EUROPEAN COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
ecfr.eu

POLICY BRIEF

THE CASE FOR CO-OPERATION IN CRISIS MANAGEMENT

Richard Gowan

SUMMARY

As a series of crises break out across North Africa and the Middle East and the financial crisis puts Western defence budgets under strain, it is becoming increasingly important for the European Union (EU) to pursue a joined-up approach to crisis management operations and in particular to work with other organisations. The EU already relies on the United Nations and the African Union to manage civil wars in cases such as Somalia and there are also new potential partners such as the Arab League and ASEAN. Although the EU has devoted time and effort to building up its own security structures over the last decade, it may now find it more cost-effective and politically expedient to prioritise helping others manage looming threats.

However, this does not mean that Europe's Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) is now irrelevant. Instead, the EU should make CSDP missions more flexible and integrate them into the efforts of other organisations. The new European External Action Service (EEAS) should think about how to utilise the network of EU delegations to get help to the UN and other partners more effectively. Finally, European officials should consider making strategic investments in sharing ideas and lessons from the EU's past experience in crisis management with with organizations like the Arab League that have begun to experiment with crisis management but still struggle to mount effective interventions.

A new generation of civil wars and humanitarian crises is emerging along Europe's southern flank. In the last six months, the Syrian crisis has claimed thousands of lives, rebels linked to Al-Qaeda have seized northern Mali, and Sudan and South Sudan have stumbled towards civil war. Meanwhile, post-war Libya remains fragile and Islamist forces control large parts of Somalia, while pirates continue to operate from Somali waters as far as India and the Seychelles. Civil disorder persists in Egypt and Yemen.

It is not clear that the European Union (EU) has the resources or political energy to handle all of these crises at a time when its leaders are absorbed in economic issues and NATO is focused on exiting Afghanistan. None of them presents a conventional threat to Europe but each could damage Europe's security and interests. An Islamist bridgehead in Somalia or Mali offers a base for terrorists and the pirates in the Indian Ocean have disrupted busy trade routes. If Syria collapses or President Bashar al-Assad holds on to power, the EU's tenuous influence in the Middle East will be severely damaged. Conflicts in North Africa not only create the risk of mass atrocities but can also drive refugees across the Mediterranean into Europe.

European governments' financial preoccupations have not rendered them completely impotent in the face of these challenges, as the Libyan campaign demonstrated. EU and NATO vessels have had some success in combating Somali piracy. In Brussels, the European External Action Service (EEAS) has pulled together detailed regional strategies

for dealing with security challenges in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel states (Mali, Mauritania and Niger). In this context the EU is preparing civilian Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions to guide police reform in the Sahel and boost the coast guards of East African states. It has even approved a CSDP mission "to support airport security in South Sudan". But getting these missions off the ground has dragged out painfully: while EU planners have taken months refining their options in the Sahel, Islamists have consolidated their grip on the north of Mali while the army mounted a coup in the south.

Europe's ambitions are limited by economic pressures and intervention fatigue. While the EU restricts itself to small CSDP missions, other organisations are putting far greater numbers of personnel on the front line in emerging conflicts. The UN has nearly 40,000 personnel in the two Sudans (including Darfur). The African Union (AU) has 15,000 troops in Somalia: its forces have engaged in street-to-street fighting with Islamists in Mogadishu, and won. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has proposed sending 3,000 troops to Mali. First the Arab League and more recently the UN have deployed observers to Syria, if with very limited effect on the growing chaos there.

So while Europe confronts a multitude of threats along its southern flank, it also has a multitude of potential partners. Although these partners lack advanced military capabilities that come as standard in NATO and EU operations, Europe may have to rely on the UN and African and Arab soldiers and diplomats to contain the current wave of crises.

The EU has always co-operated closely with other multilateral organisations – and the UN in particular – on crisis management, and played a crucial role in funding their efforts. But Europe's contributions have often been treated as altruistic, largely humanitarian gestures.

Now, however, the case for co-operation is more clearly rooted in Europe's own interests – and the EU should improve its mechanisms for working with others accordingly. This paper focuses on how the new European External Action Service (EEAS), and CSDP mechanisms in particular, can be harnessed more effectively to assist other organisations. It argues that three trends will define Europe's contribution to crisis management in the next decade:

1. The rise of "plug and play" peace operations: in future, military and civilian crisis management will not involve large-scale, centralised operations like that in Afghanistan. Instead, loose coalitions of international and regional organisations – including the EU – will bring their different assets together on an ad hoc basis with decentralised command structures, as is currently the case in Somalia.

2. A focus on "good enough" stability and security: whereas the EU has often aimed to instill long-term stability in cases such as Bosnia and Kosovo through justice and police reform, financial and strategic pressures will lead to lower ambitions. In future crises, as now in Syria, the goal will be to create short-term calm and open up sufficient political space for local power brokers to negotiate, not to transform whole societies.

3. Unashamed "leading from behind": given the economic strains inside the EU, and the growing challenges to its legitimacy as an actor in regions including Africa and Asia, European policy will increasingly focus on helping other actors manage conflicts rather than trying to deploy an EU-flagged crisis management mission every time.

Although the EU's current focus is on North Africa and the Middle East, it may also become necessary to develop security partnerships with regional organisations in other strategically sensitive areas, such as ASEAN in South-East Asia. While EU member states have devoted time and energy to developing a European security identity over the last decade – an effort that remains politically contentious – the EU's major contributions to security in the next five years may be channelled through others as international power dynamics and threats shift and evolve.

The EU's dual challenge

The EU's contributions to conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict reconstruction have long been closely connected to the operations and diplomacy of other organisations. More than two thirds of EU peacekeepers have been deployed alongside a UN or NATO mission or peacekeepers authorised by a regional organisation such as the AU. The European Commission and EU member states are leading humanitarian donors to the UN, the International Committee of the Red Cross and NGOs – and nearly 75 percent of all humanitarian aid goes to countries affected by conflict.[1] The EU also provides funding for peace-building projects and – through the African Peace Facility (APF) – has played a central role in enabling the AU to take on peace operations in the last decade.

As ECFR's recent Foreign Policy Scorecard notes, many of the EU's most effective conflict management policies involve co-operation with the UN and other multilateral bodies, or "indirect support to peace operations run by other organisations rather than direct interventions".[2] But the nature of the global framework for conflict management

1 European support to UN humanitarian and peacebuilding efforts is discussed at greater length in Sven Biscop and Richard Whitman, "The UN and European Strategy", in *The Routledge Handbook of European Security* (London: Routledge, 2012). Many of this paper's references to previous EU missions are derived from Giovanni Grevi, Damien Helly and Daniel Keohane (eds.), "European Security and Defence Policy: The First 10 Years", EUISS, 2009, and from Daniel Korski and Richard Gowan, "Can the EU Rebuild Failing States? A Review of Europe's Civilian Capacities", European Council on Foreign Relations, October 2009.

