

# Sovereignty and human security – contesting or complementing concepts?

A case study of the European Security Strategy

Louise Sundberg

# Abstract

The sovereignty concept is facing a challenge. In the postmodern world order European Union member states share a common security strategy and human security has become the guiding principle for European security thinking. The aim of this thesis is to develop conceptualizations of the sovereignty concept that incorporates elements of both state sovereignty and human security. In addition my aim is to analyze how state sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed in the European Security Strategy (ESS). Based on traditional sovereignty theories and critical human security studies I have developed three definitions of sovereignty: *statehood sovereignty*, *responsibility sovereignty* and *privilege sovereignty*. These sovereignty conceptualizations were used as my ideal types when conducting a text analysis of the ESS. My analysis demonstrates that all three sovereignty conceptualizations are expressed in the ESS. My analysis determines a conditional relationship between responsibility sovereignty and privilege sovereignty. Last, I identified that there are differences in how state sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed for EU member states and for states outside of Europe.

*Key words:* Sovereignty, Human Security, European Security Strategy, Humanitarian Intervention, Responsibility to Protect

Words: 8531

# Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Aim and research question .....	2
1.2	Disposition .....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Critical perspective.....	3
2.2	Research object .....	3
2.3	Research material .....	4
2.4	Text analysis.....	5
2.5	Operationalization .....	6
2.5.1	Statehood Sovereignty.....	6
2.5.2	Responsibility Sovereignty .....	6
2.5.3	Privilege Sovereignty .....	7
2.6	Comparison .....	7
2.7	Generalizability .....	7
2.8	Definitions.....	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Theory .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Statehood Sovereignty.....	10
3.1.1	Failing States .....	10
3.1.2	My sovereignty definition .....	10
3.2	Responsibility Sovereignty .....	11
3.2.1	Responsibility to protect.....	11
3.2.2	Cooperation .....	11
3.2.3	My sovereignty definition .....	12
3.3	Privilege Sovereignty .....	12
3.3.1	Humanitarian intervention.....	12
3.3.2	The EU .....	13
3.3.3	My sovereignty definition .....	13
3.4	Theoretical conclusion .....	14
<b>4</b>	<b>Analysis.....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Statehood Sovereignty.....	15
4.1.1	EU members .....	15
4.1.2	Non EU members .....	16
4.2	Responsibility Sovereignty .....	16
4.2.1	Responsibility to provide human security .....	16
4.2.1.1	EU members .....	16
4.2.1.2	Non EU members.....	17
4.2.2	Responsibility to cooperate .....	18

4.2.2.1	EU members .....	18
4.2.2.2	Non EU members.....	18
4.3	Privilege Sovereignty .....	19
4.3.1	Self-determination .....	19
4.3.2	Nonintervention.....	19
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions and discussion .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Further Research .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>References.....</b>	<b>25</b>

# 1 Introduction

*We no longer live in the world of pure national interests. Human rights and humanitarian problems inevitably play an important part in our policy-making.*  
(Cooper, 2000:38)

In a globalized world increasing flows of goods, services, capital and ideas cross borders and make people more interrelated than ever before. Local conflicts and insecurities are to a greater extent considered international concerns since they have global security implications. Recognizing mutual vulnerability to common threats, security, a traditionally national concern has become a global concern in the international community (Commission on Human Security, 2003:2).

Since 2003 the European Security Strategy, hereafter referred to as ESS, serves as a common strategic vision for European foreign policy and security. A common European Security Strategy problematizes the significance of traditional state sovereignty.

According to Cooper we live in a post-modern world with a new European security order. Security is defined in collective terms rather than national terms and the protection of humans are valued more than the security of states (2000:31, 34, 39). This has resulted in that the human security concepts responsibility to protect and humanitarian intervention have become global norms (Matlary, 2008:134).

In recent scholarly debates traditional realist conceptualizations of sovereignty have been criticized for not sufficiently describing the postmodern world order in which EU member states exist. Among others, Cooper suggests that states no longer can be considered absolute sovereigns since they pool, share and delegate power to external authorities (2000:7). Similarly, Manners suggests that since the EU applies universal normative principles such as sustainable peace, freedom, democracy, human rights, rule of law, equality, social solidarity, sustainable development and good governance; the EU is changing “the norms, standards, and prescriptions of world politics away from the bounded expectations of state-centricity” (2008:45-46). Kaldor, Martin and Selchow also argue that “the adoption of a human security concept represents a qualitative change in the conduct of foreign and security policy” (2007: 273). These studies are relevant to my analysis since they all imply that security focus has shifted from nations to humans. However, is the sovereignty concept completely out dated and irrelevant or is a modification of the concept possible? Is it possible to create a definition of the sovereignty concept that incorporates human security without compromising traditional state sovereignty? I claim that a reconstruction of the sovereignty concept is necessary in order to describe, analyze and critically evaluate how state

sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed in the European Security Strategy and by extension implemented at the European and national levels.

## 1.1 Aim and research question

The purpose of this study is to conduct a critical analysis of the sovereignty concept. I intend to evaluate the sustainability and explanatory power of traditional realist sovereignty conceptualizations with critical studies on human security. I seek to develop upon existing theories by analyzing how traditional sovereignty and human security can be combined. By developing conceptualizations of sovereignty, that compose elements of both state sovereignty and human security, I intend to create a deeper understanding of the sovereignty concept and contribute to the existing sovereignty debates in the European context. My aim is to analyze how state sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed in the ESS.

Consequently my research questions are:

How can the concepts state sovereignty and human security be incorporated in the same sovereignty definition?

How is state sovereignty conceptualized and expressed in the ESS?

## 1.2 Disposition

This thesis will begin with a methodology discussion where I will present my choice of perspective, research object, material, method and analysis instrument. Thereafter I will present relevant theories and based on these develop my own theoretical ideal types that I will use as my instrument when analyzing my text material. Conclusions from my analysis will subsequently be discussed.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Critical perspective

The aim of this thesis is to conduct a critical analysis of traditional realist understandings of the sovereignty concept. A critical approach problematizes and destabilizes established knowledge and raises consciousness of concepts and social conditions that we seek to change and develop upon (Hammersley, 2005, 181). I have chosen a critical perspective because I find traditional sovereignty conceptualizations problematic in the postmodern world that emphasizes on human security. By conducting a critical analysis my intention is to deliver a deeper explanatory model of the sovereignty concept that is more applicable to the contemporary world order and more appropriate to analyze the sovereignty conceptualizations in the ESS.

