

# **IRKUTSK STATE UNIVERSITY**

## **Department of World History and International Relations**

### **FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION**

PhD, associate professor Igumnova Lyudmila

#### **Introduction**

The European Union is a new, unprecedented and quite unique actor on the international stage. It has no analogues in history and contemporary politics, and there are no precise definitions of it as a political object. In order to analyze the European Union's external behavior, we first should formulate some characteristics of the EU as an international actor:

1. The European Union is not a conventional state; it lacks statehood in many terms. The EU, at the same time, is more than merely an international organization. It has incorporated many supranational characteristics into its structure. Thus, its external behavior can not be examined the same way as external affairs of a nation-state or activity of an international organization.
2. Foreign and security policies differ from all the other policy areas within the European Union. It is a sphere of "high politics", which directly influences areas of significant importance for each member state. Foreign policies are widely perceived as one of the ultimate expressions of national sovereignty. A common policy of the EU in the international arena can present challenges to nation states and may lead to substantial decrease in their sovereignty. This makes political integration an extremely complicated issue for EU member-states. The EU's achievements in this sphere remain limited in the comparison with market integration.
3. The EU countries differ from each other substantially due to deeply rooted national interests, identities, discrepancies in power etc. Despite common values in international affairs, such as democracy, liberalism and human rights, it is difficult for member states to define common objectives and reach the unity of purpose. The EU often lacks single-mindedness at the political levels of decision-making. It's difficult to formulate a common European outlook and common conception of Europe's role in world affairs. There is no consensus on common defense and in particular on the establishment of a fully integrated European military capacity.

All these factors make foreign policy of united Europe a very complicated matter and very sensitive matter in domestic politics. On the one hand, a common foreign and security policy of the EU is widely regarded as a myth, because the EU proved unable to manage many of the international issues and produce real actions. Member countries do not wish to establish supranational power within the political field; as a result intergovernmental decision-making still dominates. The EU also lacks some of the essential prerequisites of a great power status, including military capability.

On the other hand, we must admit that EU foreign policy cooperation has made a good progress in the last 30 years. EU countries try to take decisions on common foreign and security policy (CFSP) matters collectively. It is important to realize that integration in the area of foreign and military policy is a long process. The creation of a united opinion amongst all the member states will remain a difficult task for the future. It will take some time for the European Union to reach a unity of purpose, formulate a common identity, common strategic culture and to become a truly great power in international relations.

The purpose of this course is to familiarize students with the history and contemporary challenges of the European Union's foreign and security policy. The study of the EU's external behavior is important for several reasons. The creation of the European Union is one of the most successful political projects in contemporary history of Europe. The EU is the largest economical power and a very important political actor in international affairs. Continued progress towards integration in Europe has undeniable implications for the future of international politics both within and beyond Europe. The EU exercises important influence on Russia as well. Understanding the successful experience of European integration could be useful for analyzing the Commonwealth of Independent States.

### **Course description**

At the beginning of the course students are familiarized with theoretical approaches and analytical tools for understanding the development of European foreign policy. We'll compare and contrast theoretical approaches to foreign policy analysis. In order to get a fuller understanding of EU's common foreign policy it is useful to give a brief overview of its evolution: we will consider the history of European political cooperation from 1950's to the Nice treaty of 2001. The procedural issues and institutional mechanisms of how foreign policy decisions are reached within the EU will be briefly discussed as well. Then we will logically proceed to national foreign policies of European states and overview their central concepts. It will form a large part of the course because, as we mentioned before, national actors still dominate within EU's institutions. Section V covers security and defense matters. It focuses on the development of European defense framework, analyses the main security organizations in Europe and look at how they operate and how they are adopted to the new

world order. The section also addresses two particular aspects: the transatlantic dimension of European security and EU's own defense capabilities. Section VI will give students an overview of the main directions of CFSP in some geographical regions. Through these different readings, the students are presented with a balanced view on common foreign and security policy of Europe.

## **I. Theoretical approaches to foreign policy analysis**

Theoretical explanations of European integration with a focus on EU's international relations: Liberal Intergovernmental, Neo-Realist, Neo-Functionalist, Institutionalist, Constructivist Approaches.