2 "European Foreign Policy Scorecard 2012", European Council on Foreign Relations, January 2012, p. 113.

is changing as the US revises its security posture – with a greater emphasis on air and sea operations in the Pacific – and new actors take on increasing responsibility. The last year has seen the Arab League launch its first peace operation since the 1970s in Syria, while ASEAN mandated Indonesian observers to patrol the Thai-Cambodian border.[3] Yet these new actors in crisis management often lack mechanisms to launch effective operations. The Arab League's mission in Syria was a widely-derided mess while the deployment of ASEAN's monitors has repeatedly been delayed. Meanwhile, some the EU's established partners in crisis management – the UN and the AU – are facing resource constraints despite continuing to run large-scale operations, while NATO is trying to work out how to retreat from its role in Afghanistan without leaving chaos in its wake.[4]

The EU has a huge amount to offer other organisations dealing with crisis management. Yet interactions with these partners have often been hampered by the complexity of the EU's institutions. The problem of "stove-piping" that affects the EU's ability to craft coherent strategies of its own, with multiple chains of command and decision-making mechanisms, is reflected in its dealings with others over specific crises. The consolidation of the EEAS – and especially its delegations in countries affected by conflict – offers opportunities to strengthen the EU's partnerships, although persistent gaps between the new service and the European Commission continue to complicate matters.

The EU now faces a dual challenge. It must develop strategies and concepts that allow it to work better with others in a changing international environment; and it needs to ensure that its own structures and rules of procedure allow it to meet its strategic commitments, especially when put to the test by intense crises.

The changing nature of crisis management

This effort to reposition EU crisis management needs to reflect broader changes in how other organisations respond to crises. Since the launch of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in 1999, the EU has deployed relatively small military and civilian missions in support of (or to take over from) large-scale operations mounted by other organisations. These larger framework operations have included the NATO forces in Afghanistan and Bosnia and the UN mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). They have also provided a framework for broader European projects in support of security, good governance and democracy. In the 2000s, for example, the European Commission played an important role working with the UN to mount post-conflict elections in cases including not only the DRC but also Iraq.

In this context, EU missions have contributed to a grand narrative of stabilisation and state-building, accepted in most Western capitals at least, by which crisis management has involved (i) significant international security forces acting as platforms for (ii) democratisation processes and (iii) the utilisation of development aid to build up state structures and stop post-conflict countries returning to violence.

The EU and its member states have contributed to this model of crisis management in many ways. The EU's contributions have often followed the "Bosnia template", by which the union deploys police or civilian missions to manage the long-term reform of a country's security structures after NATO or the UN have managed to create at least minimal stability. [5] Where military CSDP missions have deployed, they have often followed the "Artemis model" (based on a rapid and effective EU deployment to the DRC in 2003) of discrete short-term assistance to back up UN forces.[6]

In some cases, however, the EU has provided a more sophisticated mix of support, as when it deployed a military mission to Chad in 2008 and the European Commission launched a package of financial aid to help the UN build up Chadian police capacities and maximise humanitarian relief efforts. Operation Atalanta off the coast of Somalia is a third example of a complex, multi-pronged intervention which involves the protection of World Food Programme convoys and is co-ordinated with support to the African Union's military mission to Somalia (AMISOM).

However, the grand narrative of state-building is now breaking down for three reasons. Firstly, experience in cases including Afghanistan and the DRC has bred pessimism about whether states can be built at all. Secondly, the financial crisis has placed constraints on all organisations' ability to sustain large-scale operations. Thirdly, growing political differences between organisations (such as EU–AU splits over how to deal with Côte d'Ivoire and Libya in 2011) and within them (as in recent UN Security Council debates over Syria) may place limits on what large-scale missions will be able to achieve in future.

In this context, an alternative model for crisis management is emerging. In contrast to the old paradigm, there is a growing emphasis on exploring what can be achieved with (i) limited commitments of ground forces; (ii) a focus on achieving "good enough" political compromises and institutional reforms in conflict-affected states; and (iii) a more flexible approach to the design, sustainment and command of crisis management operations.

3 The Arab League mission was deployed in December 2011 and was suspended at the end of January. In the 1970s the League deployed a (largely Syrian) peacekeeping force in Lebanon.

4 The Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, a regular partner for the EU in the Balkans and Central Asia, is also increasingly hamstrung by political differences between Russia and the West.

5 Daniel Korski and Richard Gowan, "Can the EU Rebuild Failing States? A Review of Europe's Civilian Capacities", European Council on Foreign Relations, 2009, pp. 27–29.

6 Richard Gowan, "From Rapid Reaction to Delayed Inaction? Congo, the UN and the EU", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 18, No. 5 (2011), pp. 603–604.

Examples of the new era of crisis management include:

- **Somalia**, where AU ground forces are supported by a UN logistics operation and a separate UN political mission, while an EU CSDP mission trains Somali forces outside the country. EU, NATO and other vessels conduct anti-piracy operations offshore and a further EU presence (euphoniously entitled "Nestor") is being prepared to help Somalia and its neighbours combat piracy more effectively themselves.

- **Libya**, where the NATO military campaign was accompanied by AU and UN mediation efforts, and the UN deployed a political mission to assist the post-war transition. The EU has been working on a civilian mission to help secure Libya's borders, although this has repeatedly been held up by security concerns.

- **Syria**, where the Arab League deployed an ill-conceived observer mission in December 2011 (while UN human right officials separately monitored the situation), prior to the deployment of the UN Supervision Mission in Syria (UNSMIS) in April 2012. The EU has used sanctions to put pressure on Damascus, and there is recurrent talk of some sort of UN–Arab League hybrid peacekeeping force in the future.

These cases do not prove (contrary to some analyses) that large-scale, centralized peacekeeping operations are obsolete. There are cases in which significant military forces remain crucial, such as Liberia and the DRC. Had the UN not already had troops in Côte d'Ivoire in 2010, the crisis there could have been uncontrollable. In the case of South Sudan, the Security Council has arguably erred by approving far too small a UN force to keep order in a very weak state.

However, in the near term, the EU will need to adapt to increasingly complex and fluid security environments. It will be necessary to deploy CSDP missions in conditions complicated by three factors. These are (i) a proliferation of organisational presences, many of them authorised by entities with limited experience of crisis management (such as the Arab League); (ii) the absence of consistent or clear grand narratives around state-building and democratisation; and (iii) continued financial constraints on the EU's efforts.

Where will crisis management operations be needed?

Given this confusing global context, it is hard to predict exactly what types of crisis management activities will be required in what regions in the years ahead. However, it is probable that at least three regions will be priorities for crisis management operations as a whole in the next five to 10 years.

In Africa, as this paper has already argued, there will be a continued emphasis on ongoing crises (i.e. Somalia and both Sudans). But there will also be "legacy" state-building projects in post-conflict states that have been stabilised by the UN and AU, sometimes with EU help over the last decade (i.e. the DRC, West African states and Burundi). There is also an outside risk that a large African state (i.e. Nigeria or Egypt) will face state collapse.

