

Master Thesis in International and European Relations:
LIU-EKI/INT-D- -05/002- -SE

Reading the CFSP of the EU in terms of the issue of Terrorism

An analysis on the evolution of the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the
European Union under the impact of the issue of Terrorism

Övgu Kalkan

 LINKÖPINGS UNIVERSITET	Avdelning, Institution Division, Department Ekonomiska institutionen 581 83 LINKÖPING	Datum Date 2005-01-21
--	---	------------------------------------

Språk Language Svenska/Swedish X Engelska/English	Rapporttyp Report category Licentiatavhandling Examensarbete C-uppsats X D-uppsats Övrig rapport _____ _____	ISBN
		ISRN LIU-EKI/INT-D- -05/002- -SE
		Serietitel och serienummer ISSN Title of series, numbering _____
URL för elektronisk version http://www.ep.liu.se/exjobb/eki/2005/impier/002/		

Titel Title Författare Author	Reading the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union in terms of the issue of Terrorism- An analysis on the evolution of the CFSP of the EU under the issue of Terrorism Övgu Kalkan
--	---

--

Sammanfattning**Abstract**

In the post Cold-War era, world politics was transforming itself through its emerging complex issues such as terrorism and influential and interdependent actors such as the European Union. In this new era, the European Union was developing its Common Foreign and Security Policy pillar both to present a coherent and unified EU policy and to prove its political potent in order to become an influential actor on world politics. On the other side, security environment was also transforming its content through emerging actors and issues. As one of the most prominent actors of the world politics, the EU was influenced by the transformation of security environment, whose economic 'soft power' proved necessary but insufficient for being a global power in this emerging security environment. Insufficiency of economic power in solving security problems became more visible with the terrorist attacks of September 11 and March 11 which proved the seriousness of a globalized security threat posed by terrorism. After the events took place, the EU's security approach and threat assessment have been transformed in which the issue of terrorism occupied more profound place by 'securitization' of its context. The Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU began to play more prominent role on EU policies together with incorporating the efforts on the issue of fight against terrorism both to EU's external relations and to its security dimension. Therefore, in this study, the author analyzes the research question of the development of the CFSP of the EU together with the impact of the issue of terrorism in this transforming security environment. Since examination of such a complex security issue necessitates multidimensional approach, then liberal and realist theories are used as complementary analytical instruments guiding the theoretical framework of the study.

Nyckelord**Keyword**

Common Foreign and Security Policy, European Union, Security Studies, Terrorism, Liberalism, Realism, Complex Interdependence

**Linköpings University,
Department of Management and Economics.
Master Program in International and European Relations.**

Reading the CFSP of the EU in terms of the issue of Terrorism

An analysis on the evolution of the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the
European Union under the impact of the issue of Terrorism

Author

Övgu Kalkan

Adviser

Dr. Ronnie Hjorth

This Thesis is dedicated to
my dear mother TULAY AGIN and my dear grandfather ISMET AGIN
in whose endless love and support I found my strength

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	7
Chapter I.....	8
Introduction.....	8
1.1 Purpose.....	10
1.2 The use of theory.....	12
1.3 Methodology and Sources.....	14
Chapter II.....	17
Evaluating the End of the Cold War and the Emerging New Era through the Lenses of Realist and Liberalist Approaches.....	17
2.1 Realist Understanding.....	17
2.2 Evaluating the Liberalist Concept of the Complex Interdependence in Comparison with the Realist Understanding.....	19
2.2.1 Multiple Channels and Multiple Actors such as Terrorist Groups.....	19
2.2.2 Multiple Issues such as Emerging New Dimensions in Security Issues.....	21
2.2.3 Reducing Role of Military Hard Power-Increasing Role of Multilateral Soft Power.....	22
2.3 Changing Nature of Security Studies.....	23
Chapter III.....	26
Institutionalization Process of the CFSP.....	26
3.1 Motives Preparing the Ground for Construction of the CFSP.....	26
3.2 Establishment and Development of the CFSP.....	27
3.2.1 The Maastricht Treaty.....	27
3.2.2 Yugoslav Conflicts.....	30
3.2.3 The Treaty of Amsterdam.....	30
3.2.4 Saint Malo Declaration.....	31
3.2.5 Cologne Summit.....	32
3.2.6 Helsinki Summit.....	33
3.2.7 The Treaty of Nice.....	34
Chapter IV.....	35
Understanding the Concept of Terrorism.....	35

4.1 Definition of Terrorism.....	36
4.2 Characteristics of Terrorism.....	38
4.3 Possible Causes of Terrorism.....	39
Chapter V.....	45
Terrorism and the EU Policies.....	45
5.1 The EU Policies Before the September 11 Attacks.....	45
5.1.1 Legal Background of the Issue of Terrorism in the Treaty on European Union.....	45
5.1.2 EUROPOL.....	46
5.1.3 Directory of Specialized Counter-terrorist Skills.....	47
5.1.4 Making it a Criminal Offence to Participate in a Criminal Organization in the Member States.....	48
5.1.5 European Judicial Network.....	49
5.1.6 Combating the Financing of Terrorist Groups.....	49
5.2 The EU Policies After the September 11 and Madrid Attacks.....	51
5.2.1 EU Action Plan against Terrorism- September 2001.....	52
5.2.2 EUROPOL.....	55
5.2.3 EUROJUST.....	56
5.2.4 Council Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism-June 2002.....	57
5.2.5 European Security Strategy- December 2003.....	58
5.2.6 Declaration on Combating Terrorism- March 2004.....	60
5.2.7 European Security and Defence Policy Dimension of the Fight against Terrorism- November 2004.....	64
Chapter VI.....	67
Conclusion.....	67
References.....	71
Books, Articles, Reports.....	71
Internet Resources.....	72
Documents of the European Union Homepage.....	74

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my thesis adviser Dr. Ronnie Hjorth for his inspirable guidance and suggestments during this research work. I am thankful to his comments and responses to my endless questions without which the completion of the project would be a much more challenging task.

During the project I faced some technical difficulties which inserted significant obstacles in front of the writing and especially, conclusion process. However, it was with the invaluable support of my comrades Hadayat Ullah Khan and Ahsan Ullah Kashif, I managed to overcome these difficulties and finalize the project. I own a debt of gratitude to them for their sincere cooperation.

I am most profoundly indebted to my dear parent, especially to my mother Tulay Agin, grandfather Ismet Agin and Unal K. who are so keen to see me completing my degree and provided me with endless and invaluable support. I am grateful to the moral support and encouragement of my dear mother, grandfather, Unal K., Muammer Rubaci, Umit Korkmaz and Tarik Korkmaz. I always feel fortunate to have them near me.

Övgu Kalkan

Chapter I

Introduction

With the end of the Cold War, the European Community made a huge step on developing its institutions and structures which are integrated under the name of the EU. In the post-Cold War period, the EU was an influential actor on world politics mainly through its strong and unified economic pillar. On the other side, efforts to construct the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union were taking place on the European agenda, however, on a limited scale. In the post-Cold War era, while the EU was integrating closely and transforming itself, world security environment was also transforming its context and becoming more complex and interdependent in character. Transformation of the security issues influenced actors and the necessary instruments in bringing solutions to the security problems. As one of the most prominent actors of the world politics, the EU was also influenced by the transformation of security environment, whose economic ‘soft power’ proved necessary but insufficient for being a global power in this emerging security environment. Insufficiency of economic power in solving security problems became more visible with the terrorist attacks of September 11 and March 11 which proved the seriousness of a globalized security threat posed by terrorism. After the events took place, the EU’s security approach and threat assessment have transformed in which the issue of terrorism occupied more profound place by ‘securitization’ of its context. The Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU began to play more prominent role on EU policies together with incorporating the efforts on the issue of fight against terrorism both to EU’s external relations and to its security dimension. Therefore, *in my study, I endeavored to analyze on my research question which examines the development of the CFSP together with the impact of the issue of terrorism in this transforming security environment and at the last stage how this dimension affected EU politics.*

Despite the efforts to establish common foreign policy dimension on the Community framework date back to 1950’s, concrete results are taken only during the 1990’s, culminated by the establishment of the CFSP of the EU as the second pillar. Besides, in 1990’s compared to other two pillars of the EU, development of the CFSP took on a different plane and consequently proved inefficient especially by the events of Yugoslav Wars and ethnic conflicts taking place in the middle of the Europe. However, as I examined in my study, it

was specifically under the shadow and lessons of these events that the EU made respective developments on the CFSP which were targeting to condense its political influence on world politics. Therefore, change of approach on the EU level was reflected through the spectrum of the CFSP, which was implying that to be able to be a global power it became necessary to possess political and military power together. On the other side, to be able to present clearly the development of the CFSP, the reasons behind failure of EU policies, the obstacles to implement coherent and concrete policies on the CFSP pillar and the changes that are brought to the CFSP structures and the European approach on security issues with the impact of these specific events are evaluated in my study. In examining these factors, perspectives of liberal and realist theories are used as complementary analytical tools. While realist theories made emphasis on the issues of national sovereignty and sensitivity of the issue of security and underlined the development of the EU's ESDP dimension under the CFSP pillar as an example of rising importance of 'hard power' on EU level, liberal theories maintained the necessity to go beyond the limits of classical realist perceptions, emphasizing the complementary importance of 'hard' and 'soft' power instruments and underlined the impact of liberal values on the formation of the CFSP objectives and the policy instruments.

In the post-Cold War era, it was not only the EU, but also the global security agenda that was transforming together with its complex issues and multiple interdependent actors. The most vivid example of the transforming context of the security issues and the global security threats is depicted by the events of September 11 and March 11 terrorist attacks. With the impact of these specific events, the EU took more serious and concrete steps on the issue of terrorism. First of all, the context of the concept of terrorism transformed and 'securitized' on the EU level, and placed to be one of the most serious global security threats to the EU. Secondly, since it is evaluated under the security dimension, the CFSP pillar began to occupy more prominent place both on the EU security politics and its external relations. To be able to outline the dynamics that are influential in this transformation of the issue of terrorism on the EU level and the increasing importance of the CFSP pillar, I endeavored to present transformation of the security environment. In accomplishing more credible evaluation of the issue, I studied changing context of the security studies from empirical and theoretical aspects and under the light of my findings I examined the changes witnessed on the EU level.

Transformation of the security studies, which reflected complexity of issues and interdependence of actors, brought into the fore the necessity of transforming policy instruments beyond the strict realist 'hard power' perceptions. In solving complex security problems, importance of the combination of 'hard' and 'soft' power instruments entered into

the agenda. The necessity of bringing multifaceted solutions, incorporating ‘soft power’ and ‘hard power’ instruments together with the approach of ‘cross-pillar’ coordination in various areas, reflected on the issue of terrorism. Therefore, in my study I observed how European Union’s security approach took shape and through what kind of instruments it responded to the complex security problem of terrorism by its CFSP pillar.

Consequently, today terrorism occupies one of the most prominent places both in the world security agenda and the EU security strategy. To be able to see more obviously the impact terrorism issue placed on the European security agenda and the CFSP pillar, I examined the development of the CFSP and the transforming security environment, inside which it evolved. From the perspectives of liberal and realist theories various dimensions and contradictory points of the issue outlined. At the end, the role of terrorism in the CFSP pillar and together with the impact of the issue of terrorism the place of the CFSP in EU politics is evaluated in this study.

1.1 Purpose

Today, security studies occupy one of the most significant places in IR studies. Transforming security environment encompass complex issues and interdependent actors whose impact challenge classical realist theories. *The EU as one of the most prominent actors on the world politics and the issue of terrorism as one of the most controversial and influential elements of the global security agenda and placing to be one of the key factors transforming EU’s security approach draw my attention. Therefore, the aim of the thesis is to analyze how the security context has transformed and as one of its derivatives how the issue of terrorism has affected the EU security approach and politics under the pillar of the CFSP.*

Global security environment began to transform after the end of the Cold War. However, it was the terrorist events of September 11 and March 11 which more vividly depicted the necessity of significant transformation in security agenda setting that entails theoretical and empirical framework. Despite terrorism was not a new issue on world politics, it was after these events the security strategy and understanding of the EU changed to a significant degree. Before the events, while the issue of terrorism was evaluated on the same basis with other serious crimes such as, money laundering and by lacking any specific common definition, after the events it not only affected European security strategy and evaluated as one of the key global threats to the European security but also specific and

concrete efforts are provided in dealing with the issue. On the EU level ‘securitization’ of the issue of terrorism is witnessed, which placed terrorism to be evaluated inside the more specific and unified security framework. Besides, in addition to the security approach, the issue was incorporated as an element of the EU’s external relations. Consequently, the CFSP came into fore both with an increasing prominence of external relations and security strategy on the issue of the fight against terrorism. Therefore, I found it interesting to examine the changes witnessed in the EU security understanding, together with their reflection on the CFSP especially under the issue of terrorism after these two events took place.

While examining my research question I asked various questions and aimed to answer these questions from various dimensions. One of the questions was about how the security agenda transformed during 1990s; where as the emerging dynamics, actors and issues were part of the evaluation. Terrorism issue plays prominent role in the transforming security agenda both with its causes, instruments and impacts on global society and this occupied significant part of my study. What was the role of the EU on world politics? From the perspectives of the significant event such as Yugoslav Wars, I tried to evaluate on the EU’s role and approach to the world politics by making emphasis on the instruments (which can be considered as reflection of its soft power) it has used. Besides, the development and the role of the CFSP during 1990’s are examined with the purpose of reflecting the changes witnessed on the EU security understanding after the terrorist attacks took place. Another question was about how EU security understanding transformed which incorporated the evaluation of the motives, dynamics and the role of transforming security concepts in giving the answer. Especially after these two events took place, since European security understanding transformed itself in relation to the transforming security environment with an emphasis on terrorism, I found it interesting to evaluate on these dynamics, and their impact on the EU security approach which is reflected under the CFSP.

CFSP pillar not only reflecting EU security understanding, but it also occupies important part of the EU’s external relations and therefore interested me in reflecting the facts about defining EU’s approach and policy instruments on world politics in case of security issues. After the events of the Yugoslav Wars and terrorist attacks, policy instruments defined under the CFSP took different direction. On the one side, ESDP dimension which reflected military arm of the EU has begun to be developed as part of the efforts to develop its hard power and on the other side, economic instruments are planned to be further enhanced in relation to its soft power. So, EU’s approach to the issue of terrorism incorporated the notions

of combining hard power and soft power instruments in bringing solutions to the security problems, which began to occupy more prominent place on security studies.

One of my purposes was to reflect the change witnessed in the security understanding of the EU from theoretical and empirical points, which would enhance credibility and validity of my study. In observing empirical side, I searched on the security events taking place on the world politics and affecting European agenda together with the concrete developments evolving on the CFSP pillar. From the perspective of theoretical points, research on the ideational foundations affecting the development of the CFSP, security environment and the EU policy instruments occupied important points of my study. As part of theoretical study, the development of the CFSP structure whether through intergovernmental or supranational end under the light of realist and liberalist perceptions was one of my concern. In addition to this, since theoretical framework would lay foundations of the direction EU policies would evolve toward, such as rise of hard power or soft power politics, and empirical research would vividly prove the direction of the events and the instruments that are used on the EU level such as military or economic instruments, then examining my research question through the comprehensive aspects of theoretical and empirical studies became one of my purpose.

1.2 The use of theory

In my study, I applied qualitative research strategy which incorporated realist and liberalist theories ‘as background to qualitative investigations’ (Bryman, 2001:11). Since one of my main purposes is to present a credible research, incorporating various dimensions of the issue, realist and liberalist approaches are used in terms of complementary analytical tools in examining the research question.

Theories present lenses to focus on the issues and offering various dimensions that are valid internally. Theory is something that guides and influences the collection and analysis of data (Bryman, 2001: 8). Therefore, I studied on the issue by benefiting from the tenets of realist and liberal approaches. Since liberal and realist theories offer their own ways of interpretation and collection of data, I found it necessary to use both theories as complements of each other to present a comprehensive theoretical framework and to be able to draw a valid conclusion. Issues of social sciences develop in a continuous cycle of change and transformation, which was especially the fact for security studies which I observed closely in my research. In this dynamic process, to be able to explain empirical findings and achieve

validity ‘which is concerned with the question of whether a conclusion that incorporates a causal relationship between two or more variable holds water’ (Bryman, 2001: 30), one of my concern was to go beyond the limits of perceptions presented by each of the two theories. Social sciences and in my case security studies are not ‘clear-cut’ as reflected by theories. Especially security studies, which are getting more complex and therefore in search of transforming their context, motivated me to evaluate on the issue from various dimensions which I aimed to accomplish through implementing these two theories as complements of each other in explaining the social reality of my research. In some points two theories came opposite, but most of the time used to complete insufficient perceptions of each other and enrich my research in depicting the issue.