### **Essential reading:**

1. Bulmer, Simon; Stephen Padgett: Policy transfer in the European Union: an institutionalist perspective // *British Journal of Political Science* 35.1 (Jan 2005): 103-24.
2. Marks, Gary; Hooghe, L; Blank, K: European Integration from the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multi-level Governance // *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Vol. 34, No 3 (September 1996), pp. 341-378.
3. Moravcsik, Andrew: Bringing Constructivist Integration Theory Out of the Clouds: Has it Landed Yet? // *European Union Politics* 2(2), pp. 226-249 (URL: <http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/clouds.pdf>)
4. Pierson, Paul: The path to European Integration. A Historical Institutional Analysis // *Comparative political studies*, Vol. 29, No 2, April 1996, pp. 123-163.
5. Pollack, Mark A.: Theorizing the European Union: International Organization, Domestic Polity, or Experiment in New Governance? // *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2005. 8:357-98 (URL: <http://www.temple.edu/polsci/Faculty/Bios/Pollack/Annual%20Review.pdf>)
6. Risse-Kappen, Thomas: Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis meet the European Union // *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Vol. 34, No 1 (March 1996), pp. 53-80.
7. Sandholtz, Wayne: Membership matters: Limits of the Functional Approach to European Institutions // *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Vol. 34, No 3 (September 1996), pp. 403-429.

### **Optional reading:**

1. Filtenborg, Mette Sicard; Ganzle, Stefan; Johansson, Elisabeth: An Alternative Theoretical Approach to EU Foreign Policy 'Network Governance' and the Case of the Northern Dimension Initiative // *Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*. 2002, Vol. 37(4): 387-407.
2. Kissack, Robert: Theoretical Approaches to the study of the EU as an actor in the multilateral system // *London School of Economics*, 7/8 November 2003, 12 p.
3. Moravcsik, Andrew: Is something rotten in the state of Denmark? Constructivism and European integration // *Journal of European Public Policy* 6:4 Special Issue 1999: 669-81 (URL: <http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/rotten.pdf>)
4. Sweet, Alec Stone; Thomas L. Brunell: Constructing a supranational constitution: dispute resolution and governance in the European Community // *American Political Science Review* 92.n1 (March 1998): 63(19).
5. Tonra, Ben: Social Constructivism and the Common Foreign and Security Policy (Centre for European Studies, Department of International Politics, University of Wales, Aberystwyth)
6. Green Cowles, Maria: Non-state Actors and False Dichotomies: Reviewing IR/IPE Approaches to European Integration // *Journal of European Public Policy*. 10:1 (February 2003): 102-120.

8. Aspinwall, Mark: Government preferences on European integration: an empirical test of five theories // *British Journal of Political Science*. 37.1 (Jan 2007): 89(26).

## **II The main steps towards a political union in Europe.**

### **Creation of a Common European Foreign Policy (CFSP)**

The reasons of European political unification after the end of World War II. Federative and confederate approaches to integration. Historical background of the idea of common foreign and security policy and the main steps towards a political union in Europe (1950: European Defense Community (EDC), 1953: European political community project (EPC) etc.). The treaty regime of the EU. 1957: **Rome treaty**. European communities' external activities. 1987: **Single European Act (SEA)**. 1992: **The Treaty on European Union (Maastricht treaty)**: three pillars of the EU, pillar II on CFSP, the main differences between EPC and CFSP. 1997: Innovations of **Amsterdam treaty** on foreign policy and defense. 2001: **The treaty of Nice**.

#### **Essential reading:**

1. Smith H. *European Union Foreign Policy. What it is and What it does?* - London, 2002. – 299 pp.
2. Bretherton C., Vogler J. *The European Union as a Global Actor*. – New York, 2004. – 316 pp.
3. *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy* / Ed. By C. Hill. – London: Routledge, 1996. – 316 p. (Hill, Christopher and William Wallace: "Introduction: Actors and Actions", pp. 1-18)
4. *Foreign and security policy in the European Union* / Ed. By K.A. Eliassen. – London, 1998. – 246 pp. (Marit Sjøvaag: *The single European Act* (pp. 22-42), Arnhold and David Spence: *The Common Foreign and Security Policy from Maastricht to Amsterdam* (pp. 43-58), Catriona Gourlay and Eric Remacle: *The 1996 IGC: The Actors and their Interaction* (pp. 59-93))
5. Desmond Dinan: *Ever Closer Union*.- Lynne Rienner Pub, 2005. - 663 pp.
6. White B. *Understanding European Foreign Policy*. – New York, 2001. – 196 pp.