The Middle East presents an unpredictable set of crisis management challenges. It is probable that countries such as Libya and Syria may require extended support in the years ahead. Other countries in the region (i.e. Yemen and Iraq) will also need help, as will the Occupied Palestinian Territories.

The future shape of crisis management in Asia and the Pacific is uncertain, not least because China, India and other powers in the region are suspicious of multilateral engagement on their peripheries. However, there may be crises in cases from Nepal and Fiji (fairly "classic" small fragile states) to North Korea and Pakistan (cases that overawe the hardest-headed state-building experts).

It should be added that the EU will likely remain committed to maintaining stability in two cases which it has prioritised previously: the Balkans – where recent disturbances in Kosovo have emphasised the potential for further trouble – and Afghanistan. Although NATO and the EU are committed to continue operations in Afghanistan until 2014, there will be persistent calls for European powers to maintain civilian (or at least financial support) to Kabul for a much longer period of time. This is a divisive issue among European governments, many – perhaps most – of which fear that Afghanistan is already lost.

If these are probable priorities for crisis management, who will the crisis managers be? It is probable that, apart from the EU, the UN and the AU will continue to be major players. The UN is currently the most widely deployed peacekeeping organisation, with 100,000 troops and police worldwide, and it will face the challenge of guiding countries such as Côte d'Ivoire towards long-term stability for many years yet. However, the UN will have to adapt to meet the new model of "good enough" state-building described above: the organisation is already addressing ways of balancing "heavy" blue helmet operations like that in Liberia with lighter-weight political missions such as that in Libya. The UN Secretariat has been working hard to retool its capacities to

mount both heavy and light missions, developing not only a new global logistics strategy but also systems for recruiting and deploying civilian crisis managers in a more timely and rapid manner.

NATO is also undergoing profound changes as it readies itself to withdraw from Afghanistan. Its engagements in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan were symptomatic of the grand narrative about nation-building described above. Yet the Libyan campaign saw the alliance use force in a more calibrated – if extended – manner and avoid becoming drawn into a long-term ground operation. It is not clear whether future NATO operations (inevitably affected by European military cuts) will follow the Balkan template or the Libyan model.

The AU's future trajectory is also unclear. In Darfur the organisation's well-intentioned effort at military peacekeeping went badly awry. But in Somalia it has turned round an apparently doomed mission – with a great deal of external assistance – but only because AU forces have been ready to fight a war against Islamist forces. It is not clear how long the organisation will tolerate such risks. Meanwhile, AU officials have begun to highlight their preference for mediation over peacekeeping.

In West Africa by contrast, ECOWAS – which launched a series of peace operations to countries including Sierra Leone and Liberia in the 1990s and early 2000s – is moving towards a new era of military deployments. It considered deploying forces to Côte d'Ivoire in 2011, and has declared its readiness to send troops to Mali and Guinea-Bissau this year. Nigeria, the regional leader, has often favoured a tough military approach to crisis management.

While the AU, the UN and ECOWAS have established track records in peace operations, other potential future players in the field have to define their role in crisis management in an ad hoc fashion. ASEAN, for example, has been very cautious about engaging in peace operations – although ASEAN members co-operated with the EU in Aceh in 2005–2006 – but the organisation was drawn into monitoring the Thai-Cambodian border dispute. A year ago, it seemed unlikely that the Arab League would deploy a crisis management operation, yet it was compelled to do so in Syria.

It is possible that there will be other strategic surprises for multilateral and regional organisations in the near future. Qatar and Saudi Arabia have, for example, suggested deploying Arab troops to Syria and it is conceivable that the Arab League could find itself in charge of a military deployment long before it is ready to do so. Meanwhile, the Collective Security Treaty Organisation – which failed to act during the 2010 Kyrgyz crisis – has agreed to set up a 4,000-strong peacekeeping force for regional and UN-mandated missions.[7] The landscape of international crisis management could look very different indeed five years from now.

The EU's limitations

In responding to this proliferation of crises and partners, there is a temptation for the EU to try to be every other organisation's best friend, but it will need to be selective in how it applies its tools if it is to maintain its resources effectively. Yet while many factors will push the EU to be cautious in its use of resources, it should also be ambitious in its efforts to assist new players become more effective crisis managers while sustaining established allies. Just as EU support was instrumental in developing AU peacekeeping, the EU could play a role in building up new actors such as the Arab League and ASEAN. Simultaneously, it can recalibrate its interactions with actors such as the UN, NATO and the AU as they reform themselves – especially as they can take on crises that the EU cannot handle alone.

In outlining the future of EU crisis management, it is necessary to distinguish between "demand" factors and "supply" factors. Demand factors include basic operational issues: where do organizations such as the UN lack specialized assets and personnel, such as helicopters and engineering companies, that the EU's members can offer? But there is also a political dimension: where is the EU a welcome and legitimate partner?

In recent years, for example, African governments have been increasingly frank about their doubts about European policy on the continent (especially over issues such as the role of the International Criminal Court in pursuing African leaders) and it is conceivable that this opposition will delegitimise future CSDP missions in Africa. Similarly, the proposal for an EU operation in Libya last year was clearly complicated by NATO's ongoing campaign there, and there was never any suggestion that EU rather than Arab League and UN observers should deploy to Syria. In spite of the EU mission in Aceh, there are few parts of Asia and the Pacific where the EU could lead a mission with full legitimacy.

However, supply factors also place significant limits on what the EU can achieve. Since the start of the financial crisis, proposals for CSDP missions have received a tough hearing from the European Council. As Nick Witney has underlined, the liberal interventionist logic for European crisis management has lost momentum.[8] In this context, it is likely that three considerations will affect decision-making on future EU policy: (i) a clearer definition of where crisis management meets specific European interests; (ii) the availability of credible international partners with which to manage the crisis; and (iii) a judgment on whether the cost of the initiative is affordable, and whether other actors will help bear the expenses.

---

7 See Center on International Cooperation, *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2012*, p. 107.
8 Nick Witney, "How to Stop the Demilitarisation of Europe", European Council on Foreign Relations, November 2011, p. 4.

These considerations have already resulted in a marginalization of CSDP in European policy debates. And there will an emphasis within the EU on harnessing existing resources – not least the development budget – to cover the costs of building up security. Politically, the EU's limited legitimacy means that it will often make sense to (in a phrase that has become politically poisonous in the US but still has merit) "lead from behind" and focus on helping other organisations rather than insisting on mounting autonomous EU responses to new crises.

How to strengthen the EU's role in multilateral crisis management

With these limitations in mind, the EU can co-operate with partners in crisis management in three ways: (i) civilian crisis management, including both CSDP-based options and alternatives; (ii) military crisis management; and (iii) support to help other actors improve their own capacities.

