études contemporaines

L'Union européenne, acteur de la sécurité mondiale

Textes réunis
par Anne Deighton
et Gérard Bossuat

Soleb

Professeur Élisabeth du Réau, université Sorbonne Nouvelle-Paris III, France

Dr Marie-Pierre Rey, université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, France

Dr Linda Risso, University of Reading, UK

Dr Angela Romano, University of Padua, Italy

Georges Saunier, université de Cergy-Pontoise, France

Dr Thierry Tardy, Geneva Centre for Security Policy, Switzerland

Professor Antonio Varsori, University of Padua, Italy

Laurent Warlouzet, université Paris Sorbonne-Paris IV, France

Professor Pascaline Winand, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Dr Reuben Wong, National University of Singapore

Chaire Jean-Monnet d'histoire de l'intégration européenne de Cergy-Pontoise.

CICC (université de Cergy-Pontoise).

UMR Irice (Paris I, Paris IV, CNRS).

Groupe de liaison des professeurs d'histoire contemporaine auprès de la Commission des Communautés européennes.

L'Union européenne peut-elle, et doit-elle, disposer d'une force militaire propre ? Est-elle un acteur autonome dans les relations internationales ? Quels sont les outils dont elle dispose pour développer sa politique extérieure dans les domaines de l'économie, de la diplomatie et de la sécurité ?

Depuis 1957, date de la signature des traités de Rome, une dialectique complexe s'est créée entre les institutions communautaires et les États membres pour peser sur la scène internationale. Ce livre rassemble les analyses de plusieurs spécialistes de l'histoire des relations extérieures de l'Union européenne. Historiens, politologues ou économistes, experts dans l'aide au développement ou spécialistes des questions de sécurité livrent leurs conclusions sur l'action internationale de l'Union européenne.

Le rôle de l'Union doit évoluer dans un monde en mouvement. Les contributeurs montrent qu'en dépit de grands progrès de l'esprit communautaire, les ambiguïtés subsistent, qui empêchent l'Union et les États membres de répondre aux défis actuels des relations internationales.

ISBN 2-9523726-5-9
(français)
ISBN 2-9523726-6-7
(english)

éditions Soleb,
collection « études
contemporaines »
ISSN 1953-9118

29,90 euros

9 782952 372657
ISBN 2-9523726-5-9

éditions Soleb
5 rue Guy-de-la-Brosse
75005 Paris
www.soleb.com, livres@soleb.com

l'UE acteur de la sécurité mondiale

études contemporaines

L'Union européenne, acteur de la sécurité mondiale

Textes réunis
par Anne Deighton
et Gérard Bossuat

Soleb

contributeurs

Professor Dr Sven Biscop, Royal Institute for International Relations (IRRI-KIIB) and University of Gent, Belgium

Professeur Gérard Bossuat, université de Cergy-Pontoise, France

Dr Münevver Cebeci, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey

Dr Stephen Dearden, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK

Dr Anne Deighton, University of Oxford, UK

Dr Véronique Dimier, université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Dr Basil Germond, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, Switzerland

Dr Dimitri Grygowski, université d'Artois, France

Dr Rana Izci, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey

Dr Valsamis Mitsilegas, Queen Mary College, University of London, UK

Dr Daniel Möckli, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH Zurich), Switzerland

L'Union européenne, acteur de la sécurité mondiale

textes réunis
par Anne Deighton
et Gérard Bossuat

Soleb

« Les Communautés européennes, acteurs de la sécurité mondiale. Bilan de cinquante ans de relations extérieures », colloque organisé à l'institut d'Études de sécurité, Paris, 14-15 septembre 2006.

"The EC/EU : a World Security Actor ? An Assessment after Fifty Years of the External Actions of the EC/EU", colloquium held at the European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris, 14-15 September 2006

Colloque organisé conjointement par la chaire Jean-Monnet d'histoire de l'intégration européenne de Cergy-Pontoise, l'équipe de Recherche sur les civilisations et identités culturelles comparées des sociétés européennes et occidentales (CICC) de l'université de Cergy-Pontoise, le groupe 5 « intégration européenne » de l'UMR Irice (Paris I, Paris IV, CNRS), le groupe de liaison des professeurs d'histoire contemporaine auprès de la Commission européenne en vue de la préparation d'un colloque bilan sur « les Communauté européennes, expériences et bilan de 50 ans d'intégration européenne » en mars 2007 à Bruxelles.