#### **Optional reading:**

1. Smith K.E. *European Union Foreign Policy in Changing World*. – Oxford, 2003. – 274 pp.
2. Blair A. *The European Union since 1945*. – London, 1998. – 384 pp.
3. Smith, Michael E.: *Diplomacy by Decree: The Legislation of EU Foreign policy* // *Journal of Common Market Studies*. – 2001. – Vol. 39. – No. 1. – Pp. 79-104.
4. Hoffmann, Stanley: *Towards a Common European Foreign and Security Policy?* // *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Vol 38, No 2 (June 2000). Pp. 189-98.

## **III Institutions of the EU, decision-making procedures**

### **in the area of common foreign policy**

Institutional structure of the EU: The European Council, the Council of Ministers, the presidency, the European Commission, the European Parliament, the European Court of Justice: their structure, functions and authorities. High representative of the EU for CFSP, his functions and authorities. Javier Solana's views on CFSP. Decision-making procedures in Pillar II area. Evaluation of the scope of EU competence in CFSP area vis-a-vis member states. Different theoretical approaches to understanding the institutional foundations.

**Essential reading:**

1. EU Institutions and other bodies. URL: [http://europa.eu/institutions/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/institutions/index_en.htm)
2. Decision-making in the European Union. URL: [http://europa.eu/institutions/decision-making/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/institutions/decision-making/index_en.htm)
3. Smith H. European Union Foreign Policy. What it is and What it does? - London, 2002. – 299 pp.
4. White B. Understanding European Foreign Policy. – New York, 2001. – 196 pp.
5. Peterson J., Bomberg E. Decision-making in the European Union. – New York, 1999. – 366 pp.

**Optional reading:**

1. Smith K.E. European Union Foreign Policy in Changing World. – Oxford, 2003. – 274 pp.
2. Grevi, Giovanni; Manca, Daniela; Quille, Gerrard: A Foreign Minister for the EU – Past, Present and Future (URL: <http://www.fornet.info/documents/Working%20Paper%20no%207.pdf>)
3. Foreign and security policy in the European Union / Ed. By K.A. Eliassen. – London, 1998. – 246 pp.
4. Desmond Dinan: Ever Closer Union.- Lynne Rienner Pub, 2005. - 663 pp.

## **IV National strategies in the sphere of foreign and security policy**

Member countries political cultures, foreign policy traditions and stances, growing out of their particular histories and domestic political constellations. The debates between “Euro-optimists” and “Euro-skeptics”, “Europeanists” and “Atlanticists” on foreign and security policy: theoretical issues and the position of several countries. The comparative influence of the main national actors in shaping the EU's external relations. The impact of EU membership on national foreign policies.

**Reading:**

1. The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy / Ed. By C. Hill. – London: Routledge, 1996. – 316 p.
  2. The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States / Ed by I. Manners, R. G. Whitman. – Manchester, 2000. – 284 pp.
1. **France.** An account of French foreign and security policy after World War II, an overview of its main elements. Messianic approach. Leadership in the process of European integration. Paris views on political project and country's objectives aimed at CFSP. Paris animosity towards the US dominated foreign policy and US-French disputes. Opposition to Atlanticist countries in the

EC/EU. A distinct position in NATO. French attitude to the WEU and OSCE. A policy of reconciliation with Germany and Franco-German partnership. Independent nuclear policy. Active policy in the third world countries. Foreign policy priorities of De Gaulle, Georges Pompidou, Giscard d'Estaing, François Mitterrand, Jacques Chirac. Multipolar world conception in foreign policy of France.