Especially when we consider the context of my research question, the necessity of bringing two theories to the background comes into surface more vividly. My research question focused on the issue of security which is traditionally evaluated through realist perceptions and proved insufficient as I observed in my thesis and therefore, changing context of the issue brought into necessity to evaluate also from the perspective of liberal thinking. On the one hand, the dynamics influential on the issue such as; sensitive nature of security studies especially from the perspective of national sovereignty issue, impact of states interests on supporting common policies in security matters on the EU level, importance of military power in becoming a global actor and the role of military ‘hard power’ in responding to security threats occupied main concerns of realist assumptions in my study. Therefore, realist perceptions which emphasize issues of states, their interests, sovereignty as the primary and indivisible elements and believe in anarchical nature of international relations and advocating ‘hard power’ instruments in security issues are reflected as one side of the discussion. On the other side, since the context of the security issues transformed both with emerging actors and issues in a complex and interdependent way, liberal perceptions which are evaluated by the concept of ‘complex interdependence’ through mentioning new actors which are international, transnational or supranational but interdependent in character together with the complex nature of emerging security issues and therefore questioning the requisite of bringing multifaceted solutions to the security problems are discussed.

As it is more obviously outlined by the issue of terrorism, emerging security threats encompass various key factors as causes and as a result of interdependency between various actors they influence security agenda on a global level. Therefore, it becomes insufficient to evaluate on these issues from the state centric and military power based perceptions of realism. Multifaceted solutions require incorporating various pillars of economics, politics

and social issues, as discussed by liberal assumptions. In my research, I observed the complex context of the security threat of terrorism and in response what kind of instruments implemented on the EU level and in doing this, theoretical framework of realism and liberalism assisted me to interpret on these instruments as part of the reflection of the EU security approach. As I observed in my study, since on the EU security strategy the necessity of implementing ‘cross-pillar coordination’ of various areas is emphasized on the fight against terrorism, then to be able to interpret on the policy instruments -which encompass both the subjects of hard power and soft power- necessity to focus through liberal lenses came into the fore.

In discussing the development of the structure of the CFSP, realist assumptions carried me to the intergovernmental ends and emphasized hard power instruments such as the development of the ESDP, on the other side liberal point of view discussed concrete developments witnessed on the CFSP such as establishing common European security strategy together with mentioning European ‘cross-pillar’ coordination as significant parts of the European soft power instruments in approaching terrorism issue. European security strategy and approach to the issue of terrorism under the CFSP not only incorporated the liberal values of human rights, freedom and democracy as principal objectives of the security strategy but also entailed various areas of economics, politics and external relations as reflecting European ‘soft power’ dimension.

Consequently, realist and liberal theories provided me with the analytical frameworks in evaluating on my research from various dimensions. Since one of my primary concerns of the issue was about its complexity and sensitivity, then liberal perceptions assisted me in solving the issue of complexity while realist perceptions underlined the issue of sensitivity which reflected national security concerns and power politics underlined by the military instruments. Since complex context of the issue of security reveals on empirical basis the significance of combining ‘hard power’ and ‘soft power’ instruments in problem solving, then explaining and understanding the context and these instruments brought into necessity to analyze them from the realist and liberal theoretical frameworks.

1.3 Methodology and Sources

In my study, I evaluated on the empirical findings through the perceptions laid by the theoretical framework of realism and liberalism. Therefore, my methodological design

incorporated qualitative research strategy by having interpretative features. On solving the research problem, I searched and collected data through various sources and then made interpretation by using realism and liberalism as the analytical tools.

To be able to make clear interpretation and to discuss perceptions of each theory, I found it vital to grasp tenets of realist and liberal theories. Therefore, firstly I analyzed the theoretical context of liberalism and realism to enrich the intellectual background of my study. I used theoretical sources such as books, working papers of institutes, academic journals and articles. While searching on these sources, I especially focused on the ones that evaluate on the issue of security from theoretical perspectives. To be able to reflect the changes on the security studies from theoretical dimensions, I studied on the sources which examined classical realism and especially for the liberal perspective since the concept of 'complex interdependence' occupied prominent part of my research, Keohane and Nye's book 'Power and Interdependence' is used as one of my primary source.

Since, the issue of terrorism began to occupy significant place on the EU politics and the CFSP pillar after the September 11 and Madrid 11 events, the issue was quite new and therefore hard to be found in numerous and various sources from both theoretical and empirical aspects, which can be considered as one of the limitations in front of my research. On collecting empirical data on the issue of development of the CFSP, treaties, summits and declarations are taken into consideration and various internet sources, such as European Union's 'summaries of legislation', site are used. To be able to examine the underlying meaning of treaties, summits and declarations various quotations from books and working papers are taken. In addition to this, references to speeches of significant figures, such as Kofi Annan, to the reports released by conferences and to the official documents are given in order to show how the issue takes place in world politics. On the issue of terrorism various internet resources and papers of policy briefs are examined which incorporated both political interpretations and empirical data on the issue. In reflecting the general parameters of the security issues various books on security issues, articles and academic journals are observed. Especially, on the topic of the fight against terrorism through the CFSP, I could not find various academic resources as a result of both continuing developments and as being a quite new issue for the academic studies. However, in addition to the EU documents various internet resources of university and research centers such as Centre for European Policy Studies, European Research Papers Archive, European University Institute, and Norwegian Institute of International Affairs assisted me to observe different perspectives on EU security approach.

Consequently, in evaluating my research problem, I implemented qualitative research strategy which employed the feature of interpretation by collection and analysis of data in search of social reality. In collection of data I benefited from various sources of internet, books, official documents, speeches, articles, academic journals, etc. On interpretation of the empirical findings I found it necessary to use realist and liberal theories as sophisticated instruments.



Chapter II

Evaluating the End of the Cold War and the Emerging New Era through the Lenses of Realist and Liberalist Approaches

In this part, I will analyze the changes that are taking place in the international relations during the post-Cold War era through the lenses of realist and liberalist theories. Realist and liberalist theories will be used as complementary instruments in examining transformation of the international environment, emerging dynamics and their impact on the development of the CFSP. After defining features of realist theory, liberal theory and one of its fundamental concepts of 'complex interdependence' together with its implications on the international relations will be studied in discussion with realist theory.

With the release of the Cold War tension and the restraints imposed by it, the agenda of world politics has changed to a significant degree. This change and the emergence of a new system in international relations affected actors, issues and the international environment. In that new era, liberalist perceptions gained more importance and began to challenge realist perceptions. However, despite the fact that realist perceptions are insufficient to analyze the new era and the developments afterwards, it is still necessary not to lose realist lenses to see clearly the emerging changes which are also influential in the development of the CFSP. In my analysis, I will present two alternative schools of thoughts as complements of each other to be able to depict the whole 'story'. Therefore, I believe it is necessary to outline prominent features of these 2 schools of thoughts.

2.1 Realist Understanding

Realist perceptions were dominant through the Cold War and played significant roles in international relations. According to realism, states are the major actors in international relations and the behavior of states are directed through their interests which are defined in terms of power (Morgenthau, 1946). The important determinant counts to be power 'defined in terms of military security, securing the national interest as the goal of all states operating in an anarchical environment' (Tank, 1998: 11). Besides, sovereignty is the most fundamental element of international system. States whose primary aim are utility maximizing, defined in

terms of power and driven by interest, operate in an anarchical international environment in where no order exists. Since they are self-interested actors playing in the self-help world, realism assumes them to clash in a never-ending struggle for power and survival. As the survival and power-maximization are the primary rationales, especially during the Cold War - in which the security issue of nuclear balance was the fundamental concern- 'high politics' dominated the international agenda. During the Cold War, on the basis of security and ideological cleavages, international system was divided into 2 competing camps under the hegemonic leaderships possessing the ultimate military power defined in terms of nuclear capacity. The international agenda was determined by the security issues, continuous struggle for survival, power and influence. Therefore, foreign policy outline of the states was largely drawn by the leaders of the camps and for the Western camp it was the U.S. determining the foreign policy outline under the framework of the North Atlantic Alliance. Under the security protectorate of the U.S. and the dominance of national sovereignty arguments, the EC institutionalized its organization mostly as a trading block.

Realist analysis involves 3 fundamental assumptions according to Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye. In their book *Power and Interdependence* (2001: 20), they identified these assumptions by firstly maintaining that states are coherent units and dominant actors in the world politics. Secondly, according to them realists assume that force is a usable and effective instrument of policy. Thirdly, they mentioned that, realists assume a hierarchy of issues in world politics, headed by questions of military security: the high politics of military security dominates the low politics of economic and social affairs. And these are the assumptions to be discussed and challenged during the post-Cold War. Besides, in this transforming era the development of the CFSP of the EU also existed as a controversial issue such that with its structure and role in the world politics whether it becomes a challenge to realist assumptions or whether realist assumptions constitute an obstacle against the development of it. Therefore, it is a matter of concern that in which direction the EU develops the CFSP such as through supranational or intergovernmental ends and whether the sensitive nature of security issues and national sovereignty issues underlined by realist approaches constitute a barrier for the CFSP to develop.

2.2 Evaluating the Liberalist Concept of Complex Interdependence in Comparison with the Realist Understanding

One of the explanatory concepts for evaluating on the transformation of the international environment is about 'complex interdependence', championed by the liberal school of thought. In their book *Power and Interdependence* (2001: 21), Keohane and Nye mentioned the concept of complex interdependence, which provides an alternative portrayal of transforming international regime, has 3 main characteristics namely; multiple channels connecting societies, multiple issues that are not arranged in a hierarchy and reducing role of military power. In this part, the concept of complex interdependence and its characteristics will be examined for providing a necessary analytical tool in understanding the transformation of international environment and to evaluate on the emerging dynamics which are both influential on the development of security issues and the formation of the CFSP.

2.2.1 Multiple Channels and Multiple Actors such as Terrorist Groups

According to Keohane and Nye (2001: 21), the first characteristic of complex interdependence is multiple channels which incorporate: informal ties between governmental elites as well as formal foreign office arrangements; informal ties among nongovernmental elites (face-to-face and through telecommunications); and transnational organizations (such as multinational banks). So, apart from interstate relations which are the basic channel connecting the states according to realists, new channels are emerging and affecting the formation of policies and the interactions between societies. Transgovernmental channels challenge realist assumptions that take states as black boxes and as coherent units. Inside the states different interest groups and figures are emerging including nongovernmental elites and they also establish informal ties with other nongovernmental elites that are influential in other states. Transnational channels challenge the realist assumption that states are the only units in international relations. It involves transactions between multinational corporations and those organizations uncontrolled by the state. Emerging multiple channels encompass the fact of emerging multiple actors influential in international arena apart from the states. Since any study lacking evaluation of these actors will be incomplete academically, it becomes necessary to analyze them for a complete study.

With the end of the Cold War, multiple actors other than states show themselves more often by affecting the international politics. These actors are transnational in character and through the process of globalization which transformed the interactions in economic, social, technological and communicative areas they become influential. Terrorist groups, which are destructive and posing serious threat to world peace and sovereign nation-states, can be considered as transnational groups. Terrorist groups strengthened their networks and organizations through the transformation in economics, communication and weapons technology in the new era. Terrorist organizations existed during the Cold War however, under superpower's control. For instance, Osama Bin Laden was first used by the U.S. against the Soviets at the end of 1970s in Afghanistan. However, with the end of the Cold War, there existed no common enemy to fight for and therefore they were left without the support of the superpower. 'If we dig a bit deeper, we discover that al-Qaeda was an outgrow of US support of the guerilla movement in Afghanistan during the Soviet occupation. We poured tens of millions of dollars into helping to create the very network to which bin Laden belonged, and which struck down our Twin Towers on September 11'(McReynolds, 2002). In the new era these organizations strengthened their networks and today still playing influential roles in world politics such as in the events of September 11 and March 11.

These are the facts that are influential in the formation of world politics but are not taken into consideration in realist school of thought. And in emerging new era, it is necessary to mention their roles, impacts to be able to understand the developments which is the case in the CFSP and how terrorist acts influenced it. Terrorist organizations and their influence are so vital that, the Member States decided to act coherently to fight against this security threat to protect their soil and nations all together by launching common policies. In the European Security Strategy (ESS, 2003), it is mentioned that new threats and new international actors are emerging other than classical wars between states. Europe collectively 'faces new threats which are more diverse, less visible and less predictable in character' and 'no single country is able to tackle today's complex problems on its own' (ESS, 2003). So, against these transnational security threats, Europe introduces measures collectively on the basis of the EU and the CFSP. Therefore, for analyzing the development of the CFSP and the role of terrorism on the CFSP comprehensively, it is important to examine how these actors pose security threat and what kind of instruments and policies does the EU launch in response, especially within the framework of the CFSP. These arguments will be evaluated in the next chapters, under the contexts of the institutionalization of the CFSP, understanding the concept of terrorism and the EU policies before and after the September 11 event.

2.2.2 Multiple Issues such as Emerging New Dimensions in Security Issues

The second characteristics of the complex interdependence as it is mentioned by Keohane and Nye (2001: 21), is the agenda of interstate relationships encompassing multiple issues that are not arranged in a consistent hierarchy. It moves away from realist assumptions' focus on power politics and military force which dominates the agenda. It draws attention to the growing political and economic dimensions of the international system. Therefore, it signifies the converging importance of 'high politics' and 'low politics'. During the Cold War, the agenda of world politics was determined under the shadow of military security. Other issues were sequenced after military priority and linked to the military dimension which is placed on top of the agenda. There was a clear distinction between foreign and domestic policies. However, in the new era, as liberalist perceptions underline, the hierarchy among issues do no longer exist and various issues do not subordinate to security policy any more.

This understanding gave way to new dimensions in security issues. Security issues are neither considered only through the military framework nor taken only as a matter of 'hard power'. But, admittedly it should be broadened from realist perceptions to include economic, development and societal factors. That occupied one of the primary concerns of the EU's security structure in which the CFSP taking significant part. European Security Strategy mentioned that, 'in much of the developing world, poverty and disease cause untold suffering and give rise to pressing security concerns' (ESS, 2003). As borders getting more blurred it becomes impossible for each individual state to provide security only by itself. 'The end of the Cold War has left the United States in a dominant position as a military actor. However, no single country is able to tackle today's complex problems on its own' (ESS, 2003). So, as the hierarchy between various issues decreasing, then the division between foreign and domestic policies is also getting blurred. Foreign policies do not stand just as a matter of national sovereignty as assumed by realism, but they introduce into process of interaction with other kinds of issues which are effective in the formation of policies. That is also one of the reasons why the structure of consultation, cooperation and coordination developed between European governments specifically under the structure of the CFSP.

2.2.3 Reducing Role of Military Hard Power – Increasing Role of Multilateral Soft Power

The third characteristic of complex interdependence is the decreasing role of military force. In an era of intermingling and globalizing issues it becomes less relevant to solve problems, especially economic and social ones, through use of military force. During the Cold War, nuclear power was the basic determinant of power which was used as a mean of deterrence and a tool of diplomacy. High politics dominated the agenda and military power was placed as a primary instrument. However, in the new era, as the division between high politics and low politics blurred, new issues emerged, and this transformation of political agenda also reflected on the means that are used for solution of the problems. Multiple channels which focus on the 'soft power' started to be used by incorporating multi-dimensional approach. In dealing with emerging threats, new strategies which combine militaristic and civil measures are planned to be used, especially in the case of the EU and the CFSP. Even though the EU is trying to strengthen the military dimension, it also seriously emphasizes the importance of soft power and the concept of conflict prevention. These liberal concepts of soft power and conflict prevention occupy significant place in the European Security Strategy which mentions that each of emerging new threats require mixture of instruments (2003). For instance it is declared that, 'proliferation may be contained through export controls, attacked through political, economic and other pressures while the underlying political causes are also tackled'. In dealing with terrorism, the solution of issue 'may require a mixture of intelligence, police, judicial, military and other means' (ESS, 2003).

