of the CFSP, Brian White provides a swift overview of steps leading to formulation of European coherent foreign policy.

In addition to all the above, there is a number of tremendously significant articles in this field that elaborate not only about foreign policy and external relation's characteristics, but also focus on more specific notions in this matter. Journal of European Public Policy, Journal of European Affairs and the European Journal of International Affairs consists of enormous amount of valuable analysis performed by major political scientists. The concept of normative power was introduced by Ian Manners in his work "*Normative power Europe reconsidered: beyond the crossroads*". The author argues that the European Union is not only a unique entity, but also influences the world with different means, contains altered mechanisms where military aspects are insignificant and obsolete, because of different kind of power that is at the EU's disposal. Helene Sjursen attempted to explain normative power notion even further in "*The EU as a 'normative power': how can this be?*". Some of her crucial arguments are reflected in a work by Nathalie Tocci "*Profiling Normative Foreign*

Policy: The European Union and its Global Partners". Written with the background of the discussion considering advancing adoption of the Lisbon Treaty, Nathalie Tocci performs a convincing analysis of how the European Union's normative power materialize itself in relations with other global partners. In addition to this, I consider an article written by Andrea Ciambra "*Normative Power Europe: theory and practice of EU norms: the case of Macedonia*" as noteworthy example of how the European Union transfers its 'power of attraction' into an influential instrument for persuading non – Member States of the Union to amend and adjust their legal, political and societal order in accordance to EU's structures and framework. Macedonia is presented as a case study. Moreover, a similar case study has been pursued many times on Turkey. Whilst, the continuing discussion about the possibility of future Turkish membership in the EU many scholars attempt to examine to what extent changes that have occurred in this country could be regarded to as a cause of European Union's normative influence. In addition to this, many valuable conclusions have been put forward by Matthew A. MacDonald in his work "*Three Perspectives on the European Union as a Normative Power: A Comparative Theoretical Analysis of Exogenous Political Change in Turkey as a Function of the EU Accession Process and the Implications of the EU's Normative Promotion in the Mediterranean Region for EU Relations with the Arab World*". Following theoretical explanations of normative power category and descriptions of EU's foreign policy features, there is a considerable amount of significant analysis on what the European Union in fact does to pursue with its objectives. First and foremost, we should go through a discussion present in the literature about military capabilities of the EU. Peacekeeping missions and conflict prevention operations are the best exemplification of this. Therefore, one might want to acknowledge arguments included in an article written by Judy Dempsey, "*Congo – the test for EU's peacekeeping skills*" from Financial Times (July 2003). The author presents fairly doubtful vision of EU's military capabilities while pursuing with such a demanding mission. Complexity of internal problems in Democratic Republic of Congo requires on one hand strategic, careful and delicate actions though swift and rapid on the other. Judy Dempsey argues that there is still a long way ahead of the EU to become an actor on global arena that it aims to be. Nevertheless, understanding the Europe's ambitions, the Delegation of the European Commission to the United States of America prepared a document "*The EU and the Peacekeeping*" which can be a valuable source of information as well. In this document we can read about what kind of actions have been undertaken to improve EU participation in the international peacekeeping missions, but most of all we are provided with an overview of crisis management missions that have been pursued by the EU

between the period of 2005 – 2008. Furthermore, moving on to more technical analysis, we find an interesting outline of all the obstacles that the EU have been dealing with, as far as external action and involvement is concerned, in the report prepared by Daniel Plesch and Jack Seymour "*A Conflict Prevention Service for European Union*" for British – American Security Information Council in the year of 2000. Although a bit out of date, it grasps most of the disadvantages embedded in the EU's institutional mechanism and internal dilemmas for common foreign policy implementation.

With the Lisbon Treaty already put into practice it is crucial to observe changes and provisions that have taken place within CFSP and CSDP. Therefore, one might want to reach for an article by Wolfgang Wessels and Franziska Bopp, "*The Institutional Architecture of CFSP after the Lisbon Treaty – Constitutional Breakthrough or Challenges Ahead?*" as well as "*The impact of the Lisbon Treaty on CFSP and ESDP*" published in European Security Review (March 2008). Both of them provide us with not only an overview of amended parts dealing with the foreign policy embedded in the Treaty on the European Union, but also a swift analysis of where is the Lisbon Treaty leading CFSP. Prospects for its future development constitute an interesting part of both works. Bearing in mind how truly historical event was an adoption of the Lisbon Treaty for the European Union, many political declaration also touching upon the future of the EU's external relations were presented. Javier Solana, the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU, presented his vision of Europe in the world at Harvard University in 2009. In this speech one might notice an attempt to confirm EU's ambitions and finally concrete abilities that have been provided by Lisbon Treaty to face global challenges. Transatlantic relations are stressed as a major component of preserving international security and stability. Javier Solana stresses that multilateral solutions have always been main point of departure for the EU in its foreign actions. Furthermore, very recent speech given by Catherine Ashton, Javier Solana's successor as a High Representative, on European External Action Service establishment which ought "to strengthen the coherence and effectiveness of EU's global role"[1] – a "promise delivered by the Lisbon Treaty"[2] – contains an assertion for implementing the vision of CFSP embarking from the Lisbon Treaty. These are one of many political declarations that touch upon European Union's external actions. They are crucial for examining incoherencies between legal and political framework and the actual performance – if it exists in the first

---

[1] Catherine Ashton's High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy speech on the proposal for the European External Action Service, March 2010
[2] Ibidem

place. Therefore, one might find it very useful to perform a comparative study between those two variables.

Additionally to all the above, European Commission's internet website constitutes an undisputable source of numerous up – to – date information considering conflict prevention, missions and operations undertaken, instruments of the EU's foreign policy and so on. As a result one might want to support the theoretical part of the research with more quantitative data which is to be found on the various official European Union internet websites.

2.2 The concept of normative power

Concepts of soft power, civilian power and normative power are very interlinked. In the case of foreign policy they all refer to completely opposite vision of means and objectives used on the contrary to for example foreign policy in the perspective of realism. Foreign policy based on features such as cooperation, multilateralism, coalition – building, cooptation, integration, power of attraction, putting rules and values in international relation into practice remain the core and essence of power pursued by normative means. European Union is set as an typical example of normative power. One might ask: why is that the case? What is so special about the EU?

