

## **Working Group Workpackage VI**

External Action and CFSP (Ian Manners)

### **Agenda**

Thursday 6 June 2013

14.00 – 15.30 h

Fondation Universitaire, Rue d'Egmont 11

Salle Francqui

### **“EU External Actions beyond Lisbon”**

**Chair:** Professor Ian Manners, University of Copenhagen

The LISBOAN network aims to strengthen cooperation between institutions of higher education and research in Europe with a view to teaching and researching the Treaty of Lisbon, the European Union's legal foundation since December 2009. While the first meeting of the External Action thematic working group focussed on researching the Treaty of Lisbon; and the second meeting focussed on the links between the teaching and researching of the Treaty of Lisbon, this final meeting will look to the future of EU External Actions beyond Lisbon.

#### **14:00-15:00: External Action beyond Lisbon (four short presentations):**

- Prof. Ian Manners (University of Copenhagen) *Introduction*
- EU practitioner (*to be confirmed*), ‘CSDP beyond the Lisbon Treaty’.
- Dr. Kristi Raik (FIIA, Helsinki), ‘EEAS and national diplomacies beyond the Lisbon Treaty’
- Hanna Tuominen (University of Helsinki), ‘The EU at the UN Human Rights Council beyond the Lisbon Treaty’

#### **15:00-15:15: Achieving progress in EU External Action beyond Lisbon (general discussion):**

- Has progress in EU External Action (EU EA) beyond Lisbon been achieved in CSDP, the EEAS, or the EU at the UN?
- Are there areas where EU EA has progressively improved since the Lisbon Treaty?
- Are there areas where EU EA has regressed since the Lisbon Treaty?
- Are there areas of EU EA where reforms within the context of the Lisbon Treaty are needed?
- Are there areas of EU EA where future treaty revisions are needed?

#### **15:15-15:30: Future research and teaching agenda beyond LISBOAN (general discussion):**

- What lessons for research to be drawn from the first years of the EU EA after Lisbon?
- What lessons for teaching are to be drawn from the first years of the EU EA after Lisbon?
- Where should the future research and teaching agenda go beyond LISBOAN?

## **Report**

### **Presentations: External Action beyond Lisbon**

*Kristi Raik* (FIIA, Helsinki) began her presentation (entitled “EEAS and national diplomacies beyond the Lisbon Treaty”) by arguing that the realist theory of international relations offered an explanation of the need for stronger common European foreign policy, making reference to such external trends as the rapid transformation of global structures and Europe struggling to adapt to these new realities by the EU’s geopolitical and economic re-positioning as a result of overall weakening of its global position. The theory also defined, via issues like sovereignty, *directoire* of the Big3 and cautious role of the High Representative/Vice President, why it was so difficult for the EU Member States to reach an agreement. According to Kristi Raik, the EEAS is understood as the lowest common denominator: it was meant not only to strengthen the ‘EU umbrella’, but especially to enhance national influence, as shown by an example of Germany mobilising other Member States to support its non-paper in the current debate on the 2013 review of the EEAS. Kristi Raik considered that this situation reflected the existence of problems with trust, sense of ownership, political will and commitment with regards to the EEAS. The Service had just started functioning, but it was already criticised on several accounts. At the same time, the Member States were interested in the debate upon smoothing the cooperation within CFSP, as it offered them rational cost-efficiency via pool-and-share possibilities for scarce resources, relevant particularly in the times of economic crises. Thus, EU delegations were seen as an added value, and some Member States were keen on not only using common premises, but also on ‘communitising’ the consular services. With a view to the loyalties of national diplomats, Kristi Raik also argued that in Brussels / in EU-settings, the Europeanization of the elite-level was a fact.

The second presentation by *Hanna Tuominen* (University of Helsinki) was entitled “The EU at the UN Human Rights Council beyond the Lisbon Treaty”. Hanna Tuominen described the cooperation between the EU Member States as smooth. The coordination of the EU delegation allowed the Union to deliver ‘one message with many voices’, based on objectives adopted in June 2012 EU Strategic Framework for Human Rights and Democracy. Nevertheless, she pointed out that the rotating presidency system was still used. The EU Special Representative for Human Rights received good notes from the EU Member States, in contrary to the High Representative, who visited Geneva once in her term. In terms of challenges, Hanna Tuominen noted a number of points: (i) The EU delegation was small; (ii) there was a lack of trust between the EU Member States and (iii) there was competition between the EU Member States and oftentimes egoism prevailed. Moreover, she highlighted challenges arising from the external environment: Arab uprising, much more and more diversified new players, political blocks, the influence of the economic crisis, etc.. In conclusion, she argued that although not much had changed, the EU was now more influential and visible at the HRC. While strategic planning had improved (annual set of objectives based on the 2012 Framework), she considered that the EU delegation needed more resources. She stressed that the rotating presidency would continue working and had to be made working even if there were tensions on the line between EU-Member States or questions on the

