



Project No.: CIT4-CT-2006-028698

RECON
Reconstituting Democracy in Europe

Integrated Project
Priority: 7 - Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge-Based Society

Deliverable No. 78
**Workshop: conceptualizing European foreign and security policy
in transformation**

Due date of deliverable: September 2010
Actual delivery date: 16-17 September 2010

Start date of project: 1 January 2007

Duration: 60 months

Lead contractor for this deliverable:
Partner 1 ARENA – Centre for European Studies
University of Oslo, Norway

Final Version

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	X
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

1. Introduction

RECON Deliverable No. 78 – *Workshop: conceptualizing European foreign and security policy in transformation* – is part of work package 6, which focuses on the foreign and security policy dimensions of the European Union. It seeks to assess the status and the prospect for democracy within the field of foreign and security policy in relation to the three RECON models. The WP uncovers at what level – national, transnational or supranational – mechanisms for democratic control are developed. It also clarifies the principles that the EU binds itself to in its foreign and security policy, as well as the kinds of standards and policy instruments that the EU has established in order to ensure domestic-external consistency.

During the months 37 to 54 of the project, WP 6 focuses on assessing and analysing empirical findings, while to some extent continuing to collect data. The WP will thus undertake a reassessment of the empirical indicators for the three RECON models to the field of foreign and security policy in light of data collection. Further, the WP 6 participants will intensify the comparison of findings across partner institutions.

2. Presentation of the workshop

The workshop ‘What kind of democracy for what kind of European foreign and security policy?’ was staged in Oslo on 16-17 September 2010 and gathered 23 researchers from nine different institutions. The workshop was organized by WP 6 leaders Helene Sjursen (ARENA, University of Oslo) and Wolfgang Wagner (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt) and all WP 6 partners participated with a total of eleven papers. The event was thus a main instrument ensuring dialogue across partner institutions and contributing to the comparison of findings in the fourth year.

The aim of the workshop was to discuss two key questions within WP 6: first, to what extent can one say that the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) has moved beyond intergovernmentalism? And second, if so, what type of democratic configuration would that require? The two workshop chairs, Sjursen and Wagner opened the event by presenting their co-authored framework paper. With this, they introduced the overarching questions by highlighting the importance of examining the depth and form of integration in the CFSP as a first step towards assessing the status and prospect of democracy in this policy area. Because assumptions about the intergovernmental character of the CFSP are often used to justify why there is no democratic shortage in this area, investigating that claim will set the premises for answering what kind of democracy is needed for the CFSP. As long as the CFSP remains intergovernmental, democratic accountability and control continues to be an issue for each member state. However, if a move beyond intergovernmentalism has taken place, the question of democracy becomes far more complex.

Many of the contributors focused on the institutional and structural conditions shaping the CFSP. The extent to which member states share information was held out as one indicator of the level of institutional integration in the area of CFSP. Federica Bicchì and Caterina Carta (London School of Economics and Political Science) presented the results of their extensive study of the EU’s COREU/ CORTESY network, which is used to circulate a range of different types of information related to the CFSP among the member states. They demonstrated how the EU member states have become embedded in a system of information exchange that has developed far beyond what was intended at the outset. COREU is now also

used as a forum for decision-making. It has contributed to eroding the barriers between national and European levels of foreign policy making. Antje Wiener (University of Hamburg) and Uwe Puetter (Central European University) argued that a stable, largely routinised decision-making context has developed in the CFSP-field. However, they also underlined that the normative framing of the CFSP is contested. Such contestation is important, in their view, if we are to understand the process towards consensus-building at the European level. Kolja Raube (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven) examined the level of executive integration within the CFSP and asked to what extent a state-like executive is developing. He argued, based on an analysis of changes following from the Lisbon Treaty, that the intergovernmental features of the executive institutions have been complemented by integrative and centralizing moves. Thus, he concluded that, in particular due to the role of the High Representative and the establishment of the European External Action Service (EEAS), the CFSP can no longer be seen as purely intergovernmental. Digging further into the EEAS, Caterina Carta discussed what type of foreign action service the EEAS might become. Carta argued that the EEAS' policy mission and bureaucratic arrangements will be of particular importance in determining its future shape, as these structures will largely determine the institutional culture and actual functioning of the new service.