Civilian crisis management

The EU's options for collaborative civilian crisis management involve both CSDP-based options and alternatives making use of new EEAS structures. EU civilian crisis management never solely relied on autonomous ESDP/CSDP missions. The European Commission previously provided the economic pillar on the UN-led Interim Administration in Kosovo, and took on oversight of police training in Albania and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (in the latter case as a follow-on to an ESDP presence) in addition to managing significant quantities of conflict-related programming in cases such as Afghanistan. There is no reason that the EEAS and the European Commission should not continue to build upon this tradition of conflict-related activities in tandem with other actors (if, that is, they can overcome the institutional divisions that continue to undermine co-operation in Brussels).

As noted above, even where autonomous civilian CSDP missions have deployed they have often worked very closely with organisations such as the UN to achieve their goals. In the DRC case, small civilian teams have dealt with police training and security sector reform under the UN security umbrella, and often making use of UN assets such as helicopters. In Darfur, a contingent of EU police personnel – plus some military staff – worked within AU structures. In the case of the Aceh monitoring mission, the EU oversaw a civilian presence partly staffed by personnel from ASEAN member states – while the EU offered sound administrative structures, the Asian personnel added their legitimacy and knowledge. There is now a growing emphasis on further developing this "plug-and-play" approach to civilian crisis management, by which the EU either plugs distinct EU modules into operations run by others or provides an EU framework for a mission to which others can play a significant role. For example:

- a team of governance or border management experts could be deployed in a UN operation for a fixed term, with a clear EU mandate, identity and funding, while answering to the UN head of mission. This option could allow the EU to achieve targeted goals: EU member states could deploy experts on organised crime in a region such as West Africa under the UN's political aegis.

- a team of EU specialists could provide logistics or administrative support to political staff deployed by a less well-prepared organisation such as the Arab League in a new mission. In this case the EU would have overall technical responsibility but might share political responsibility.

- parallel, organisationally autonomous civilian missions by the EU and another organisation, such as NATO, could be overseen by a joint strategic cell that could agree on the division of responsibilities.

Options for modular EU support to the UN have already been discussed by the Political and Security Committee, while the EEAS is currently exploring better ways to align its civilian capacities with NATO's. However, as the EU's previous experience with the AU and ASEAN suggests, potential future arrangements with a full range of organisational partners need to be considered. It is also necessary for the EEAS and the European Commission to consider how they can provide support to other organisations in the absence of a CSDP mission.

Would it be possible, for example, for a UN mission to request an existing EU delegation in a country where peacekeepers are deployed to provide advice on a range of specific security and/or governance issues to a government or to act as a conduit and hub for security-related programming based on an overall UN strategy? Might it be possible to attach short-term police or security sector reform teams to EU delegations? Could the head of a delegation be designated as the primary liaison and broker between the UN and the Brussels institutions, centralising discussions of how European funding can support UN activities?

Military crisis management

While deploying civilian CSDP modules and adapting EU delegations to support other organisations both involve complications, adapting *military* CSDP deployments to meet current realities is of necessity harder. In the past, European militaries have distinguished between EU contingents deployed to operate under UN command (as in Lebanon) and those under EU command working alongside the UN (as in the DRC in 2003 and 2006). Blurring the distinction between these two types of deployment is extremely complicated, and not necessarily conducive to effective operations.

However, there are cases in which specialised "CSDP military modules" could deploy to assist the UN or another organisation achieve fixed goals, but with a separate chain of command. For example:

- in a case where the UN or the AU is deploying a new operation, the EU could send an autonomous engineering mission with orders to construct necessary camps and other military infrastructure. This would be a time-limited operation with a sharply defined set of tasks, reducing worries about costs and mission creep. The EU could also deploy distinct assets, such as a field hospital, to assist a UN, AU or other force.

- in a case where – as, recently, in Libya – the presence of chemical or biological weapons is a concern for the UN, the EU could send a dedicated team of military WMD specialists to help secure and disarm the stockpiles. Again, they could maintain their own chain of command.

- although the debate about how to utilise the EU Battlegroups is ongoing, one option would be to use them to provide temporary security to UN, AU or other civilian political staff deploying into unstable environments. The EU mandated a mission of this type to assist humanitarian workers in Libya last year, although it was never deployed.

One obstacle to the EU deploying military CSDP modules would be the complexity of getting clearance from the European Council in a timely fashion – many of the tasks described above require rapid response. But such mandates are not always necessary. The EU Movement Planning Cell (EUMPC, part of the EU Military Staff) has previously played a useful co-ordinating role in identifying and co-ordinating member states' military assets to help UN humanitarian operations in cases such as the 2010 Pakistan floods. This was, of course, justified by co-ordination with European Commission humanitarian officials. Could the European Council agree to let the EUMPC play a similar role in, for example, co-ordinating the rapid transport of personnel and basic equipment of a UN political team or a regional organisation's human rights observers into theatre?

Increasing the readiness of others

While there are many ways that the EU can use its military and civilian tools to assist partner organisations, it is also important that it continues to transfer knowledge and lessons learned to others. As noted above, the EU has a potentially important role to play in assisting organisations such as ASEAN and the Arab League to develop their crisis management capacities, just as it has helped the AU before. It should work closely with the UN and other organisations that are also providing this sort of support. Options for co-operation run from simple mechanisms to build expertise to much larger investments. For example:

- the EEAS could run a "Crisis Management Scholarship" scheme, by which EEAS staff in Arab and Asian countries could identify potential leaders of future missions for training in Europe. The EU Security and Defence College has already devoted time to working with partners, which can be increased.

- European personnel with experience of CSDP operations in cases such as Afghanistan and Kosovo could organise training and operational simulations in Jakarta, Qatar and other centres.

- the EU could develop a basic stockpile of equipment – 4x4 vehicles, basic communications kit, etc. – to loan to other organisations undertaking rapid civilian deployments in emergencies.

- following the model of the African Peace Facility, the EU could set aside a fund to support non-military crisis management operations and associated training by regional organisations, either in general or with a specific focus (an Arab Peace Facility, for example) to help new crisis managers emerge.

Ultimately, such co-operation may lead to networks of crisis managers better-equipped to handle future crises with the EU. Such networks may offer a framework for a new era of innovative CSDP operations.

Concrete steps

What concrete steps can the EEAS, the European Commission and EU member states take to strengthen co-operation with their partners in crisis management? There is a need for a mix of conceptual steps – to build consensus for co-operation – and "learning by doing", to see what will work on the ground. For example:

- the European Council's Political and Security Committee (PSC) should request the officials responsible for CSDP, along with other relevant elements of the EEAS and the European Commission to undertake a global assessment of partner organisations' gaps and needs in civilian crisis management, and how the CSDP "modules" could address these. Much of the assessment could take place on the basis of existing studies conducted by partner organisations themselves – such as the UN's recent review of its civilian deployment mechanisms – with added analysis on concrete options for EU/CSDP support.