With my critical approach I intend to emphasize the importance of human security in the European security thinking and shed light on how this normative security approach affects traditional sovereignty conceptualizations. I seek to develop alternative conceptualizations of sovereignty that incorporates elements of both state sovereignty and human security. My intention is to uncover richer understandings of the relationship between the concepts state sovereignty and human security in the international community as well as contribute to the existing sovereignty debates in Europe.

### 2.2 Research object

I have chosen to analyze the sovereignty concept since it is a highly debated conception in the contemporary European security context. I find the sovereignty concept to be an interesting research object for two main reasons. First of all a common security and defense policy question the significance of self-determining sovereign member states in the EU. It is therefore of principal interest to evaluate and analyze the significance of the concept for EU member states. Has the concept lost its traditional importance or has state sovereignty been re-conceptualized in order to fit the new European security context? Second of all recognizing human security as the guiding security approach within the EU (Kaldor, 2007:273) further problematizes the significance of the traditional sovereignty concept. Since ideas about sovereignty is likely to shape state action and interaction in the international community, understandings of the sovereignty concept are likely to have implications on foreign policies and global politics.

Therefore I argue that a postmodern understanding of the sovereignty concept is essential in order grasp the new European security order.

## 2.3 Research material

The European Union has a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and a common European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) which coordinates EU member states external action (EU, 2013). The EU has published several key documents on security, however I have chosen to limit my analysis to the European Security Strategy (ESS). The ESS serves as a framework and strategic vision for European security. It outlines the new European security environment, defines main security challenges and threats and outlines strategic objectives and policy implications for EU member states (ibid.).

I find the ESS to be an intriguing research material for several reasons. First of all traditionally only states develop security strategies. EU member states committing to a common security strategy problematizes traditional sovereignty conceptualizations. Second of all the ESS is an interesting document considering that it was created as a response to the new global security environment after 9/11, a new security order that is characterized by global threats and common solutions to them (Dannreuther & Peterson, 2006: 6; Asmus, 2006:22). Thirdly a common European security strategy has implications on how EU member states interact with each other as well as with other key actors in the international community since it is a guiding document on security. The security strategy thus influences how and when state sovereignty might be contested for the benefit of human security. Fourth the security strategy is an important document in European foreign politics since it also outlines how the CFSP and ESDP are expected to be developed, reinforced and integrated for EU member states. I believe that this makes the European Security Strategy a principally interesting research material.

The European Security Strategy consists of three separate documents that together make up the ESS. "A secure Europe in a better world: European Security Strategy" was first published in 2003. In 2008 the "Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy: providing security in a Changing World" complemented the preceding document and in 2010 the draft "Internal Security Strategy for the European Union: Towards a European Security Model" was released. I have chosen to complement the two acknowledged external documents of the Security Strategy from 2003 and 2008 with the draft on Internal Security Strategy from 2010 in order to extend my material. Complementing my material with the draft is beneficial. A more extensive material will enrich my analysis and my conclusions will be better supported since they will be based on a broader sample of material. A material that stretches over a longer period of time will create a better and more coherent understanding of how sovereignty and related security discourses have changed over time. Even though I analyze three different documents I believe that I have avoided the problem with conceptual travelling, meaning that the concept loses or changes its original meaning when applying it



to another context. Since the three documents are published as complements to each other and touch upon the same security order I argue that I can use the same sovereignty operationalization when analyzing all three documents of the ESS even though they are published with a few years apart.

## 2.4 Text analysis

Since the aim of this study is to interpret how sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed in the ESS I have chosen to conduct a descriptive text analysis. With this approach I will be able to uncover assumptions and understandings of the sovereignty concept through intense readings of the ESS (Esaiasson et. al., 2012: 210-211). I intend to describe the sovereignty conceptualizations through systematically classifying the expressions of sovereignty into appropriate sovereignty categories. Classifying the sovereignty conceptualizations into ideal types will help me to systematically study how sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed in the ESS (Beckman, 2007: 20).

Ideal types are absolute and extreme illustrations of ideas or concepts that clarifies, isolates and summarizes significant characteristics (Beckman, 2007: 28-29). Political scientists have used ideal types to analyze complex and controversial concepts such as state legitimacy and democracy (Beckman, 2005:28-29; Teorell & Svensson, 2007:43). Likewise sovereignty is a multifaceted concept and therefore I find ideal types to be an appropriate analysis instrument in order to clarify and present the sovereignty concept's different meanings, understandings and expressions. Ideal types are developed with the purpose of illustrating variation and uncover new relationships in a material (Badersten, 2002: 31-32). Using ideal types as my analytical tool sit well with my aim to discover and illustrate new conceptualizations and perspectives of the sovereignty concept in the ESS. When developing ideal types distinctive traits are emphasized whereas less significant aspects of the concept are diminished (ibid.). This enables me to moderate outdated traditional sovereignty characteristics whereas significant human security traits can be emphasized.

Nevertheless the sovereignty ideal types that I have developed are theoretical illustrations of sovereignty conceptualizations rather than accurate representations of the sovereignty concept in reality (Beckman, 2005:28-29). This implies that I cannot claim my ideal types to perfectly describe the sovereignty conceptualizations in the ESS. However I can claim that my sovereignty ideal types are appropriate analytical tools to compare to the sovereignty expressed in the ESS.

## 2.5 Operationalization

Developing my own definitions of the sovereignty concept gives me the opportunity to illustrate new aspects of the concept. I have operationalized my sovereignty ideal types based on traditional realist sovereignty theories, critical human security studies and relevant challenges in the new security order.

I have identified and incorporated significant security concepts that are frequently employed in global politics and relevant to the European security context. When operationalizing my ideal types I have consciously limited myself to security concepts and challenges that I find are relevant to my research purpose and to the ESS in order to ensure that my analysis instrument is appropriate (Teorell & Svensson, 2007: 40).

Since my sovereignty ideal types are operationalized based on relevant and acknowledged theories on sovereignty and security I argue that my analysis instrument has high validity (Esaiasson et. al., 2012: 216). Basing my study on acknowledged theories I also suggest that my study is cumulative (Teorell & Svensson, 2007:35). This increases the possibility to relate my research results to existing theories and increase the likelihood to make more general contributions to existing research.