As argued by Sijrsen and Wagner in the framework paper, the EU's foreign policy might also be influenced by the perceptions and policies of key external partners such as Turkey. Three papers in the workshop examined EU-Turkish relations. Meltem Müftüler-Baç and Arzu Kibris (Sabanci University) presented findings from their study on the voting behaviour of Turkey and a selection of EU members in the UN General Assembly from 1997-2008. They found a high degree of voting convergence between Turkey and the EU, except in areas where Turkey perceives the EU's positions to contradict with vital national interests. Moreover, they found that there is stronger voting convergence between Turkey and the EU than between Turkey and the US. Also with a view to identify the level of convergence between Turkey and the EU in the field of foreign policy, Nora Fisher Onar (Sabanci University) compared the EU and Turkish perspectives on the Israeli/Palestinian question. She concluded that there has been a steady, though not linear, convergence on this issue. This is due, in her view, not only to corresponding energy and security interests, but also to changes in the Turkish foreign policy perspective since the early 2000s, bringing it closer to the EU. Analysing the extent to which the EU influences the policies of candidate countries, Selin Türkeş (Sabanci University) discussed the Turkish Constitutional Court's decision to ban the pro-Kurdish political party DTP in 2009. Investigating the reasons presented by the Court to justify its decision, which implied a breach of the EU's membership conditions, Türkeş found that the Court referred to internal EU norms, principles and practices. This, she argued, suggests that the EU's ability to influence Turkish policies depends on the level of consistency between the EU's external policies and its internal practices.

In their framework paper, Sijrsen and Wagner also held out that another way of studying the intersection between the EU's foreign policy and democracy would be to analyse the EU's policy profile. Two contributions used this as a starting point in order to shed light on the principles that the EU binds itself to in its foreign and security policy as well as the 'actual' consistency in concrete cases. Marianne Riddervold (ARENA) examined whether or not the EU's foreign policy behaviour changes when it acquires military means. Investigating why the EU launched its military anti-piracy Operation Atalanta, she concluded that the need for long-term protection of humanitarian aid to Somalia was a key mobilizing argument. Contrary to what one would expect of a traditional great power, the EU has not prioritised its own interests at the expense of protecting humanitarian aid, and has bound itself to global law

when using force against pirates. Magdalena Gora (Jagiellonian University Krakow) argued that the future characteristic of EU foreign policy depends on whether its foreign policy norms are accepted by the new member states. Gora examined Poland's perspectives on EU foreign policy by analysing Polish positions on international development aid and on the future shape of the Common Security and Defence Policy. Her findings suggest that EU foreign policy norms are accepted only to the extent that they are consistent with national interests.

Finally, two contributions addressed the state of democracy in EU foreign policy-making more directly. In order to examine at what level – national, transnational or supranational – mechanisms for democratic control of EU military missions are developed, Dirk Peters, Wolfgang Wagner and Cosima Glahn (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt) presented their study of Operation Atalanta. They found that since decision-making remains in the hands of the member states, the prime locus of parliamentary activity is at the national level, whereas the democratic control at the European level is reduced to a 'deliberate audit function'. Cathleen Kantner (University of Stuttgart) examined whether there is evidence of a European-wide transnational public sphere regarding security issues. By conducting a quantitative and qualitative media content analysis, she found that European, transnational, and transatlantic debates on humanitarian military interventions take place in national media. In her view, the latter thus fulfill their democratic function. But although the media might contribute to political will formation, institutional designs that can channel the citizens' opinions into transnational procedures of political will formation are lacking.

With this workshop, an important milestone of WP 6 was reached, that of reassessing the empirical indicators for the three RECON models to the field of foreign and security policy.

3. Participants

See attachment.

4. Programme

See attachment.

What kind of democracy for what kind of European foreign and security policy?

RECON Workshop

WP 6 – The Foreign and Security Dimension

Oslo, 16-17 September 2010

Venue: ARENA, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo.

Programme

Thursday 16 September 2010

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 09:30-10:30 | Welcome and Introduction
Helene Sjursen and Wolfgang Wagner
<i>ARENA, University of Oslo/Peace Research Institute Frankfurt</i>

Discussant: Cathleen Kantner, <i>Free University Berlin</i> |
| 10:30-11:30 | An embedded community of information: the COREU/CORTESY network and the circulation of information within EU foreign policy
Federica Bicchi
<i>London School of Economics and Political Science</i>

Discussant: Anne Elizabeth Stie, <i>ARENA, University of Oslo</i> |
| 11:30-11:45 | Coffee break |
| 11:45-12:45 | The EU as a human rights promoter in Turkey: The closure case of DTP
Selin Türkeş
<i>Sabanci University</i>

Discussant: Erik O. Eriksen, <i>ARENA, University of Oslo</i> |
| 12:45-13:45 | Lunch |
| 13:45-14:45 | Executive Integration and the Changing Nature of CFSP after the Lisbon Treaty
Kolja Raube
<i>Katholieke Universiteit Leuven</i>