- in co-ordination with the relevant European Commissioners, the High Representative for Foreign Affairs should identify three or four "test cases" for boosting EU delegations' support to UN and other peace operations. In these test cases, the heads of delegation should be tasked with playing an enhanced

broker role, identifying ways in which the delegation can work on governance/security issues with a government, thereby taking pressure off a UN/other peace operation in fulfilling its mandate.

- the PSC should request the EUMPC to conduct a study on options for co-ordinating emergency lift support to peace operations mounted by other organisations. This could draw on the EUMPC's experience in co-ordinating humanitarian lift, as well as earlier lift support for the AU in Darfur.

- in order to identify options for support to emerging crisis management actors, EEAS officials dealing with CSDP issues should offer to organise lessons-learning exercises with the Arab League and ASEAN on recent crises. To reduce potential sensitivities around these sessions, UN peacekeeping officials could co-host, or a third-party think-tank (such as the Center for International Peace Operations (ZIF) in Berlin) could take formal responsibility for the discussions.

- the High Representative should commission a scoping study on options for an "Arab Peace Facility" as a counterpart to the African Peace Facility, and possible alternatives. This study could also cover other options noted above, such as an EU-managed stockpile of equipment available to crisis management operations launched by other organisations.

- The European Security and Defence College should work with the relevant regional directorates of the EEAS to discuss the possibility of a "crisis management scholarship scheme" backed by EU delegations in Asia, Africa and elsewhere.

The proposals outlined above are all deliberately limited and careful steps. The EU's financial and political constraints mean that this is not the time to launch grandiose new security initiatives. But by strengthening the EU's web of partnerships with the UN and regional organisations, the EEAS can help bring resources to bear on crises that directly threaten European interests. If the EU cannot manage all these crises alone, it can at least play a significant role in enabling others to take the lead in doing so.

This inevitably involves compromises and frictions: European officials will sometimes disagree with the strategies that the UN or the AU takes, for example, and African and Arab leaders will not take orders from Brussels. But with new dangers emerging along Europe's southern flank and further afield, perfectionism is not an option. Instead, the EU has to what it can with its constrained resources to manage crises as they arise through whatever channels are available. In crisis management – as in many other policy areas – the EU needs all the friends it can get.

Acknowledgements

A version of this paper was originally presented at the conference jointly organised by ECFR and the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 'Ensuring a Comprehensive EU Approach to Crises. Readiness, Response and Recovery' on 28th February 2012. Nick Witney gave very helpful advice on both the original and final versions. Olivier de France, Hans Kundnani and Alba Lamberti provided useful comments on the final text, as did a number of officials from relevant governments and organisations.

About the author

Richard Gowan is a senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations. He is also associate director for crisis diplomacy and peace operations at New York University's Center on International Cooperation.

ABOUT ECFR

The **European Council on Foreign Relations** (ECFR) is the first pan-European think-tank. Launched in October 2007, its objective is to conduct research and promote informed debate across Europe on the development of coherent, effective and values-based European foreign policy.

ECFR has developed a strategy with three distinctive elements that define its activities:

- **A pan-European Council.** ECFR has brought together a distinguished Council of over one hundred Members - politicians, decision makers, thinkers and business people from the EU's member states and candidate countries - which meets once a year as a full body. Through geographical and thematic task forces, members provide ECFR staff with advice and feedback on policy ideas and help with ECFR's activities within their own countries. The Council is chaired by Martti Ahtisaari, Joschka Fischer and Mabel van Oranje.

- **A physical presence in the main EU member states.** ECFR, uniquely among European think-tanks, has offices in Berlin, London, Madrid, Paris, Rome, Sofia and Warsaw. In the future ECFR plans to open an office in Brussels. Our offices are platforms for research, debate, advocacy and communications.

- **A distinctive research and policy development process.** ECFR has brought together a team of distinguished researchers and practitioners from all over Europe to advance its objectives through innovative projects with a pan-European focus. ECFR's activities include primary research, publication of policy reports, private meetings and public debates, 'friends of ECFR' gatherings in EU capitals and outreach to strategic media outlets.

ECFR is backed by the Soros Foundations Network, the Spanish foundation FRIDE (La Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior), the Bulgarian Communitas Foundation, the Italian UniCredit group, the Stiftung Mercator and Steven Heinz. ECFR works in partnership with other organisations but does not make grants to individuals or institutions.

www.ecfr.eu

Among members of the European Council on Foreign Relations are former prime ministers, presidents, European commissioners, current and former parliamentarians and ministers, public intellectuals, business leaders, activists and cultural figures from the EU member states and candidate countries.

Asger Aamund (Denmark)
President and CEO, A. J. Aamund A/S and Chairman of Bavarian Nordic A/S

Urban Ahlin (Sweden)
Deputy Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and foreign policy spokesperson for the Social Democratic Party

Martti Ahtisaari (Finland)
Chairman of the Board, Crisis Management Initiative; former President

Giuliano Amato (Italy)
Former Prime Minister; Chairman, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna; Chairman, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani; Chairman, Centro Studi Americani

Gustavo de Aristegui (Spain)
Diplomat; former Member of Parliament

Viveca Ax:son Johnson (Sweden)
Chairman of Nordstjernan AB

Gordon Bajnai (Hungary)
Former Prime Minister

Dora Bakoyannis (Greece)
Member of Parliament; former Foreign Minister

Leszek Balcerowicz (Poland)
Professor of Economics at the Warsaw School of Economics; former Deputy Prime Minister

Lluís Bassets (Spain)
Deputy Director, El País

Marek Belka (Poland)
Governor, National Bank of Poland; former Prime Minister

Roland Berger (Germany)
Founder and Honorary Chairman, Roland Berger Strategy Consultants GmbH

Erik Berglöf (Sweden)
Chief Economist, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Jan Krzysztof Bielecki (Poland)
Chairman, Prime Minister's Economic Council; former Prime Minister

Carl Bildt (Sweden)
Foreign Minister

Henryka Bochniarz (Poland)
President, Polish Confederation of Private Employers – Lewiatan

Svetoslav Bojilov (Bulgaria)
Founder, Communitas Foundation and President of Venture Equity Bulgaria Ltd.