When analyzing the ESS my developed ideal types were used as categories within which I placed text sections from the ESS. I traced text extracts that corresponded to my sovereignty ideal types by asking questions to the text material. When presenting my analysis I will support my findings with illustrating examples from the ESS. In order to ensure intersubjectivity I will clearly report and motivate my classifications and conclusions (Teorell & Svensson, 2007: 54). My analysis was guided by the following questions.

### 2.5.1 Statehood Sovereignty

In order to analyze how statehood sovereignty is expressed in the ESS I explored how states were narrated. I asked myself does the ESS recognize independent states and countries? I explored if the criteria for recognized statehood was met and investigated whether states were assumed to have governmental power over a well-defined territory and population. I also analyzed if there were any differences in how statehood sovereignty was conceptualized for EU members and non EU member states.

### 2.5.2 Responsibility Sovereignty

In order to analyze how responsibility sovereignty is expressed I explored how state obligations were reported. Are there any underlying assumptions about state responsibilities in the ESS? I investigated if I could identify any expectations of states. I also analyzed how state responsibility to protect and intervene were

outlined. I looked into what expectations there are of states to cooperate. I analyzed if the responsibilities for EU members and non EU-members are outlined in the same way or if there are different expectations of state responsibility inside and outside the European Union.

### 2.5.3 Privilege Sovereignty

In order to analyze how privilege sovereignty is expressed I analyzed in what way the rights of states are described in the ESS. Are there any core assumptions about state rights? Or can I identify a lack of state rights? I traced under what circumstances and to what extent, state rights are respected and violated in my material. I analyzed how the principle of nonintervention and territorial integrity are outlined. I also investigated if there any differences in how the rights of EU members and non EU-members are depicted.

## 2.6 Comparison

Many theorists have paid attention to the ESS and among others Maria Stern have emphasized the human aspects present in the document. She exposes traces of a European colonial past and uncovers gendered, racialised, feminized and subordinate representations of “others” in the ESS. She claims that these representations naturalizes and reproduces a certain narrative of Europe. This narrative outlines what countries belong to Europe and what countries are narrated as outsiders (2011). I believe that the way Europe is reproduced will influence how global threats and security are outlined as well as affect how state sovereignty is conceptualized. Therefore I have conducted a comparison with consideration to the research results by Maria Stern.

In order to enrich my analysis I have compared how sovereignty is conceptualized for EU member states with how sovereignty is conceptualized for non EU-members. This comparison is interesting because assumptions about state sovereignty is likely to have implications on foreign politics. Assumptions about state sovereignty in the ESS could indicate how EU member states tackle global threats, which states are outlined as potential partners as well as shape ideas about when it is advisable to intervene for humanitarian causes.

## 2.7 Generalizability

With the recognition of mutual vulnerability to global threats and the adoption of the human security approach; states have become increasingly interrelated and interdependent. Realizing this, the European Union is likely to invest more in the

ESS and international cooperation and collective security solutions are likely to become more common in the international community. Even though my analysis only covers sovereignty conceptualizations in the ESS, my conclusions could be generalized to studies of sovereignty more broadly. My definitions of sovereignty can constitute an explorative foundation for future research on sovereignty and human security in the international community and my conclusions can contribute to the European sovereignty debates.

When conducting my study I recognize the risk of inconsistent analysis due to human factors. With the purpose of ensuring reliability I have studied the ESS several times in order to ensure a consistent analysis (Teorell & Svensson, 2007: 59). In order to ensure reliability I have also strived to be aware of any preconceived opinions, understandings or biases of mine that could have an impact on my analysis. This awareness should increase the possibility to generalize my conclusions to sovereignty in a broader sense.

## 2.8 Definitions

I will now define a few key concepts that are frequently used throughout this thesis. It has been suggested that we live in a postmodern world order with a new international states' system (Cooper, 2004: 26-27). When referring to the *postmodern world* I mean the international framework that we live in. It is characterized by a dissolved distinction between what is domestic and international, less significant borders, recognition of mutual vulnerability and an increased focus on individuals (Cooper, 2004:26-31).

I have defined important human security concepts based on recognized definitions in "The Responsibility to Protect" by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) from 2001 and "Human Security Now" by the Commission on Human Security from 2003. I have chosen to define my human security concepts based on these documents since they are acknowledged guiding documents in global politics and security and thus employed by both the UN and EU.

I have chosen to use the definition of human security by the Commission on Human Security. They define *human security* as protecting individuals from threat, enhance human rights, freedoms and development (2003:4). With the increasing importance of human security norms, the principle of responsibility to protect has emerged. The ICISS defines *responsibility to protect* as the responsibility of states in the international community to protect their own citizens as well as the citizens of other states (2001:16). The principle of responsibility to protect has generated a demand for humanitarian intervention. The ICISS defines *humanitarian intervention* as a military intervention for human protection purposes (2001:9).

### 3 Theory

My theoretical base consist of traditional realist theories of the sovereignty concept such as those put forward by Hans J. Morgenthau, Alan James and F.H. Hinsley. Recognizing that many of the realist orthodox theories are quite old I have to the greatest extent possible complemented these theories with more recent research in order to support their validity.

Considering the critical character of my study I have used an extensive amount of critical theories on human security such as studies by Mary Kaldor, Alex Bellamy and Mikael Baaz. Using critical theories will help me identify how the human security approach challenges the traditional sovereignty conceptualizations (Hammersley, 2005: 181). Critical theories can be distinguished from traditional theories in the sense that they have a practical purpose rather than a strictly explanatory one. A critical theory provides both an explanatory description and is normative in the sense that it provides practical proposals for change (Horkheimer, 1972, 188-225). Critical human security studies problematize realist conceptions of international security and seek to challenge attitudes that emphasize state security above the security of individuals (Newman, 2010: 78-79). Critical human security theories are appropriate to my study since they question traditional conceptualizations of state sovereignty. Using critical human security theories will help me identify and analyze how the traditional sovereignty concept can be modified in order to better describe the postmodern security order. Due to the great supply of critical human security theories I have chosen to limit my study to critical theories which main focus are the European context.

