

Note from the Editor

Karen E. Smith, London School of Economics, Editor

The first article of this issue of *CFSP Forum*, by Sophie Vanhoonacker and Hylke Dijkstra, analyses the evolution of the Council secretariat's role in the fo

relations.

Beyond Note-Taking: CFSP Challenges for the Council Secretariat¹

Sophie Vanhoonacker and Hylke Dijkstra, Maastricht University, the Netherlands

The highly sensitive character of European foreign policy has always made member states reluctant to transfer competencies to the supranational level. When 'the Six' launched European Political Cooperation (EPC) in 1970, they organised this flexible form of foreign policy

make its views known 'if the activities of the European Communities [were] affected by the work of the Ministers' (e.g. sanctions).² Since there was no central Secretariat, it was the country in the chair that bore the entire administrative burden.

Today the situation has changed considerably. Th

bring us to the hasty conclusion that the old-age
rivalry between i

secure building at the Avenue de Cortenbergh.¹⁵ In addition, the Secretariat also houses the EU Military Staff (EUMS), the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC), the Joint Situation Centre (SITCEN) in charge of intelligence, and the Operation Centre (since 2007). These bodies play a role in the implementation of civilian and military ESDP missions and they employ around 300 officials, most of whom are seconded.

Although the above-mentioned developments have attracted hardly any public or academic attention, the changes in terms of staff, administrative structure and the change of

mission and, in the Western Balkans, even with the prospect of EU enlargement. These phases imply different dynamic roles for both players. Structural ambiguities such as overlap and inconsistency between first and second pillar actions stimulate rivalry and have spurred a number of 'turf battles' – not so much at the political (Solana – Patten / Ferrero-Waldner) as at the administrative level.¹⁹ The 'Crisis Management Procedures' (2003) were a first attempt to define the role of the different actors but they are very general since they were drafted when the EU had hardly any experience with crisis management.²⁰

Procedures and coordination mechanisms do not, however, provide the full answer. Since missions differ considerably in terms of scope, duration, location and size, there is also a need for flexibility. In a document on civil military co-ordination, the Secretariat and the Commission services plead for a culture of co-ordination 'rather than seeking to put too much emphasis on detailed structures and procedures'.²¹ The risk with such approach is however that it makes smooth co-ordination dependent on the goodwill of the players involved. Ideally both partners find a balance between increased institutionalisa

EU Representation at the UN: The Peacebuilding Commission as a Paragon of Complexity

Edith Drieskens and Roos Van de Cruys, Institute for International and European Policy, Leuven University, Belgium¹

On 17 October, the UN Security Council (UNSC) discussed

Although all of them had approved the 'debate' format when the UNSC agenda for October was decided upon, a number of representatives also seized the opportunity to express their disappointment at the fact that the

representatives of the European Union (EU) and Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) – i.e. EU Presidency Portugal and NAM Chair Jamaica – had not been invited to participate.⁵ Italy even turned dramatically to the audience and wondered aloud how the EU and its member states could be encouraged to remain the main donor given the circumstances. France and Slovakia gave in to the strong Italian pressure to follow its example and recognised that it was indeed regrettable that the EU could not deliver a statement, whereas the UK and Belgium remained silent on the issue. As a result, it was difficult to find even a speck of EU unity in the UNSC chamber that Wednesday morning.⁶

In fact, the representation of the EU has been under discussion for most of the PBC's first session. The PBC was established as an 'intergovernmental advisory body' by concurrent resolutions of the UNSC and UNGA. As the result of intensive and often difficult negotiations, these founding resolutions stipulate that PBC's Organisational Committee consists of 31 members: seven members from the UNSC, seven from the UNGA, seven from ECOSOC, the five top contributors to UN budgets and funds as well as top contributors

nameplate reading 'European Union', today, it has to be satisfied with two invitations, one seat and a single nameplate mentioning 'European Community'. Within EU circles, hopes are high that a solution can be found even within this month. But it will require persuasion, both from Portugal and the other member states, to convince the US, which prefers the EU's presence to remain limited to one invitation, seat and nameplate only. From this perspective, emotional outbursts are only counterproductive. Especially a country like Italy, which wants to give its current membership of the UNSC a 'European dimension', should be aware of this.¹³

Mn82 0 0 10.02 38.22018 6 10.0ber5 Tm(Mn82 Tf0 0 0 10.02 156.39288 68C /Span <</MCID 1 >

Soviet Union-Afghanistan conflicts, and disarmament. Additionally, the EC's external activities were introduced mainly by diplomatic instruments, as démarches and declarations, and the Community did not sign agreements on cooperation with other organisations. The only exception was the agreement signed by the EC with the Council of Europe in 1987, which was a result of the numerous references made by the Community with regards to the European Convention on Human Rights, including t

prevention, crisis management and peace keeping operations – the areas in which the EU and UN have developed the strongest links and where the EU was the primary contributor financially and in terms of personnel. The culmination of this period came in 2003 when the EU was involved in Bosnia, Macedonia, and the Democratic Republic of Congo resulting in two new agreements.