**Reading:**

1. Guyomarch A., Machin H., Ritchie E.: France in the European Union. – London, 1998. – 268 pp.
2. Menon, Anand: From Independence to Cooperation: France, NATO and European Security // International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), Vol. 71, No. 1. (Jan., 1995), pp. 19-34.
3. Sichertman, Harvey: Chirac: beyond Gaullism? (French President Jacques Chirac) // The National Interest n42 (Winter 1995 n42): 16(11).
4. Clarke, Michael: French and British security: mirror images in a globalized world // International Affairs. 76,4 (2000). – P. 725-739.

2. **United Kingdom.** Historical legacy and national political culture, their influence on contemporary foreign policy. The main features of diplomatic strategy: globalism of foreign policy interests, Anglo-Saxon messianic approach, strong relationship within the US, traditional dualism toward Europe, minimalist and intergovernmental approach to integration. British reasons to be conservative and skeptical. British “return” to Europe at the end of 1990s and the policy of Tony Blair. British military capacities. British view of alliance strategy, the centrality of NATO. British view of the WEU. London’s policy in the third world and in the Commonwealth framework.

**Reading:**

1. Gamble, Andrew: Between Europe and America: The Future of British Politics. – New York, 2003. – 262 pp.
2. Clarke, Michael: British security Policy // Foreign and Security policy in the European Union / Ed. by Kjell A. Eliassen. – London, 1998. - pp. 124-145.
3. Britain, the Commonwealth and Europe. The Commonwealth and Britain’s Applications to Join the European Communities / Ed by A. May. – Chippenham: Antony Rowe Ltd., 2001 – 188 pp.
4. Niall, FitzGerald: Britain and Europe. We need them, they need us // The World today, Dec. 1996; 52, 12, pp. 307-309.
5. Timothy Garton Ash: Is Britain European? // International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), Vol. 77, No. 1. (Jan., 2001), pp. 1-13.
6. Stephens, Philip: Britain and Europe: An Unforgettable Past and an Unavoidable Future // The Political Quarterly Publishing Co. Ltd. 2005, Oxford. pp. 12-21.
7. Mauter, Wendell R.: Churchill and the Unification of Europe // The Historian 61.1 (Fall 1998): 67(1).

3. **Germany.** Historical factors that influence German foreign and security policy: World War II experience, Soviet threat, development from an occupied country into EU’s and NATO’s central

player. The main trends in German foreign policy: a wish to reject totalitarian legacy, German partnership with the US, heavy dependence on American security guarantees, European integration as a German political strategy, combination of Atlanticism and Europeanism in foreign policy, special partnership with France, extending German influence eastwards and cooperation with Eastern Europe, “soft” power approach. Foreign policy priorities of Gerhard Schröder and Angela Merkel.

**Reading:**

1. Meiers, Franz-Josef: Germany's Defence Choices // *Survival*, vol. 47, no. 1 (Spring 2005), pp. 153–16.
2. Kühnhardt, Ludger: Germany's Role in European Security // *SAIS Review* 15 Special Issue (1995) 103-128
3. Janes, Jackson: The change in government and transatlantic relations // *German Politics and Society* 24.1 (Spring 2006): 119(16).
4. Seidelmann Reimund: The Security Policy of a United Germany // *Foreign and Security policy in the European Union* / Ed. by Kjell A. Eliassen. – London, 1998. - pp. 107-123.
5. Chandler, William M.: Foreign and European policy issues in the 2002 Bundestag elections // *German Politics and Society* 21.1 (Spring 2003): 161(16).

4. **Spain.** The impact of historic and geographic factors on the diplomatic agenda of Madrid. Foreign policy of F. Franco. Isolation of Spain after the end of WWII. Gradual improvement of the relationship with the West. Entry into the UN. Transformation of Spanish foreign policy after F. Franco. Integration into international community. Entry into the EEC. Foreign policy priorities: European integration, Latin America, Mediterranean, the US etc. Spain's participation in the European security architecture, its role in NATO and WEU. Spain and the problem of terrorism. Iraq war issue.