With the intention of analyzing how sovereignty is conceptualized in the ESS I need to illustrate how a reconstruction of the sovereignty concept can look like. In order to develop new conceptualizations of sovereignty it is essential to clarify what the traditional sovereignty concept entails. I have identified three key expressions of the sovereignty concept that will make up the foundation in my sovereignty conceptualizations. I have identified recognized statehood to be a basic requirement in order to attain state sovereignty (Morgenthau, 1948: 341; Hinsley, 1986:17). With the recognition of statehood comes certain rights and obligations of states (Heller & Sofaer, 2000:24, 26). Therefore I suggest that recognized statehood, state rights and state obligations are appropriate expressions of state sovereignty in the international community. My aim is to complement and modify the traditional sovereignty conceptualizations with critical human security studies in order to develop new sovereignty definitions. I will evaluate the explanatory power of each traditional sovereignty expression in a human security context by situating it within potential challenges. I have identified failing states,

responsibility to protect, cooperation, humanitarian intervention and the EU to be relevant challenges in the European security context.

## 3.1 Statehood Sovereignty

Since the peace of Westphalia in 1648 the sovereignty concept has been an important notion in international relations shaping state action and interaction in the international community (Axtmann, 2004:260). It has been a contested concept and numerous theorists have given the concept different interpretations and meanings. In its most traditional form recognized statehood has been the basic sovereignty requirement (Hinsley, 1986:17). In order to be recognized as a state the features absolute governmental power over a well-defined territory and population needs to be attained (Morgenthau, 1948:341; Axtmann, 2004: 260-262). Traditionally statehood recognition have provided states with an absolute, unquestioned and unconditional state sovereignty in the international community (Morgenthau, 1948:341).

### 3.1.1 Failing States

Weak or failing states are suggested to challenge the traditional statehood conceptualization since the absolute governmental power is deteriorating. However Löwenheim and Paltiel claim that even though failed states imply a weakened governmental control, national governments are considered the ultimate authority within defined territories since there is no external authority with legal rights to stand above the state (2004:2). Krasner sustains this argument and claims that even though failed states have a deteriorating government they still endow state recognition from the international community (2001:7). Failed states thus fulfill the requirement for statehood and are recognized as sovereign states.

### 3.1.2 My sovereignty definition

I recognize that the traditional statehood requirement; governmental power over a well-defined territory and population, is an appropriate conceptualization of sovereignty in the postmodern world order. I suggest that recognized statehood constitute a basic requirement for state sovereignty. Recognized statehood will therefore constitute my first sovereignty definition. When analyzing the ESS, statehood recognition will be my minimalistic indicator of state sovereignty. This sovereignty ideal type will be defined as *statehood sovereignty*.

## 3.2 Responsibility Sovereignty

Traditionally security has been defined in terms of national security and has been achieved through military defense of external borders (Kaldor, 2012:82). Armed forces and military equipment have therefore been strictly national concerns (Cooper, 2000:20). It has thus been a state obligation to defend its borders and territory from external enemies and threats in order to protect its population (Axtmann, 2004: 262; Commission on Human Security, 2003: 2).

### 3.2.1 Responsibility to protect

Recognizing mutual vulnerability to global threats has resulted in that human rights and human security has become international concerns (Men, 2011: 535). Kaldor and Martin support this notion and recognizes the human security approach as the guiding principle in contemporary European security thinking (2010:1). Due to the increasing importance of human security norms in the international community, states are imputed a greater responsibility to provide human security on a global basis (Commission on Human Security: 2001:13). With the increasing importance of the human security approach, a global responsibility to protect has been developed. Kaldor and Martin suggests that in order to ensure global security and protect individuals from global threats; states needs to support the principle of responsibility to protect (2010:1-11). Similarly The Commission on Human Security suggests that human security requires strong and stable institutions” (2003:6). Human security is thus dependent upon the responsibilities of sovereign states. Bellamy suggests that the human security norm has reshaped state identities and interests and that responsibility to protect has been internalized as part of the state identity (2013:343). Being recognized as a state thus implies a responsibility to protect. The state obligation to protect populations across national borders suggests an expanded responsibility and therefore also an expanded sovereignty.

### 3.2.2 Cooperation

Recognizing a mutual vulnerability to global threats has resulted in numerous forms of transnational cooperation and joint operations, such as the European common defense and security policy. The commission on Human Security outlines that in order to protect people, concerted efforts are required (2003:11). Cooper argues that since states pool, share and delegate power over their territories and populations to external authorities, such as the EU, they can no longer be perceived as absolute sovereigns (2000;7, 25). However Cooper recognizes that sharing sovereignty can be perceived as a tool that states use in order to pursue national interests, national security and to meet state responsibilities more effectively (Cooper, 2000: 26). In line with Cooper, Krasner

argues that states voluntarily can enter international agreements and new forms of cooperation without challenging their state sovereignty since it is a way of pursuing national security for their populations (2001: 8-9). This notion suggests that by pooling, sharing or delegating power, states in fact fulfill the obligations to protect their citizens and therefore reinforce their state sovereignty (Ferreirada Silva, 2011: 2).

### 3.2.3 My sovereignty definition

I recognize that the traditional state obligation to provide national security is a core duty in the postmodern world order. In addition I have observed that the state responsibility to provide security has been expanded due to the adoption of a human security approach. The traditional state obligation to provide national security has been extended to a global responsibility to protect. I suggest that state obligations and responsibilities have been reinforced and are therefore appropriate expressions of state sovereignty in the postmodern world order. When analyzing the ESS I will use state responsibility as my second expression of the sovereignty concept. This sovereignty ideal type will be defined as *responsibility sovereignty*.

## 3.3 Privilege Sovereignty

Recognized statehood has provided states with certain rights in the international community (Heller & Sofaer, 2000, 24, 26). The sovereignty concept has traditionally been based on the mutual understanding of the state right to territorial integrity. Respect for national borders and nonintervention have been guiding principles for state action and interaction (Axtmann, 2004:260; Baaz, 2006:8; Men, 2011: 535). This is line with James who suggests that states traditionally have had absolute control, unlimited power and self-determination within its defined territory (1986: 30, 48). The state right to freedom from external authorities have thus been the traditional indicator of state sovereignty (Morgenthau, 1948: 345; Krasner, 2001: 10-12).

### 3.3.1 Humanitarian intervention

According to the ICISS there has been an “adoption of new standards of conduct for states in the protection and advancement of international human rights” (2001:14). They propose that there has been a gradual “transition from a culture of sovereign impunity to a culture of national and international accountability” and that “international human rights norms” are used as a “concrete point of reference against which to judge state conduct” (2001:14).