In 2001, the EU on several occasions underlined its commitment to develop and institutionalise its cooperation with the UN.¹⁸ During the European Council in Göteborg, essential decisions were taken that the member states would support political dialogue and strengthen cooperation with

European Political Identity and Others' Images of the EU: Reflections on an Under-explored Relationship

Sonia Lucarelli, University of Bologna at Forlì, Italy

How the EU is perceived on the international scene is relevant not only because perceptions influence the actual behaviour of the EU's counterparts, but also because they might influence the very self-representation of the EU in the 'domestic' European debate. Harsh criticisms (from Robert Kagan) or appreciations (from Jeremy Rifkin) of the EU from the outside have heavily influenced the European public debate in recent years and are likely to have affected also the very self-representation of the (informed) Europeans as a political group (i.e. their political identity).

(Canada). Two transversal chapters on NGOs and EU Commission delegations completed the report.

What can we learn from this survey? Two results should be underlined. In the first place, the EU is not a widely known and debated actor for public opinion and the media outside Europe. Moreover, most people would not make a qualitative difference between the EU as a political actor and a more vague 'Europe' as a geographical area with cultural and political similarities. Few people have an idea of what the EU is and even fewer of what it stands for. Though very much dependent on levels of education and societal position, a low level of knowledge of the EU is common to the different countries and continents. In 2001, 23% of the Chinese had an opinion about the EU (World Values Survey 2001), while the percentages were 45% in South Africa (Afrobarometer 2002) and 43% in Brazil (Latinobarometro 1995-2004).⁴

Second, the image of 'Europe' which emerges from the surveys is undoubtedly influenced by historical relations with a European country in the past. This is particularly the case of the post-colonial countries in our sample, such as India. Given these general results, let me introduce what can be gained from the survey in terms of external acknowll

distinction to US strategy in the area.⁸ A more positive view in the media can also be observed in less pro-European countries such as India. However, the degree of recognition of relevant EU distinctiveness in democracy promotion has proved to be less than could be expected.

Moreover, the EU is

Europe became more influential than the United States in world affairs, for instance, in Australia (62% see the perspective of the EU becoming more powerful than the US as positive vs. 23% against), Brazil (53% vs. 28%), Canada (63% vs. 26%), China (66% vs. 16%), Japan (35% vs. 13%) and South Africa (35% vs. 25%).¹⁵ The only exception is India (35% vs. 38%).¹⁶ Analogously, the image of the EU as a possible counterbalance to the US appears in public discourse and in the media. 'In Egypt, the EU ranks second in volume of coverage after the US, but the tone is more positive.'¹⁷

As for borders, the survey indicates that the borders of Europe are mainly drawn on a cultural-political basis rather than on a geographic and institutional basis. The image which emerges more clearly is one of a 'divided West': though similar to the US in several respects, a European distinctiveness is recognised. In terms of geographic borders, great attention has been paid in the external press to the process of enlargement and the normative transformation of Central and Eastern European countries, in both cases for reasons of self-interest (what type of economic implications will this have for us?). For instance, the Japanese press followed the 2004 enlargement of the EU closely, adopting 'a tone of admiration in many news texts', 'yet, enlargement's economic consequences were contemplated in terms of possible economic threats to Japan'.¹⁸ EU enlargement was also the most prominent media news item in Australia.¹⁹

Conclusions: a partially uncomfortable mirror?

If we sum up the results of the survey in the light of the three categories presented in the introduction – distinctiveness, recognition, labelling and bordering, we see that there are areas in which the EU's distinctiveness is largely (if not universally) recognised: its integration experience (its multilateral attitude, its global environmental policy and its conflict management policies), and in those areas the EU tends to be largely appreciated. Despite this, only a small portion of the population perceives the EU as a world power. The greatest impediment to EU credibility, however, appears to be its international trade policy and its common agricultural policy. In terms of labelling, the main image the EU casts of itself is one of an economic power, but it also emerges as possible – largely called for – counterbalance to US hegemony. The image

which emerges is one of a partially 'divided We 201.79811

http://www.cap.lmu.de/download/2006/2006_GPC_Survey_Results.pdf. (accessed 26.01.2007)

¹⁰ Bertelsmann Stiftung, *World Powers in the 21st Century*.

¹¹ Lagos, *La Unión Europea*.

¹² Chaban and Kauffman, 'Country Report: Japan'.

¹³ quoted in A. Poletti, R. Peruzzi, and S. Zhang, 'Country Report: China', in S. Lucarelli (ed.) *Research Report: The External Image Of The European Union*, Garnet Working Paper N. 17/7, 2007, Available at: http://www.garnet-eu.org/fileadmin/documents/working_papers/1707/8%20China.pdf.

¹⁴ See <http://www.hindu.com/2004/11/08/stories/2004110806810100.html>

¹⁵ Globescan/Programme on International Policy Attitudes, 'PIPA-Knowledge Networks Poll: Global Public Opinion on the US Presidential Election and US Foreign Policy', 2004, available at

<www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/EvalWorldPowers/LeadWorld_Apr05/LeadWorld_Apr05_rpt.pdf>, 2 April 2007.

¹⁶ Globescan, 'PIPA-Knowledge Networks f1s98 0 r 7.a203568 098061 Tr