The literature considering this issue provides us with many interesting arguments and observations. First of all, if we look closely at the legal framework of the EU we could see that within all the following Treaties, departing from Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty) through amendments made by the Amsterdam Treaty and Nice Treaty followed by very recent Treaty of Lisbon (Reform Treaty), in the first paragraphs it is stressed that the EU is funded on the basis of values such as human rights, democracy, rule of law, freedom and equality. In the Lisbon Treaty it is formulated as follows: "The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail"[3]. Furthermore, the EU shall devote itself to preserving international security, justice, sustainable development, combat social exclusion and discrimination, increase prosperity and economic growth – these are one

---

[3] Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, art. 1a, 2007

of the most important values and aims set for the European Community in the major legal documents. Focus is not only placed on political freedoms, but also on social and economical aspects, which makes those objectives very diverse. Moreover, "in its relations with the wider world, the Union shall uphold and promote its values and interests and contribute to the protection of its citizens. It shall contribute to peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair trade, eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights, in particular the rights of the child, as well as to the strict observance and the development of international law, including respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter"[4]. In addition to the above, ambition of the EU is not only to pursue with those objectives and values within the Member States, but to promote them on the international arena. The normativeness of the European Community is based on principles and values embedded in the Treaties on one hand and presenting them as foreign policy objectives on the other. However, it can be questioned as what can be considered as normative? Is it really possible to objectively distinguish certain values as being normative on the contrary to the other? "All-encompassing values such as 'democracy', 'peace', 'justice' or 'order' can be interpreted in a myriad different ways by different actors at different points in time"[5]. In order to challenge complexity of the 'normative' notion, Arnold Wolfers in his work "The Goals of Foreign Policy" argues that there is a certain category of values which are universal. He refers to them as 'milieu goals'. "Milieu goals are those which, while indirectly related to a particular actor's specific interests, are essentially concerned with the wider environment within which international relations unfold"[6]. Therefore, what makes a foreign policy normative is a continuous attempt to shape milieu goals throughout international cooperation and global institutions. As a result we witness creation of the 'common lifeworld', a concept presented by one of the most prominent social constructivists – Thomas Risse – in his work "Let's Argue! Communicative Action in World Politics". That is precisely what the European Union aims for. The world based on values, international politics funded on principles, cooperation and dialogue as a major instrument of resolving conflicts – it seems as if ideas of realism have been complete neglected by founders of European Community.

Furthermore, the normative power performed by the European Union is deriving from the essence of the EU as an unique entity. It is a daunting task to categorize the EU by what it

---

[4] Ibidem, art. 2, p. 5
[5] Nathalie Tocci, *Profiling Normative Foreign Policy: the European Union and its Global Partners*, CEPS working document no. 279, December 2007, p. 5
[6] Ibidem, p. 6

really is. Recently due to adoption of the Lisbon Treaty it formally can be referred to as international organization as the EU has been given a legal personality. Nevertheless, with the high level of integration within many policy areas it introduces a special kind of organization. The institutional set up of the European Union and policy areas classified as being on Community's agenda determine the type of means on the EU's disposal. First of all, although CFSP is developing, EU lacks an army that would serve as a basic military capability of the whole Community. That is why, Member States of the Union have to make a use of different sources and influence international surrounding by altered means. Hence, as milieu goals can only be pursued by certain instruments which exclude use of military force and war, this creates a background for EU's opportunity as a normative power. Different set of instruments applied by foreign policy of the EU collaborates with the idea of 'soft power' approach presented by Joseph Nye – cooptation, cooperation, persuasion rather than sanctions, military action and conditionality. All in all, the character of the EU and foreign policy features determine the kind of power that the Community posses. Nathalie Tocci makes a bold statement that "The Union wishes to promote a Kantian world because of the weakness of its foreign policy instruments and its incoherent foreign policy apparatus, unable to confront decisively the real threats and challenges it faces"[7]. While devoted to principles, the EU heavily relies on strategic alliance with the United States and NATO which provides military support in times of crisis.

Entity perceived as a normative power aims to promote certain values by foreign policy means. The European Union fulfils this idea completely. In the Lisbon Treaty it is stated that: "The Union's action on the international scene shall be guided by the principles which have inspired its own creation, development and enlargement, and which it seeks to advance in the wider world: democracy, the rule of law, the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity, and respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law"[8]. Moreover, while acting on the global arena it aspires to be considered as a role model for international community. The impact of this performance is a subject of many research within the scope of political science and international relations and while credibility of this performance can be questioned it is hard to point out more obvious example of normative power than the European Union.

---

[7] Nathalie Tocci, *Profiling Normative Foreign Policy*, op. cit, p. 2
[8] Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, art. 10a, p. 1, 2007

2.3 Common Foreign and Security Policy in theoretical perspective

On 7th February 1992 European Political Cooperation has been replaced by Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty[9]. The main difference between those two policy areas is that CFSP covers issues connected with defence. The Common Defence and Security Policy is an integral part of the CFSP. What is more, CFSP is entitled to cover all the areas in external and foreign policy of the European Union. This is a big achievement in the view of federalism. The core ideas of federalism were presented by Italian deputy, member of the European Parliament – Altiero Spinelli in his work "Ventotene Manifesto". His vision was based on idea of creating the United States of Europe, were European states cede their sovereignty to common democratic institutions. In this perspective, well functioning CFSP policy constitutes the most progressive and developed example of putting those proposals into practice. We have to bear in mind that the main reason for federal, united Europe was to prevent future conflicts on international arena from happening by linking nation states with a kind of a covenant or contract. This would bind them together in a federal structure. "It is also important to remember that the act of forming such a covenant is rooted in the core principles of equality, partnership, reciprocity, mutuality, toleration, recognition, and respect"[10]. Therefore, associations between the CFSP and federal vision of Europe can easily be found. The CFSP is based on principles common for the whole Union, it's objectives are formulated in accordance to those values, it is entitled to represent all the Member States in international relations. Although the EU is still more intergovernmental than federal in its performance, the creation of common external policy scheme seems to direct the future development of the Community in the federal direction.