Bellamy suggests that since the principle of responsibility to protect has become internalized in the international community, it has become an



international state norm to respond to human suffering through humanitarian intervention (2013: 346). States are thus expected to conduct military interventions for human protection purposes (ICISS, 2001:9). Baaz supports this notion and suggests that recent debates are concerned with how to intervene rather than if to intervene at all (Baaz, 2006). Since the human security approach detects local, regional and global threats towards individuals' rights and freedoms; even states are perceived as potential human security perpetrators (Commission on Human Security, 2003:2). This implies that the state right to nonintervention has become conditional upon how well human security is met in the international community (Baaz, 2006: 36).

Humanitarian intervention problematizes the traditional sovereignty concept since it violates the freedom from external intervention and the right to self-determination (James, 1986: 30, 48; Krasner, 2001: 10-12). However the International Commission on Intervention and Sovereignty outlines that humanitarian intervention is only supported whenever a state is unable or unwilling to provide its population with sufficient security through national means and that whenever a population is not suffering, nonintervention is the core norm in the international community (2001:16). This is in line with Men who proposes that both state sovereignty and human security are significant concepts and values in the postmodern world order (2011: 535).

### 3.3.2 The EU

The European Union has been suggested to threaten the traditional conceptualization of state sovereignty since there is an external authority challenging the absolute state power (Krasner, 2001:25) However Cooper claims that the European Union is a transnational rather than a supranational institution (2000:26). This implies that even though there is an external power, the European member states are acknowledged as autonomous and independent states with absolute national power within their territory (Weber, 2012: 21, 27).

### 3.3.3 My sovereignty definition

I recognize territorial integrity and nonintervention to be core principles in the postmodern world order. Therefore I suggest that the rights of sovereign states are an appropriate expression of the sovereignty concept. However I have identified that sovereignty expressed as a state right have become conditional upon how well states are able to meet human security requirements. I suggest that since the rights of states can be questioned, reduced and even violated in order to ensure human security, it is more appropriate to talk about state privileges. I argue that territorial integrity is a state privilege that states enjoy whenever human security is ensured. When analyzing the ESS I am going to use state privileges as my third expression of state sovereignty. This sovereignty ideal type will be defined as *privilege sovereignty*.

### 3.4 Theoretical conclusion

Based on traditional conceptualizations of sovereignty, critical security theories and relevant challenges I have developed three theoretical models of how the sovereignty concept can be conceptualized in the postmodern world order. My definitions of the sovereignty concept are: *statehood sovereignty*, *responsibility sovereignty* and *privilege sovereignty*. These theoretical models were used as my ideal types when analyzing how sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed in the ESS.

## 4 Analysis

I have analyzed how state sovereignty is expressed in the ESS based on my three sovereignty ideal types: *statehood sovereignty*, *responsibility sovereignty* and *privilege sovereignty*. In addition I have analyzed if there are any differences in how state sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed for EU member states and non EU member states.

### 4.1 Statehood Sovereignty

I will now analyze how statehood sovereignty is expressed in the ESS.

#### 4.1.1 EU members

My analysis demonstrates a core assumption that the European Union consists of sovereign states with recognized statehood. In the ESS it is explicitly outlined that “the European Union in the twenty-first century consists of 500 million people across the twenty-seven countries which make up the Union” (ESS, 2010:3). Distinguishing that the European Union consists of countries with defined populations suggests that recognized statehood is a core assumption in the ESS. Furthermore my analysis demonstrates the importance of national borders within the EU. I have identified that common threats are outlined as having “cross-border impact on security and safety” and that organized crime occur “regardless of borders” (ESS, 2010:5). These extracts support the notion that national borders are important concepts for EU member states.

I have identified a core understanding that EU member states have recognized governmental power over their internal affairs. This conclusion is supported by the ESS outlining that “EU member states have their own national security policies and strategies” (2010:7) as well as their own “national, regional and local policies” (ESS, 2010:11).

Through my analysis I have identified a core understanding that EU members are perceived as recognized states with governmental power, well-defined territories, national borders and populations. My conclusion is that EU member states achieve recognized statehood. This finding determines that *statehood sovereignty* is expressed for EU member states in the ESS.

## 4.1.2 Non EU members

My analysis demonstrates that not only EU-member states enjoy statehood recognition. I have identified that the referral to “states” and “countries” throughout the ESS supports the notion that all states in the international community enjoy statehood recognition and are expected to have governmental power over their territories and populations. This is supported by the ESS declaring that governments are the foundation of international society (ESS, 2003:10). I have observed a fundamental core assumption that recognized states are significant actors in the international community and that *statehood sovereignty* is conceptualized for all states.

Through my analysis I have identified that even unstable states with deteriorating governments enjoy state recognition and are defined as “countries in need” (ESS, 2008:2), “third countries” (ESS, 2003:12), “countries emerging from conflict” (ESS, 2003: 11) and “weak or failing states” (ESS, 2003:4). I have come to the conclusion that all states in the international community are recognized and conceptualized as having recognized statehood. My conclusion is that *statehood sovereignty* is expressed for all states in the ESS. This is in line with Hinsley (1986: 17) who suggests that recognized statehood automatically implies state sovereignty. This finding also implies that sovereignty conceptualized as statehood is not questioned or negotiated (Morgenthau, 1948: 341).

## 4.2 Responsibility Sovereignty

I will now analyze how responsibility sovereignty is expressed in the ESS. I will analyze both the state responsibility to provide human security and the responsibility to cooperate.

### 4.2.1 Responsibility to provide human security

#### 4.2.1.1 EU members

My analysis demonstrates a core understanding that EU member states are expected to provide human security. I have identified a relationship between the European member state identity and the recognition of a global responsibility to protect. Throughout the ESS, it is indicated that “Europe should be ready to share in the responsibility for global security” (ESS, 2008:12), that “we hold a shared responsibility to protect populations” (ESS, 2003:1), that “the European Union must remain engaged and ready to commit resources” (ESS, 2003:8) and that “we must think globally and act locally” (2003:6). Being identified as a EU member state thus implies a duty to ensure human security and recognize a responsibility to protect global populations. This is in line with Bellamy who suggests that the

principle of responsibility to protect has become internalized in states and has become the norm in the international community (2013:343).

