

Introduction

Two years ago we began this volume with a question regarding whether the concept of a European Union (EU) foreign policy was paradoxical, as Jan Zielonka has suggested.¹ According to Zielonka, the EU wanted to become a powerful international actor without becoming a superstate and hoped to have a strong impact on Europe and the rest of the world without basing these aspirations on a well-defined and consistent strategy. The adoption of the Treaty of Lisbon was meant to address this paradox, but, two years on, the picture is even more blurred.

The history of European integration includes the struggle by the European Economic Community/European Union (EEC/EU) to acquire substantial external dimension prerogatives, that is, a foreign policy. The Treaty of Rome (1957) opened the way for external relations of the European Communities (EC) based on economic considerations. The Pleven Plan in 1950, the creation of the Western European Union in 1954, and the Fouchet Plan proposed in 1961 subsequently attempted to add diplomatic and military capacities to the external economic competencies the EC had already acquired. The aim was to turn the EC into an autonomous actor. All these attempts failed to achieve their purpose, but the logic of the European integration process eventually led to a progressive evolution toward closer cooperation in foreign policy.

In the 1970s, a crucial measure undertaken on this long path was the creation of the European Political Cooperation (EPC). As a precursor of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the EPC came to symbolize the need for dialogue at the European level. The member states had to understand that, on the international stage, their interests were best defended if they worked together. The EC already conducts an autonomous economic foreign policy in international forums such as the World Trade Organization (WTO). The EU itself, as part of the Middle East Quartet (with the United Nations, the United

States, and Russia), is directly involved in significant cases of international negotiations such as those concerning the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. However, the balance is counterweighted by the individual membership of EU member states in international organizations. The permanent status of France and Great Britain on the United Nations Security Council is probably the most prominent example here. Furthermore, individual member states largely focus on bilateral negotiations with third parties—and, indeed, continue to conduct their foreign policy primarily in this fashion. However, as illustrated in recent years by the Libyan crisis, the Arab Spring, the ongoing decades-long peace process in the Middle East, the Georgian crisis, or the Russian-Ukrainian gas crisis, Europe could benefit from more cooperation and a single, unified voice to counter third parties' policies of *divide et impera*.

This second edition of *The Foreign Policy of the European Union* aims to assess the state of European foreign policy and the degree of EU success in proposing itself as a valid international actor two years after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. The complexity of this subject demanded bringing together the foremost experts on different aspects of EU foreign policy. The first edition drew on the findings of an international conference held in Rome in July 2008, organized by the University of Rome Tor Vergata in collaboration with the Center for American Studies in Rome and the Brookings Institution. Four years later, in order to reflect changes in the international environment, new topics have been added and contributors to the first edition have updated (or, in some cases, rewritten) their chapters. As in the first edition, the contributors come from different disciplinary backgrounds and provide a unique mix of academics and policymakers. One of the few volumes of its kind on the subject of the EU's foreign policy, *The Foreign Policy of the European Union* provides timely updates on individual issues both past and present, theoretical and practice-oriented, and country- and region-specific.

This volume also deals with both “horizontal” and “vertical” issues. Vertical issues focus on particular geographic regions; horizontal issues explore themes relevant to the EU's external affairs. Vertical analyses are based on the EU's relations with the rest of the world, from its immediate neighbors to East Asia, North America, the Middle East, and Latin America. Horizontal issues include the EU's foreign policy tools, ranging from those provided by the CFSP to Justice and Home Affairs (JHA), and monetary policy and the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP).

In more specific terms, the volume addresses the following questions:

—How have relations between the EC/EU and the rest of the world developed historically?

—What are the instruments the EC/EU has set up to deal with different parts of the world?

—What are the main objectives that the EU wants to pursue in other areas of the world? How have they changed over the years?

—Is it possible to say that there has been a shift of attention by the EU in its foreign policy, from economic issues to political ones?

—Has the EU contributed to the development of human rights, peace, and democracy?

—Has the EU contributed to the economic development of specific areas of the world?

—Does EU foreign policy contribute to creating a European identity?

—Is the EU considered a useful and reliable partner?