The initiatives for creating a common foreign policy embark from the evolution of the European integration process. It was continuously progressing, challenging the views and theories popularized by many political science scholars. Economical growth, development and trade cooperation along with political interest in controlling evolution of situation in Germany were fundamental for adoption of the first Treaties – European Coal and Steel Community and European Economic Community. It is intriguing what kind of factors determined further development of the integration process which finally lead to Common Foreign and Security Policy. Ernst Hass and Lean Lindberg as founding fathers of

---

[9] Came into force 1st November 1993

[10] A. Wiener, T. Diez, *European Integration Theory*, Oxford University Press, 2009, second edition, p. 28

neofunctionalism theory provide us with interesting arguments embedded in famous publication "The Uniting of Europe". Neofunctionalism assumes that actors on international arena are self – interested and rational. They have their own preferences and pursue with integration provided that it answers their interests and gives certain advantages. Political actors turn to solutions made on global level by international institutions because it is beneficial for them. There is no coincidence in expanding integration process. Moreover, the core idea related to assumptions presented above is encapsulated in the notion of spillover. This idea can easily be applied to CFSP and the explanation of its occurrence in the first place. Furthermore, the concept of spillover constitutes the basis for neofunctionalism and justification for integration process in Europe according to their vision. "The idea is that some sectors are so interdependent that it is impossible to isolate them from the rest. Thus, the integration of one sector at the regional level is only practicable in combination with the integration of other sectors, as problems arising from the functional integration of one task can only be solved by integrating yet more tasks"[11]. Therefore, while examining the history of European integration it is noticeable that the process develops slowly, though progressively. It includes more sectors and touches upon more issues. As a result we experience formulation of common foreign policy of the EU. It is no longer only an economical and trade cooperation.

However, other European integration theorists would disagree. Historical institutionalism and Paul Pierson, as one of the most prominent scholars in this field, consider the spillover concept as to narrow. Moreover, to explain such a unique phenomenon as CFSP we need to look more broadly and examine historical path that remains a fundament for common foreign policy's emergence. Therefore, Paul Pierson introduces path dependency concept, which, though very simple in its ideas, can be regarded as innovative. Path dependency relates to the principle that if an actor, political entity or organisation of some kind follows a certain route of development it would be disadvantageous to suddenly re – track and begin with a new pattern of development. The costs of doing so would be too immense. Therefore, the choices that already have been made determine the path that the subject is following. That is why, "once actors have ventured far down a particular path, they are likely to find it very difficult to reverse course (...)"[12]. Needless to say, if one looks at the integration process in Europe through historical institutionalism and with perspective of path dependency it becomes obvious that the European Union's development and continuing

---

[11] Ibidem, p. 49

[12] Paul Pierson, Theda Skocpol, *Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science*, in Ira Katznelson, Helen Milner, *Political Science: State of the Discipline*, W.W. Norton, New York, 2002, p. 693

integration must have eventually lead to formulation of even closer community with common political institutions and common foreign policy. This causality remains a fundamental reasoning for emergence of CFSP and therefore CSDP. However, following this idea we would probably end up in European Union being a United States of Europe as it was proposed by federalists where Member States no longer constitute the basic form for community, but an obsolete. With sovereignty transferred completely into international level and European Union's citizenship as the only one remaining, path dependency would acknowledge it's triumph. However, as the discussion on the future of the EU continues it remains to be seen how the integration process proceeds.

Another approach that can be applied to the emergence of the CFSP is social constructivism and the idea of common lifeworld formulated by Thomas Risse. Social constructivism denies rational theory as the best explanation of integration process. Actors are not mainly interest driven. It is not about utility – maximizing and egoism that makes actors cooperate with each other in order to achieve certain goals. The social structure and social norms set the basis for cooperation. "Constructivist emphasis on norm – guided behaviour and constitutive rules does not imply, however, that norms are never violated"[13]. Social constructivism perceives international arena as a place for interaction and cooperation based on norms and values. So, if the European Union is a social structure with common principles set as objectives, with common European law as a legal framework and common policy implications for all Member States we then observe a creation of distinguished region in the global setting. It should be considered as a common lifeworld. As a consequence and if this is truly the case, then common solutions in many areas including foreign policy are essential for increasing performance of the whole Community and for satisfying it's social component. It is expected of the leaders to agree on common solutions in many policy areas. The collective identity provides an impetus for further cooperation in the same way as social action and interaction does.

Although all the theoretical approaches mentioned above have their own shortcomings and limitations they allow to grasp a broader perspective on Common Foreign and Security Policy, as it is undeniably a cause of integration process. Hence, European integration theory provides us with the background for more thorough examination of foreign policy area of the EU. CFSP and the decisions that determine its existence, development and future have been

---

[13] A. Wiener, T. Diez, *European Integration Theory*, op. cit, p. 149

made during Inter – Governmental Conferences of the EU by delegates of the sovereign Member States. Whether this is a consequence of spillover process, path dependency, social construction or federal movement, it still remains a question and entails a further discussion among political science's scholars. Nevertheless, the fact that CFSP is a tool for promoting European Union's normativeness and devotion for certain principles such as democracy, human rights, rule of law, justice on one hand and security, peacekeeping and conflict prevention on the other, is an undeniable fact. However, in order to conduct a research which would enable us to examine credibility of EU's performance based on those principles we ought to use different tools than European integration theory provides. Additionally, there is no one theory that would answer all questions considering the development and implications of CFSP, that is why, while elaborating on this topic one have to be aware of this fact and avoid any misconceptions that can appear while analysing data and conducting a research.

3. Research Method

Examining results of EU's performance and policy implications is not an easy task. Research tools available are limited because of the dynamic character of events that shape European Union as an international actor. Furthermore, as mentioned in the Introduction, the aim of this research is to asses and scrutinize efficiency and credibility of actions undertaken by the European Community in order to fulfil objectives set for Common Foreign and Security Policy. Thus, I consider examination of recent provisions included in the Lisbon Treaty as essential. In addition, placing them next to the number of missions and operations performed under the regulation of CFSP would result in a comparative study and identification of a gap between official political declarations along with legal framework and the actual European international engagement. Therefore, the research question for which I will attempt to provide answers is formulated as follows:

How credible is the performance of the European Union in the matter of normative promotion and fulfilment of the following Common Foreign and Security Policy goals: conflict prevention, peace and international security protection?