#### 4.2.1.2 Non EU members

In the ESS it is explicitly outlined that global threats “cross boundaries, touching as much on domestic as foreign policy. Indeed they demonstrate how in the twenty-first century, more than ever, sovereignty entails responsibility” (ESS, 2008:12). This extract indicates that all states have a greater responsibility to protect global populations due to the human security approach. Since a human security approach does not recognize any borders (Commission on Human Security, 2003:2) global threats imply that all states in the international community have a global responsibility to protect. This sustains Kaldor and Martin’s proposal that states need to be in favor of the responsibility to protect in order to ensure human security (2010:1-11).

I have acknowledged that *responsibility sovereignty* is expressed differently for non-EU members. I have identified that western, non EU countries, are portrayed as potential partners and key actors with a responsibility to provide global security. The ESS outlines that “it is necessary to build relationships with other countries through a global approach to security” (ESS, 2010:16) and that “We should look to develop strategic partnerships...with all of those who share our goals and values and are prepared to act in their support” (ESS, 2003; 14). These extracts illustrate how western, non-EU states, who share European human security norms, are conceptualized as responsible sovereigns. These western non EU states are also expected to ensure human security. There is an understanding that EU states and western non EU states are expected to recognize a global responsibility to protect and when doing so they are acknowledged as responsible sovereigns.

However when referring to non-western states, such as eastern, African or Middle Eastern countries, the ESS tend to emphasize the responsibility to “strengthen the prosperity and stability of these countries” (ESS, 2008:10) and “enhance their capabilities” (ESS, 2008:3). These states tend to be narrated as in need of help to protect, rather than as capable protectors. I have identified an assumption that non-western states are not expected to recognize a responsibility to protect to the same extent as EU members or western states. This result is interesting considering Maria Sterns analysis of the ESS. In line with here study I have identified that non-western countries tend to be narrated as different from EU members and western states (2011).

I have come to the conclusion that *responsibility sovereignty* is expressed for EU members and western non EU members in the ESS. However I have identified that non-western states are not portrayed as responsibility sovereigns to the same extent.

## 4.2.2 Responsibility to cooperate

### 4.2.2.1 EU members

Through my analysis I have identified an expectation of EU member states to cooperate within the union as well as with international key actors in order to protect humans from global threats. The ESS clearly outlines that “we must continue to pool our efforts in order to guarantee even greater protection for our citizens” (ESS, 2010:9) and that “European countries are committed to...co-operating through common institutions” (ESS, 2003:1). These extracts sustain the notion that by pooling power, EU member states fulfill the obligation to protect national as well as global populations. This result suggests that when EU states pool power they protect their populations from global threats more effectively (Cooper, 2000:26) and thus reinforce their *responsibility sovereignty* (Ferreirada Silva, 2011:2). I conclude that cooperation, pooling and sharing resources are ways for EU members to achieve as well as reinforce *responsibility sovereignty*.

### 4.2.2.2 Non EU members

My analysis determines that the state responsibility to cooperate in order to ensure global security applies to non EU members as well. In the ESS I find that “There are few if any problems we can deal with on our own”, “International cooperation is a necessity” and that common threats are “shared with all our closest partners” (ESS, 2003:13). Even though not explicitly expressed I perceive that the ESS makes a difference in how the responsibility to cooperate are conceptualized for western and non-western states outside the EU. “Close partners” are likely to be neighbor states or states that share EU norms and values in the west. I find that the expectation to cooperate in order to ensure human security is higher for western than for non-western states outside of the EU. This suggests that EU members and western states are more likely to be conceptualized as responsibility sovereigns than non-western states.

I conclude that all states that recognize a responsibility to cooperate in order to tackle global threats are conceptualized as *responsibility sovereigns*. Even though it is not explicitly declared in the ESS I suggest that there is concealed understanding that non-western states are not expected to cooperate against global threats to the same extent as EU members and western states. Therefore I suggest that non-western states are not consistently portrayed as responsibility sovereigns in the ESS.

## 4.3 Privilege Sovereignty

I will now analyze how privilege sovereignty is expressed in the ESS. I will analyze both the right to self-determination and the right to non-intervention.

### 4.3.1 Self-determination

Through my analysis I have recognized the significance of “transnational cooperation” (ESS, 2010:16), “Members State’s internal law and order” (ESS, 2010:11) and the importance of “embracing the external activities of the individual member states” (ESS, 2003:13). These extracts support the notion that the European Union is a transnational institution and consists of independent, self-determining states with autonomous domestic activities (Cooper, 2004:37; Weber, 2012:21, 27). However my analysis demonstrates an expectation of EU member states to give up part of their self-determination in order to ensure human security. This is evident in the following extract: “The Member States must continuously strive to develop instruments so that national borders, differing legislation, different languages and ways of working do not impede progress in preventing cross-border crime”. EU members are thus expected to condition their domestic self-determination in order to cooperate for global security. I recognize that privileges of EU member states such as self-determination and autonomy, have become conditional due to the human security approach. I recognize that EU member states are assigned *privilege sovereignty* as long as these privileges do not impede the EU strive for human security.

### 4.3.2 Nonintervention

I have identified a core understanding that “respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of states... are not negotiable” (ESS, 2008:2). This extract sustains the apprehension that nonintervention is the norm in the international community as well as in the EU (Baaz, 2006:3; Commission on intervention and sovereignty, 2001:16). My analysis demonstrates that apart from explicitly declaring that territorial integrity is the core norm, sovereignty conceptualized as a state privilege is barely expressed in the ESS. However I have explored under what circumstances, to what extent and in what ways *privilege sovereignty* is being violated.

My analysis demonstrates a relationship between *responsibility sovereignty* and *privilege sovereignty*. I have identified that *privilege sovereignty* is conditional upon *responsibility sovereignty*. This implies that in order for states to enjoy the privilege of territorial integrity they need to fulfill a global responsibility to protect. This is in line with Baaz who suggests that the state right to nonintervention has become conditional upon how well states are able to ensure human security (2006:36). I have thus identified that the state responsibility to

ensure human security significantly challenges the state privilege to territorial integrity.

My analysis demonstrates that the relationship between *responsibility sovereignty* and *privilege sovereignty* have implications on how sovereignty is conceptualized for EU members and non EU members. I have identified that when *responsibility sovereignty* is expressed for EU members, the *privilege sovereignty* for non EU members tend to be violated.