Transforming international security environment require combination of 'hard power' and 'soft power' as policy measures. Therefore, 'soft power' instruments of the EU, especially on the name of preventive measures, are advocated as an antidote against the complex security problems. These multi-faceted European measures include: Humanitarian Aid Programmes, European Assistance Programmes, European Development Programmes, etc. Besides this, European preventive measures can also be grouped into 3 through the provision of instruments of assistance, support and pressure. 'In terms of assistance, the EU provides foreign aid to foster development and democratization worldwide. It can also provide technical assistance for example in support of WMD non-proliferation measures. With respect to pressure the EU has introduced conditionality as a component of its international agreements – addressing the support for terrorism and WMD proliferation' (Lindstrom and Schmitt, 2004).

2.3 Changing Nature of Security Studies

Since international security environment and global problems are transforming, the context of security studies and the instruments left in search of transforming themselves. It is not only military issues shaping the security concerns of each states but, socio-economic dimensions also occupy significant place in the security agenda. In order to present comprehensive analysis, security studies should incorporate various perspectives of socio-economic and military elements. Therefore, in this part I will first analyze the changes taking place on socio-economic issues and then evaluate their reflections on security studies by incorporating EU security understanding and terrorism issue.

Together with the transformations brought by globalization, interactions between societies gained new momentum. On the one hand, while globalization process fastened the spread of technological innovations and economic transactions, on the other side it continued to function through market forces dispersing wealth but not equality. Since, there exist no global economic mechanisms to disperse wealth equally between societies and groups, then developed nations which accomplished to introduce necessary means of production, technology, work force and equipment benefited from the revenues of the system. As a result, the gap between the poor and the rich enlarged and these people, who could not integrate and compete on the global market, became alienated. The era we are living is the one in which ‘the richest 1 percent of the world’s population receive as much as the poorest 57 percent. More than a billion people live on less than a dollar a day’ (United Nations Development Programme, 2001). Since demands of poor and marginalized people could not be satisfied, then the center of resentments turned into potential places for terrorist activities. As one of the consequences of these grievances, on September 11, World Trade Center which is an economic organization and one of the symbols of global economic policies became target of the terrorist group.

Terrorist activities occupy profound place in security studies, in states’ threat assessments and in the CFSP. That is one of the reasons why the EU Security Strategy (2003) identified under the subject of ‘global challenges and key threats’, the issues of the poverty and economic failure of the developing world and their potential to give rise to pressing security concerns. Besides, the vitality of these socio-economic problems in a global geography and the necessity of drawing active policies are underlined by declaring that with the new threats ‘the first line of defense will often be abroad’ (ESS, 2003).

Apart from material interests, norms of democracy, human rights, rule of law occupy significant place in EU's external relations which can be interpreted as part of transformation of security issues. Wider concept of security -both in the state level, incorporating the security of the EU as a whole to its national security concerns and in the EU level incorporating both the security of the periphery and the far distances to its security concerns- has been emerged. The importance of the norms such as well governed, democratic societies and their impact on the European security were depicted through various events that took place in the new era and led to the development of wider concept of security. Wider concept of security incorporated multilateral use of soft and hard power instruments into the structure of the CFSP.

Today, socio-economic issues which were suppressed under the hegemony of military issues during the Cold War, compete for the top place in security agenda by being root causes of security threats. Therefore, I claim that roots of the problems that are economic, social or political in character should be evaluated through sophisticated analytical approaches other than only through classic realist assumptions. Classical realism primarily focuses on power politics and military force in attaining security. However, growing utility of economic and political forms of power made military power insufficient in solution of conflicts and parsimonious in analyzing security studies.

In outlining transforming nature of security environment, some scholars point out the transforming nature of the warfare. For instance K.J. Holsti argues the violent conflicts in the new era as the 'wars of the third kind'. These are civil wars and they are characterized as long wars of attrition, fought with both tactics of guerilla and terrorism. They generate great casualties and do not make distinction between combatants and noncombatants (Holsti, 1992). So, this new definition of warfare can be useful in highlighting the nature of terrorism.

The concept of 'security community' – as developed by Karl Deutsch- endeavor to explain the security structure of Europe, which is not threatened by a whole-scale risk of nuclear war but by newly emerging, less visible security threats that feeds mostly on socio-economic conditions. The security community is also characterized by Gartner, Hyde-Price and Reiter (2001: 3) through 'absence of war and absence of military option in the interactions of states'. It is also possible to add the term of 'Cooperative security' which has been used as an umbrella term upholding consultation over confrontation, prevention over correction and interdependence in place of unilateralism (Evans, 1994: 3-20). When we adopt the notion of security community to the EU, we can say that since this community is in continuous interaction with other societies, it is not a community only for itself but also affecting the lives of other actors through multilateral and peaceful means which are alien to

realist understanding. EU influences the behavior and interactions of other actors through sustaining and exporting its norms. Besides, it is also sensitive to the developments taking place in the international system. 'Security community will have global connections and are affected by security risks and challenges in the wider international system' (Gartner, Hyde-Price and Reiter, 2001: 4).

On the other side, the instruments developed as part of the CFSP, still leave significant room for realist thinking. Today, the EU develops European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) as part of the CFSP. Lessons of Balkan wars (inability of the EU during the crises) and changing nature of security threats showed the vitality of adding defense dimension for a credible CFSP. In that aim, EU Security Strategy also underlined the significance of military intervention. 'The climate in which the paper was produced is actually described with precision, including: the post-Cold War opportunities coupled with new dangers of local conflicts: actual violence in the Balkans (i.e. on European soil); an increasing need for troop and police deployments in sometimes distant places; and the realization of a potential combination of 'new threats' (international and catastrophic terrorism), failed states and organized crime' (Menotti, 2003).

European efforts to develop common defense structure under the CFSP can be discussed in the framework as whether realist approaches begin to dominate the security studies or not. 'One paradoxical consequence of the end of the Cold War has been the renaissance of strategy. Despite the greatly improved military security environment in Europe (with the exception of parts of the Balkans and the Caucasus), the classic concern of strategy –the use of military force for political purposes (the agenda of Clausewitz) - is now a major concern for the foreign and security policy elites in much of Europe' (Hyde-Price, 2001: 45). The military developments in the CFSP, brings the question of whether military power remains the fundamental element in achieving security. From realist perceptions, as long as the international politics remain in an anarchical system, military force will be the key instrument in achieving security and key element in security studies.

Consequently, as long as the global challenges vary in complexity, the instruments and approaches in security studies will also continue to vary. Therefore, the context and definition of elements should transform themselves to encompass multidimensional approaches such as usage of soft and hard power instruments in security issues.

Chapter III

Institutionalization Process of the CFSP

In this part, I will analyze the institutionalization process of the CFSP through observing the development of the CFSP after the Cold War. In the first part developments after the fall of Berlin Wall and their impact on the construction of the CFSP will be examined. In the second part, significant events of the international arena, which are affecting European politics and the development of the CFSP will be illustrated. Agreements, discussions and interpretations through the lenses of realist or liberalist thinking which will examine the institution either toward the intergovernmental or supranational ends will be observed.

3.1 Motives Preparing the Ground for Construction of the CFSP

1990s opened with the new challenges and the actors on the international arena. The Cold War was just over and the international system was in a continuous attempt to identify itself, the characteristic of the system, its newly emerging actors, power centers and security threats. It was a matter of question that what would be the role of EC/EU in this emerging era.

‘The IGC planned for 1990-1 was initially intended to focus on monetary union and its institutional consequences, not directly on political union defined in terms of foreign and defense policy. It was the revolutions in central and eastern Europe in the course of 1989 and the rapid moves towards German unification which followed in 1990, that forced foreign and security policy up to the IGC’ (Forster and Wallace, 2000: 467). There were various security concerns that motivated European leaders to establish the CFSP dimension in a Community framework. First of them was about transformation witnessed in central and eastern Europe in where a security and power vacuum have been resulted from the breakdown of the Warsaw Alliance. Emerging security and power vacuum in central and eastern European states were preparing ground for regional, ethnic conflicts which would also imply new refugees on the door of Western Europe. Secondly, European governments realized the importance of containing reunited and now stronger Germany which possesses the potential of being a regional hegemon. It was necessary to integrate Germany into European structure through political dimension. Besides future behavior of the US in security matters was also matter of concern. Since the European continent ceased to be under the risk of nuclear confrontation, it became

questionable that whether the U.S., would be willing to continue its security guarantees in the European continent. It was a possibility that the US would take its advantage as a superpower and concern with other strategic issues around the world. 'The period of uncertainty following cast doubts on the United States' willingness to remain engaged in Europe by questioning the future of NATO. Without a dominant Soviet threat, it became increasingly difficult for American policy makers to justify spending defense dollars protecting wealthy Europeans. European nations realized that they had to take greater responsibility for their own security in an increasingly unpredictable international environment' (Eliassen, 1998: 4).

One of the concerns of the EU to formalize the CFSP can be explained through the desire to build a global role for itself. At the beginning of the 1990s, EC/EU was already proving its potent on economic issues. However, it was a question mark that whether it would perform a more global role. From the realist perceptions, since military power is the most important determinant of power then it would be a 'must' to include security dimension together with military arm, and foreign policy dimension which would formalize a coherent European voice to direct political events in the international arena.

3.2 Establishment and Development of the CFSP

3.2.1 The Maastricht Treaty

The CFSP of the European Union is established as the second pillar of the EU by the Treaty on European Union which entered into force in 1993. For the first time the objective of 'common foreign policy' is included in the Treaty framework. Besides, the Treaty incorporated the security aspect of the Union which articulated the 'eventual framing of a common defense policy that might in time lead to a common defense' (Article J.3, J.4.1). By the introduction of the CFSP of the EU, the Union aimed to 'make its voice heard on the international stage, express its position on armed conflicts, human rights and any other subject linked to the fundamental principles and common values which form the basis of the European Union and which it is committed to defend' (*The Council of the EU, CFSP web site*). So, the EU began to push for forming a coherent voice which would assert European block as a global power on the international arena. However, where as realists would define a global power in terms of military capabilities, it seems that the Europeans defined a global power through liberal aspects such as constructing a coherent and unified regional block

which would prove its political potent more through diplomatic means. It is because the objectives and means to achieve them are broadly defined in political terms and instead of clearly outlined military dimension political instruments are emphasized under the framework of intergovernmental decision-making structure.

Implementation of military dimension is pointed vaguely on the defense policy without identifying a clear agenda for the framing of a common defense and its instruments. When we take into consideration the realist perceptions, this open-ended status of common defense policy without possessing a concrete military dimension would be a failure in paving the way of EU playing a global role.

On the other side, there is still a profound room left for realist approaches by Article 2 of the Treaty, mentioning one of the objectives as ‘to assert its identity on the international scene, in particular through the implementation of a common foreign and security policy including the progressive framing of a common defense policy, which might lead to a common defence...’ This point questions the norms of being a global power and the usage of military forces for political purposes. The mentality of being an assertive global power by underlining the defense dimension can be attached to the realist understanding. Besides, since adding security dimension to the Community framework explained in the name of ‘asserting the Union’s identity on the international scene’, then it required to ask a question about whether this signals a departure from a liberal view toward a realist approach that includes Clausewitz’s agenda of usage of military force for political purposes. To be able to see clearly toward which direction the CFSP is taking the way, it is necessary to observe the structure and the instruments established by the Treaty.

Structure of the CFSP

The CFSP has been established on the basis of intergovernmental decision-making structure. Decisions would be taken unanimously by interlocking national policy-makers based on the considerations of national interests. By its institutional structure and the instruments at its disposal, it is different from the other pillars of the Community. Where as in areas of trade policy and single market majority voting is used, in the CFSP unanimous voting procedure is required. In the area of security and foreign policy, which are the vital concerns of nation-states and can not be forgone in any way in realist literature, consensus among various nation-states is needed in decision-making.

Definition of the principles and general guidelines of the CFSP is attached to the European Council. The Commission is entitled to submit legislative proposals and budget execution. European Parliament is given the right to put questions and recommendations to the Council and held the annual debate on the implementation of the CFSP. Other actors such as the Council of Foreign Affairs Ministers, the Political and Security Committee, European correspondents, the CFSP Working Group and CFSP counselors also involved in the process (*EU Summaries of legislation, the CFSP web site*). However, these actors other than the Member States possess limited capacity of influence. The key instruments established for the implementation of the CFSP were; common positions and joint actions. On a particular issue, taking 'Common position' required Member States to adjust their national policies to comply with the position defined by the Union. 'Joint actions' are identified as the operational actions launched by the Member States under the direction of the CFSP.

Apart from other pillars carrying supranational characteristic, the CFSP is distinguished by its intergovernmental nature in which nation states continue to occupy the main place in decision-making. Besides, in the absence of consensus among the concrete national interests, it is the political will of each nation state which is expected to provide the leverage for decision making. However, according to realist understanding, states themselves do not agree to apply policies that would challenge their national interests. Therefore, the CFSP can be evaluated as a sum of national interests of the Member States. 'Institutions can not be expected to put limits on foreign policy initiatives of the Member States, to shape their interests or to bring them to stick to common policies if they collide with their own national interest' (Sjursen, 2003). Theoretically, intergovernmental structure of the CFSP seems to support realists who advocate the norm of cooperation within a situation of coinciding material national interests other than norms or values. On the other side, since objectives and the instruments of the CFSP mostly defined on the basis of defending liberal values, ideational foundations of the CFSP provide credible grounds for the liberalist perceptions.

Consequently, nation-state based structure of the CFSP seemed to be ineffective through vaguely defined instruments and unanimous voting procedure however, it still constituted part of ambitious European project.

3.2.2 Yugoslav Conflicts

After the end of the Cold War, Europeans faced the first major security problem in the continent through the Yugoslav crisis. During the conflicts both in Bosnia and Kosovo, European leaders were divided on the issues of definition of the conflict together with the necessary means in solution of the problems. There were divisions between the Member States especially on the use of armed forces, at a time which was considered as a necessary instrument for enforcing diplomatic initiatives. Basically, governments were reluctant to commit armed forces in Balkans. By lacking the military intervention capacity and political will, the EU intervened as part of the UN peacekeeping force and part of the NATO force. On the other side, it was the U.S. and its leadership in NATO that intervened militarily and ended up the conflict. Consequently, in its first empirical testing ground, the CFSP failed as a result of slow decision-making procedure inside the intergovernmental structure, which necessitates consensus among Member States, together with a lack of military intervention capacity.

3.2.3 The Treaty of Amsterdam

The Yugoslav conflict presented European ineffectiveness in crisis situation which also represented a failure of the newly established CFSP. Besides, the crisis showed the importance of relying on its own military capability both to enforce political initiatives and to abstain from excessive dependence on the US military power. Through that atmosphere came the Amsterdam Treaty which brought significant innovations for the CFSP.

Structure of the CFSP

The 1997 Amsterdam Treaty added a new foreign policy instrument of ‘common strategies’. The European Council would define common strategies by consensus which would provide general framework for Union’s actions in three pillars and consistency in its external relations. On the other side, in decision-making procedure, the norm of ‘constructive abstention’ is introduced. CFSP decisions would still require unanimous voting but a Member State can abstain from applying the decision. Although, in two cases the qualified majority voting is introduced, a provision allowing the Member State to block the adoption of a

decision in case of ‘important and stated reasons of national policy’ is also put into legal framework.

Amsterdam Treaty created a new post of the High Representative for the foreign policy who ‘is responsible for assisting the Council in CFSP related matters by contributing to formulation, preparation and implementation of decisions’ (*EU Summaries of legislation, the CFSP web site*). The position of the High Representative indicates one of the intergovernmental aspects such that, Javier Solana (High Representative for the CFSP) ‘reports directly to national ministers and is responsible only to them. He is not a Commissioner but directly appointed by the national governments to fulfill the aspirations of the Member State in the foreign and security policy area’ (*European Foreign and Security Policy Newsletter*, 2000).

By the Amsterdam Treaty it is declared that the Union would ‘avail itself of the WEU to elaborate and implement decisions on the tasks that are referred to’, which are namely, Petersberg tasks covering the areas of military and civil crisis management. After the failure in Yugoslav wars, it is possible to note that the Union drew some lessons especially on the issue of military capability. Petersberg tasks are incorporated into Union *acquis* which would be carried out by the WEU. Besides, ‘The revision of the TEU of Amsterdam did admittedly strengthened the references to defense as well as bringing the Petersberg tasks into the TEU’ (Treacher, 2004). Therefore, it is possible to say that the EU began to develop strategies and military dimension.