3.1 Data Overview

While conducting this research I have came across many valuable sources of information. However, my main focus is placed on the legal framework of the Treaties. The Treaty on European Union (The Maastricht Treaty) and provisions on Common Foreign and Security

Policy refer to one of the major visions of EU's presence and placement in international relations. In addition, the Lisbon Treaty (The Reform Treaty) which is amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community[14] increases the scope of European's foreign policy sector by adding new objectives and specifying instruments and means of influence that are at Community's disposal. Moreover, it indicates and characterizes type of relations between European Union and other international organizations, as well as stresses strategic importance of cooperation with NATO and USA most of all in the matter of international security and peacekeeping. Additionally, the Treaties provide us with a clear overview of principles and values that are fundamental for the whole Community and therefore it is obvious on what kind of standards the normative power of the European Union is emerging. Furthermore, European Security Strategy from December 2003 is an extremely valuable source for identifying European perspective on contemporary threats. It is also declaring what actions will the EU undertake in order to face global challenges and protect international peace and security. Conflict prevention and crisis management are identified as essential points in achieving stability in problematic regions. This entails a promise of more internationally present and active European Union.

Moreover, official documents are supported by political declarations of Member State's leaders, European bureaucrats and High Representatives of European institutions who shape the public opinion on performance of the EU in the eyes of the societies. They are responsible for deciding upon actions and policies which are suppose to respect European fundamental principles outlined in the Treaties and pursue with operations which should put those ideas into practice. Their interpretations and visions of European Union as a normative power are very significant and useful. The newly created position of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy embarking from the Lisbon Treaty includes key responsibilities in shaping EU's engagement and foreign relations with the rest of the world. The position is currently held by Catherine Ashton, who in her opening speech presented her idea on EU's external performance, once again stressing European attachment to principles and values: "Like many of you, I am convinced there is a clear call - inside the EU and around the world – for greater European engagement. To promote peace, protect the vulnerable, fight poverty and address the many problems of our time. We have to answer this

---

[14] In this process TEC has been renamed to Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

call. Combining leadership and partnership. Defending our values and promoting our interests"[15].

As already mentioned in the Literature Overview, various interesting positions considering CFSP, EU's external relations, concept of normative power and analysis on the outcomes of EU's influence have been published along with numerous up – to – date information present on European Commission's websites which add additional value for this research.

4. The European Union and International Involvement

The presence of the European Union in the world is overwhelming. It consists of many aspects such as trade relations where the EU is a major actor, development aid where the EU's dominance is completely unthreatened and advocacy for challenging global environmental problems which is often mentioned as a European main topic on the agenda. However, the core idea of this research is to examine EU's presence in the aspects of peacekeeping, security and conflict prevention. These are salient issues for international society and additionally very complex. They touch upon relevant aspects such as sovereignty, integrity, military action, international involvement, etc. Moreover, they engage foreign policies of nation states in certain crisis situations and demand a somewhat political in – put. In many cases this occurs to be problematic. We have to bear in mind that states are acting rationally and many times we have observed how the possible harm to their vital interest caused by involvement and engagement in a certain crisis situation prevented them from taking any actions or at least postponed it, which resulted in numerous human casualties, instability and immense violence. Therefore, while international community is devoted to cooperate and work on global peace and security under the United Nations Charter filled with magnificent declarations announcing a better world based on mutual understanding, cooperation, multilateralism, trust – building, peacekeeping, enhancing development, fighting poverty and increasing prosperity, one might ask what has been done to answer conflicts in Darfur, Somalia and Congo?

In addition to the above, taking into account the type of entity that the European Union entails it appears that fulfilling CFSP's objectives efficiently still remains a daunting task. Nevertheless, the aims have been set, as well as policies and instruments that ought to execute

---

[15] Catherine Ashton, High Representative (HR), Opening Remarks, European Parliamentary Hearing, 11 January 2010, Brussels.

them. What can be questioned however, is their overall impact and applicability to certain situations along with the overall outcome.

4.1 Political visions of EU's presence in the world

Political visions of how, when and where, the European Union should place its involvement is closely linked to overall debate on the future development and direction of the integration process. Whether it should focus on rather inter – governmental or supranational module, remains under a constant discussion. The issue of qualified majority voting (QMV) is resembling this argument very accurately. "While for some countries like France and the United Kingdom, the area of foreign policy is considered too sensitive to transfer full sovereignty to the European level, others like Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries for example, judge that the intergovernmental approach only constitutes an intermediary phase, and estimate that the only way to overcome the paralysis in CFSP is to move to decision making by QMV"[16]. CFSP and European's performance on international level in times of crisis and various tensions in certain regions of the world were widely criticise and accused of being ineffective. Therefore, provisions included in the Lisbon Treaty were suppose to address those allegations. The decision making process within CFSP is strictly inter – governmental which obviously may cause various apprehensions considering that 27 sovereign Member States with different foreign policy objectives ought to agree upon a common decision. Therefore, QMV has been extended. Furthermore, the constructive abstention rule (introduced for the first time in the Amsterdam Treaty) has been sustained. "This procedure allows a Member State to abstain on a vote without blocking an otherwise unanimous decision in the CFSP area, thereby enabling actions that are supported by the majority of Member States to continue"[17]. Additionally, more coherent and consistent European performance in external relations is a major objective for High Representative (HR) of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy who therefore is responsible for creation of European External Action Service (EEAS). "Composed of officials from the Council, Commission and diplomatic services of Member States, the EEAS will seek to streamline the EU external services by combining all those involved in foreign affairs"[18]. These are one of the most important amendments which are intended to make EU's capabilities in the aspect of

---

[16] Sophie Vanhoonacker, *From Maastricht to Amsterdam: Was it Worth the Journey for CFSP?*, Archive of European Integration, University of Pittsburgh, 1997

[17] Sophie Dagand, *The impact of the Lisbon Treaty on CFSP and ESDP*, European Security Review, No. 37, March 2008, p. 3