Part I of the volume is devoted to the EU's foreign policy tools. First, Federiga Bindi provides a historical overview of the EU's creation and the evolution of its foreign policy. Then Nicola Verola focuses on the new tools that the EU has acquired since the Lisbon Treaty. He notes an evolutionary crescendo in the EC/EU's treaties, with the Lisbon Treaty at the top, which granted a unique judicial personality to the EU and created the position of "High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy" (hereafter "high representative"). After a careful analysis of the various institutional and legislative changes brought about by the Lisbon Treaty, Verola argues that instead of pushing for a more efficient CFSP, the provisions of the treaty appear to be more focused on keeping under tight control any potential evolution of the CFSP.

The chapter by Raffaele Trombetta complements Verola's juridical perspective by offering an overview of the EU's foreign policy tools. He points out that when analyzing the EU's foreign policy, one should not fall into the trap of looking only at the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). By looking at the EU's past successful enlargements and at relations with the neighborhood, Trombetta suggests that particularly in the aftermath of the Arab Spring, it is rather in the field of "low politics" that the EU has achieved more success and offers the most promising incentives for democratic change in the region.

Stephan Keukeleire and Kolja Raube are more skeptical than two years ago about the effectiveness of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), now the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). However, they point out that civilian missions are one of the recent "success stories" of European integration and an innovative element of the EU's military aspirations. Although the ESDP/CSDP represents a significant transformation in the EU's struggle to obtain its own military capability, they warn that the CSDP has a long way to go before achieving this.

The chapter by Francesca Longo highlights the link that has emerged between two former pillars of the EU—the CFSP and the JHA—after the creation of the Area of Freedom, Security, and Justice (AFSJ). She argues that the EU has been and essentially remains a "civilian" and "normative" power. Longo analyzes

the 2003 European security strategy and the EU's relations with Mediterranean countries to present her case. She suggests that the EU is not focusing as much (as its U.S. ally might want) on military power, because Europe has developed its own model of conflict resolution, placing more emphasis on shared values and "low politics."

Part II of the volume is dedicated to the EU and its relations with the neighborhood. Tom Casier provides an up-to-date analysis of the the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP), which, he points out, was too broad a framework to encompass the diversity of all the partner states. Consequently, the EU had to reconsider its approach and create new frameworks, such as the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) and the Eastern Partnership (EaP). The ENP represents a shift in the EU's strategy of creating stability across its borders through means other than membership conditionality. Ultimately, Casier argues, the success or failure of the ENP will be determined by the outcomes of the social learning process and the ability of the EU to consistently put forward a coherent voice when dealing with its eastern and southern neighbors.

Serena Giusti and Tomislava Penkova discuss the rather ambivalent historical relations between the EU and Russia, which oscillate between attraction and rejection. They explore how the incorrect self-perceptions of the EU and Russia vis-à-vis each other distort their relations. Giusti and Penkova also emphasize that different positions adopted by individual EU member states on Russia significantly affect the EU's foreign policy effectiveness. Russia exploits this division to its own ends. They warn that despite recent progress in its relations with Russia, the EU still holds insufficient leverage, and the eurozone crisis is diminishing the EU's impact in the neighborhood. Given Russia's geopolitical weight, this fact holds important consequences for contemporary international relations and, in particular, for transatlantic relations.

In another chapter, Serena Giusti and Tomislava Penkova examine the EU policy toward Ukraine and Belarus. In looking at these two countries and their interactions with the EU, the United States, and Russia, the authors challenge many of the conventional views on the subject. They point out that the past two years have seen many developments in the relations with the two countries. Ukraine has been less western-oriented under the presidency of Viktor Yanukovich, while the EU has failed to draw Belarus closer in its orbit and isolated it further with sanctions it imposed after the December 2010 presidential elections. Giusti and Penkova recommend that the best way to deal with the eastern neighborhood is for the EU to pragmatically and consistently engage Russia in an attempt to create a "win-win" situation for the entire region.