Amsterdam Treaty can be evaluated as a serious European step toward developing strategic thinking and military dimension under the CFSP in addition to its soft power. Together with its intergovernmental nature, evolution toward a military operational capability can be considered as a supporting evidence for the realist assumptions. Aside from soft power instruments, the possibility of usage of hard power which brought solutions in conflicts, especially in the Balkans, started to take place in the CFSP.

3.2.4. Saint Malo Declaration

One of the turning points for the CFSP came with the St. Malo Declaration that is revealed after the Franco-British Summit in 1998. The declaration was prominent for underlining the importance of developing European security and defense capacity. It is mentioned that the EU needed ‘the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by the credible military forces, the

means to decide to use them and a readiness to do so in order to respond to international crises' (Franco-British Summit, 1998). The underlying rationale was that, the time for developing independent European capacity for action has come so that 'Europe can make its voice heard in world affairs' (Franco-British Summit, 1998). Progress toward militarization of the CFSP indicates that, at the end of crisis in Balkans and the European failure, it is widely admitted that being a civilian power and the instruments of soft power were necessary but not sufficient for being a global power. As realist understanding would assume, global actors need at the first sight a real power and 'real power necessitated the acquisition of military capabilities' (White, 2001).

Similar to the Amsterdam Treaty, there were several factors preparing the ground for St. Malo Declaration which aimed to deepen and widen the CFSP by attaching defense capability. Therefore, it is not possible to explain the institutionalization process of the CFSP through the concept of spillover effect which constitutes part of liberal explanations for the EU integration and other 2 pillars. As R. Kagan, N. Ginesotto and V. Kremenyuk (2002) mentioned in their article, there are 3 main reasons for incorporating defense dimension to EU's competencies. One of them was about the lessons taken from Balkan wars. 'There is no doubt that Kosovo has given a big boost to proposals for integrating defense policies more closely into the EU structure. European leaders have been shocked by the inadequacy of their disparate armed forces in the crisis and by the extent of their dependence on uncertain US leadership' (Dale, 1999). Another reason was that, defense dimension was felt necessary to be able to deepen the CFSP and to construct a coherent EU foreign policy. The third reason was related to Transatlantic relations and NATO such that 'a European military capability was considered necessary to compensate for the new uncertainty over US military involvement in crisis management in Europe' (Kagan, Ginesotto and Kremenyuk, 2002).

3.2.5 Cologne Summit

At the June 1999 Cologne Summit, broad principles for defense dimension have been outlined. The summit conclusions emphasized that, to be able to fulfill the objective of a common *European policy on security and defense*, the EU must develop 'capacity for action backed up by credible military capabilities and appropriate decision-making bodies and procedures'. 'The focus should be to assure that the EU possesses the necessary capabilities (including military capabilities) to conduct crisis management operations in the scope of the Petersberg

tasks' (Gartner, 2001). Under the CFSP, the emphasis started to be made on the security and defense dimension more often, which includes the proposals for the formation of European military capability for autonomous action. The framework of ESDP has been drawn by reference to Petersberg tasks. By establishing ESDP as part of the CFSP, the Union was taking steps toward becoming a global power, whose diplomatic efforts would imply more influence in international arena as it is followed by autonomous European military capacity. Since European Union began to introduce ESDP dimension into its structure, then this represented a movement towards a realist paradigm in which military power is championed as a diplomatic instrument. On the other side, in the Cologne Summit the principles underlining the ESDP were drawn apart from establishing concrete institutional structure.

3.2.6 Helsinki Summit

On December 1999, the European Council in Helsinki gave priority to strengthening the common European Policy on Security and Defense. The European Council reemphasized its determination in developing an autonomous capacity to take decisions together with launching and conducting EU-led military operations in case NATO is not engaged. As a first concrete step in that direction, a military component has been introduced under the title of 'headline goal'. Through the 'headline goal', Member States committed themselves to the establishment of a functioning 'Rapid Reaction Force' which would carry out Petersberg tasks. Rapid Reaction Force represents Union's capacity to deploy up to 60.000 troops within 60 days and to sustain them for at least one year to tackle military crisis (Helsinki European Council, Presidency Conclusions, 1999).

The Rapid Reaction Force which is introduced as a military component of the Union, however, is not envisaged as a standing 'European army'. The personnel of this force would remain under the command of national armed forces and it would be composed of those states wishing to participate. So, it is both intergovernmental and voluntary in nature. The Rapid Reaction Force would fulfill the limited tasks which are namely Petersberg tasks. 'It would have no role in territorial defense, and would have no integrated chain of military command' (*European Foreign and Security Policy Newsletter*, 2000).

3.2.7 The Treaty of Nice

The main aim of the Treaty of Nice of December 2000 was determining the way in which the EU institutions would operate effectively through the biggest enlargement process of its history. However, still in the area of the CFSP some innovations have been made. Political and Security Committee (PSC), the European Union Military Committee (EUMC) and the European Union Military Staff (EUMS) (*the Council of the European Union web site*) have been established. 'For the first time in EU's history security and defense policy has been institutionalized with the recognition in Article 25 of the Treaty of Nice of the central role of the new Political and Security Committee' (Howorth, Terriff, Webber and Croft, 2001). As mentioned by Howorth, Terriff, Webber and Croft (2001) PSC's tasks are identified as:

- Keep track of international situations, and offer policy advice to the Council of the EU
- Coordinate, supervise and monitor discussions on the CFSP
- Take responsibility for dealing with crisis situation and examine all options for action
- Exercise 'political control and strategic direction' of the EU's military response to any crisis

Consequently, it is possible to comment that through declarations, summits and decisions, the EU took steps in developing its CFSP more visibly from the dimension of security and defense. This can be interpreted as a result of the European deficiencies that were faced in the Balkan wars and the call for being a significant global actor. When these developments in the CFSP are taken as a response to specific event, then they would oppose the liberal concept of 'spillover affect'. At the same time, debates about the military structures still focused on intergovernmental basis. Especially on the construction of the Rapid Reaction Force, in which the military personnel remained under the command of national armed forces, the intergovernmental structure observed explicitly. Besides this, the PSC whose tasks are designed to include significant role in crisis management activities by the Nice Treaty, is also composed of national representatives in intergovernmental structure (Official Journal C 80). Developing military capabilities would be an aspect in support of realist vision of power politics. Besides, the bureaucratic and nationalistic concerns which limited the further development of the CFSP can also be counted as patterns of realist assumptions. On the other side, since objectives and the instruments of the CFSP mostly defined on the basis of defending liberal values, ideational foundations of the CFSP provide credible grounds for the liberalist perceptions.

Chapter IV

Understanding the Concept of Terrorism

Today, the issue of terrorism ranks in one of the top places of the security agenda of both the nation states and the global community. Especially after the events of September 11, a global coalition for the war against terrorism is endeavored to be established under the leadership of the US. The event was a massive show off about how a terrorist organization can inflict such a security threat to a ‘superpower’ in its own soil. The event depicted the seriousness of the danger and after that, threat assessments and security approach of the EU has changed. Terrorism placed in one of the global security threats to the EU by the EU Security Strategy document. Therefore, I believe it is necessary to understand how the issue influenced EU politics. However, to be able to observe this issue clearly, it is necessary to understand the context of the issue. In order to evaluate on the context of the terrorism, this part of my study will focus on three subtitles which are: definition of terrorism, characteristics of terrorism and possible root causes of terrorism.

Terrorism is not a new phenomenon. The word terrorism derives from the French word *regime de la terreur* which was the case between the period 1793 and 1794 in France. At that time, for the beginning, it was used as a positive term which seemed necessary and instrumental for the consolidation of the new revolutionary government. Therefore, it was used as a state instrument to protect the new regime from the destructive and subversive elements. Maximilian Robespierre, the French Revolutionary leader (1794), defined it as such “terror is nothing other than justice, prompt, severe, inflexible: it is therefore an emanation of virtue: it is not so much a special principle as it is a consequence of the general principle of democracy applied to our country’s most urgent needs’ (Robespierre, 1794). Despite the fact that act of terrorism is not new, even today the definition of the concept takes its place in the world politics as being one of the most controversial issues. The most significant reason for this complexity of the definition lies in the concept’s political context. Still, there is no common international definition of the act of terrorism and therefore, an organization can be identified as freedom fighter or terrorist depending on the point of view of the interpreter. Political concerns are influential which can take form of sympathy for the cause and disapproval for the ruling regime. Especially in the West, interpretation of political violence is related to the legitimacy of ruling regime. In western democracies, legitimate states offer

alternative ways of political expression, making the choice of resorting to violent means irrelevant. ‘Political violence against the state is therefore more apt to be termed ‘terrorism’ - with all the negative connotations the term denotes – than is political violence on the part of the state.... As a consequence of such reasoning, what might be viewed as terrorism by the West (if it occurs in a ‘Westernized’ or liberal democratic state) may be regarded differently when it happens in less ‘legitimate’ states’ (Burgess, 2003). The problem of definition also constituted important part of the EU inefficiency in developing common policies and serious measures on the issue.

After the September 11 attack, the issue of terrorism started to be evaluated on a different basis. The EU defined the issue of terrorism on a more serious security level and more concrete and unified measures are taken for the fight against terrorism. However, before that EU policies were not serious and sufficient enough to deal with the problem. Therefore, I find it necessary to observe why transformation of policies took place on the EU level. To be able to understand the differences between policies, it is necessary to observe the concept itself first which will help to grasp the seriousness of the problem.

4.1 Definition of Terrorism

As one of a result of its political context, it becomes impossible to find a uniform definition for the act of terrorism. As Walter Laqueur (1987: 149-150) mentions, ‘even if there were an objective, value free definition of terrorism, covering all its important aspects and features, it would still be rejected by some for ideological reasons’. Despite the validity of this argument, it is still necessary to observe the context of terrorism which would broaden the understanding of the concept. Besides, it is mentioned both on the EU and the UN documents that there is a need to construct common objective definition of terrorism. If common objective definition and shared international public opinion on the elements that constitute terrorism could be achieved, then it would blame all kinds of violence against innocents and would not legitimize any of these kinds of acts according to political, social or ideological motivations. This would also help clearing the distinction between freedom fighters and terrorists. Therefore, I will observe its definition from various resources and compare them for finding common characteristics that can be explanatory for the concept.

In case of the US, there is still no common definition even between various agencies of the state. By the US Department of the Defense, terrorism is defined as ‘the calculated use

of unlawful violence to inculcate fear, intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious or ideological' (United States Department of Defense, 2003). On the other side, the US State Department characterizes terrorism as 'premediated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience' (Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, 2003).

When we look at the UN Counter-Terrorism site, we see that the definition is still under discussion by the General Assembly's Sixth Committee that is considering a draft Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism. In various Declarations by the Security Council and the General Assembly, apart from giving direct definition of the act, some common points relevant to the issue have been declared. These are:

- 'Acts of terrorism endanger innocent lives and the dignity and security of human beings everywhere, threaten the social and economic development of all States and undermine global stability and prosperity' (UN Security Council Resolution, 2001)
- 'Acts, methods and practices of terrorism constitute a grave violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, which may pose a threat to international peace and security, jeopardize friendly relations among states, and aim at the destruction of human rights, fundamental freedoms and the democratic bases of society' (UN General Assembly, 1995).

The EU released various documents mentioning the characteristics of the threat posed by the act of terrorism. Council Framework Decision of 2002/475/JHA defined terrorist offences as; these offences must be committed with the aim of intimidating people and seriously altering or destroying the political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country (The Council of the EU, 2002). In the Security Strategy, terrorism is discussed under the title of key threats to European security which are 'more diverse, less visible and less predictable' (ESS, 2003). It is mentioned that 'terrorism put lives at risk: it imposes large costs: it seeks to undermine the openness and tolerance of our societies and it poses a growing strategic threat to the whole Europe. Increasingly, terrorist movements are well-resourced, connected by electronic networks and are willing to use unlimited violence to cause massive casualties' (ESS, 2003).

Consequently, these were the general explanations on the concept of terrorism laid down by the three significant actors on world politics. Despite there is no common definition of the act of terrorism, they still lay down some common characteristics of the act of terrorism.

4.2 Characteristics of Terrorism

Political Context: The political context of terrorism can be seen as one of the most prominent features of the concept which separates it from being a purely criminal matter. Terrorist organizations use violence as a mean to achieve ends like those of criminal organizations. However, terrorist groups are not designed for these kinds of criminal matters of gaining material interests, but rather they are organized for threatening or changing existing political order. As Paul R. Pillar (2001) mentions:

Terrorism is fundamentally different from these other forms of violence, however, in what gives rise to it and how it must be countered, beyond simple physical security and police techniques. Terrorists' concerns are macroconcerns about changing a legal order: other violent criminals are focused on the microlevel of pecuniary gain and personal relationship. 'Political' in this regard encompasses not just traditional left-right politics but also what are frequently described as religious motivations or social issues

Endangering and Targeting the Noncombatants: Terrorist acts choose victims randomly which includes to a large extent noncombatants from the society. Apart from the identity of the victims, it is the political message delivered to the watching public is important. 'If there is no specific precaution taken in case something bad happens, the one who is chosen, as the target will be defenseless. This potential victim has got nothing to do with defending himself not knowing the danger, because, the time and the place of the murderous action are up to the terrorist himself within his rules and aims' (Forsnet, 2000).

Use of Violent Means: In expressing themselves, terrorist organizations use violence means which can stem from the factors such as: influencing and drawing public attention to the problem and the situation of absentee of the democratic channels to express themselves. Especially, in failed states when democratic channels are blocked to the opposition and they are prevented from reaching democratic channels to express their views in political arena, they can resort to violence as an instrument of expression. By using violent means, terrorists aim to change the existing order and undermine the power of the legitimate political authority. They use violence, so that 'by exposing the vulnerability of power, they want to undermine

the loyalty of the population and their belief in authority, thereby creating awareness that things are changeable. By creating incidental or intentional victims among the civil population, they want to create widespread fear and ensuing popular pressure on state authorities to make compromises with the terrorists' (Muller, 2003).

Intention of Sowing Fear in a Target Population: By definition 'terrorism as a concept means 'intimidating', but this intimidating is in great intensity and capable of creating sudden feelings of fear on individuals explaining the manner of violence' (Forsnet, 2000). Terrorist attacks target noncombatants by resorting to violent means as a strategy, aiming to sow fear in a target population. They aim to intimidate public which would help weakening the resistance of public and force people to obedience and accept their clause.

Propaganda of the deed: The Italian revolutionary Carlo Pisacanes' theory of the propaganda of the deed underlines the significance of delivering a message to the public audience by the acts of terrorism other than the lives of the victims. In an era of rapid globalization of media, which is instrumental in delivering the message to a huge mass of audience in various geographies, terrorist organizations discover the effectiveness of publicity. By launching massive attacks which are broadcasted through TVs and media coverage, terrorist organizations exploit media instruments in propagation of their cause. This constitutes a part of terrorist strategy, separating it from other kinds of armed conflicts. As Brian Michael Jenkins expresses,

'What sets terrorism apart from other violence is this: terrorism consists of acts carried out in a dramatic way to attract publicity and create an atmosphere of alarm that goes far beyond the actual victims. Indeed, the identity of the victim is often secondary or irrelevant to the terrorists who aim their violence at the people watching. This distinction between actual victims and a target audience is the hallmark of terrorism and separates it from other modes of armed conflicts. Terrorism is theater.' (Jenkins, 2004)

4.3 Possible Causes of Terrorism

To be able to develop an effective long-term strategy in dealing with the threat of terrorism, it is necessary to understand the root causes of terrorism. Forces and causes of terrorism are

diverse and encompassing complexity of various fields such as economics, social, political and religious. The complex nature of the problem and its importance for the EU as a prominent security threat is also underlined by the EU Security Strategy which declared that, 'it arises out of complex causes. These include the pressure of modernization, cultural, social and political crises, and the alienation of young people living in foreign societies. This phenomenon is also part of our own society' (ESS, 2003).

It is not possible to discern all root causes of terrorist activities. Terrorist organizations differ in their ends and their causes of activities incorporate various factors. In that difficulty of identifying the definition and causes of terrorism clearly, it also becomes less relevant to use military force in eliminating the roots of terrorism. As it is mentioned in complex interdependence part, today's world is getting more interdependent and the relations between multiple actors are getting more complex. Consequently, it brings into necessity to evaluate on the problems by using multi-faceted approaches. Especially on the issue of terrorism, declining role of military solutions and instead increasing necessity of bringing a multi-dimensional approach that includes economics, politics and diplomatic initiatives coming into surface. Therefore, in this part of my study, I will present some possible causes of terrorism from various bases.