The ESS outlines that “with the new threats, the first line of defense will often be abroad” (2003:7) and that EU members should encounter these threats by engaging in “early, rapid and when necessary, robust intervention” (ESS, 2003: 11). These extracts suggests that EU members are responsibility sovereigns, expected to intervene in order to ensure human security. However this implies that the territorial integrity of non EU members is violated and thus that their *privilege sovereignty* is challenged. Since privilege sovereignty is attained whenever human security is met, non EU members are portrayed as not being able to fulfill responsibility sovereignty. My analysis demonstrates that EU members reinforce their *responsibility sovereignty* through recognizing a responsibility to protect and intervene. This violates the *privilege sovereignty* of non EU members as well as postulates that non EU members are not capable responsibility sovereigns. My conclusion is that human security outweighs territorial integrity in the postmodern world order. Even though it has been suggested that both state sovereignty and human security are significant values in the contemporary international community (Men, 2011: 535) I recognize an emphasis on human security which conditions territorial integrity and challenges *privilege sovereignty*.

Even though not explicitly expressed in the ESS I have observed a tendency to distinguish between the privileges of western and non-western states outside of the EU. The ESS outlines that:

*A number of countries have placed themselves outside the bounds of international society. Some have sought isolation; others persistently violate international norms. It is desirable that such countries should rejoin the international community, and the EU should be ready to provide assistance. Those who are unwilling to do so should understand that there is a price to be paid, including in their relationship with the European Union. (ESS, 2003:10)*

This extract suggests that there are non-European countries in the international community that do not share EU values and norms for human security, and thus do not fulfill *responsibility sovereignty*. Since my analysis earlier demonstrated that western non EU states are depicted as potential partners with common norms and values, I suggest that states “outside the bounds of international society” refers to non-western states. My analysis of the extract above demonstrates that if non-western countries are not willing to recognize a responsibility to ensure human security, the loss of territorial integrity is “the price to be paid”. I conclude that non-western states are portrayed as more likely to have their *privilege sovereignty* violated since they are more likely to fail as *responsibility sovereigns*.



This is in line with Maria Stern who suggests that there is an evident othering that subordinates non-western countries in the ESS (2011).

## 5 Conclusions and discussion

First of all the aim of this thesis is to develop theoretical sovereignty definitions that incorporates elements of both state sovereignty and human security. I have developed *statehood sovereignty*, *responsibility sovereignty*, and *privilege sovereignty* in order to clarify how sovereignty can be conceptualized and expressed in the new European security order.

Second of all the aim of this thesis is to analyze how state sovereignty is conceptualized in the ESS. My analysis concludes that *statehood sovereignty*, *responsibility sovereignty* and *privilege sovereignty* are all expressed in my material. Based on my analysis I have been able to draw conclusions about how and under what circumstances my sovereignty ideal types are reinforced, challenged and conditioned. I have also been able to draw conclusions about how sovereignty is conceptualized and expressed for states within as well as outside the EU.

I have identified that all states in the ESS are conceptualized and expressed as *statehood sovereignties*. I find recognized statehood to be a minimalistic requirement for state sovereignty. There is thus a fundamental understanding that states are core actors in the international community. This finding is interesting since it sustains traditional realist understandings of how the world is organized. Even though the adoption of human security has normalized transnational cooperation, responsibility to protect and humanitarian intervention; global politics is still founded on a base of recognized states. I believe that the statehood concept is profoundly embedded in global politics and that it is complex to find another way to classify and organize actors in the international community as well as determine their obligations and rights without the idea of statehood.

I have identified that *responsibility sovereignty* is expressed to a greater extent than *privilege sovereignty*. With the adoption of a human security approach, states are expected to recognize a global responsibility to protect and cooperate against global threats. I have identified that states reinforce their *responsibility sovereignty* when they intervene or cooperate for humanitarian causes. Human security has thus become more important than territorial integrity and self-determination. Considering the increasing importance of human security norms and the growing amount of human security doctrines I believe that humanitarian intervention and international cooperation are likely to become more common in Europe as well as in the international community in general. *Responsibility sovereignty* is therefore likely to become more prominent as sovereignty conceptualization.

I have identified that EU members and western countries are portrayed as *responsibility sovereigns* to a greater extent than non-western countries. There is thus a greater expectation of EU members and western countries to provide

human security. This suggests that non-western countries are portrayed as subordinate, incapable or unwilling to adhere to European and western human security standards. This differentiation between east and west could produce more global threats and disturb peaceful international relationships rather than work in favour of human security.

I have determined a relationship between the responsibilities and privileges of sovereign states. I have identified that *privilege sovereignty* is conditional upon how well states are able to ensure human security. When states recognize a global responsibility to protect and cooperate they are conceptualized as responsibility sovereigns. Since states ensure human security through this sovereignty type they are also more likely to attain *privilege sovereignty* when recognized as responsibility sovereigns. Since EU members and western states recognize a global responsibility to protect they attain both *responsibility sovereignty* and *privilege sovereignty*. However since non-western states tend to be conceptualized as lacking *responsibility sovereignty* their *privilege sovereignty* is challenged too. Even though nonintervention is the norm for state interaction, the adoption of a human security approach has made *privilege sovereignty* conditional. I suggest that *privilege sovereignty* will deteriorate with the increasing significance of human security norms in the international community.

In my analysis I have come to the conclusion that non-western states tend to be conceptualized solely as *statehood sovereigns* whereas European and western states tend to be conceptualized as *statehood sovereigns*, *responsibility sovereigns* and *privilege sovereigns*. I consider this to be an interesting finding since ideas about sovereignty, responsibilities and privileges in the ESS are likely to influence European foreign policy as well as guide EU interventions, operations and missions and affect state influence in global politics. European and western states, conceptualized as responsibility sovereigns and privilege sovereigns, are likely more influential in global politics than non-western states solely conceptualized as statehood sovereigns.

## 6 Further Research

In order to conduct a critical analysis of the sovereignty concept I developed sovereignty definitions with consideration to my main material, the ESS. Even though my conceptualizations of sovereignty are based on acknowledged theories it would be rewarding to apply my analysis instrument on other security documents as well, in order to try its explanatory power and sustainability separate from the ESS. Such a study could also increase the validity of my sovereignty ideal types.