Siniša Rodin discusses relations with another important neighboring region: the Western Balkans. He looks at the relations between the EU and individual

countries in the region and comes to the conclusion that in institutional terms, it is the European Commission, the EU Council, and individual member states (not the high representative) that play the more significant role in the region. In other words, the Lisbon Treaty has not been successful in establishing one voice for the EU when dealing with (all) third countries. The fact that the EU's policy toward the Western Balkans is a mix of enlargement and common foreign and security policy only partly explains this situation. After providing an up-to-date overview of the EU's relations with the countries in the region, Rodin strongly advocates the future enlargement of the EU. He warns that in the absence of a new cycle of membership negotiations in the Western Balkans and with Turkey, the EU's institutional memory will be negatively affected and future enlargements will be unnecessarily delayed.

Joseph Joseph addresses one of the most contentious issues in the history of EU enlargement: the possible membership of Turkey. He points out that despite the growth in the number of EU candidate countries since 2010, Turkey continues to be a tricky case and has hardly made any progress in its accession negotiations. Aiming to provide an overview of the challenges and opportunities that Turkey presents to the EU and vice versa, he concludes that unlike two years ago, ambivalence exists on both the EU and Turkish sides. He predicts that heated debate will continue for years and concludes that accession negotiations will be not so much a matter of contention over the *acquis communautaire* but a mission of diplomatic maneuvers and negotiations.²

In a chapter about the EU and Mediterranean non-member states, Alfred Tovas returns to the mechanisms of the ENP introduced in this volume by Tom Casier. Tovas looks at a specific case: the ENP and the Arab countries of the Mediterranean basin and argues that the EU should pay special attention to this region, because with the rise of China and India, it will likely become more dependent on the Mediterranean region for the import of energy supplies. In this sense, he suggests that it is important for the EU to be more flexible and compromising with some of its short-term interests (for example, protectionism in agriculture or limited mobility) in order to achieve better and mutually beneficial relations with the neighborhood in the medium and long term. Tovas argues in favor of a rational, reasonable approach and a sober calculation of the impact of the ENP on Arab countries, as well as on the interests of the other key superpower acting in the region: the United States.

The chapter by John Peet complements Tovas's by looking at recent geopolitical trends following the Arab Spring in the wider Middle East. He suggests that until now the EU has looked at this region through a series of negative prisms determined more by domestic considerations (such as fear of instability or of illegal immigration) than by foreign policy ones. Peet praises some of the

high representative's work in the peace process efforts and concludes with some proposals on how the EU could enhance its presence in the region.

Part III of the volume discusses the relations of the EU with the other continents. The chapter by Daniel Hamilton addresses the impact of the Lisbon Treaty on transatlantic relations. He observes that both the EU and the U.S. are frustrated with the complexities of each other's institutional structure and decisionmaking arrangements and that the Lisbon Treaty has done little to address these aspects. Hamilton argues that it is in the field of "domestic politics" (for example, police and judicial cooperation and counterterrorism efforts) that the Lisbon Treaty has brought the greatest changes to EU-U.S. relations. He also points out that transatlantic relations have failed to evolve in the same rhythm as the changes taking place in the EU. Hamilton warns that in the absence of conscious efforts from both sides to preserve and enhance these relations, the nature of contemporary challenges may encourage the two sides to drift apart.

In a chapter dedicated to the EU's relations with Latin America and the Caribbean, Joaquín Roy recalls that it was only after Spain and Portugal joined the EU that relations with this region increased. Roy argues that the relationship between the EU and the region is unequal but beneficial, inasmuch as the EU is one of the biggest donors in this area and offers a model for integration. Despite contemporary internal challenges, the EU continues to be engaged, giving these countries an alternative to dealing with the United States.

The shadow of the United States is also present in Finn Laursen's chapter dedicated to EU-Canadian relations. The asymmetry favors the EU, with Canada relatively more interested in developing freer trade and greater cooperation with the EU. Laursen puts EU-Canadian relations into broader perspective, describing their development alongside and through (other) international organizations. He proposes stronger ties between Canada and the EU and decries the fact that recent trade relations have deteriorated because of disputes caused by the EU's common agricultural policy (CAP), various nontariff barriers, and fisheries policies. In the absence of more free trade ties with the EU, he warns that Canada may well shift its attention toward other regions of the globe, such as East Asia.