Economic Difficulties and Poverty: The link between poverty and terrorism is somehow debatable between scholars. However, many world leaders such as UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and European Union High Representative for CFSP Javier Solana advocate that poverty and economic difficulties are one of the prominent factors sowing the roots of terrorism. While the profiles of terrorist leaders can be discussed as well-off and well-educated, it can be the grievances and the despair stemmed from poverty that create an atmosphere of winning new supporters and sympathizers. As UN Secretary General Kofi Annan mentions:

'While not automatic result of any one factor, terrorism is related to social, political and economic conditions. Terrorists thrive on despair and the UN must find a way to deal with legitimate grievances. Accordingly, there needs to be more on the horizon than simply winning a war against terrorism. There must be the promise of a better and a fairer world and a concrete plan to get there. For this reason, the vision of Millennium Declaration has become more, not less important as has the need to take action to turn its promise to into reality' (Annan, 2003).

In the Millennium Development Goals eradication of extreme poverty and hunger occupies the number one goal. In addition to poverty, inequality and high unemployment rates also encompass part of the causes of terrorist acts. Young and desperate people living under poor conditions, without access to education and working opportunities can become supporters of terrorist organizations with ease which are providing stable home, food, and consistent income for families (Economic and Social Council, 2004). US President George Bush also stressed that, ‘he can see how ‘youngsters’ who see only a hopeless future could be susceptible to recruitment as suicide bombers’ (Bush, 2002).

From the European perspective in the European Security Strategy (2003), it is also mentioned that ‘in much of the developing world, poverty and disease cause untold suffering and give rise to pressing security concerns...In many cases, economic failure is linked to political problems and violent conflict’. Consequently, economic difficulties play prominent role in creating desperate and hopeless people which could be manipulated by terrorist organizations. Therefore, an economic aspect of the problem is underlined in various platforms, especially on the EU level.

Absence of Good Governance: Democracy, rule of law and human rights are essential components of good governance. In case of absentee of these elements, we see repressive governments using coercive instruments to take control of its citizens. In the lack of democratic channels, these are the governments or regimes which are ruling without the consent of the citizens to whom political arena and the democratic ways of expressing themselves are blocked. As it is mentioned in the Report of the “Conference on the Roots of Evil’ (2003):

Terrorism takes root in chaos and the absence of good governance. Democracy and proper governance including free expression and a vibrant civil society, respect for human rights and functioning, fair judiciary allow dissent to be expressed in nonviolent and legitimate ways

When these conditions are lacked and people are repressed by a coercive administration, the opposition may turn to terrorist means in order to replace the government with the one representing their interests.

Globalization and Rapid Modernization: As the process of globalization surpass the national borders, both developed and underdeveloped nations coming face to face with alien values. On the one hand, while some people are benefiting from the economic advantages

and technological advantages of the globalization process, these people who cannot adapt to the process suffer from it. These people who are economically weak and suffering may develop grievances. On the other side, globalization does not only incorporate rapid development and increasing transactions in economics and technology, it also reinforces reforms and changes in political and social behavior. It brings new values and norms which are alien to the societies and which can be perceived as an extension of influence of external powers. As Mark Strauss (2003) mentioned in his article in Foreign Policy:

Modern-day globalization- the opening of borders to the greater movement of ideas, people and money – has stirred familiar anxieties about ill-defined “outside forces”. As the Pew Research Center published a survey conducted in 44 countries revealing that, although people generally have a favorable view of globalization, sizable majorities of those polled said their “traditional ways of life” are being threatened and agreed with the statement that “our way of life needs to be protected against foreign influence”.

Therefore, when people see that their traditional values are in danger, new radical ideologies can become attractive to some parts of societies. In defending their ideologies they can resort to violent instruments of terrorism. In addition to this, modernization and globalization brought opportunities for these transnational actors such as easy and rapid access to transportation, new technology, financial channels, weapons (which can take form of weapons of mass destruction), communication, media (which will publicize their causes), etc.

Extremist Ideologies which can take form in secular or religious nature: People can be manipulated and convinced by extreme ideologies especially in a fertile grounds provided by social, economic or political grievances. Marginalized people who are mostly poor and impoverished can be more easily attached to the extreme ideologies through which they can rebuild their identities as being part of a group and ideology. Through extreme ideologies political objectives find necessary grounds for legitimization. Besides, while sanctifying its own norms, it dehumanizes the enemy image and its values and therefore led to creation of strong divisions between ‘we’ and the ‘others’.

On the other side, impoverished social and economic conditions can combine with a political culture that encompasses motives of violence and sacrifice. In that case, factor of ‘social facilitation’ (as mentioned by Ted Robert Gurr) gains importance. ‘This concept refers to social habits and historical traditions that sanction the use of violence against the

government, making it morally and politically justifiable, and even dictating an appropriate form, such as demonstrations, coups or terrorism. Social myths, traditions and habits permit the development of terrorism as an established custom' (Crenshaw, 1981). The vivid example for the argument can be presented by the suicide bombers for whom concepts of sacrifice and martyrdom play vital role in their beliefs and way of life. Therefore, these beliefs and extreme ideologies can serve to apply ruthless measures such as terrorism in accomplishing sacred objectives.

Failed or Weak States: These are the states which are lacking the capacity to insert authority and control in the whole state territory. Terrorists benefit from that power vacuum by establishing terrorist cells and training camps in these geographies. Therefore, by lacking full territorial control, failed states become heaven for terrorist organizations, which is depicted vividly by the case of Afghanistan. The importance of the security danger that is posed by the state failure is also underlined in the European Security Strategy (2003) mentioning that:

Bad governance - corruption, abuse of power, weak institutions and lack of accountability- and civil conflict corrode states from within. In some cases, this has brought about the collapse of state institutions. Somalia, Liberia and Afghanistan under the Taliban are the best known recent examples. Collapse of the state can be associated with obvious threats, such as organized crime or terrorism. State failure is an alarming phenomenon that undermines global governance and adds to regional instability.

Therefore, failed states not only constitute challenges for its own citizens but they also pose threats to world societies by creating regional instability or as becoming sources of terrorist activities. This raises the concerns of international society, such as the EU, both in the issues of security and good governance.

Discrimination and Alienation based on Ethnic or Religious Identities: One of the most important functions of the modern democratic states is to integrate all segments of the society to the system. However, in some cases significant segment of the society is deprived of access to political channels of expression on the basis of ethnic or religious identity. Discrimination based on ethnic origin constitutes a significant factor in ethno-nationalist terrorism which is chosen by the marginalized groups as a tactic to achieve political objectives. Deprivation alienates people from the administration and gives way to rising

resentments and secessionist movements which can take form of terrorism. ‘When sizeable minorities are systemically deprived of their rights to equal social and economic opportunities, obstructed from expressing their cultural identities (e.g. forbidden to use their language or practice their religion), or excluded from political influence, this can give rise to secessionist movements that may turn to terrorism or other forms of violent struggle’ (International Expert Meeting, 2003).



Chapter V

Terrorism and the EU Policies

Today, terrorism comes into fore as a supra-national enemy without any borders against the security of the states. Benefiting from the forces of globalization - such as easy and rapid access to transportation, financial channels, communication and media- together with technological advances, which provided improved capacity in mobility and lethality, terrorist activities are no more limited in scale of destruction in human and material terms and on geography. Terrorism does not only pose instability and security threat to the nation-states but it also becomes problematic for the world peace. September 11 and Madrid terrorist attacks not only affected the security of the targeted country but also made a significant impact on the world security agenda. Therefore, as the EU affected by the terrorist attacks, it is necessary to observe how EU set its security agenda in accordance with terrorism and what differences these terrorist events brought into EU policies especially under the CFSP.

5.1 The EU Policies Before the September 11 Attacks

Before the September 11 attacks, the EU approach to the terrorism issue took place in the field of Justice and Home Affairs with a minor degree. Even though in the EU platforms it is acknowledged that ‘terrorism is not a new phenomenon in Europe, in the United Kingdom, Ireland and Spain alone it has caused 5000 deaths in 30 years’ (European Commission, 2004), concrete measures are not implemented and only minor steps are taken in the EU basis. Therefore, in this part, EU’s efforts on the terrorism issue before the September 11 attack will be analyzed.

5.1.1 Legal Background of the issue of Terrorism in the Treaty on European Union

Reference to terrorism issue is given by the Article 29 of the Treaty on European Union under the title VI of the ‘Provisions on police and judicial cooperation on criminal matters’. The article’s objective is to provide the citizens ‘with a high level of safety within an area of

freedom, security and justice by developing common action among the Member States in the fields of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters and by preventing and combating racism and xenophobia' (Official Journal C 340, 1997). It is mentioned that, this objective can be achieved by the prevention of various crimes such as, 'in particular terrorism, trafficking in persons and offences against children, illicit drug trafficking and illicit arms trafficking, corruption and fraud' (Official Journal C 340, 1997). Whereas terrorism counted to be one of the global security challenges to the Europe today, at that time it is mentioned on the same basis with the other serious crimes on the Treaty basis. Terrorism issue was evaluated within the borders of police and judicial cooperation together with other crimes. Besides, since terrorism is not a new phenomenon, this article related to the terrorism issue is only structured on 1997 with the Treaty of Amsterdam. The instruments in combating these crimes, including terrorism are mentioned in the Treaty as;

- closer cooperation between police forces, customs authorities and other competent authorities in the Member States, both directly and through the European Police Office (Europol), in accordance with the provisions of Articles 30 and 32;
- closer cooperation between judicial and other competent authorities of the Member States in accordance with the provisions of Articles 31(a) to (d) and 32;

5.1.2 *EUROPOL*

Throughout the instruments to fight against the crimes including terrorism, EUROPOL is mentioned on the Treaty basis. However, it is not possible to define Europol's role in the issue directly after the introduction of the Amsterdam Treaty. It is because, firstly, in the Article 30 it is mentioned that 'the Council shall promote cooperation through Europol and shall in particular, within a period of five years after the date of entry into force of the Treaty of Amsterdam' (Official Journal C 340, 1997). Secondly, at that date the Europol was functioning in the form of European Drugs Unit (EDU) and it is 'in July 1999, the EDU finally evolved into the European Police Office (Europol), and its remit has grown from simply drugs policing to include areas of serious crime as diverse as, forgery, terrorism and money laundering' (BBC web site, 2003). Terrorism is evaluated on the same basis with other serious crimes. Besides, it is the Council Decision of 1998 instructing Europol to deal with

crimes committed or likely to be committed in the course of terrorist activities against life, limb, personal freedom and property (The Council of the EU, 1998).

Before the September 11 event, Europol had more limited functions. It did not have any specific center for the analysis and coordination of information about terrorism issues. Therefore, Europol did not have resources particularly devoted to analyze terrorist risks and to facilitate exchange of information and threat assessment in the relevant field.

5.1.3 Directory of Specialized Counter-terrorist Skills

Joint Action of 15 October 1996 adopted by the Council on the basis of Article K.3 of the Treaty of European Union aimed at creation and maintenance of a Directory of specialized counterterrorist competences, skills and expertise to facilitate counterterrorist cooperation between the Member States of the EU (The Council of the EU, 1996). As it is mentioned in the Joint Action, police cooperation for the purposes of preventing and combating terrorism is considered as a matter of concern for the Member States. Besides, nation states developed counterterrorist agencies with developed areas of competences, skills and expertise and they should be available to appropriate agencies in other Member States when they need so (The Council of the EU, 1996). Therefore, in order to accomplish this aim and enhance cooperation in that field, creation and maintenance of Directory of specialized counterterrorist competences, skills and expertise which would make it more widely available to agencies in all Member States found necessary.

This Joint Action is a step toward enhancing cooperation between the Member States in the issue of counterterrorism. However, it is obvious that this is still insufficient. The information to be sent to the Directory would be considered inside the security issue and the Member States would be reluctant to send the necessary information. Since, the structure is clearly intergovernmental and depending on the cooperative will of the national agencies, it is a big possibility that the cooperation will be weak. This voluntary structure is also declared in Article 2, ‘when making their contributions to the Directory, Member States shall take full account of the security classification and protection established by each Member State’ (The Council of the EU, 1996). So, security issues are still left to rigid protection of each Member State -as assumed by realist theory-, which on the other hand weakened EU’s counterterrorist competences.

5.1.4 Making it a Criminal Offence to Participate in a Criminal Organization in the Member States

Joint Action 98/733/JHA of 21 December 1998 adopted by the European Council is about making it a criminal offence to participate in a criminal organization in the Member States of the EU (The Council of the EU, 1998a). It is mentioned that the ‘Council considered about seriousness and development of certain organized crimes which are particularly; terrorism, drug trafficking, trafficking in human beings, money laundering and other acts of violence against life, physical integrity or liberty of a person’ (The Council of the EU, 1998a). It is acknowledged that in confronting these offences, Member States should enhance cooperation and a common approach toward the offence of participation in the activities of criminal organizations.

In Article 1 of the Joint Action, criminal organization is defined as structured association established over a period of time, of more than two persons, acting in concert with a view to committing offences which are punishable by deprivation of liberty or a detention order of a maximum at least four years or a more serious penalty, whether such offences are an end in themselves or a means of obtaining material benefits, and where appropriate, of improperly influencing the operation of public authorities (The Council of the EU, 1998a). Terrorist offences are also incorporated in this definition, however, in comparison to the definition given after the September 11 attack by the Council Framework decision of 2002/475/JHA which will be discussed in the next part, it seems very limited and insufficient. In the Article 1 of Joint Action, terrorism is evaluated on the same basis with other criminal offences, such as money laundering, which are ‘an end in themselves or a means of obtaining material benefits’ (The Council of the EU, 1998a). The differences between the two definitions present how European approach has been transformed under the impact of the September 11 event. However, limited approach brings limited solutions which was the case in terrorism issue as it is explicitly shown by this Joint Act. Therefore, it is not a surprise that the common approach and the instruments developed on the terrorism issue were superficial and inefficient in the EU basis before the September 11 attack.

5.1.5 European Judicial Network

Pursuant to the Action Plan on combating and preventing organized crime, adopted by the European Council in Amsterdam in 1997 and by the necessity of improving judicial cooperation between the Member States of the EU, Joint Action 98/428/JHA of 29 June 1998 is adopted on the creation of a European Judicial Network (The Council of the EU, 1998b). The aim of the Joint Action is to ‘make further improvements to judicial cooperation between the Member States, particularly in combating forms of serious crime often perpetrated by actual, in most cases transnational organizations’ (The Council of the EU, 1998b). European Judicial Network is composed of decentralized network of contact points. These contact points main function is to assist and advise judicial authorities in the Member States and therefore to facilitate judicial cooperation (*Justice and Home Affairs, European Judicial Network web site*).

Joint Action can be considered as a prominent step toward the share of information which can facilitate cooperation in judicial matters related to criminal matters but in order to enhance law enforcement capability especially in such a serious issue of terrorism, it should further the cooperation in judicial terms. The procedure and the mechanisms of cooperation are left a bit vague and described in general terms which can lead to slow and complicated process, where as for the issue of terrorism the necessity of more specific and effective measures for the enhanced judicial cooperation is surfaced especially by the September 11 event.

5.1.6 Combating the Financing of Terrorist Groups

Especially from the beginning of 1999, the EU took significant steps on prevention of the financing of organized crime which included terrorism. The Council Recommendation of 9 December 1999 covered intensifying cooperation in combating the financing of terrorist groups. In order to further cooperation, it is declared that enhanced exchange of information should take place. According to the Council Recommendation, Member States should ‘exchange information on the structures and modus operandi used for financing terrorist groups operating in more than one Member State, which is available to their security authorities’ (The Council of the EU, 1999). Competent Council Working Party is entitled to deal with these terrorists groups which are presenting a specific threat.

The boundaries of implementing these measures are mentioned as ‘Member States should participate in this procedure only to the extent admissible pursuant to national law and in so far as the organization identified has violated the law in force in respective Member State. Therefore, no Member State should feel obliged to take parts in these measures’ (The Council of the EU, 1999). These limits restrict EU capacity on applying significant measures about the issue. Firstly, this is a Council Recommendation that is not obliging all Member States to take part within and therefore presenting the lack of will on taking concrete steps. Secondly, the cooperation on the exchange of information on security issues will be limited to framework of national laws and when we consider the rigidity of national laws in security matters, it is impossible to expect deepening cooperation on the issue. Besides, this aspect also depicts difficulty of developing cooperation on security issues which is restricted by the realist national concerns of the Member States.