éditions Soleb
5 rue Guy-de-la-Brosse
75005 Paris
www.soleb.com
livres@soleb.com

collection « études contemporaines »
ISSN 1953-9118
ISBN 2-9523726-5-9 (français)
ISBN 2-9523726-6-7 (english)

The EC/EU: a World Security Actor ?

edited by Anne Deighton and Gérard Bossuat

Soleb

sommaire

Introduction
Anne Deighton 10

EC and the Great Powers

The EC/EU and the US (1957-2006)
Antonio Varsori 24

L'URSS et l'Europe communautaire, représentations et pratiques 1957-1991
Marie-Pierre Rey 52

Forging Common EU Policies on China
Reuben Wong 70

Emergence of the EC as a foreign policy actor: institutions and structures

The Invention of EU Diplomacy: The European Commission Delegation in Washington D.C.: a "Political" Delegation from the Fifties to the 21st century
Pascaline Winand 94

The birth of a European diplomatic service: from contrôleurs-techniques to the delegates of the Commission in ACP countries
Véronique Dimier 116

Speaking with one voice? The evolution of a European foreign policy
Daniel Möckli 132

Western Europe's self-assertion towards the superpowers: the CSCE chance and its aftermath
Angela Romano 152

Emergence of the EC as a foreign policy actor: economic, political and social dimensions

The Evolution of European Union Development Policy
Stephen Dearden 172

Principles, values and EU international politics in historical context: the interplay between internal security and human rights
Valsamis Mitsilegas 188

An Environmental Experience: "Greening" the EU's External Policy
Rana Izci 224

The EU's Security Impact on Turkey: Democratization and Desecuritization
Münevver Cebeci 244

sommaire

Emergence of the EC as a foreign policy actor: security and political-military dimensions

Similar, yet so different: why the European Defence Community was not a forerunner of the ESDP
Linda Risso 264

Les enjeux de sécurité dans la politique d'élargissement des Communautés et de l'Union européenne
Élisabeth du Réau 284

The Ambiguous Ambition
The Development of the EU Security Architecture
Sven Biscop 304

La gestion des crises fait-elle de l'Union européenne un acteur de la sécurité ?
Thierry Tardy 324

The Naval and Maritime Dimension of the European Union
Basil Germond 346

Emergence of the EC as a foreign policy actor: cases studies on diplomatic and economic crises

La Commission européenne face au défi de la « Grande Europe » : la négociation de la zone de libre-échange en 1958
Laurent Warlouzet 364

La RFA et la France face aux turbulences du système monétaire international : l'Union économique et monétaire (UEM) comme exutoire, instrument de dissuasion et de négociation, 1957 à 1978
Dimitri Grygowski 382

La guerre des Malouines : réflexions sur la coopération politique européenne
Georges Saunier 402

Conclusions

Histoire et relations extérieures de la Communauté européenne
Gérard Bossuat 422

foreword

This publication and the conference which preceded it owe much to the cooperation of many people and institutions. Our thanks go to Dr Nicole Gnesotto, who, as Director of the Paris-based European Union Institute for Security Studies (http://www.iss-eu.org/), provided us with a congenial and appropriate base in the Institute in which to hold our conference. Dr. Jenny Raflik's efficient and tireless administration ensured that the complicated organisation of this international conference proceeded smoothly and pleasantly. Many of our participants received co-funding from their universities or places of work, for which we offer our thanks. The support structure of the international Groupe de liaison des professeurs d'histoire contemporaine auprès de la Commission des Communautés européennes (http://www.restena.lu/lcd/cere/uk/groupe/glinfouk.html) has ensured that our work can be seen alongside that of the other international research groups in this wider project, whose conferences and publications mark fifty years since the signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1957.