[18] Ibidem, p. 4

foreign relations more credible. However, if we compare principles and objectives of Union's external relations defined in the Lisbon Treaty and instruments included in order to fulfil them, it seems that the gap between overall ambitions and real capabilities is still in place. The Lisbon Treaty did not bring any revolution in the matter of CFSP, it is rather an attempt to overcome an impasse that occurred after failure of the Constitutional Treaty. This fact has a direct impact on European Union as a normative power in peacekeeping, security and conflict prevention. Deficiency in coherent foreign policy actions undermines this notion and leads to ambiguous performance of Europe in external relations. Prominent European political personalities are aware of the problem and at the same time assure the international society on the will of all Member States to challenge problems within EU's external actions. Javier Solana states that: "If you analyse EU foreign policy on a day-by-day basis, the difficulties to get everyone to agree and the slowness of our procedures stand out. But if you analyse it on a year-by-year basis, the conclusion is clear: we are, collectively, clearly getting better" and declares: "We need a Europe that works. If that is the ambition, we need to accept the consequences. We need to equip Europe with the people, resources and structures to perform the tasks that we want it to do"[19]. Effective missions and operations of the EU under the framework of CSDP are described as a major priority by Catherine Ashton (HR) in her opening speech given in European Parliament: "They save lives. They create the space in troubled areas for politics to work. They are a crucial part of what Europe is doing on the ground. We need to build on the progress made in recent years, making sure that our missions are well-staffed, well-equipped and well-led. So that we are ready to take action whenever our engagement is needed"[20]. However, the impact of European international engagement after the Lisbon Treaty and new provisions on CFSP and CSDP remains to be seen.

The European Security Strategy from 12 December 2003 which was drafted under a supervision of Javier Solana as High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union, constitutes first document in which key threats and global challenges are described from European perception. It also outlines strategic objectives among which one might find building security in the neighbourhood regions and international order based on effective multilateralism. The EU acknowledges the need and demand for more intensive involvement in international security issues as the global threats and their character have changed. "In an era of globalisation, distant threats may be as much a concern as those that

---

[19] Javier Solana's speech, College of Europe, Bruges, 19 October 2005.
[20] Catherine Ashton, High Representative (HR), Opening Remarks, European Parliamentary Hearing, 11 January 2010, Brussels.

are near at hand. Nuclear activities in North Korea, nuclear risks in South Asia, and proliferation in the Middle East are all of concern to Europe"[21]. The overall message is clear – European Union is aware of the fact that XXI century is bringing completely altered threats to global security, with different set of conflicts and problems that have to be challenged. Furthermore, the EU is prepared to bear higher responsibility for international stability and peace. Therefore, all Member States united by common principles and objectives embarking from the CFSP devote themselves to cooperation in order to confront contemporary threats and preserve global peace and security.

However, once again one might question all the above visions, ambitions and declarations while examining the reality which includes factors such as lack of consistency in EU's policy making, lack of military capabilities, complex decision making process within CFSP, different interests and priorities of national foreign policies, and many more. Although, all mentioned problems are already identified and Member States are undertaking legal and policy actions in order to fight them, it will take time until normative power of the EU in the aspect of peace, security and conflict prevention will be able to influence international arena more thoroughly. In addition to remarks made at the beginning of this point, the crucial aspect of ambiguities present in the Europe's global performance is lack of one, agreed and common vision of the future structure of European Union as a Community: supranational or inter – governmental entity.

4.2 The issues of peace and security in the EU's perception

International security and peace are topics of a global concern at the moment. We are witnessing the process of indication of new threats that have emerged such as terrorism with possible use of weapons of mass destruction, transnational crime, falling states and a new type of danger that they present. Those challenges demand solutions and actions on the international level. The European Union is stating clearly that as a Community it bears responsibility for not only internal, but also global peace and security. However, it wasn't until the Treaty of Maastricht were we find declaration considering preserving peace and strengthening international security among EU's objectives. During times of the Cold War, European Community was lacking a comprehensive legal bonding considering security and peace cooperation. It was more about bilateral agreements and mutual assurance of military help in case of third party attack. The enemy was undoubtedly identified – the Soviet Union

---

[21] A Secure Europe in a Better World – European Security Strategy, Brussels, 12 December 2003, p. 6

and Eastern Bloc. The polarization of the world was so strong and intensified that internal security cooperation of the European Community was not the main issue on the agenda. Member States bonded by bilateral alliances focused on collaboration through North Atlantic Treaty Organization along with Western European Union and focused on continuing the West – East dialogue that would prevent possible yet another conflict on the global scale. One have to bear in mind the type of institutional set up and the status of integration that the European Community found itself in. With economical and trade cooperation constituting the main precondition for collaboration it was still far from common declarations of a more political bonding and character. Nevertheless, after the deadlock in the integration process during 1960s, European Community established TREVI group (Terrorism, Radicalism et Violence Internationale) in 1976. It was a forum created for internal affairs ministers to share intelligence and discuss common actions against international terrorism. In 1985 TREVI's competences were expanded. This was the first political initiative considering external and internal security performed by European Community before the legal breakthrough that was brought by the Maastricht Treaty and it's establishment of the Common Foreign and Security Policy along with Justice and Home Affairs pillar. In addition to this, within Title V of the Treaty on European Union which includes provisions on Common Foreign and Security Policy for the first time objectives for EU's external policy have been formulated and outlined. They consists in the main part of major principles that ought to guide European Union's performance, but moreover we find a clear declaration of commitment to strengthening global peace and security. "The objectives of the common foreign and security policy shall be: (...) to strengthen the security of the Union and its Member States in all ways; (...) to preserve peace and strengthen international security, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter as well as the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the objectives of the Paris Charter; (...)"[22]. The EU aims to achieve this goal through international cooperation which proves that multilateral solutions dominate in European policy discourse. Therefore, promoting international cooperation has been included as one among five CFSP's objectives. Taking into consideration that most of the Member States are bonded by various alliances, for instance through NATO, Maastricht Treaty includes a provision which underlines that CFSP policy and objectives that is aims to pursue do not undermine Member State's previous obligations. It is formulated as follows: "The provisions of this Article shall not prevent the development of closer cooperation between two or more Member States on a

---

[22] The Maastricht Treaty: Treaty on European Union, Title V, art. J.1, p. 2, 1991

bilateral level, in the framework of the WEU and the Atlantic Alliance (...)"[23]. The Treaty on European Union was suppose to declare Community's ambition of more active presence on international arena, as well as political will to contribute towards more secure and peaceful global society. Nevertheless, in order to make those ambitions credible one need to obtain instruments of influence. That is why, according to Maastricht Treaty, Western European Union (WEU) should equip the Community in all means necessary to fulfil CFSP's objectives, particularly in the matter of internal security: "The Union requests the Western European Union (WEU), which is an integral part of the development of the Union, to elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defence implications (...)"[24]. WEU was perceived as a defence component of the EU. However, it wasn't until the adoption of Amsterdam Treaty where the European Union initiates the so – called Petersberg Tasks, which enabled the Community to intervene in a broader scale whenever crisis situation appeared. Defined in 1992, Petersberg Tasks are the military tasks of a humanitarian, peacekeeping and peacemaking nature that the European Union along with assistance of Western European Union are empowered to do. In addition to all the above, it appears that 1990s triggered a vision of more globally present and active European Union, devoted to security and responsible for preserving international peace. Political declarations are followed by attempt to define instruments used in external relations by the EU. Nevertheless, the scale and results of undertaken missions as a part of Petersberg Tasks and whether they meet the requirements set in the Maastricht Treaty could be discussed upon.