Ingrid Bonde (Sweden)
CFO & Deputy CEO, Vattenfall AB

Emma Bonino (Italy)
Vice President of the Senate; former EU Commissioner

Franziska Brantner (Germany)
Member of the European Parliament

Han ten Broeke (The Netherlands)
Member of Parliament and spokesperson for foreign affairs and defence

John Bruton (Ireland)
Former European Commission Ambassador to the USA; former Prime Minister (Taoiseach)

Ian Buruma (The Netherlands)
Writer and academic

Erhard Busek (Austria)
Chairman of the Institute for the Danube and Central Europe

Jerzy Buzek (Poland)
Member of the European Parliament; former President of the European Parliament; former Prime Minister

Gunilla Carlsson (Sweden)
Minister for International Development Cooperation

Maria Livanos Cattaui (Switzerland)
Former Secretary General of the International Chamber of Commerce

Ipek Cem Taha (Turkey)
Director of Melak Investments/ Journalist

Carmen Chacón (Spain)
Former Minister of Defence

Charles Clarke (United Kingdom)
Visiting Professor of Politics, University of East Anglia; former Home Secretary

Nicola Clase (Sweden)
Ambassador to the United Kingdom; former State Secretary

Daniel Cohn-Bendit (Germany)
Member of the European Parliament

Robert Cooper (United Kingdom)
Counsellor of the European External Action Service

Gerhard Cromme (Germany)
Chairman of the Supervisory Board, ThyssenKrupp

Maria Cuffaro (Italy)
Maria Cuffaro, Anchorwoman, TG3, RAI

Daniel Daianu (Romania)
Professor of Economics, National School of Political and Administrative Studies (SNSPA); former Finance Minister

Massimo D'Alema (Italy)
President, Italianieuropei Foundation; President, Foundation for European Progressive Studies; former Prime Minister and Foreign Minister

Marta Dassù (Italy)
Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs

Ahmet Davutoglu (Turkey)
Foreign Minister

Aleš Debeljak (Slovenia)
Poet and Cultural Critic

Jean-Luc Dehaene (Belgium)
Member of the European Parliament; former Prime Minister

Gianfranco Dell'Alba (Italy)
Director, Confindustria Delegation to Brussels; former Member of the European Parliament

Pavol Demeš (Slovakia)
Senior Transatlantic Fellow, German Marshall Fund of the United States (Bratislava)

Kemal Dervis (Turkey)
Vice-President and Director of Global Economy and Development, Brookings.

Tibor Dessewffy (Hungary)
President, DEMOS Hungary

Hanzade Doğan Boyner (Turkey)
Chair, Doğan Gazetecilik and Doğan On-line

Andrew Duff (United Kingdom)
Member of the European Parliament

Mikuláš Dzurinda (Slovakia)
Former Foreign Minister

Hans Eichel (Germany)
Former Finance Minister

Rolf Ekeus (Sweden)
Former Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission on Iraq; former OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities; former Chairman Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, SIPRI

Uffe Ellemann-Jensen (Denmark)
Chairman, Baltic Development Forum; former Foreign Minister

Steven Everts (The Netherlands)
Adviser to the Vice President of the European Commission and EU High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy

Tanja Fajon (Slovenia)
Member of the European Parliament

Gianfranco Fini (Italy)
President, Chamber of Deputies; former Foreign Minister

Joschka Fischer (Germany)
Former Foreign Minister and vice-Chancellor

Karin Forseke (Sweden/USA)
Business Leader; former CEO Carnegie Investment Bank

Lykke Friis (Denmark)
Member of Parliament; former Minister for Climate, Energy and Gender Equality

Jaime Gama (Portugal)
Former Speaker of the Parliament; former Foreign Minister

Timothy Garton Ash (United Kingdom)
Professor of European Studies, Oxford University

Carlos Gaspar (Portugal)
Chairman of the Portuguese Institute of International Relations (IPRI)

Teresa Patricio Gouveia (Portugal)
Trustee to the Board of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation; former Foreign Minister

Heather Grabbe (United Kingdom)
Executive Director, Open Society Institute – Brussels

Charles Grant (United Kingdom)
Director, Centre for European Reform

Jean-Marie Guéhenno (France)
Deputy Joint Special Envoy of the United Nations and the League of Arab States on Syria.

Fernando Andresen Guimarães (Portugal)
Head of the US and Canada Division, European External Action Service

Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg (Germany)
Former Defence Minister

István Gyarmati (Hungary)
President and CEO, International Centre for Democratic Transition

Hans Hækkerup (Denmark)
Former Chairman, Defence Commission; former Defence Minister

Heidi Hautala (Finland)
Minister for International Development

Sasha Havlicek (United Kingdom)
Executive Director, Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD)

Steven Heinz (Austria)
Co-Founder & Co-Chairman, Lansdowne Partners Ltd

Annette Heuser (Germany)
Executive Director, Bertelsmann Foundation Washington DC

Diego Hidalgo (Spain)
Co-founder of Spanish newspaper El País; Founder and Honorary President, FRIDE

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer (The Netherlands)
Former NATO Secretary General

Danuta Hübner (Poland)
Member of the European Parliament; former European Commissioner

Anna Ibrisagic (Sweden)
Member of the European Parliament

Jaakko Iloniemi (Finland)
Former Ambassador; former Executive Director, Crisis Management Initiative

Toomas Ilves (Estonia)
President

Wolfgang Ischinger (Germany)
Chairman, Munich Security Conference; Global Head of Government Affairs Allianz SE

Minna Järvenpää (Finland/US)
International Advocacy Director, Open Society Foundation

Mary Kaldor (United Kingdom)
Professor, London School of Economics

Ibrahim Kalin (Turkey)
Senior Advisor to the Prime Minister of Turkey on foreign policy and public diplomacy

Sylvie Kauffmann (France)
Editorial Director, Le Monde

Olli Kivinen (Finland)
Writer and columnist

Ben Knapen (The Netherlands)
Minister for European Affairs and International Cooperation

Gerald Knaus (Austria)
Chairman, European Stability Initiative; Carr Center Fellow

Caio Koch-Weser (Germany)
Vice Chairman, Deutsche Bank Group; former State Secretary

Bassma Kodmani (France)
Executive Director, Arab Reform Initiative

Rem Koolhaas (The Netherlands)
Architect and urbanist; Professor at the Graduate School of Design, Harvard University

David Koranyi (Hungary)
Deputy Director, Dinu Patriciu Eurasia Center of the Atlantic Council of the United States

Bernard Kouchner (France)
Former Minister of Foreign Affairs

Ivan Krastev (Bulgaria)
Chair of Board, Centre for Liberal Strategies

Aleksander Kwaśniewski (Poland)
Former President

Mart Laar (Estonia)
Minister of Defence; former Prime Minister

Miroslav Lajčák (Slovakia)
Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (Germany)
Member of the European Parliament

Pascal Lamy (France)
Honorary President, Notre Europe and Director-General of WTO; former EU Commissioner

Bruno Le Maire (France)
Minister for Food, Agriculture & Fishing

Mark Leonard (United Kingdom)
Director, European Council on Foreign Relations

Jean-David Lévitte (France)
Former Sherpa to the President of the French Republic; former Ambassador to the United States

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (Spain)
Member of the European Parliament; former Minister of Justice

Adam Lury (United Kingdom)
CEO, Menemsha Ltd

Monica Macovei (Romania)
Member of the European Parliament

Emma Marcegaglia (Italy)
CEO of Marcegaglia S.p.A; former President, Confindustria