division of competences which were quite likely to arise. Finally, the external context set limits for EU action and influence.

### **Discussion I: achieving progress in EU External Action**

In the first round *Ian Manners* (University of Copenhagen) was most interested in three issues: 1) an impact of economic crisis on EU's external action, 2) the tension between Brussels' and national perspectives, and 3) relations with other actors. *Gunilla Herolf* wondered if the Member States had given up on the EEAS or if they would still give it a try. *Kristi Raik* replied that with regard to all the questions, the answer was dependent on an EU Member State in question, and that there was a clear division into smaller and bigger Member States. As far as the smaller Member States were concerned, she considered that they had not given up on the common diplomatic service; they rather saw it as a "transition" or "extraordinary" period. She argued that the need for a common and stronger foreign policy was stronger than ever.

In the second round, *Hanspeter Neuhold* shared his surprise that the rotating presidency was still being executed in the area of CFSP. *Gianni Bonvicini* commented on the impact of economic crisis that it might have influenced the EEAS in two directions: (i) by reinforcing the CFSP through rationalising money spent, the number of diplomats sent to abroad posts etc., (ii) by drawing away the attention paid by Member States to CFSP and the EEAS. He added that the launch of the EEAS was to enhance the EU's representation in international organisations, but also said that it was not going to happen anytime soon. Given that even the rotating presidency was surviving, the fact was that CFSP had become more multi-polar and less multilateral. *Hanna Tuominen* clarified that the role of the rotating presidency in the HRC was to speak on behalf of the EU member States. She also underlined that the human rights values were common to all Member States, but their understanding and principality in their execution differed.

In the third round, *Ana Bojinovic Fenko* asked to precise who the 'small states' were and if there were any differences between small and new/fresh states, such as e.g. Slovenia, who had been building its statehood for a bit more than 20 years now. *Kristi Raik* answered that there was no explanation to that, as the smaller Member States might very much differ in their approach towards the common foreign service, as shown by the example of the sceptic Czech Republic and optimistic Estonia.

In the next round *Geoffrey Edwards* touched upon a few issues in his remarks. He agreed with the instrumental usage of CFSP and EEAS, hidden under rhetoric on 'complementarity with interest of [e.g.] UK'. According to him, the socialisation depended on the time, area, and field, and it might be temporary only. Finally, he concluded that there was no strong leadership – there was only a weak one, and the reason for that was partially the High Representative herself. In reply, *Kristi Raik* stated that these were the Member States who had made it clear that they did not wish to have any strong leadership by electing C. Ashton to the function of HR/VP. Moreover, she believed that no attention was given to CFSP because nowadays the Member States were much more focused on commercial/trade diplomacy.

Hanna Tuominen added that often the fragile united position of the Member States was broken by other actors, e.g. China.

### **Discussion II: future research and teaching agenda**

Gianni Bonvicini argued that there were different aspects within the EU external action – in a wider definition: e.g. trade and monetary policy, in a narrow perspective: peace building, conflict-prevention, promotion of human rights and democracy etc. Hanspeter Neuhold proposed to speak about “The EU facing global challenges”, instead of the currently fashionable “The EU as a global actor”. *Gunilla Herolf* considered that she could easily differentiate between two kinds of her students: one group appreciated and even praised the role of the EU, particularly in comparison to the US, whereas the second group was very sceptic towards the EU. It was therefore crucial to be careful while phrasing the teaching agenda, in order to make students realise the difficulties of politics. Ana Bojinovic Fenko advised to do more research on inter-regionalism, e.g. South to South connections. *Kalliope Agapiou-Josephides* recommended to follow up on undertaken actions, e.g. on EU Election Observation Mission, as there was no evaluation provided.

*Anita Sek* (TEPSA Trans European Policy Studies Association)