We are both very grateful to the European Commission's Jean Monnet Action; to the French institutions (CICC, centre de recherche sur les Civilisations et Identités culturelles comparées des sociétés européennes et occidentales de l'université de Cergy-Pontoise, UMR Irice de Paris-I, Paris-IV, CNRS) for funding without which this conference would not have been possible.

avant propos

La publication des actes de cette conférence internationale doit beaucoup à la coopération de nombreuses personnes et institutions. Nos remerciements vont au Dr Nicole Gnesotto qui comme directrice de l'Institut de l'Union européenne pour les études stratégiques (http://www.iss-eu.org/) nous a fourni un lieu approprié et sympathique à l'Institut où s'est tenue la conférence. Son organisation doit beaucoup au travail incessant et efficace du Dr Jenny Raflik qui a facilité son déroulement dans des conditions optimales. Beaucoup des participants ont été aidés par leur université ou leur organisation auxquelles nous exprimons nos remerciements. Le soutien du Groupe de liaison des professeurs d'histoire contemporaine auprès de la Commission des Communautés européennes (http://www.restena.lu/lcd/cere/uk/groupe/glinfouk.html) donne à nos travaux l'assurance que cette publication entre dans le plus large projet de colloques et publications qui marquent les 50 ans de la signature des traités de Rome en 1957.

Nous sommes tous deux reconnaissants à la Commission européenne (Action Jean-Monnet) et aux institutions françaises (CICC, centre de recherche sur les Civilisations et Identités culturelles comparées des sociétés européennes et occidentales de l'université de Cergy-Pontoise, UMR Irice de Paris-I, Paris-IV, CNRS) d'avoir financé cette conférence sans lesquelles elle n'aurait pas pu se tenir.

Anne Deighton

introduction

The narrative of the change in Europe's fortunes over the last century is remarkable. In 1900, the world was eurocentric. It was dominated by the European great powers with their advanced economies and their empires. By 1945, Europe was powerless, crushed by two self-inflicted and bloody wars. Germany and Europe were then both divided by an "iron curtain", creating two antagonistic blocs in one continent: one capitalist, and one dominated by marxist-leninist ideas. It was in this often insecure environment, where fear of Germany remained, but in which the two global superpowers with their ideologies and weaponry also dominated the smaller European countries, that the Treaty of Rome was signed fifty years ago by six continental West European states (France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg).

In fact, the Treaty of Rome itself had little to say about foreign policy, or about external relations beyond the scope for new trading arrangements and Association agreements. In the early 1950s, West European efforts to create a common defence and security identity (the European Defence Community) had failed, and Western Europe had only NATO and the Western European Union. There was some interest in foreign policy machinery with the Fouchet Plans of the late 1950s and early 1960s, but these also floundered by 1962.

It was not until the 1970s that a change began, and growing European self-confidence also brought developments in the activities of the European Commission. Pressures for more common external policies and institutions to reflect greater West European activity did accumulate throughout the cold war, but it was not until the period after 1989 when the pace of change accelerated dramatically and visibly.[1] Some scholars may seek unifying themes in or narratives of Community/ Union foreign policy, such as freedom, peace, prosperity, even federalism, to make the past—and perhaps the present—clearer. However, it is not possible to impose one narrative upon these developments. The past was more complicated, more incremental, more uncertain than any one label can capture. The pressures for change came sometimes from within the Brussels machine, sometimes from member states acting together, sometimes from individual states, or even from individuals. The lack of common clear aims and ambitions for the European Community project—or even of what has been called a finalité for Europe has dogged Europe's politics and some of its scholarship.

The contributions of the scholars who have contributed to this volume reveal those broad elements of the Community/Union's foreign policy that have changed since 1957. They can be briefly summarised as follows:

— **There is now more** foreign policy emanating from Brussels. The EU is more active in the international sphere than it was fifty years ago, and the last fifteen years have seen the greatest development. This is not to say that member states do "less" foreign policy, (whether this is so is not known, but it is unlikely). However, the Brussels machinery—both in the Council and in the Commission—is more extensive and visible. The High Representative, sectoral Council ministers, and the Commissioner for External Relations all have more extensive responsibilities, and the supporting Commissioners with international roles—for enlargement, trade, justice related issues, humanitarian policies, aid and development have serious and significant portfolios.

— **The scope of European Union foreign policy** is more clearly understood. The European Security Strategy has laid out a broad trajectory for the Union for the next few years. There is revived interest in, variously, the role-model; neo-imperial; and normative-based potential of the European Union as a regional and global actor. Yet, somewhat ironically, the limitations upon Union action are also better known. Many of the policy and institutional problems regarding external action have not been resolved (and the collapse of the Constitutional project has been acknowledged to have made further change more difficult).