The Lisbon Treaty brings a new perception on matters of security and peace. The European Union acknowledges linkage between development, economical growth, social welfare, good governance and stability, peace, security around the world. Therefore, CFSP objectives have been expanded to include the following: "(...) foster the sustainable economic, social and environmental development of developing countries, with the primary aim of eradicating poverty", "help develop international measures to preserve and improve the quality of the environment and the sustainable management of global natural resources, in order to ensure sustainable development", "promote an international system based on stronger multilateral cooperation and good global governance"[25]. New vision of EU's contribution to preserving global security is not only about facilitating conflicts and crisis that are already

---

[23] Ibidem, art. J.4, p. 5, 1991
[24] Ibidem, art. J.4, p. 2, 1991
[25] Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, ch. 1, art. 10A, p. 2d, 2f, 2h, Lisbon, 13 December 2007

taking place, but to prevent them from happening by integrating and supporting less developed regions of the world. Therefore, in 2004 European Neighbourhood Policy has been established. It's main priorities were to "avoid the emergence of new dividing lines between the enlarged EU and our neighbours and instead strengthening the prosperity, stability and security of all concerned"[26]. Although ENP is restricted to closest surrounding of the EU it constitutes the most visible idea of putting objectives of the CFSP embedded in the Lisbon Treaty into practice. Additionally, ENP is addressing strategic objectives included in European Security Strategy from December 2003. The Lisbon Treaty obviously confirms previous legal bonding and declarations from the Maastricht Treaty considering preserving peace, preventing conflicts and strengthening international security, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, with the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and with the aims of the Charter of Paris.

Conflict prevention, peace and security are identified as strategically important for the future of European continent. "In its treaties and declarations, the EU has in fact recurrently flagged conflict resolution as a primary objective in its fledging foreign policy"[27]. The perception of peace and security elevated throughout last decades and developed along with progressive integration of European Community. Once peace and stability has been established on European continent, it is identified that at the moment the major challenge is to spread it beyond EU's borders. This correlates with the vision of the EU being more internationally engaged and responsible for matters of a global concern.

4.3 EU in action: Missions and Operations

One of the main objectives of European Union's external policy embedded in the Lisbon Treaty is high degree of cooperation in order to preserve peace, prevent conflicts and strengthen international security. Therefore, under the framework of Common Security and Defence Policy (which is a part of CFSP) the EU conducts crisis management missions, civil peacekeeping missions as well as military operations. The main regional focus of this engagement is set on Africa and the Balkans. The largest civilian mission ever lunch under the CSDP was the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX) initiated in April 2009. The general aim is to assist and support the Kosovo authorities in the rule of law

---

[26] European Commission, External Relations website,
http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/enp/index_en.htm, 05.05.2010
[27] Nathalie Tocci, *The EU and Conflict Resolution: Promoting peace in the backyard*, Routledge, 2007, p. 7

area, mainly in the police, judiciary and customs sector. Furthermore, Kosovo is identified as of a great importance for the EU, that is why with this mission European Community wants to contribute to creation of a "democratic and multi-ethnic Kosovo with full respect for the rule of law, cooperating peacefully with its neighbours and contributing to regional and European stability"[28]. It is recognized that if Kosovo would follow this particular democratic path it will move closer to European integration. Therefore, the EU is making an attempt not to enforce certain political solutions, but to mentor, monitor and advise, which collaborates ideally with the notion of Europe as a normative power. Civil peacekeeping missions are dominated by police operations undertaken in various countries struck by turmoil and instability. At the moment the following missions can be mentioned as the most important ones: EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (EUPM, from 1 January 2003), policy mission in Kinshasa, DRC (April 2005 - June 2007) which constitutes first CSDP civil mission in Africa, EU police advisory team (EUPAT) in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which follows termination of military operation PROXIMA, EU Police mission in Afghanistan (EUPOL AFGHANISTAN, initiated in June 2007, established for a period of at least 3 years) and EU Police Mission in the Palestinian Territories (EUPOL COPPS, initiated in January 2006, established for a period of 3 years). They all provide technical assistance with staff that ought to share their experiences and give significant instructions and training considering local governance as well as advising in various internal issues that safeguard local community. In addition, advisory and assistance missions, humanitarian aid with civilian monitoring are another scope of interest for EU's operations. Most of them are focused on African countries. So far under the auspice of CSDP the European Union carried out the following: EU mission in support of the Security Sector Reform in Guinea-Bissau (EU SSR Guinea – Bissau, February 2008 until 31 May 2010), EUTM Somalia – European Union military mission to contribute to the training of Somali security forces (initiated on 7 April 2010), EUSEC CONGO, EU advisory and assistance mission for security reform in the Democratic Republic of Congo (EUSEC CONGO, the mission was launched on 8 June 2005 and its mandate runs until 30 September 2010), first mission to Sudan aimed at supporting African Union in stabilizing situation in Darfur (AMIS 2005 – 2007), EUFOR mission to Chad with main objectives to protect civilians and provide humanitarian aid (2008) and EU Border Assistance Mission to the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine (October 2005 - November 2009). However, one has to bear in mind that all missions mentioned above do not

---

[28] Council of the European Union website,
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showPage.aspx?id=1458&lang=EN, 20.05.2010

involve any kind of military engagement whatsoever. In fact there have only been five military operations conducted under the CSDP – operation ARTEMIS in Democratic Republic of Congo (June 2003), operation lead by EUFOR forces aimed at supporting UN troops (engaged in MONUC mission) in Democratic Republic of Congo (April – November 2006), EUFOR ALTHEA operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (December 2004), EUFOR mission in Chad (2008 – 2009) and EUFOR Concordia mission in FYROM (2003). They entailed higher level of engagement in the region, additionally demanded more staff and military troops, equipment, as well as more thorough strategic planning and required higher financial support. This figure comparing to number of civilian missions focused on police assistance, rule of law, border management, monitoring and humanitarian aid can hardly be regarded as impressive and satisfactory. Nevertheless, the core idea of European Union's external action was first and foremost based on Petersberg Tasks and, as it was mentioned before, they consists of humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks followed by crisis management operations. Hence, Member States of the EU were reluctant towards direct military engagement.