**Reading:**

1. Gooch, Anthony: Spain, Western Europe and the European Community (The Foreign Relations and Foreign Policy of Spain: A Survey for 1992, part 4) // *Contemporary Review* 261.n1519 (August 1992): 57(5)
  2. Barbe, Esther: Spanish Security Policy and the Mediterranean Question // *Foreign and Security policy in the European Union* / Ed. by Kjell A. Eliassen. – London, 1998. - pp. 147 - 160.
5. **Italy.** The main priorities of Italian foreign policy. Italian point of view on European integration and CFSP. An attempt to demonstrate independence and activity of country's foreign policy after the end of Cold War. The foreign policy priorities of Silvio Berlusconi: Italian policy in NATO, Rome and transatlantic relations. Italian initiatives in the sphere of common European foreign policy. Geographical regions of Italian “responsibilities” – Mediterranean, Africa, Balkans, Central and Eastern Europe, Russian-Italian relations. The policy priorities of Romano Prodi: his point of view on Italian role in the EU and transatlantic relations.

**Reading:**

1. Tripodi, Paolo: A half-century of Italian foreign policy // *Contemporary Review*, Sept, 1996 (URL: [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2242/is\\_n1568\\_v269/ai\\_18826921](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2242/is_n1568_v269/ai_18826921))
2. Walston, James: Italian Foreign Policy: Light and shade in the second Berlusconi government // ASMI Conference, The American University of Rome, 26 November 2004, 8 pp. (URL: <http://www.york.ac.uk/depts/poli/news/asmi/walston.pdf>)
3. Croci, Osvaldo: Italian foreign policy survey. The Second Berlusconi Government and Italian Foreign Policy // *The International Spectator* 2/2002, pp.89-101 (URL: <http://www.iai.it/pdf/articles/Croci.pdf>)

## **V European defense and security**

European security architecture. The range of organizations through which European security is viewed: NATO, WEU, OSCE.

1. **The Western European Union (WEU) and European integration in the area of security and defense.** Brussels Treaty of 1948. (Western) Western European Union, its structure and the main stages of its development. WEU during Cold War period. Geopolitical realities after Cold War and reforms in the Union in 1980s. Revival of WEU. WEU according to Maastricht treaty provisions. Petersberg declaration of 1992. WEU and Amsterdam treaty. Tony Blair and Jacques Chirac meeting in St. Malo in 1998. Summit of the EU in Helsinki (1998). Providing the EU with a defense component of its own, Rapid reaction forces in Europe. WEU-EU and WEU-NATO relationships. The Europeanists' view on the Western European Union: WEU as an integral part of the EU, conception of a powerful Europe and a strong organization of European security. The Atlanticists' line: the WEU as an autonomous organization. The role of the WEU in European integration. EU-WEU merger. Prospects for European defense cooperation and establishing independent military capacities. "Capability-expectation gap". Theoretical views on Europeanisation of EU's defense.

### **Reading:**

1. *Defending Europe: the EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy* / Ed. by Howorth J., Keeler J. – New York, 2003. – 247 pp.
2. *Europe's new security challenges* / Ed. by H. Gartner, A. Hyde-Price, E. Reiter. – London, 2001. – 470 pp. (Gärtner, H.: *European Security, the Transatlantic Link, and Crisis Management in Europe*, pp. 125-148., Schmidt P: *The Compatibility of Security Organisations and Policies in Europe*, pp. 149-163).
3. *Foreign and security policy in the European Union* / Ed. By K.A. Eliassen. – London, 1998. – 246 pp.
4. Grudzinski P., Van Ham P. *A Critical Approach to European Security: Identity and Institutions.* – London-New York, 1999. – 165 pp.
5. Deighton, Anne: *The European Security and defense policy* // *JCMS* 2002, Vol. 40. No 4., pp. 719-41.
6. Gordon, Philip H.: *Does the WEU have a role? (Western European Union)* // *The Washington Quarterly* 20.n1 (Wntr 1997): 125(16).