— **The position of the Union** in relation to the great global power blocs has changed. During the Cold War, the European Community did not take a major independent role in global politics. The tools it had at its disposal were fewer, its membership was smaller, while certain member states conducted autonomous and very vigorous national policies and also opposed a greater EC presence on the international scene. There is consensus that the Union should now be counted amongst the major centres of international economic and political power. While the United States is generally still seen as the pre-eminent global power, analysts also look at the European Union as well as China, Brazil, India, and also Russia as having significant actual or potential sources of power.

— **The relationship** between the EU and other regional and international organisations has also changed. The Council of Europe and the CSCE (now OSCE) have also become more specialized, more dependent upon EU funding, and perhaps more marginal, in relation to the European Union. NATO, while still an important part of the defence profile of most EU states, is widely perceived to count for less now as the primary source of security for its members. The close relationship between the UN and the EU is supported, but the nature and significance of that link is not entirely clear.

— **Resistance to the use of military force** by the member states of the Union acting in the name of the European Union has gradually been eroded. During the cold war, Western European Union and NATO were two sources of institutional hard power beyond the state, although Western European Union was militarily impotent, and in reality served as a forum for political debate. The principal tensions that exist are now largely between the temptation—but costs—of nationalising military power back to the state level, and the increased sharing of military capabilities with the Union, although the "future of NATO" debate remains a significant one.

— **Commission and Council** have both enjoyed greater roles in policy-making and implementation. Flanking security developments that relate to the use of tools both within Pillars One and Two have increased exponentially: these include measures relating to policing, migration, as well as cross-border legal, trade, administrative, and criminal matters. Such issues were barely detectable on the radar of Community politics in the 1970s.

— **Commission funding for aid** and similar projects has increased. The Union has taken more pride and given greater public attention and funding to its humanitarian, aid and development policies. Member states' contributions also make a very significant contribution.

— **Enlargement.** The long-term commitment to enlargement has had huge and positive effects upon both existing member states and member states who have joined since 1973, and whose foreign policies have then been "Europeanised" by the Community/Union. This is as true for the big European powers, like the United Kingdom and Spain, as well as for the much smaller powers. The very process of enlargement has also obliged the Community/Union to think more carefully about what it is trying to achieve internationally. However, the sheer size and complexity of the Union itself may, without proper management, reach a point when there may be diminishing returns (relating both to Union consensus on specific policies, but also relating to efficiency and capacity) for the enlarged Union in the international sphere.

There are, within this check-list of change, two trends that at first sight appear incompatible, but which policy-makers and contemporary historians alike have had to realize, accept and operationalise. The first relates to the changing nature of foreign, and particularly security policy, and is connected both to the end of the dominant paradigm of the cold war and to forces of globalisation. These developments have resulted in a serious overstretching of the concept of "security" policy. Its meaning has been exponentially widened so that the word is almost meaningless. "Human security policy" is virtually all-inclusive and indistinguishable from "policy"—economics, personal freedom and dignity, individual rights, and environmental issues, as well as traditional military security all seem now to fall under this heading. Alongside this, it is now impossible to understand foreign or security policy as being separate (conceptually or in policy-making terms) from domestic policy. This is true for states, and the EU. Thus immigration, management of security issues like trafficking, drugs, terrorism, environmental and energy security questions cannot effectively be dealt with at the national level alone. Europe is highly interdependent between its own states, as well as with the outside world, and the new security and foreign policy reflects this truth.

However, the second observation is that states remain extremely powerful, both formally and informally, in the European Union, and here lies the great and enduring ambiguity of the Union. States can and do still disagree on major issues that touch philosophical questions: for example, the right of states to intervene militarily across national boundaries; how to react diplomatically to the use of the death penalty by third powers. They also disagree on policies affecting core national interests including the sharing of intelligence; nuclear weaponry; "special" relations with third powers; relations with ex-colonial (colonial overhang remains a potent dimension of national political cultures in many European states) or other hegemonic powers (such as Russia, for some ex-Warsaw Pact countries); as well as the sources of political accountability in foreign affairs (national or European Parliament).