There is no doubt that the EU is committed to be active participant on international arena and therefore, undertakes various actions aimed at stabilising, securitizing and preventing conflicts. Furthermore, European Community interprets peacekeeping in a broader sense. "Peacekeeping has evolved from its traditional role of maintaining a safe and secure environment to include elements like election observation missions, support for police and the judiciary in states recovering from the ravages of conflict, promotion of the rule of law, and respect for human rights"[29]. Hence, the EU is often accused of leaving the "dirty work" which includes peace enforcement with military engagement to United States or NATO, while focusing on the aftermath of the crisis by providing assistance in the areas mentioned above. However, this corresponds with an argument that the European Community, trying to overcome its lack of hard power, concentrates on not enforcing but transferring certain type of governance, democratic values and principles presenting itself as a model that could be followed. External missions and operations of the EU ought to fulfil this objective.

---

[29] EU Focus, *The EU and the Peacekeeping: Promoting Security, Stability and Democratic Values*, Delegation of the European Commission to the US, November 2008, p. 2

4.4 Successes and Failures of EU's engagement

In 1999 Yugoslavia became a region dominated by extremely brutal conflict, where Albanian minority experienced many atrocities and acts of violence from Serbian majority. In order to resolve this crisis NATO forces lead by the United States in particular undertook a swift and rapid, yet incoherent action which finally resulted in stabilizing situation in Yugoslavia. While analyzing this set of events what strikes the most is total lack of agreement, strategy and action from the European Community. Yugoslavia's conflict is provided as an example of European Union being absolutely incapable of handling crisis situations even in their own "backyard". Since then however, many reforms amending institutionalized set up, coordination and policy implementation mechanisms took place. In addition, this resulted in various positive effects of EU's international engagement.

Military mission CONCORDIA sent to FYRM in 2003 was one of the first operations of this kind lead by European Union. It was well coordinated and therefore, after 3 months of engagement the armed conflict was not identified as the main threat anymore. Instead criminality became the main obstacle for local authorities to pursue with efficient governance on their territory. That is why, military mission was substituted by police mission PROXIMA. As situation in Macedonia was stabilizing, PROXIMA was transformed into police advisory mission EUPAT in 2005. "This shows how the EU was able to – in a two-year lapse – to build the capability for a deeper normative action, abandoning a military perspective in favour of assisting the efforts of Macedonia's government"[30]. The ultimate goal of this engagement was brining stability in Macedonia fully in the hands of elected leaders, while at the same time presenting possible membership in the European Union as a "reward" for implementing European norms and principles such as democracy, rule of law, human rights, free market into the reality of this region. Macedonia's leaders were assuring international society of working in full partnership with EU in order to follow this particular path. As a result, by December 2005 Macedonia was acknowledged as a candidate State to EU's membership. In addition to this, normative influence and power of attraction of the European Union in the case of Macedonia achieved truly remarkable success.

The same pattern, although without the military component, can be observed in Kosovo where the EU has lunched the largest civilian mission ever conducted under the CSDP. The

---

[30] Andrea Ciambra, *Normative Power Europe: theory and practice of EU norms, the Case of Macedonia*, Jean Monnet Working Papers in Comparative and International Politics, No. 64, July 2008, p. 20

European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX) resulted in not only stabilizing the fragile political situation but also contributed to Kosovo choosing a path of European integration and domestic normalization. With the support of the European mission crucial problems such as ethnic conflicts and social cohesion have been identified by local authorities which are determined to challenge them under the European auspice.

However, what has been achieved in the Balkans not necessarily has to work in Africa. Operation ARTEMIS deployed in Bunia, Democratic Republic of Congo, in 2003 was the first mission conducted beyond the European continent by EU forces. Conditions of this engagement were extremely hard and daunting. DRC have been experiencing violent conflict for the last four years in which 3 million people lost their life, the country has been plagued by instability, misrule and interference by its neighbours Rwanda and Uganda and child soldiers are used to replenish local militias"[31]. The number of troops under EU's command was 1,400 soldiers, half of them were coming from France. Control over the airport near the city of Bunia has been restored as well as the order in the city itself. Nevertheless, at the same time many shortcomings in EU's military capabilities could be spotted. First of all, operation ARTEMIS can hardly be considered as conducted under the CSDP policy as the only country that was able and willing to offer well equipped and prepared to operate in African conditions soldiers was France. Stability has been restored basically only in the surrounding of Bunia. In other regions of Congo atrocities, violence and massacres continued. Timeframe of this operations has been very short due to the fact that France was not able to bear a burden of financing it on her own, while other Member States were reluctant to contributing financially for prolonging it. All in all, although primary objectives have been fulfilled, mission ARTEMIS shed light on various shortcomings in EU's international engagement.

In April 2006 EUFOR mission was initiated in order to support UN MONUC presence in Congo. Once again, limitations which occurred while conducting operation ARTEMIS could not have been omitted in this case as well. EUFOR mission revealed how problematic it is for the EU to provide necessary assets while operating abroad. The mission was delayed by two weeks due to lack of two surgeons who were needed in order to close the gap in EUFOR's medical team. Moreover, political crisis occurred in relations between France and Germany. Both countries were not able to reach compromise considering salient issues such as duration of the mission, number of troops involved and strategic objectives of the mission.

---

[31] Judy Dempsey, *Congo - the test for EU's peacekeeping skills*, Financial Times, 15 July 2003

"However, a main point of criticism was that the primarily reason for countries such as France and Belgium to engage in these kind of missions was to secure their influence on the regional government and to pursue their own economic interests"[32]. Therefore, in this particular case normative character of the mission has been completely abandoned.