Consequently, when we look at the efforts on the EU level on the issue of terrorism in general, we see that the EU endeavored to take some steps, however, these measures seriously suffered from various limitations. Terrorism was considered on the same basis with other kind of police issues instead of being evaluated as a serious security issue. Since, it is evaluated on the same basis with other crimes, ineffective measures are introduced. As it is shown by the Joint Action and Council Recommendation, exchange of security information would be restricted to the boundaries drawn by national authorities. Since security issues considered to be one of the most vital concerns of the nation state, Member States would not be very enthusiastic to share security information. As part of the sensitivity of security issues, participation of each Member State is left nonobligatory in significant measures such as Combating the Financing of Terrorist Groups. All these facts depicted the absentee of common understanding on the issue of terrorism on the EU level together with lack of political will and unity on the issue. Security issues were underlined as primary concerns of each Member States which called back the significance of realist understanding and its limitations on the EU institutions. Therefore, in opposition to the spillover affect as it was the case in other EU pillars, the EU could not apply concrete measures as part of the integration process, but rather it was the particular event of the September 11 which made Europe to reevaluate its policies on the issue of terrorism.

5.2 The EU Policies After the September 11 and Madrid Attacks

On September 11, the world witnessed more vividly not only the horrifying challenge of terrorism but the vulnerability of even a superpower against the threat. 'It was more than just a terrorist attack, but not an interstate war, yet one in which the world's only superpower revealed a colossal vulnerability' (Emerson and Gros, 2001). After the event, especially from the European perspective it is more obviously acknowledged that, 'no single country is able to tackle today's complex problems in its own. Besides, terrorism poses a growing strategic threat to the whole of Europe. And the more recent wave of terrorism is global in its scope' (ESS, 2003). Therefore, the prominence of stepping up EU's efforts on a wider spectrum and taking concrete and common measures came into ground.

The necessity of taking steps in the EU in security issues underlines the increasing reality of complex interdependence. Issues and actors are getting diverse and complex in nature and nation states alone became insufficient for the solutions of the problems. This fact reinforces states to become more interdependent not only in economic matters but also in security issues of high politics. In the fighting against terrorism, states construct coalitions and the EU incorporates common measures.

After the September 11 and Madrid attacks, terrorism issue is securitized on the EU basis. After these specific events, concrete measures in various fields of the EU are taken. Related to the issues of law enforcement and counterterrorist financing, more effective measures are introduced in the field of Justice and Home Affairs. In the CFSP, 'fight against terrorism' part is devoted to the issue and after the Madrid attacks Counter-terrorism Coordinator was appointed. Therefore, the issue transformed from being considered as a criminal police issue to be dealt by EUROPOL without sufficient mechanisms, to higher ranks of security issues. Today, it is identified as one of the fundamental key threats to the European security by the European Security Strategy paper.

Not only the issue of terrorism transformed, but also the context of the security issues transformed. As a result of this, European Security Strategy evaluated under the CFSP, emphasized the significance of comprehensive approach to security issues, especially on the issue of terrorism, which would incorporate multi-faceted instruments and solutions in dealing with the problem. Therefore, in this part of my study, I will evaluate on the complementary policies which are taken on the EU level on the fight against terrorism as a reflection of 'cross-pillar' understanding.

5.2.1 EU Action Plan against Terrorism - September 2001

After the September 11 attack, on 21 September 2001 the EU issued Action Plan against Terrorism which presented a kind of road map for the EU to concentrate on during its fight against terrorism. It is mentioned that, ‘the EU will step up its action against terrorism in a coordinated and interdisciplinary approach embracing all Union policies’ (Conclusions and Plan of Action of the Extraordinary European Council Meeting, 2001). Therefore, the approach presented in the Action Plan offered multifaceted solutions in various areas which represent EU’s comprehensive understanding of security issues, especially terrorism. The document called for enhancing cooperation both inside the EU and between the EU and the other countries. It called for the EU to focus on five areas which are namely;

- Enhancing police and judicial cooperation
- Developing international legal instruments
- Putting an end to the funding of terrorism
- Strengthening air security
- Coordinating the EU’s global action

On the issue of enhancing police and judicial cooperation, the EU underlined its agreement on the introduction of European Arrest Warrant and common definition of terrorism. The aim of European Arrest Warrant is to provide handing over the wanted person from one judicial authority to another inside the EU with respect to fundamental rights and freedoms. And from January 1, 2004, the ‘European Arrest Warrant’ replaced extradition procedures. Besides, with the aim of drawing up a common list of terrorist organizations, the European Council called upon Justice and Home Affairs to deal with the identification of the presumed terrorists and their organizations in Europe. The Council adopted EU list of terrorist organizations and persons linked to terrorist activities on December 2001, which is updated on 17 May 2004.

In the aim of developing international legal instruments, the EU called for implementation of the existing international agreements on the fight against terrorism, such as UN, OECD, etc. Besides, ‘the EU supports the Indian proposal for framing within the United Nations a general convention against international terrorism, which should enhance the impact of the measures taken over the last twenty-five years under the aegis of the

UN'(Conclusions and Plan of Action of the Extraordinary European Council Meeting, 2001). Therefore, it is one of the sign indicating how EU becoming more enthusiastic about the issue and calling for discussion on the international framework through adoption of legal texts.

The issue of putting an end to the funding of terrorism is mentioned as one of a vital point on the fight against terrorism. In order to contribute to the international action, the European Council entitled the ECOFIN and Justice and Home Affairs to take necessary measures relevant to the issue. As a result of the efforts in putting an end to terrorist financing, on 22 July 2003 the Council Framework Decision 2003/577/JHA on the execution in the EU of orders freezing property or evidence has been adopted with an objective of establishing rules which will provide each Member State to execute in its borders a freezing order issued by a judicial authority of another Member State (The Council of the EU, 2003). The efforts in this area of fighting terrorist funding is successful to an extent that 'European governments have frozen about \$35 million in suspected al Qaeda assets since September 11 compared to about \$34 million in the US and \$124,5 million worldwide' (Stevenson, 2003). The document also underlined the importance of international law and called for Member States to sign and ratify United Nations Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (Conclusions and Plan of Action of the Extraordinary European Council Meeting, 2001). The EU continuously emphasizes the significance of cooperation not only inside the EU but also with the other countries on international level. This is one of the indicators of the EU's liberal perspectives underlining the importance of multilateralism and international law in bringing effective solutions to security issues.

The EU outlined its efforts on various areas and transport security is one of them. On strengthening air security, as it is outlined in the Action Plan the European Council called upon Transport Council to take necessary measures on the issues of:

- classification of weapons
- technical training for crew
- checking and monitoring of hold luggage
- protection of cockpit access
- quality control of security measures applied by the Member States

Therefore, on the issue of ensuring air security, these measures are planned to be applied uniformly in all the Member States and the introduction of them are expected in the near future.

On coordination of the EU's global action, General Affairs Council is called upon to play the primary role in the fight against terrorism. The General Affairs Council is asked not only to ensure consistency between Union's policies but also to evaluate on the EU's relations with the third countries on the basis of these countries relations with terrorist organizations. Therefore, two important points can be drawn from this area of work. One point represents EU's determination on providing unity in this security issue. Secondly, the EU's determination is not only limited to application of the Community framework inside but also incorporating it to its external relations as part of its politics. This point can be considered as a sign of 'conditionality' which is mentioned as an important feature of EU's policy together with assistance programs and targeted trade measures inside the EU's Security Strategy. As part of the EU's external relations and humanitarian assistance programs after the September 11 period, it is mentioned in the Commission Report of Overview of EU action in response to the September 11 event that, 'aid amounting to over 310 million Euro has been mobilized by the Union to relieve suffering of the Afghan people over the coming months. Besides, as an immediate reaction, the Commission has released 5,5 million Euro in emergency aid' (European Commission, 2001). Therefore, assistance programs occupy important place on the fight against terrorism which is a reflection of the security understanding that 'the integration of all countries into a fair world system of security, prosperity and improved development is the condition for a strong and sustainable community for combating terrorism' (Conclusions and Plan of Action of the Extraordinary European Council Meeting, 2001).

The Action Plan, draw a brief framework of the EU's role on the international arena. As a requirement of the fight against terrorism, preventing and stabilizing regional conflicts are mentioned. In that aim, the EU declared that it will play a part in international efforts together with other partners such as the Russian Federation and the United States in bringing solution to the Middle East conflict on the basis of the UN Resolutions. For effective application of the EU policies, the significance of developing the CFSP and the ESDP are underlined.

Consequently, the Action Plan is considered to be one of the most determined steps on the issue of the fight against terrorism. When we look into the efforts shown after releasing the Action Plan on following years, we see that these objectives came into reality

through implementation, such as European Arrest Warrant and list of terrorist organizations. On the other side, the document reflected EU's liberal worldview especially by making emphasis on the concepts of multilateralism and international law. The Action Plan not only aimed at constructing unified politics inside the EU, but also presented a framework on its role on world politics and its relations with the third countries related to the issue of terrorism. In addition to launching concrete and unified EU measures, political dialogue with the third countries, application of international law and the necessity of bringing solutions on multilateral basis occupied significant places inside the document.

5.2.2 EUROPOL

After the September 11 attacks, Europol devoted more specific measures into the issue of terrorism. It established Counter Terrorism Program covering the tasks of 'analyzing gathered information from strategic and operational aspects, undertaking threat and risk assessments and based on their results carrying out awareness activities' (*Europol website*, 2002). Therefore, a specific centre for terrorist activities has been established to share and coordinate relevant information. Besides, the Europol was given the right to ask police forces of Member States to launch investigation and to share information with Interpol, the US and the others. Its budget was increased to a degree to cover the cost of counterterror missions.

On the other side, there still exist controversial points preventing the Europol from being functioning effectively on the issue. Some of them arises from intergovernmental structure in which, 'concerning the exchange of information between Member States' security services and Europol, it is up to each Member State to decide what kind of information can be transferred to Europol without endangering investigations and intelligence gathering in the long run (The Council of the EU, 2003a). Therefore, voluntary nature of exchange of information together with the fact that 'the legal changes necessary to develop the operational intervention capacity of Europol are taking time to be ratified' (European Commission, 2004) constrain the scope of cooperation. Besides, Europol challenges the dilemma of sharing multinational information especially on the issue of security between Member States. In the Interim Report on the evaluation of national anti-terrorist arrangements it is mentioned that, 'law enforcement bodies generally support a more in depth cooperation with Europol (and some Member States are active partners) but security services are reluctant to provide information' (The Council of the EU, 2003a). Therefore, it is

possible to say that, ‘some members have been reluctant to share information about terrorism with Europol, preferring to work through state to state contacts. Europol thus often lacks a complete understanding of current threat levels, international connections among suspected terrorists and the counterterrorism efforts of its own members’ (Bensahel, 2003). Consequently, despite a progress has been made on the issue of terrorism on the Europol basis, there still needs work to strengthen the organizational structure.

5.2.3 *EUROJUST*

By the Presidency Conclusions of the Tampere European Council, establishment of the Eurojust is decided on October 1999 (Presidency Conclusions of the Tampere European Council, 1999) and became operational with the Council Decision of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime (The Council of the EU, 2002a). The objective of establishing Eurojust is to enhance judicial cooperation between the Member States and to facilitate exchange of information and coordination of investigations and prosecutions taking place more than one Member State on the issue of fighting against serious crimes including terrorism.

Eurojust is intergovernmental in character and composed of national member of each Member States who are a prosecutor, judge or police officer. National members are bounded by the national law of each Member States. On the area of investigations and prosecutions, the Eurojust posses competences of; (The Council of the EU, 2002a)

- promoting coordination between the competent authorities of the various Member States
- facilitating the implementation of the international mutual legal assistance and of extradition requests.

Instead of launching investigations by itself, Eurojust reinforces coordination and cooperation between competent authorities in the Member States which occupies important place on the EU’s fight against terrorism. It is because, if the EU can initiate coordinated action and mutual legal assistance in the fight against terrorism, then terrorists can not benefit from the differences between the national law of each Member States. ‘Just as Europol may limit the ability of terrorists to hide in the gaps between European law enforcement agencies, Eurojust may also limit their ability to hide in the gaps between different legal jurisdictions by moving Europe one step closer to a single judicial area’ (Bensahel, 2003).

5.2.4 Council Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism - June 2002

Council Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism is launched with an objective of approximation of the laws of the Member States by establishing minimum level of penal sanctions for terrorist type of offence (The Council of the EU, 2002). It brought uniform definition to terrorist offences by declaring that; ‘terrorism offences must be committed with the aim of intimidating people and seriously altering or destroying the political, economic, or social structures of a country (murder, bodily injuries, hostage taking, extortion, the fabrication of weapons, threatening to commit any of the above, etc.)’ (The Council of the EU, 2002). Since ‘before that time only 6 of the 15 Member States had legislation on their book that criminalized terrorism’ (Archick, 2002), then the document proves to be an important step toward constructing concrete policies and coordination of legislation on the issue of terrorism throughout the EU. The document reveals how the issue of terrorism has been transformed on the EU basis. Before, terrorism was evaluated together with other criminal matters under the same definition, but now it is evaluated on a different basis and the definition encompasses very serious elements of security such as; destroying political, social or economic structures of a country. Besides, the document identified some standards to be placed in national legislation of each Member States in punishing terrorist offences, such as:

- effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties, which may entail extradition,
- mitigating circumstances (collaboration with the police and judicial authorities, etc)

Apart from taking action through the EU institutions, the document presents a framework which aims to provide common background by evaluating terrorist offences and identifying standards for punishment. Without uniform definition of the concept, the EU was in complexity of evaluation of the act. The introduction of uniform definition of terrorist offences would provide an example for the Member States which will further approximation of their legal procedures together with limiting terrorists from benefiting the differences between national laws and confusion of identification of the act.

5.2.5 European Security Strategy - December 2003

On December 2003, the EU released the first EU official document on constructing common security strategy. In addition to underlining the EU's role as a global actor, the document presented EU security approach under the subtitles of global challenges and key threats, strategic objectives and policy implications for Europe which encompass the aspects of the issue of terrorism.

In the evaluation of the post-Cold War period, transformation of security environment is mentioned and terrorism is presented as one of the key global security challenges to Europe which is 'more diverse, less visible and less predictable in character' (ESS, 2003). The document identified a transformed security environment in which the concepts of complexity and interdependence came into ground. The post-Cold War environment is presented to be interdependent in a way that it 'is one of increasingly open borders in which the internal and external aspects of security are indissolubly linked', while the issues are getting more complex in a sense that state failure, poverty, disease and civil wars giving rise to pressing security concerns (ESS, 2003). Some causes of security challenges are mentioned which include 'the pressures of modernization, cultural, social and political crisis and the alienation of young people living in foreign societies. This phenomenon is also part of our own society' (ESS, 2003).

Strategic objectives are also drawn according to comprehensive understanding which incorporated complexity and interdependence in a global security environment together with their effect on the EU. The security environment is getting more interdependent in a way that, 'in an era of globalization, distant threats may be as much a concern as those that are near at hand' and as a result of this 'the first line of defense will often be abroad' (ESS, 2003). The EU acknowledging that it is becoming impossible to be isolated from the security problems occurring abroad. As part of the strategy, since terrorist networks operate globally and become more serious in this atmosphere of complex interdependence, the EU mentioned the necessity of 'being ready to act before a crisis occurs' (ESS, 2003). Therefore, the EU signaled for more active policies on security issues.

Since, the EU provided comprehensive analysis on security issues, European active policies on dealing with terrorism incorporated various fields such as; intelligence, judicial, police, military and other means. In order to incorporate various fields, necessity of bringing multilateral approach together with the implementation of international law are underlined.

On the other side, as failed states and regional instability - together with other reasons - are associated with terrorism, the EU policies offered the notion of engagement in various areas as part of a line of defense in order to eliminate the root causes of terrorism. 'The European Union and the Member States have intervened to deal with regional conflicts and put failed states back on their feet, including in the Balkans, Afghanistan and in the DRC'(ESS, 2003). However, this preventive engagement does not stem from the notion of hard power and activated through a pre-emptive action just as the one represented by the US National Security Strategy which declares that 'while the United States will strive to enlist the support of the International Community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively' (NSS, 2002). European security strategy of preventive engagement incorporated various areas of civil engagement based on liberal values of democracy, rule of law and human rights to be implemented by its soft power on a multilateral basis with the aim of fighting terrorism from its root causes.