Discussant: Guri Rosén, <i>ARENA, University of Oslo</i> |
| 14:45-15:45 | European Union foreign policy practices: enacting normative meaning-in-use internationally
Antje Wiener and Uwe Puetter
<i>University of Hamburg/Central European University, Budapest</i>

Discussant: John Erik Fossum, <i>ARENA, University of Oslo</i> |
| 15:45-16:00 | Coffee break |

16:00-17:00 **The institutional backbone of democratic control: parliaments in European security politics**

Dirk Peters, Wolfgang Wagner and Cosima Glahn

Peace Research Institute Frankfurt

Discussant: Anne Elizabeth Stie, ARENA, University of Oslo

20:00 *Dinner at Tjuvholmen Sjømagasin*

Friday 17 September 2010

09:30-10:30 **Event driven political communication on humanitarian military intervention in the EU and the US (1990-2006)**

Cathleen Kantner

Free University Berlin

Discussant: Daniel Gaus, ARENA, University of Oslo

10:30-11:30 **Beyond the nation-state? Poland in the European foreign policy**

Magdalena Góra

Jagiellonian University Krakow

Discussant: Helene Sjursen, ARENA, University of Oslo

11:30-11:45 *Coffee break*

11:45-12:45 **The European Union and Turkish voting in the UN General Assembly: an analysis of the EU's impact on voting alignment acceding countries**

Meltem Müftüler-Baç and Arzu Kibris

Sabanci University

Discussant: Wolfgang Wagner, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt

12:45-13:45 *Lunch*

13:45-14:45 **Convergent interests and value-orientations? The EU and Turkey on the Israeli/Palestinian question**

Nora Fisher Onar

Bahçeşehir University

Discussant: Federica Bicchì, London School of Economics and Political Science

14:45-15:45 **The EEAS: The puzzle of a service of a new kind**

Caterina Carta

London School of Economics and Political Science

Discussant: Marianne Riddervold, ARENA, University of Oslo

15:45-16:00 *Coffee break*

16:00-17:00 **Finally flexing its muscles? The EU's naval military operation against piracy**

Marianne Riddervold

ARENA, University of Oslo

Discussant: Dirk Peters, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt

17:00-17:30 **Summing up**

20:00 *Dinner at Café Christiania*

List of participants

1	Bicchi, Federica	London School of Economics and Political Science f.c.bicchi@lse.ac.uk
2	Carta, Caterina	London School of Economics and Political Science c.cart@lse.ac.uk
5	Eriksen, Erik O.	ARENA, University of Oslo e.o.eriksen@arena.uio.no
6	Fossum, John Erik	ARENA, University of Oslo j.e.fossum@arena.uio.no
7	Gaus, Daniel	ARENA, University of Oslo daniel.gaus@arena.uio.no
8	Gjelvold, Rune	ARENA, University of Oslo rune.gjelvold@arena.uio.no
3	Glahn, Cosima	Peace Research Institute Frankfurt glahn@hsfk.de
9	Góra, Magdalena	Jagiellonian University Krakow gora@ces.uj.edu.pl
10	Hofius, Maren	University of Hamburg maren.hofius@wiso.uni-hamburg.de
11	Kantner, Cathleen	Free University Berlin kantnerc@zedat.fu-berlin.de
12	Kibris, Arzu	Sabancı University arzukibris@su.sabanciuniv.edu
13	Müftüler-Baç, Meltem	Sabancı University muftuler@sabanciuniv.edu
14	Onar, Nora Fisher	Sabancı University nora.fisher@bahcesehir.edu.tr
4	Peters, Dirk	Peace Research Institute Frankfurt peters@hsfk.de
15	Puetter, Uwe	Central European University puetteru@ceu.hu
16	Raube, Kolja	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven kolja.raube@ghum.kuleuven.be
17	Riddervold, Marianne	ARENA, University of Oslo marianne.riddervold@arena.uio.no
18	Rosén, Guri	ARENA, University of Oslo guri.rosen@arena.uio.no
19	Sjursen, Helene	ARENA, University of Oslo helene.sjursen@arena.uio.no

- 20 Stie, Anne Elizabeth ARENA, University of Oslo
a.e.stie@arena.uio.no
- 21 Türkeş, Selin Sabanci University
mselint@su.sabanciuniv.edu
- 22 Wagner, Wolfgang Peace Research Institute Frankfurt
wm.wagner@fsw.vu.nl
- 23 Wiener, Antje University of Hamburg
antje.wiener@wiso.uni-hamburg.de