This contradiction between these two truisms is the principal reason why European foreign policy has always been contested, has often been ambiguous, and will not in the short to medium term, ever be as decisive as that of a well-focused state. The fungibility between foreign and domestic policies may have the effect of creating more common ground and perhaps even solidarity between member states, even as policies affecting "abroad" are being discussed, sometimes disputed, but then formulated, and implemented. However, states will not willingly and knowingly give up completely their role in the EU system—and rightly so. This is why nearly every one of the chapters that follow deal with the state-level politics, as well as those of the Union, and this is true even in policy areas that are legally transferred under Treaty law.

Methods

The chapters that follow represent a conscious effort to bring together an international group of historians and international relations scholars, as well as political scientists, and security, economic, legal, environmental and strategic studies experts. All have worked in an historical context as far as has been possible, and have therefore sought to honour the aim of this volume to examine Community/ Union foreign policy over the fifty years since the Treaty of Rome. The editors also sought to achieve a genuinely international balance of scholars, as well as a balance between younger and more experienced scholars: the synergy at our conference was very dynamic.

Methodologically, the book reveals that difficult questions remain for international and transnational scholars of the Union—and that these questions will get more complicated as the Union grows. It is not easy to write both about state and the Union, as they are at different levels of analysis. The easy approach is national, both because archives seem to be more accessible, and also because decision-making within the Union often seems fuzzy. But a national approach cannot necessarily capture the complexity and themes of a large international institution's policies. Yet, taking a Community/ Union level analysis, it is not easy to know from where policy emerges, as Commission and Council both have strong, if often informal ties with states, or state bureaucracies as well as their own decision-making procedures. The gestation period of some policies adds more complications. Further, it is becoming increasingly clear that scholars of Community/ foreign relations, both current and in the past, need also to examine the recipients of Community/Union policies, the perceptions of those outside the Community/Union and their interaction with Europe. The task of collecting such material, over time and over space, is enormous, and quite obviously requires the application of multilingual teams of scholars, as well as the individual efforts of lone scholars. Only in this way can the different aspects of the histories of Community/ Union foreign policies in time be covered comprehensively.

Outline

The book begins with an examination of the role of the EC/EU in relation to the great powers over time. (Varsori, Rey) These two broad-brush chapters with their wide range of insights are complemented by an original inclusion—a chapter on the rising power of China in relation to the EU policies. (Wong)

The second section examines the institutions and structures of EU policy-making. The issue of representation was always, and remains a sensitive one for the EU. Even today, the member states of the Union continue to have some of their most prestigious embassies in the capital cities of other member-states, even as these same states will have common representation through joint Commission missions (often also with very powerful national links) in third countries outside the Union. (Winand, Dimier) This speaks volumes about both the structuring of EU foreign policy, the varied nature of what ambassadorial representation is actually about, and of course the economic, investment and trade competition between EU states that is part of the very fabric of the EU itself. The section continues with an examination of the broader pattern of the diplomatic and political development of the Community itself, the setting of the political activities of the major state actors, and the rise and impact of the CSCE process perceived through multinational lenses. (Moeckli, Romano)

While traditional foreign policy—whether civilian diplomacy or the threat of countervailing power—remains at the heart of foreign policy analyses, it is those new areas of external diplomacy that must also attract our attention and our scholarly examination. Development and aid policies (Dearden); and then the gradual weaving of law and justiciable matters into the fabric of EU foreign policy (Mitsilegas) are both examined in Section three: these are rarely considered alongside the more political dimensions of the Community's international role. Yet aid and development have become the two touchstones of those who construct the cultural fabric of the Union as a "normative power". Justice and governance questions and the cultural differences about perceptions of security and non-security issues also remain close to the political agenda across Europe—and never more so than in countries, like Turkey, who wish to join the EU in the future. (Cebeci) Environmental policies are another clear arena for collective, Union-wide foreign policies, as environmental issues are not naturally confined to state borders, whether they concern water, soil, chemicals or the ways in which we exploit and use our resources, and the resultant impact this has upon global warming, levels of "greenhouse gases", our carbon footprints, or radiation. (Izci) The Chernoboyl nuclear disaster was a classic case in point, as restrictions as a result of the fall out from the explosion had to be imposed upon farmers as far away as those who kept sheep on the Welsh hills.