Íñigo Méndez de Vigo (Spain)
Secretary of State for the European Union

David Miliband (United Kingdom)
Member of Parliament; Former Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs

Alain Minc (France)
President of AM Conseil; former chairman, Le Monde

Nickolay Mladenov (Bulgaria)
Foreign Minister; former Defence Minister; former Member of the European Parliament

Dominique Moïsi (France)
Senior Adviser, IFRI

Pierre Moscovici (France)
Member of Parliament; former Minister for European Affairs

Nils Muiznieks (Latvia)
Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights

Hildegard Müller (Germany)
Chairwoman, BDEW Bundesverband der Energie- und Wasserwirtschaft

Wolfgang Münchau (Germany)
President, Eurointelligence ASBL

Alina Mungiu-Pippidi (Romania)
Professor of Democracy Studies, Hertie School of Governance

Kalypso Nicolaïdis (Greece/France)
Professor of International Relations, University of Oxford

Daithi O'Ceallaigh (Ireland)
Director-General, Institute of International and European Affairs

Christine Ockrent (Belgium)
Editorialist

Andrzej Olechowski (Poland)
Former Foreign Minister

Dick Oosting (The Netherlands)
CEO, European Council on Foreign Relations; former Europe Director, Amnesty International

Mabel van Oranje (The Netherlands)
CEO, The Elders

Marcelino Oreja Aguirre (Spain)
Member of the Board, Fomento de Construcciones y Contratas; former EU Commissioner

Monica Oriol (Spain)
CEO, Seguriber

Cem Özdemir (Germany)
Leader, Bündnis90/Die Grünen (Green Party)

Ana Palacio (Spain)
Former Foreign Minister; former Senior President and General Counsel of the World Bank Group

Simon Panek (Czech Republic)
Chairman, People in Need Foundation

Chris Patten (United Kingdom)
Chancellor of Oxford University and co-chair of the International Crisis Group; former EU Commissioner

Diana Pinto (France)
Historian and author

Jean Pisani-Ferry (France)
Director, Bruegel; Professor, Université Paris-Dauphine

Ruprecht Polenz (Germany)
Member of Parliament; Chairman of the Bundestag Foreign Affairs Committee

Lydie Polfer (Luxembourg)
Member of Parliament; former Foreign Minister

Charles Powell (Spain/United Kingdom)
Director, Real Instituto Elcano

Andrew Puddephatt (United Kingdom)
Director, Global Partners & Associated Ltd.

Vesna Pusić (Croatia)
Foreign Minister

Robert Reibestein (The Netherlands)
Director, McKinsey & Company

George Robertson (United Kingdom)
Former Secretary General of NATO

Albert Rohan (Austria)
Former Secretary General for Foreign Affairs

Adam D. Rotfeld (Poland)
Former Minister of Foreign Affairs; Co-Chairman of Polish-Russian Group on Difficult Matters, Commissioner of Euro-Atlantic Security Initiative

Norbert Röttgen (Germany)
Minister for the Environment, Conservation and Nuclear Safety

Olivier Roy (France)
Professor, European University Institute, Florence

Daniel Sachs (Sweden)
CEO, Proventus

Pasquale Salzano (Italy)
Vice President for International Governmental Affairs, ENI

Stefano Sannino (Italy)
Director General for Enlargement, European Commission

Javier Santiso (Spain)
Director, Office of the CEO of Telefónica Europe

Marietje Schaake (The Netherlands)
Member of the European Parliament

Klaus Scharioth (Germany)
Dean of the Mercator Fellowship on International Affairs; former Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the US

Pierre Schori (Sweden)
Chair, Olof Palme Memorial Fund; former Director General, FRIDE; former SRSG to Cote d'Ivoire

Wolfgang Schüssel (Austria)
Member of Parliament; former Chancellor

Karel Schwarzenberg (Czech Republic)
Foreign Minister

Giuseppe Scognamiglio (Italy)
Executive Vice President, Head of Public Affairs Department, UniCredit S.p.A

Narcís Serra (Spain)
Chair of CIDOB Foundation; former Vice President of the Spanish Government

Radosław Sikorski (Poland)
Foreign Minister

Aleksander Smolar (Poland)
Chairman of the Board, Stefan Batory Foundation

Javier Solana (Spain)
Former EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy & Secretary-General of the Council of the EU; former Secretary General of NATO

George Soros (Hungary/USA)
Founder and Chairman, Open Society Foundations

Teresa de Sousa (Portugal)
Journalist

Goran Stefanovski (Macedonia)
Playwright and Academic

Rory Stewart (United Kingdom)
Member of Parliament

Alexander Stubb (Finland)
Minister for Foreign Trade and European Affairs; former Foreign Minister

Michael Stürmer (Germany)
Chief Correspondent, Die Welt

Ion Sturza (Romania)
President, GreenLight Invest; former Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova

Paweł Świeboda (Poland)
President, Demos EUROPA - Centre for European Strategy

Vessela Tcherneva (Bulgaria)
Spokesperson and advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Teija Tiilikainen (Finland)
Director, Finnish Institute for International Relations

Luisa Todini (Italy)
Chair, Todini Finanziaria S.p.A

Loukas Tsoukalis (Greece)
Professor, University of Athens and President, ELIAMEP

Erkki Tuomioja (Finland)
Foreign Minister

Daniel Valtchev, (Bulgaria)
Former Deputy PM and Minister of Education

Vaira Vike-Freiberga (Latvia)
Former President

Antonio Vitorino (Portugal)
Lawyer; former EU Commissioner

Andre Wilkens (Germany)
Director Mercator Centre Berlin and Director Strategy, Mercator Haus

Carlos Alonso Zaldívar (Spain)
Former Ambassador to Brazil

Stelios Zavvos (Greece)
CEO, Zeus Capital Managers Ltd

Samuel Žbogar (Slovenia)
EU Representative to Kosovo; former Foreign

ALSO AVAILABLE FROM ECFR

New World Order: The Balance of Soft Power and the Rise of Herbivorous Powers
Ivan Krastev and Mark Leonard, October 2007 (ECFR/01)

A Power Audit of EU-Russia Relations
Mark Leonard and Nicu Popescu, November 2007 (ECFR/02)

Poland's second return to Europe?
Paweł Swieboda, December 2007 (ECFR/03)

Afghanistan: Europe's forgotten war
Daniel Korski, January 2008 (ECFR/04)

Meeting Medvedev: The Politics of the Putin Succession
Andrew Wilson, February 2008 (ECFR/05)

Re-energising Europe's Security and Defence Policy
Nick Witney, July 2008 (ECFR/06)

Can the EU win the Peace in Georgia?
Nicu Popescu, Mark Leonard and Andrew Wilson, August 2008 (ECFR/07)

A Global Force for Human Rights? An Audit of European Power at the UN
Richard Gowan and Franziska Brantner, September 2008 (ECFR/08)

Beyond Dependence: How to deal with Russian Gas
Pierre Noel, November 2008 (ECFR/09)