In addition to active policies, the EU aimed to pursue more coherent and capable policies encompassing both civil and military instruments. On developing common policies on security issues, the CFSP together with the ESDP would play primary role. On the other side, cooperation and coordination of these bodies with Justice and Home Affairs underlined as a requirement on the fight against terrorism. Developing military forces is required in order to address new threats. From one dimension, this can be considered as a rise of realist 'hard power' understanding on the EU level, however in the security paper military factor is mentioned as one mean together with the civil ones to take place on the implementation of the EU policies. Therefore, when we take military element as a complement of European security strategy, then the necessity of making interpretations beyond the limits of realist understandings will come into fore. Besides, while 'in failed states military instruments may be needed to restore order', in regional conflicts 'military assets and effective policing may be needed in the post conflict phase' (ESS, 2003). So, military role is drawn to a minor degree and as a post conflict tool. Therefore, while European security approach offers a constructive road in 'restoring order' by military means, it provides destructing road of causes of terrorism by civil means.

Consequently, by releasing the first official EU document on security, the EU underlined the significance of transformed security scene, which is defined by complexity and interdependence, and the necessity of constructing unified and concrete approach to the security issues, such as terrorism on the EU level. Terrorism is mentioned as one of the global key threats to the EU, requiring multifaceted approach and instruments in solution. On

addressing strategic objectives, the EU provided comprehensive approach to the security issues, incorporating various fields of civil issues for an effective multilateralism. EU security understanding became more active that included the notion of preventive engagement. On the other hand, the security paper also left a room for developing military capacity as part of the solutions. However, it was not presented as the main target but as part of the combination of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ power instruments. Therefore, since today’s complex security issues necessitated comprehensive understanding of both ‘hard power’ and ‘soft power’ policies, the EU acknowledged the significance of this approach in its security strategy.

5.2.6 Declaration on Combating Terrorism - March 2004

On 11 March 2004, Madrid was hit by terrorist attacks which killed 201 people. The impact of the attack not only limited to Spanish national districts, but also echoed on the EU level. ‘For Europe March 11 equals September 11. The mass terror attacks in Madrid last week, say European online commentators, mark the beginning of a new era in which Europe will have to learn to defend itself from al Qaeda-style terror operations’ (Morley, 2004). In response to the Madrid attack, the EU reacted by releasing the Declaration on Combating Terrorism which declared 11 March to be considered as official European day of commemorating the victims of terrorism. On 25 and 26 March 2004 European Council, the document is declared in the aim of ‘supplementing 2001 Action Plan against Terrorism and realigned it to pursue seven major objectives’ (European Commission, 2004). The strategic objectives revised by the declaration are:

- *deepening international consensus and enhancing international efforts to combat terrorism:* EU’s belief on the importance of effective international cooperation and the rule of law is reemphasized in the revised declaration. On sustaining international cooperation, primary role of the UN as an actor and global adherence to its means such as UN Conventions on Terrorism are underlined. Besides, the fight against terrorism is also repositioned to affect EU’s external relations with the third countries by mentioning the objective to include effective counterterrorism clauses in all agreements by the third countries. Therefore, the fight against terrorism becomes more of a principle of the EU

policies and occupies important part of not only its security strategy but also its external relations.

- *reducing terrorists' access to financial and economic resources:* The EU aims to enhance effectiveness of freezing assets procedures which would encompass non-economic aspects. Besides, for comprehensive fight against terrorist financing relevant bodies required to make cooperation in the fields of information exchange and improving operational capability. In addition to that, necessity of dialogue with the third countries in the relevant fields mentioned.
- *increasing capacity of the EU institutions and the Member States to detect, investigate and prosecute terrorists and prevent terrorist attacks:* Especially, after the September 11 period the EU started to strengthen its institutions such as Europol, on the matter of security and effective use of their capacity is presented as a matter of concern. Since, information exchange is vital on the issue, then promoting cooperation between the Member States on intelligence exchange is underlined by the paper. To be able to provide necessary intelligence assessments on the EU, enhancing capacity of relevant EU bodies required. It is obvious that the paper does not explicitly define the way to enhance capacity of these institutions but rather mention it as a necessity in a good will. Besides, while the tune of the paper giving impression of constructing European front on security issues especially on the fight against terrorism by giving more role to the EU institutions in general, it still could not replace the necessity of producing more concrete measures on specific areas such as on intelligence issues.
- *protecting the security of international transport and set up effective systems of border controls:* Since, the issue of terrorism requires multifaceted solutions, the EU incorporates various areas of action to its policies such as transport security. In that field, the EU aimed to incorporate counterterrorist efforts to the relevant EU bodies to ensure security. Besides this, not only within the EU bodies but also with the third parties such as international organizations the EU aimed to work in coordination both to develop European transport security standards and to further adherence to international standards.
- *strengthening the capacity of the Member States to deal with the consequences of a terrorist attack:* The tasks included in that field first start by identification of the areas for closer cooperation in consequence management both inside the EU and with the third parties. Secondly, it targets to develop capabilities of communication of the Member States with their citizens in the event of a terrorist attack. As a consequence of terrorist attack, it also considers to provide assistance to the victims of terrorist attacks. This is

one of the step showing how the EU becoming more serious on the issue of terrorism by developing strategies not only to eliminate its root causes but to take precaution in case the event takes place. Therefore, as the Madrid attack brought the seriousness of the danger closer both to the geography and the agenda of the European politics, then as a response the EU furthered its strategies developed after the September 11 attack.

- *identifying factors that contribute to the terrorist activities:* This objective targets on evaluating the root causes of terrorism both within the EU and internationally and to develop strategies in order to eliminate them. As factors of extreme religious or political beliefs and socio-economic conditions have impact on the act of terrorism, the EU aims to investigate the contribution of these factors to terrorism in order to introduce accurate response measures. On addressing factors effective on terrorism, external assistance programmes are considered to be used more efficient as policy instruments which would encompass support for good governance and the rule of law. Therefore, in the fight against terrorism, the EU aims to use democratic principles and values as the basis of policy instruments. The policy instruments are to be developed for the long term solutions not only targeting the fight against terrorism but by eliminating the root causes which also give way to failed states, it would open the road for process of sustainable development for the countries.
- *encouraging Third Countries to engage more effectively in combating terrorism as part of the EU external relations:* The EU sets the fight against terrorism as one of the priority areas in its external relations. In addition to the efforts on identifying root causes of terrorism and to replace them with development policies, the EU aims to enhance counterterrorism capacity of the third countries. In that aim, the EU plans to develop capacities which would evaluate third countries counterterrorism activities. As one of the instruments, technical assistance strategies which would improve counterterrorism activities in the third countries are planned to be developed in coordination with the other international organizations. Besides, specific counterterrorism clauses in compliance with the Plan of Action is to be put as part of the EU external relations in all agreements with priority countries.

Establishment of a Position of a Counterterrorism Coordinator: In order to coordinate the efforts on the fight against terrorism and to evaluate the issue on a more specific level, the EU established the position of Counterterrorism Coordinator under the CFSP pillar. The coordinator's main tasks are to: 'coordinate the work of the Council of the EU in combating

terrorism, to maintain an overview of all the instruments at the EU's disposal, to closely monitor the implementation of the EU Action Plan on Combating Terrorism, and to secure the visibility of the Union's policies in the fight against terrorism' (*The Council of the EU, fight against terrorism web site*). Mr. Gijs de Vries is appointed as the first EU counterterrorism coordinator.

Draft declaration on solidarity against terrorism: In addition to the ambitious objectives and the instruments that are planned to be developed, the EU explicitly declared its solidarity against terrorism in compliance with the solidarity clause contained in the Article 42 of the draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe. It signified one more step toward constructing common European block on one of the main security issues, which it lacked before the events of September 11 and March 11. Therefore, the EU both by declaration on solidarity against terrorism and the incorporation of the solidarity clause on the draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe proved an important degree of political will on establishing common European approach on security matters, which can bring the CFSP pillar into a prominent reality of the EU politics and make it a more effective and unified global actor on world politics. The declaration specifies that if one of the Member States becomes victim of the terrorist attack, then the Member States shall act jointly and mobilize all the instruments at their disposal, including military resources in order to:

- to prevent the terrorist threat in the territory of one of them,
- to protect democratic institutions and the civilian population from any terrorist attack
- assist a Member State or an acceding State in its territory at the request of its political authorities in the event of a terrorist attack (European Council, 2004)

Consequently, after the Madrid attack the EU took one more important step on constructing common policies on the fight against terrorism. The issue of fight against terrorism not only evaluated as a specific security issue but also it became a factor affecting the EU's external relations. Therefore, the fight against terrorism transforming to become one of the most significant principles framing the EU's external relations. The EU not only developing its capacity on the issue, but also endeavor to assist for enhancing capacities of the third parties in various areas which is reflecting EU's multilateral and multifaceted approach to this security issue. It is also possible to mention that, as the issue echoed more on the EU level the EU took more serious and specific steps such as by establishing position of

counterterrorism coordinator and incorporating counterterrorism clause in agreements as part of its external relations. Declaration on solidarity is an important step toward establishing unified European front on the issue of terrorism, however this represents just a beginning step. In order to bring this clause into reality more explicit definition of how the Member States will act jointly and the kind of coordination mechanism should be given. Besides, the point declaring that each Member State and acceding States shall choose themselves the appropriate means to comply with this clause lack a clear definition of what it can be meant by appropriate means, therefore making the issue of contribution voluntary and vague in character.

5.2.7 European Security and Defense Policy Dimension of the Fight against Terrorism - November 2004

Declaration on Solidarity against terrorism prepared the background for developing military capacities in the fight against terrorism. The EU would respond to the crisis situations by mobilizing civilian and military means, which encompass conflict prevention and crisis management capacities in compliance with the CFSP objectives. Since, on the EU level multifaceted strategies which necessitate combination of both soft power and hard power are developed, then the EU began to take steps for developing its military capacity also in relation to the fight against terrorism.

The ESDP, by developing the capacity for civilian and military crisis management operations targets to contribute to the fight against terrorism on four main areas of action as it is mentioned by the Conceptual Framework on the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) Dimension of the Fight against Terrorism (2004) which are:

- *prevention*: Prevention of an asymmetric threat is to ensure that the Member States will support an operation by providing effective intelligence and information gathering.
- *protection*: As part of a crisis-management task, the aim of protection entails minimizing the vulnerabilities of the EU personnel, material and civilian targets.
- *response/consequence management*: In addressing the effect, it is mentioned that the EU-led ground forces will be available in cooperation with the local authorities.
- *support to third countries in the fight against terrorism*: ESDP tasks can be evaluated in order to incorporate support to third countries in the fight against terrorism. In addressing

the fight against terrorism, issues of protecting EU citizens on the third countries especially on the event of hostage taking will be considered.

ESDP tasks are mainly drawn by the framework of crisis management and conflict prevention capacities which aims to facilitate ‘a comprehensive approach to prevent the occurrence of failed states, to restore order and civil government, to deal with humanitarian crises and prevent regional conflicts’ (Conceptual Framework on the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) Dimension of the Fight Against Terrorism, 2004). So, the main framework of the ESDP tasks was targeting failed states which pose security threat indirectly by positioning on the periphery however, as the Madrid attack vividly brought the danger closer to the European geography then the ESDP missions are reevaluated to address the issue of terrorism inwards the center of Europe. In that aim, four main areas of action of the ESDP are designed to produce more accurate policies for the EU territory in addition to its international efforts. It is also possible to interpret that, the EU develops its ESDP capacities in the fight against terrorism due to the conditions provided by the specific event instead of being a direct result of integration process on the EU level.

One of the basic principles of the ESDP dimension of the fight against terrorism is about constructing common policies under the norms of solidarity and collective action on a ‘voluntary’ basis. ‘The voluntary nature of Member States’ contributions is one of the fundamental principles of the EU capability development process. It shall be for each state to choose the most appropriate means to comply with this solidarity commitment; ways of pooling, sharing or coordinating often scarce resources in this field should be sought’ (Conceptual Framework on the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) Dimension of the Fight Against Terrorism, 2004). This voluntary nature of the security coordination can be considered as one of the reasons which make it very difficult to implement uniform measures and achieve concrete results for developing the EU military capability. Despite taking some steps toward introducing common policies and developing military capabilities, the EU still strongly preserves its intergovernmental structure on a security issue which is even evaluated as one of the main global threats to the European territory. Security issues transform in character by encompassing more areas for action which necessitate ‘effective and cross pillar co-ordination’ (Conceptual Framework on the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) Dimension of the Fight against Terrorism, 2004) and multilateral cooperation, therefore the concept of complex interdependence becomes more explanatory. On the other side, sensitivity of security issues still preserve their vital place on the nation states politics as the realist

assumptions would observe. As a result of this, the EU while bringing into multifaceted solutions for security issues and go beyond the limits of realist assumptions, on the other side still imprisoned by the sensitive nature of the issue for the Member States.



Chapter VI

Conclusion

In this study I analyzed the research question of the development of the CFSP pillar of the EU under the impact of the issue of terrorism. The CFSP was important through reflecting unified European external policy and therefore giving an idea of the EU's political role on world politics. On the other side, the issue of terrorism transformed to occupy more serious place on world security agenda after the events of September 11 and March 11 terrorist attacks which also placed impact on the EU politics and security architecture. Since the EU spent efforts to be an influential actor on world politics not only through its economic dimension but also through political power, evaluated its security politics after these specific attacks. As a result of the security evaluation under the impact of these two events, new security architecture is designed which dedicated significant portion to the issue of the fight against terrorism. Compared to the period before these terrorist attacks took place, the issue of terrorism is 'securitized', meaning the issue is transformed to higher ranks of security matters. New policy instruments revealing the combination of 'hard' and 'soft' power approach and entailing various areas of cooperation, incorporated under the CFSP. Therefore, terrorism is also introduced into important parts of European politics especially under the CFSP.

In the new era, the security environment together with its actors, issues and dynamics have transformed. On one side, the CFSP has been established to provide the EU with a more unified voice and concrete power on world politics. On the other side, world security environment has been transformed through emerging complex issues and more interdependent actors. In this new security environment, terrorism took place as one of the most complex and serious threats to the global security. It was in this background, terrorism is examined as one of the most complex issues in the world security agenda and the EU as an interdependent actor affected by this complex security threat and designed new policies in response. Since complexity of the issue and the transforming context of the security studies revealed the insufficiency to observe the issue from one point of view, through one theory in social sciences, then analytical tools of realist and liberal theories are used as complements of each other in this study.

During the 1990's the CFSP developed through treaties, summits and declarations. One of the underlying motives to enhance CFSP is explained through EU's bid for more

global role. While developing the CFSP structure, the EU defined its objectives through the framework of liberal vision in the name of defending fundamental principles of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, however, on the other side a significant room left for realist assumptions by developing Community's military arm under the ESDP. Specifically under the shadow of the events of Yugoslav Wars and ethnic conflicts, efforts are furthered under the CFSP especially toward developing autonomous European military capabilities. Failure of the EU's policies in bringing solutions to Yugoslav Wars revealed the fact that in achieving global role, it was not sufficient to develop only soft power through economic dimensions but hard power of military instruments should also be accomplished as complementary. This point brought European approach nearer to realist assumptions including Clausewitz's agenda of usage of military power for political purposes.

Increased efforts on the CFSP at the end of 1990s produced various results such as; creation of High Representative for the CFSP, establishment of the Political and Security Committee, incorporating Petersberg tasks to the Union acquis, formalizing security and defence dimension and introducing Rapid Reaction Force. Rapid Reaction force is entitled to fulfill Petersberg tasks however, should not be envisaged as European army in which Member States' contributions drawn on a voluntary framework. The EU which was rising through its soft power in economic matters as tenet of liberal understanding, on the other side could not escape from the reality of developing military capability for being a global power however, still imprisoned by the national concerns and divisions of the Member States as it is again assumed by the realist approach.