I have analyzed the sovereignty concept in three separate documents that together constitute the ESS. It would be interesting to conduct a deeper analysis of each document and compare the sovereignty conceptualizations in the different papers with each other. Conducting such a study would make a comparison over time possible. Studying sovereignty conceptualizations over time could provide a richer understanding of how the concept has developed side by side with the ever – increasing human security concept. Above all it would be important to conduct a deeper comparison of the two external strategies with the internal strategy in order to uncover any differences in how sovereignty is conceptualized within as well as outside the union. Such a study is desirable since my analysis demonstrated that sovereignty is conceptualized differently for EU members, western countries and non-western countries.

In this study I have only analyzed sovereignty conceptualizations in one security strategy, the ESS. It would be interesting to compare the common European Security Strategy with a national security strategy, such as the American National Security Strategy, NSS. This document would be an intriguing comparison document since it was used as an inspiration to the development of the ESS and it would be interesting to study if sovereignty conceptualizations in the two documents bear any resemblance. Comparing the two security strategies would also make it possible to analyze whether sovereignty in a national security strategy is conceptualized differently than in a common security strategy.

In this thesis I have developed an alternative theoretical model on how to conceptualize sovereignty by incorporating human security concepts. I hope that I have provided a richer understanding on how the concepts are related to each other in the ESS. However human security and state sovereignty are widely debated and complex concepts in Europe and the international community. Even though I can claim that my thesis contributes to contemporary sovereignty discussions, more research is needed on the subject.

## 7 References

### Literature

- Asmus, Ronald D, 2006. "The European Security Strategy: An American view" in Dannreuther, Roland & John Peterson (red.) *Security, Strategy and Transatlantic Relations*. New York: Routledge.
- Badersten, Björn, 2002. *Medborgardyg*. Lund: Natur och Kultur.
- Beckman, Ludvig, 2005. *Grundbok i idéanalys*. Stockholm: Santerús förlag.
- Cooper, Robert, 2000. *The post-modern state and the world order*. London: Demos.
- Cooper, Robert, 2004. *The Breaking of Nations – order and chaos in the twenty-first century*. London: Atlantic Books.
- Dannreuther, Roland & John Peterson, 2006. "Introduction: Security Strategy as doctrine" in Dannreuther, Roland & John Peterson (red.) *Security, Strategy and Transatlantic Relations*. New York: Routledge.
- Essaiusson, Peter – Mikael Gilljam – Henrik Oscarsson – Lena Wägnerud, 2012. *Metodpraktikan: Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*, 4 ed. Stockholm: Nordstedts Juridik AB.
- Heller, Thomas, C. & Abraham D. Sofaer, 2000. "Sovereignty: The practitioners' perspective" in Stephen D. Krasner (red.) *Problematic Sovereignty: Contested rules and political possibilities*. New York: Columbia University Press, p. 24-52.
- Hinsley, F.H., 1986. *Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horkheimer, Max, 1972. *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*. New York: Continuum.
- James, Alan, 1986. *Sovereign statehood: basis of international society*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Krasner, Stephen D., 2001. *Problematic Sovereignty: Contested rules and political possibilities*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Martin, Mary & Mary Kaldor, 2010. *The European Union and human security: External interventions and missions*. New York: Routledge.
- Teorell, Jan & Torsten Svensson, 2007. *Att fråga och att svara: samhällsvetenskaplig metod*. Malmö: Liber AB.

## Research articles

- Axtmann, Roland, 2004. "The State of the State: The Model of the Modern State and Its Contemporary Transformation", *International Political Science Review*, 25(3): 259-279.
- Baaz, Mikael, 2006. "Statssuveränitet och humanitär intervention – (o)förenliga principer I dagens globaliserade värld", *Centrum för Europaforskning Göteborgs Universitet (CERGU)*, 1-42.
- Bellamy, Alex, J, 2013. "The Responsibility to protect: Added value or hot air?", *Cooperation and Conflict*, 48(3), 333-357.
- Ferreira da Silva, Pedro, 2011. "Sovereignty in European Context: How the European Union Reinforces National Sovereignty". Conference Paper of the Shanghai International Conference on Social Sciences (SICSS), p. 1-6.
- Hammerslay, Martyn, 2005. "Should Social Science Be critical?", *Philosophy of Social Sciences*, 35(2), 175-195.
- Kaldor, Mary, 2012. "The EU as a new Form of Political Authority: The Example of the Common Security and Defense Policy", *Global Policy*, 3(1), 79-86.
- Kaldor, Mary – Mary Martin – Sabine Selchow, 2007. "Human Security: A new narrative for Europe", *International Affairs*, 83(2): 273-288.
- Löwenheim, Oded – Jeremy Paltiel, 2004. "Defining Sovereignty". Conference Paper of 2004 Annual Meeting, *International Studies Association*, p.1-26.
- Manners, Ian, 2008. "The normative ethics of the European Union", *International affairs*, 84(1), 45-60.
- Matlary, Janne Haaland, 2008. "Much ado about little: the EU and human security", *International Affairs*, 84(1), 131-143.
- Morgenthau, Hans J., 1948. "The problem of Sovereignty Reconsidered", *Columbia Law Review*, 48(3): 341-365.
- Newman, Edward, 2010. "Critical Human Security Studies", *Review of International Studies*, 36 (1):77-94.
- Weber, Katja, 2013. "Recalibrating Sovereignty-Related Norms: Europe, Asia and Non-Traditional Security Challenges", *European Integration*, 35(1):19-35.

## Electronic sources

- Commission on Human Security (2003). 'Human security now' [electronic]. Available:  
<http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/91BAEEDBA50C6907C1256D19006A9353-chs-security-may03.pdf>. Accessed: 2013-12-04.
- EU, 2013 *About CSDP – European Security Strategy* [electronic]. Available:  
[http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/security\\_strategy\\_for\\_europe/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/security_strategy_for_europe/index_en.htm) . Accessed: 2013-12-26.
- International Commission on Intervention and Sovereignty, ICISS (2001). 'The Responsibility to Protect'[electronic]. Available:  
<http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf> . Accessed: 2013-12-04.

## **Public Documents**

ESS 2003. *'A secure Europe in a better world' – European Security Strategy.*

ESS 2008. *Report on the implementation of the European Security Strategy – providing security in a changing world.*

ESS, 2010. *Internal Security Strategy for the European Union "towards a European Security Model".*