Even as these new foreign policies questions have come to the fore, the old security issues have of course not completely gone away, although they now often appear in a different guise, as the fourth section reveals. During the early cold war, fear about the capacity of West Germany—the old foe—to use force was still extraordinarily raw, and this was with some good reason given the losses of World War II. Yet this perspective upon the European great power equation has subtly changed over time. Issues about the use of force present different challenges over time as the papers in this section show. (Risso) The old questions of territorial integrity and defence have dramatically receded—although the NATO guarantees were of great importance to those countries who were making a bid for double membership of NATO and the EU in the 1990s, all of which gave great leverage to the EU and NATO on security issues as the complex enlargement negotiations progressed through the 1990s and early years of the 21st century. (du Réau)

Today, voluntary interventions to restore order and security in non-EU states have acquired a huge significance, resulting in the development of the European Security and Defence Policy with its accompanying administrative and management structures and consequent debates on the exercise of this power in a multilateral world of which the EU is a part. (Biscop, Tardy) Indeed, one might even glimpse a hint of neo-colonial activity in the multilateral governance and government reconstruction schemes as are under way in the Balkans. Yet, at the same time, traditional mechanisms for power projection—in particular navies—also require reconfiguration at the European level to meet specific, sometimes low-level, but often dangerous types of security challenge that a globalising world has generated. (Germond)

The last section provides archivally-based accounts of three different types of crisis with which West Europeans have had to deal during the cold war. Two economic chapters, with their different levels of analysis—Commission, and nation-state levels—reveal the complexity of international economic diplomacy within Western Europe. They show the constraints and pressures upon those seeking to invent new economic mechanisms within the European framework, whether over the free trade area, or European Monetary politics. (Warlouzet, Grigowsky). The tensions generated by state initiatives in an environment of European political cooperation is likewise highlighted by analysis of the Falklands war. (Saunier)

Conclusion

The powerlessness of Europe in 1945 has largely disappeared; but the pre-First World War culture of eurocentricity still carries echoes into the 21st century. The path back to Europe's recovery and repositioning in the international system over the past fifty years has been uncertain and sometimes hesitant, as this volume shows. The Union has adapted to many changing priorities thus far, but, like any large international organisation, is slow, often contradictory and cumbersome, and frequently at the mercy of its strongest member-states. And, most important, there is still considerable uncertainty about how Europeans see the culture, nature of the EU, and its role EU in the world.

One crucial question is to know which are the ways in which the EU can and should exercise its international role in a way that captures the consent and as well as the global imagination of its citizens. Most people would say that Europe is now largely territorially secure. Yet if we take the wider definition of security—embracing human and personal security, to many EU citizens the margins between security and insecurity seem very narrow. As the EU takes on the challenge of risk assessment for these new security areas—environment, energy, terror, immigration, drug running—expectations are high that it should both deliver this security within the Union itself, yet also deliver security—especially the basic security requirement such as life, water, food, and even order—beyond its borders. Why the Union should fulfil this latter imperative, and how it should do it is the stuff of politicians' and policy-makers' discourse and decision both at the national and the Union level.

By the same token, bipolarity has vanished, but do we envisage the rise of a new multipolarity (or even a new bipolarity) between great states and great international organisations like the EU, and the UN? What and where is the competition to the Union, and who are its natural allies? Does the Union itself have the cohesion to act consistently as a global strategic actor? Can such multipolarity actually be constructed and effected without the disasters that accompanied the rise of new powers at the beginning of the Twentieth Century? These are the principal questions which historians, politicians, and hopefully, the global statespeople of the twenty-first century now have to grasp.

---

[1] There is still a notional distinction made between the different aspects of the Community/ Union's presence in the world. External relations was intended to cover the work of the European Commission, carried through under the legal framework of the Treaty of Rome, and concentrating largely upon trade, and aid. Foreign policy is conducted through the so-called Second, intergovernmental Pillar in which the member states play the dominant role, and with mechanisms created under what was called European Political Cooperation, now called the Common Foreign and Security Policy. It is out of this Second Pillar that the European Security and Defence Policy has been developed. However, in practise the divisions are far less clear, especially in areas in which the remit of the Pillars overlaps, Anne Deighton and Victor Mauer (eds), *Securing Europe? Implementing the European Security Strategy*, (Zurich: ETH, 2006, www.css.ethz.ch/publications). I am very grateful to Tobias Lenz for comments on this introduction.