Re-wiring the US-EU relationship
Daniel Korski, Ulrike Guerot and Mark Leonard, December 2008 (ECFR/10)

Shaping Europe's Afghan Surge
Daniel Korski, March 2009 (ECFR/11)

A Power Audit of EU-China Relations
John Fox and Francois Godement, April 2009 (ECFR/12)

Beyond the "War on Terror": Towards a New Transatlantic Framework for Counterterrorism
Anthony Dworkin, May 2009 (ECFR/13)

The Limits of Enlargement-lite: European and Russian Power in the Troubled Neighbourhood
Nicu Popescu and Andrew Wilson, June 2009 (ECFR/14)

The EU and human rights at the UN: 2009 annual review
Richard Gowan and Franziska Brantner, September 2009 (ECFR/15)

What does Russia think?
edited by Ivan Krastev, Mark Leonard and Andrew Wilson, September 2009 (ECFR/16)

Supporting Moldova's Democratic Transition
Nicu Popescu, October 2009 (ECFR/17)

Can the EU rebuild failing states? A review of Europe's Civilian Capacities
Daniel Korski and Richard Gowan, October 2009 (ECFR/18)

Towards a Post-American Europe: A Power Audit of EU-US Relations
Jeremy Shapiro and Nick Witney, October 2009 (ECFR/19)

Dealing with Yanukovych's Ukraine
Andrew Wilson, March 2010 (ECFR/20)

Beyond Wait-and-See: The Way Forward for EU Balkan Policy
Heather Grabbe, Gerald Knaus and Daniel Korski, May 2010 (ECFR/21)

A Global China Policy
François Godement, June 2010 (ECFR/22)

Towards an EU Human Rights Strategy for a Post-Western World
Susi Dennison and Anthony Dworkin, September 2010 (ECFR/23)

The EU and Human Rights at the UN: 2010 Review
Richard Gowan and Franziska Brantner, September 2010 (ECFR/24)

The Spectre of a Multipolar Europe
Ivan Krastev & Mark Leonard with Dimitar Bechev, Jana Kobzova & Andrew Wilson, October 2010 (ECFR/25)

Beyond Maastricht: a New Deal for the Eurozone
Thomas Klau and François Godement, December 2010 (ECFR/26)

The EU and Belarus after the Election
Balázs Jarábik, Jana Kobzova and Andrew Wilson, January 2011 (ECFR/27)

After the Revolution: Europe and the Transition in Tunisia
Susi Dennison, Anthony Dworkin, Nicu Popescu and Nick Witney, March 2011 (ECFR/28)

European Foreign Policy Scorecard 2010
March 2011 (ECFR/29)

The New German Question: How Europe can get the Germany it needs
Ulrike Guérot and Mark Leonard, April 2011 (ECFR/30)

Turning Presence into Power: Lessons from the Eastern Neighbourhood
Nicu Popescu and Andrew Wilson, May 2011 (ECFR/31)

Egypt's Hybrid Revolution: a Bolder EU Approach
Anthony Dworkin, Daniel Korski and Nick Witney, May 2011 (ECFR/32)

A Chance to Reform: How the EU can support Democratic Evolution in Morocco
Susi Dennison, Nicu Popescu and José Ignacio Torreblanca, May 2011 (ECFR/33)

China's Janus-faced Response to the Arab Revolutions
Jonas Parello-Plesner and Raffaello Pantucci, June 2011 (ECFR/34)

What does Turkey think?
Edited by Dimitar Bechev, June 2011 (ECFR/35)

What does Germany think about Europe?
Edited by Ulrike Guérot and Jacqueline Hénard, June 2011 (ECFR/36)

The Scramble for Europe
François Godement and Jonas Parello-Plesner with Alice Richard, July 2011 (ECFR/37)

Palestinian Statehood at the UN: Why Europeans Should Vote "Yes"
Daniel Levy and Nick Witney, September 2011 (ECFR/38)

The EU and Human Rights at the UN: 2011 Review
Richard Gowan and Franziska Brantner, September 2011 (ECFR/39)

How to Stop the Demilitarisation of Europe
Nick Witney, November 2011 (ECFR/40)

Europe and the Arab Revolutions: A New Vision for Democracy and Human Rights
Susi Dennison and Anthony Dworkin, November 2011 (ECFR/41)

Spain after the Elections: the "Germany of the South"?
José Ignacio Torreblanca and Mark Leonard, November 2011 (ECFR/42)

Four Scenarios for the Reinvention of Europe
Mark Leonard, November 2011 (ECFR/43)

Dealing with a Post-Bric Russia
Ben Judah, Jana Kobzova and Nicu Popescu, November 2011 (ECFR/44)

Rescuing the euro: what is China's price?'
François Godement, November 2011 (ECFR/45)

A "Reset" with Algeria: the Russia to the EU's South
Hakim Darbouche and Susi Dennison, December 2011 (ECFR/46)

Ukraine after the Tymoshenko verdict
Andrew Wilson, December 2011 (ECFR/47)

European Foreign Policy Scorecard 2012
February 2012 (ECFR/48)

The Long Shadow of Ordoliberalism: Germany's Approach to the Euro Crisis
Sebastian Dullien and Ulrike Guérot, February 2012 (ECFR/49)

The End of the Putin Consensus
Ben Judah and Andrew Wilson, March 2012 (ECFR/50)

Syria: Towards a Political Solution
Julien Barnes-Dacey, March 2012 (ECFR/51)

How the EU Can Support Reform in Burma
Jonas Parello-Plesner, March 2012 (ECFR/52)

China at the crossroads
François Godement, April 2012 (ECFR/53)

Europe and Jordan: Reform before it's too late
Julien Barnes-Dacey, April 2012 (ECFR/54)

China and Germany: Why the Emerging Special Relationship Matters for Europe
Hans Kundnani and Jonas Parello-Plesner, May 2012 (ECFR/55)

After Merkozy: How France and Germany Can Make Europe Work
Ulrike Guérot and Thomas Klau, May 2012 (ECFR/56)

The EU and Azerbaijan: Beyond Oil
Jana Kobzova and Leila Alieva, May 2012 (ECFR/57)

A Europe of Incentives: How to Regain the Trust of Citizens and Markets
Mark Leonard and Jan Zielonka, June 2012 (ECFR/58)

The European Council on Foreign Relations does not take collective positions. This paper, like all publications of the European Council on Foreign Relations, represents only the views of its authors.

Copyright of this publication is held by the European Council on Foreign Relations. You may not copy, reproduce, republish or circulate in any way the content from this publication except for your own personal and non-commercial use. Any other use requires the prior written permission of the European Council on Foreign Relations

© ECFR June 2012.

ISBN: 978-1-906538-58-3

Published by the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR), 35 Old Queen Street, London, SW1H 9JA, United Kingdom

london@ecfr.eu

Design by David Carroll & Co davidcarrollandco.com