In addition, how credible is the EU's performance in normative promotion of peacekeeping, security and conflict prevention considering all the above missions and operations mentioned? It appears that many successful accomplishments of European Community's international involvement at the same time have to face various shortcomings. Problems in providence of military assets, lack of common military planning unit, participation deficit of the Member States, misunderstandings between EU and UN forces, but most importantly lack of common agreement and political will while conducting crisis management and peacekeeping missions, contribute heavily to the gap between the vision of active EU in international relations and the reality.

5. Conclusions

There is no doubt that the sole character of the European Union as an entity determines the fact that traditional categories of power are not applicable in this case. Lack of common military forces under one command is one of the main factors that prevent the EU from following supranational path of development, but at the same time poses many obstacles for credibility in promotion of its principles. Obviously, normative objectives such as peacekeeping, international security and conflict prevention have to be fulfilled by normative means. Therefore, persuasion, influence and power of attraction are basic instruments used by the EU while facing international crisis. However, it appears that normative power of the EU brings considerable effects in a limited surrounding. It works for close neighbourhood, but is completely inadequate for regions such as Africa, where the scale of problems and various difficulties at this point cannot be overcome only by instruments being at the EU's disposal. Nevertheless, even though successes achieved by European Community's external policy are modest, they still provide evidence for attempts made by the EU to challenge international accusations of Europe being vague and passive.

Credibility of the EU in the aspect of peacekeeping, security and conflict prevention is evolving in the positive direction. It is definitely lacking clear, recognised achievements on

---

[32] Elizabeth Deheza, *EU crisis management in Africa. The time for a "real adventure" has come*, Amicus Europae, No. 30, Warsaw, October 2009, p. 6

international arena, however, since establishment of CFSP significant progress have been made. The fundamental problem lays in the European Union itself and the fact that it constitutes of sovereign Member States which, though bonded by Community's foreign policy objectives, still identify their national primary goals in international relations. Compromise and common agreement on EU's actions in the matter of foreign policy is complex. Another problem that can be identified is the model of EU presented in the Treaties. European Union is supposed to be contributing to "peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair trade, eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights (...)"[33] and many other aspects which are thoroughly elaborated upon and converted into numerous objectives for the EU embedded in the Lisbon Treaty. Obviously it is extremely hard for an entity such as the European Union to efficiently fulfil all of them, which makes European Community a victim of its own ambitions. The role model of international organization presented in the EU's legal framework is, if not utopian, then at least tremendously hard to live up to. Therefore, European Union devoted to normative promotion of international security, peacekeeping and conflict prevention, fully capable of pursuing with rapid response when necessary, effective and completely independent in its actions is a project for many years to come.

All in all, the European Union is credible in fulfilling foreign policy objectives such as security, peacekeeping and conflict prevention to the extent which is enabled by the sole character of the EU itself. The Lisbon Treaty contributes to EU being more effective, although, it can hardly be considered as a breakthrough. Responsibility and credibility of the future performance of EU's foreign policy lays in the hands of the Member States.

---

[33] Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, art. 2, p. 5, Lisbon, 13 December 2007

Reference

Andrea Ciambra, *"Normative Power" Europe: theory and practice of EU norms: the case of Macedonia*, Jean Monnet Working Papers in Comparative and International Politics, University of Catania, July 2008

Sophie Dagand, *The impact of the Lisbon Treaty on CFSP and ESDP*, European Security Review, No. 37, March 2008

Judy Dempsey, *Congo the test for EU's peacekeeping skills*, Financial Times, July 2003

Thomas Diez , Stephan Stetter and Mathias Albert, *The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Power of Integration and Association*, Cambridge University Press, 2008

EU Focus, *The EU and the Peacekeeping*, Delegation of the European Commission to the USA, November 2008

Matthew MacDonald, *Three Perspectives on European Union as a Normative Power*, Dalhousie EUCE Student Essay No. 1, 2007

Ian Manners, *Normative power Europe reconsidered: beyond the crossroads*, Journal of European Public Policy, Volume 13, Issue 2, March 2006

Daniel Plesch, Jack Seymour, *A Conflict Prevention Service for European Union*, British – American Security Information Council, Research Report 2000.2, June 2000

Karen Elizabeth Smith, *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*, second edition, 2008

Michael Smith, *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy – The Institutionalization of Cooperation*, Cambridge University Press, 2004

Nathalie Tocci, *Profiling Normative Foreign Policy: The European Union and its Global Partners*, Centre for European Policy Studies, 2007

Nathalie Tocci, *The EU and Conflict Resolution: Promoting Peace in the Backyard*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2007

Sophie Vanhoonacker, *From Maastricht to Amsterdam: Was it Worth the Journey for CFSP?,* Archive of European Integration, University of Pittsburgh, 1997

Wolfgang Wessels, Franziska Bopp, *The Institutional Architecture of CFSP after the Lisbon Treaty – Constitutional Breaktrough or Challenges Ahead?*, No. 10, July 2008

Brian White, *Understanding European Foreign Policy*, Palgrave, 2001

Richard Whitman and Ana Juncos, *The Lisbon Treaty and Foreign, Security and Defence Policy: Reforms, Implementation and the Consequences of Non – Ratification*, European Foreign Affairs Review, No. 14, 2009

Documents:

Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, 13 December 2007, Lisbon

The Maastricht Treaty – Treaty on European Union, 7 February 1992, Maastricht

The Treaty of Amsterdam amending the Treaty of the European Union, the Treaties establishing the European Communities and certain related acts, 2 October 1997, Amsterdam

Internet Websites:

http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/cfsp/conflict_prevention/index_en.htm - Conflict Prevention Partnership

http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/cfsp/index_en.htm - CFSP for the European Union

http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/cfsp/crisis_management/index_en.htm - Crisis Management

http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/ifs/index_en.htm - Instruments for Stability

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showPage.aspx?id=268&lang=en – Overview of the Missions and Operations of the European Union

http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/10/129&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en – Catherine Ashton's High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy speech on the proposal for the European External Action Service, March 2010

http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/ashton/docs/ashton_speech_hearing-ep.pdf - Catherine Ashton, High Representative / Vice President Opening remarks, European Parliament Hearing, January 2010

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/discours/110218.pdf - Javier Solana's speech at Harvard University, Europe in the World, 2009