In his chapter dedicated to the relationship between the EU and Africa, Maurizio Carbone emphasizes that the African continent has always played a major role in European foreign relations, going back to the founding Treaty of Rome. He critically analyzes the provisions of the series of three major agreements between the EU and Africa: the Yaoundé Convention, the Lomé Convention, and the Cotonou Agreement. Carbone argues that the EU approach toward Africa has been driven by its neoliberal interests with emphasis put more on protecting its own issues (security and migration) to the detriment of those

of African countries (better aid and improved trade deals). Indeed, Carbone warns that the EU's short-sighted approach has made it lose ground and influence in the region, opening the way for other important players such as the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India, and China).

In her chapter on the EU's relations with East Asia, Philomena Murray argues that there is increasing common ground between these actors through multidimensional engagement in trade, investment, development, market access, and various aspects of foreign policy. These positive relations are determined by the EU's soft power, perceived as a beneficial alternative to the American approach. However, she warns that the EU is not perceived as a unitary and coherent actor in the region and that the recent eurozone crisis has raised further questions about the applicability of the EU model in East Asia. Murray points out that despite the region's colonial past, the EU failed to adopt a coherent approach toward the region even before the 1990s. The Treaty of Lisbon has done little to remedy this situation. Because the EU high representative, the president of the EU Council, and the president of the EU Commission all appear to be speaking for the EU internationally, this institutional complexity creates confusion. Murray argues that the EU's expectations should be realistic and that while the interest of the EU is to promote a "global Europe," East Asian countries mainly want to counterbalance U.S. influence in the region.

Mara Cairra analyzes the evolution of the EU's foreign policy with a significant power : China. She provides a historical overview of EU-Chinese relations, from the beginning of formal relations in the 1970s to the present time, when relations between the two actors appear to be driven mostly by pragmatism. She points out that EU-Chinese relations remain limited to sectoral dialogues, given the existence of areas of contention (Taiwan, Tibet, and arms embargo) and China's lack of understanding of the nature of the EU project. As in the case of the other vertical issues, the relationship between the EU and China is almost triangular, with the United States always present in the background. Cairra points out that the Treaty of Lisbon contains many potential instruments for the deepening of EU-Chinese relations, and, like other authors in the volume, she highlights the crucial role the high representative could play in the process. She suggests that the eurozone crisis has greatly impacted the EU's prestige in China, because the EU common currency had been seen here as one of the most successful results of the European integration process.

Finally, part IV presents a horizontal approach and discusses the EU's promotion of its values and models abroad. Laura Ferreira-Pereira argues that for the EU to be able to promote peace, democracy, and respect for human rights in the world, politics is not enough. In order to present itself as a model on the basis of "what the EU is" and the values it espouses, it needs to be a "model

power.” This requires the European Union to play a proactive role and to act in a consistent way at the international level.

In the following chapter, Elena Baracani compares the EU and U.S. approaches to foreign policy. She argues that “democracy promotion” lies at the heart of both actors’ foreign policy agendas and that they are united by a series of similarities. She also points out that while the United States has a long history of democratic promotion, the EU has only recently become a promoter of democracy.

In the final chapter, Federiga Bindi and Irina Angelescu summarize the findings of the various contributions to this volume and assess the present state of EU foreign policy. They concur with the general belief that the EU’s external actions are most effective when there is unity of purpose among its member states. They argue that it would be limiting to compare the foreign policy of the EU with that of nation-states, and that the EU has been most successful in its relations with third countries in the field of “low politics” (economic, judicial, and police cooperation). While the Lisbon Treaty does not make the EU look more like a state, it provides the tools for a more effective foreign policy—but the EU’s success is conditional on the common political will among member states and institutions.

Notes

1. Jan Zielonka, “Introduction—Constraints, Opportunities and Choices in European Foreign Policy,” in *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy*, edited by Jan Zielonka (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), p. 11.

2. The *acquis communautaire* is the entire body of legislation of the European Communities and Union. Applicant countries must accept the *acquis* before they can join the EU.