During the development stage of the CFSP in 1990s, the issue of terrorism is evaluated on the same basis with other serious crimes on the basis of police and judicial cooperation. Related to the issue of terrorism, legal arrangements such as Europol, Directory of Specialized Counterterrorist Skills, European Judicial Network and Combating the Financing of Terrorist Groups are introduced. However, these structures suffered from various dimensions. Firstly, there was no specific definition of terrorism. Secondly, since it incorporated security dimension of intelligence sharing, the Member States were reluctant to cooperate as a result of national secrecy concerns as envisaged by realism. Procedures of these legal arrangements are drawn vaguely, establishing intergovernmental structures on voluntary and nonobligatory basis. Together with the lack of political will between the Member States to cooperate, these arrangements fall away from taking concrete results. Therefore, before the September 11 event only some insignificant steps are taken on the issue of terrorism.

Specifically under the impact of September 11 and March 11 events, terrorism issue is transformed in the EU context by getting ‘securitized’ and evaluated under one of the key security threats. Under the topic of the fight against terrorism through the CFSP, the EU responded by enhanced cross-pillar coordination and introduced concrete measures especially in law enforcement and financial areas. Uniform definition of terrorist offences has been released which aimed to approximate standards in the national legislation of Member States in punishing terrorist offences. Besides, European Arrest Warrant entered into force on 1 January 2004. Council Framework Decision is adopted on the execution in the EU of orders freezing property and successful results are taken. Europol devoted specific efforts by establishing the Counter Terrorism Program. However, as a result of intergovernmental and voluntary structure, Europol challenged the dilemma of sharing multinational information on the issue of security. Eurojust became operational on 2002 with the aim of enhancing judicial cooperation between the Member States.

EU released important documents of Action Plan and Security Strategy which framed the EU security architecture and the issue of terrorism. Significant emphasis on root causes of security threats and terrorism is made and to eliminate the threats from the roots, a ‘preventive strategy’ is produced. Preventive engagement strategy is developed as a result of wider security understanding beyond the limits of realist perceptions and incorporated various areas of civil engagement based on liberal values of human rights and democracy. In addition to this, increasing role is given to the CFSP and JHA bodies in cooperation and coordination of policies. Terrorism incorporated on the foreign policy dimension through a kind of conditionality which would be implemented by assistance programs and targeted trade measures. On the other side, ESDP is also mentioned to be instrumental in the fight against terrorism. Efforts are enhanced both in civil and military instruments as complements, to deal with the security issues.

After the terrorist attack in Madrid, EU furthered its efforts on the fight against terrorism. By the Declaration on Combating Terrorism tasks of identification of the areas for closer cooperation in consequent management both inside the EU and with the third parties are incorporated. This point indicates that EU started to develop strategies not only to eliminate root causes but also to take precaution in the EU territory. Besides this, position of Counterterrorism Coordinator is established under the CFSP. EU declared its solidarity against terrorism which specified that if one of the Member States becomes victim of the terrorist attack, then Member States shall act jointly and mobilize all the instruments at their disposal, including military resources (European Council, 2004). The solidarity clause is also

incorporated on the draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe which revealed an important degree of political will on the issue.

In the framework underlining the ESDP dimension of the fight against terrorism, more specific areas of actions are declared for the development of civilian and military crisis management capacities. Before, the ESDP tasks were targeting failed states which were posing security threat indirectly by positioning on the periphery, however as the Madrid attack brought the danger closely to the European geography, the ESDP missions are reevaluated.

Consequently, the importance of terrorism revealed by transforming European policies and bringing more specific measures entailing cross-pillar coordination. In solution of this complex issue, EU developed strategies encompassing both ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ power politics. On the one hand, efforts to enhance military capacities together with the limitations inserted by intelligence and secrecy issues as a result of nationalist concerns can be considered as a rise of realist perceptions. However, developing military means should be evaluated within a wider concept of security incorporating both military and civil engagements. On the other side, wider concept of security entailing multifaceted policies under the CFSP can be discussed as a rise of liberalist perspectives. Terrorism issue also embedded principally in the relations with third countries. Therefore, multidimensional policy instruments incorporating civil and military aspects as complements can be interpreted as rise of both liberal and realist thinking under the CFSP.

References

Books, Articles, Reports

Archick, Kristin (2002): 'Europe and Counterterrorism: Strengthening Police and Judicial Cooperation', Congressional Research Service Report to Congress, Occhipinti, USA

Bensahel, Nora (2003): 'The Counterterror Coalitions: Cooperation with Europe, NATO and the European Union', RAND, USA

Bryman, Alan (2001): 'Social Research Method', Oxford University Press, UK

Crenshaw, Martha (1981): 'The Causes of Terrorism', Comparative Politics, Vol.13, No.4

Dale, Reginald (1999): 'The Search for a Common Foreign Policy', Europe, July/August

Eliassen, Kjell A. (editor)(1998): 'Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union', Sage Publications, London

European Foreign and Security Policy Newsletter, Issue No. 2 June, 2000

Evans, G. (1994): 'Cooperative Security and Intrastate Conflict', Foreign Policy, 96 (Autumn)

Forster, Anthony & Wallace, William (2000): 'Common Foreign and Security Policy: From Shadow to Substance?', in Wallace, Hellen & Wallace, William (eds) (2000): Policy-Making in the European Union', Oxford University Press Inc, USA

Gartner, Heinz (2001): 'European Security, the Transatlantic Link and Crisis Management', in Gartner, Heinz, Hyde-Price, Adrian & Reiter, Erich (eds) (2001): 'Europe's New Security Challenges', Lynne Rienner Publishers, UK

Gartner, Heinz, Hyde-Price, Adrian & Reiter, Erich (eds) (2001): 'Europe's New Security Challenges', Lynne Rienner Publishers, UK

Holsti, K.J. (1992): 'International Politics', Prentice Hall International, New Jersey

Howorth, Jolyon, Terriff, Terry, Webber, Mark & Croft, Stuart (2001): 'The Common European Security and Defence Policy', Briefing Paper 1/01, ESRC One Europe or Several? Programme

Hyde-Price, Adrian (2001): "'Beware the Jabberwock!": Security Studies in the Twenty-First Century', in Gartner, Heinz, Hyde-Price, Adrian & Reiter, Erich (eds) (2001): 'Europe's New Security Challenges', Lynne Rienner Publishers, UK

Kagan, Robert, Gnesotto, Nicole & Kremenjuk, Victor (2002): 'European Security and Defence Policy: Taking Stock', Working Paper No.8, European Security Forum

Keohane, Robert O. & Nye, Joseph S. (2001): 'Power and Interdependence', Longman, USA

Laqueur, Walter (1987): 'The Age of Terrorism', Little, Brown and Company, Boston

Lindstrom, Gustav & Schmitt, Burkard (2004): 'Facing Terrorism: European Perspectives and Strategies', Institute for Security Studies, Paris

Menotti, Roberto (2003): 'European Security Strategy-Is it for Real?', in Fedorov, Yury E., Menotti, Roberto & Allin, H. Dana (2003): 'European Security Strategy: Is it for Real?', Working Paper, European Security Forum, No.14

Morgenthau, Hans (1946): 'Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace' Knopf, New York

Muller, Harald (2003): 'Terrorism, Proliferation: a European Threat Assessment', Chaillot Papers 58, Institute for Security Studies

Pillar, Paul R. (2001): 'Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy', Brookings Institution Press, USA

Sjursen, Helena (2003): 'Understanding the Common Foreign and Security Policy: Analytical Building Blocks', Working Paper, Advanced Research on the Europeanization of the Nation State (ARENA), Oslo

Strauss, Mark (2003): 'Antiglobalism's Jewish Problem', Foreign Policy, Nov/Dec

Tank, Pinar G. (1998): 'The CFSP and the Nation-State', in Eliassen, Kjell A. (editor) (1998): 'Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union', Sage Publications, London

Treacher, Adrian (2004): 'From Civilian Power to Military Actor: The EU's Resistible Transformation', European Foreign Affairs Review, Vol.9

White, B. (2001): 'Understanding European Foreign Policy' Palgrave, Basingstoke

Internet Resources

Annan, Kofi (2003): Fighting Terrorism for Humanity, A Conference on the Roots of Evil, Conference Report, organized by Government of Norway and International Peace Academy, New York, available at: www.nupi.no, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, found 27-09-2004

BBC, Crime Fighters: Policing, Europol, 2003, available at: www.bbc.co.uk/crime/fighters/europol.shtml, found 07-11-2004

Burgess, Mark (2003): 'The Problems of Definition', Center for Defense Information, available at: www.cdi.org

Bush, George (2002): Press Release, US Department of State, available at: <http://usembassy-australia.state.gov/hyper/2002/0514/epf203.htm>, found 2-12-2004

Economic and Social Council (2004), Final Resolutions, Midwest Model United Nations, available at: www.mmun.org found 03-10-2004

Emerson, Michael & Gros, Daniel (2001): 'Issues for Europe- Post 11 September', Center for European Policy Studies, Brief No. 8, available at: www.cebs.be, found 03-11-2004

'Fighting Terrorism for Humanity, A Conference on the Roots of Evil' (2003), Conference Report, organized by International Peace Academy and Government of Norway, New York, available at: www.nupi.no, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, found 27-09-2004

Forsnet 2000, What is Terrorism?, available at: www.terror.gen.tr, found 12-10-2004

International Expert Meeting (2003), 'Root Causes of Terrorism', Oslo, available at: www.nupi.no/IPS/filestore/Root_Causes_report.pdf, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, found 29-09-2004

Jenkins, Brian Michael (2004): 'Where I Draw the Line', Christian Science Monitor, available at: <http://www.csmonitor.com/specials/terrorism/lite/expert.html>, found 10-09-2004

Maximilien, Robespierre (1794): 'Justification of the Use of terrorism', Modern History Sourcebook, available at: <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/robespierre-terror.htm>, found 01-12-2004

McReynolds, David (2002): 'Responding to September 11', War Resisters, available at: http://www.warresisters.org/war_without_end.htm, found 10-10-2004

Morley, Jefferson (2004): 'Europe Faces a New Era: After a Mass Terror Attack in Madrid, Voters Reject Bush Ally', Washington Post, available at: www.terror.gen.tr, found 09-09-2004

Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism (2003): 'Patterns of Global Terrorism', US Department of State Publication, available at: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/20177.pdf>, found 2-12-2004

Stevenson, Jonathan (2003): 'How Europe and America Defend Themselves', Foreign Affairs, available at: www.terrorism.net, found 13-10-2004

The National Security Strategy of the United States (NSS) (2002), Washington, D.C., available at: www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html, found 15-10-2004

UN Development Programme (2001), Human Development Report, available at: www.un.org, found 29-10-2004

UN General Assembly (1995), Resolution 49/60 on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism, available at: <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N95/768/19/PDF/N9576819.pdf?OpenElement>, found 17-11-2004

UN Security Council (2001), Resolution no.1377 on Declaration on the Global Effort to Combat Terrorism, available at:
<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/633/01/PDF/N0163301.pdf?OpenElement>,
found 17-11-2004

United States Department of Defence (2003), Department of Defence Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms,
available at: http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf, found 2-12-2004

Documents from the European Union Homepage

Activities of the European Union, Summaries of Legislation (2002), The Common Foreign and Security Policy, available at: www.europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/r00001.htm, found 15-09-2004

Cologne European Council (1999), Presidency Conclusions, available at:
<http://ue.eu.int/eudocs/cmsUpload/Cologne%20European%20Council-Presidency%20conclusions.pdf>, found 02-10-2004

Conceptual Framework on the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) Dimension of the Fight Against Terrorism (2004), available at:
http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/14797Conceptual_Framework_ESDP.pdf,
found 05-12-2004

Conclusions and Plan of Action of the Extraordinary European Council Meeting (2001), available at: http://ue.eu.int/cms3_fo/showPage.asp?id=631&lang=EN&mode=g,
found 23-11-2004

European Commission (2001), 'Overview of EU action in response to the September 11 event and assessment of their likely economic impact, Commission Report, available at:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/cfsp/doc/com01_611.htm, found 14-11-2004

European Commission (2004): 'Terrorism: the European Response', available at:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/, found 17-10-2004

European Council (2004), Declaration on Combating Terrorism, Brussels
available at: <http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/79635.pdf>, found 02-12-2004

European Police Office (Europol) (2002), An Overview of Counter Terrorism Unit Activities, available at: http://www.europol.eu.int/index.asp?page=publ_terrorism,
found 13-11-2004

European Police Office (Europol) (2004), Factsheet on Europol, available at:
<http://www.europol.eu.int/index.asp?page=facts>, found 25-10-2004

European Security Strategy (ESS), A Secure Europe in a Better World (2003), Brussels, December 12, available at: <http://ue.eu.int/pressData/en/reports/7367.pdf>,
found 02-10-2004

Franco-British Summit (1998), Joint Declaration on European Defense, St.Malo, 4 December

Helsinki European Council (1999), Presidency Conclusions, available at:

<http://ue.eu.int/eudocs/cmsUpload/Helsinki%20European%20Council-Presidency%20conclusions.pdf>, found 08-10-2004

Justice and Home Affairs, European Judicial Network (EJN),

www.europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/fsj/criminal/network, found 28-10-2004

Overviews of the European Union Activities, Foreign and Security Policy (2004): available

at: http://www.europa.eu.int/pol/cfsp/overview_en.htm, found 15-09-2004

Tampere European Council (1999), Presidency Conclusions, available at:

http://europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/oct99/oct99_en.htm, found 15-11-2004

The Amsterdam Treaty (1997), Official Journal C 340, available at: [http://europa.eu.int/eur-](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/11997D/htm/11997D.html)

[lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/11997D/htm/11997D.html](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/11997D/htm/11997D.html),

found 25-09-2004

Treaty on the European Union (1992), Official Journal C 191, available at:

<http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/11992M/htm/11992M.html>,

found 16-09-2004

Treaty of Nice (2000), Official Journal C 80, available at:

<http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/12001C/htm/12001C.html>,

found 13-10-2004

The Council of the European Union, Fight against terrorism, available at:

http://ue.eu.int/cms3_fo/showPage.asp?id=406&lang=EN, found 15-09-2004

The Council of the European Union, The Common Foreign and Security Policy, available at:

<http://ue.eu.int/showPage.asp?id=248&lang=en&mode=g>, found 16-09-2004

The Council of the European Union, European Union Institutions and Other Bodies, available

at: http://www.europa.eu.int/institutions/council/index_en.htm,

found 08-10-2004

The Council of the European Union (1996), Joint Action on the basis of Article K.3 of the

Treaty of European Union concerning the creation and maintenance of a Directory of

specialized counter-terrorist competences, skills and expertise in order to facilitate

counterterrorist cooperation between the Member States of the European Union, 96/610/JHA,

Official Journal L 273, available at:

[http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=](http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=31996F0610&model=guichett)

[31996F0610&model=guichett](http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=31996F0610&model=guichett), found 18-10-2004

The Council of the European Union (1998), Council Decision instructing the Europol to deal

with crimes committed or likely to be committed in the course of terrorist activities against

life, limb, personal freedom or property, 1999/C 26/06, Official Journal C 026, available at:

[http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=](http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=31999D0130(02)&model=guichett)

[31999D0130\(02\)&model=guichett](http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=31999D0130(02)&model=guichett), found 15-10-2004

The Council of the European Union (1998a), Joint Action on making it a criminal offence to participate in a criminal organization in the Member States of the European Union 98/733/JHA, Official Journal L 351, available at:

http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=31998F0733&model=guichett, found 26-10-2004

The Council of the European Union (1998b), Joint Action on the creation of a European Judicial Network, 98/428/JHA, Official Journal L 191, available at:

<http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/133055.htm>, found 28-10-2004

The Council of the European Union (1999), Council Recommendation on cooperation in combating the financing of terrorist groups, Official Journal C 373,

available at: <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/133117.htm>, found 29-10-2004

The Council of the European Union (2002), Council Framework Decision on combating terrorism, 2002/475/JHA, Official Journal L 164, available at:

http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=32002F0475&lg=EN, found 15-10-2004

The Council of the European Union (2002a), Council Decision setting up Eurojust, Official Journal L 63, available at: <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/133188.htm>

found 16-11-2004

The Council of the European Union (2003), Council Framework Decision on the execution in the EU of orders freezing property or evidence, 2003/577/JHA, Official Journal of the European Union L 196/45, available at:

http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/oj/dat/2003/l_196/l_19620030802en00450055.pdf,

found 07-11-2004

The Council of the European Union (2003a), Interim Report on the Evaluation of National Anti-Terrorist Arrangement, available at:

http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/Interim_Report.pdf, found 13-11-2004