7. Jones, Seth G., F. Stephen Larrabee: Arming Europe // *The National Interest*. 82 (Winter 2005): 62(7).
  8. Kaldor, Mary; Salmon, Andrew: Military Force and European Strategy // *Survival*. Vol. 48, No 1 (Spring 2006), Pp. 19-34.
  9. Mathiopoulos, Margarita; Istvan Gyarmati: Saint Malo and Beyond: Toward European Defense // *The Washington Quarterly* 22.4 (Autumn 1999): 65.
  10. Posen, Barry: ESDP and the Structure of the World Power // *International Spectator*. 34:1, 2004: 5-17 (URL: <http://www.iai.it/pdf/articles/posen.pdf>)
  11. Salmon, Trevor: The European security and defense Policy: Build on Rocks or Sand? // *European Foreign Affairs Review*. – 2005. – No 10. – Pp.359-379.
2. **NATO and transatlantic dimension of European security.** The North-Atlantic treaty of 1949, security guarantees in the treaty. North-Atlantic treaty organization, its structure and military forces. The main stages in the development of NATO. Cold War and American-European partnership, American engagement in European security, peculiarities of American and European approaches toward Cold war security problems (USSR, Vietnam War, Arab-Israel conflict, and Central-American crises). US-EU relations after Cold War. Persian Gulf crisis, war in Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Iraq: their influence on transatlantic relations. European pillar in NATO, attempts at building a European security and defense identity (ESDI) within NATO framework. Contemporary European and American security strategies: differences in approaches. Theoretical perspectives on transatlantic relations.

### Reading:

1. Sloan S.R. NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community. *The Transatlantic Bargain Reconsidered*. – New York, 2003. – 285 pp.
2. Kagan, Robert: *Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*. - Atlantic Books, 2003. - 112 pp.
3. Hamilton, Daniel: Three Strategic Challenges for a Global Transatlantic Partnership // *European Foreign Affairs Review*. – 2003. - nr. 8. - pp. 543-555.
4. Jones, Erik: Debating the transatlantic relationship: Rhetoric and Reality // *International Affairs* 80,4 (2004), pp. 595-612.
5. Kagan, R. Power and Weakness // *Policy Review* 2002. - nr. 113. (URL: [www.policyreview.org/jun02/kagan\\_print.html](http://www.policyreview.org/jun02/kagan_print.html)). - 19 pp.
6. Kupchan, Charles A.: The fourth age: the next era in transatlantic relations // *The National Interest* 85 (Sept-Oct 2006): 77(7).
7. Kupchan, Charles A.: The rise of Europe, America's changing internationalism, and the end of U.S. primacy // *Political Science Quarterly* 118.2 (Summer 2003): 205(28).
8. Lind M. The End of Atlanticism: America and Europe beyond the U.S. Election // *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft*. - 2005, nr. 1., pp. 25-41. (URL: <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/ipg/02691.pdf>).
9. Moravcsik A. Striking a New Transatlantic Bargain // *Foreign Affairs* vol. 82, 2003, nr. 4, pp. 74-89. (URL: <http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/bargain.pdf>).
10. Nelson, N. Daniel: Transatlantic Transmutations // *The Washington Quarterly*. 2005. - Vol. 25. – 2002. - nr. 4. - pp. 51–66.

3. **Transformations in NATO and its role nowadays.** Security needs of the new world order and NATO, modernization of the Alliance, review of NATO's strategic doctrine in 1999, Prague (2002) and Istanbul (2004) Summits, reduction of NATO military forces and command structure, rapid reaction forces in NATO, expansion of NATO, "out of area" issues in the Alliance. NATO and the war on terrorism, "Active endeavor" operation. 5 aims of NATO: Afghanistan, Iraq, Arab-Israel issue, NATO-EU, NATO-Russia. "Partnership for peace", "Mediterranean dialog".

**Reading:**

1. The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation (URL: <http://www.nato.int/docu/rdr-gde-prg/rdr-gde-prg-eng.pdf>)
  2. Cornish, Paul: NATO: the practice and politics of transformation // International affairs 80,1 (2004), pp. 63-74.
  3. Johnson, Rebecca, Micah Zenko: All dressed up and no place to go: why NATO should be on the front lines in the war on terror // Parameters 32.4 (Winter 2002): 48(16).
  4. Michta, Andrew A.: What Next for NATO? // Orbis Volume 51, Issue 1 (Winter 2007), pp. 155-164.
4. **The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).** The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), its creation and activities. Budapest summit of 1994 and its decisions. The main aims and tasks of CSCE/OSCE, the structure and activities of OSCE. NATO-OSCE relations. Some missions of OSCE in Yugoslavia and in the Commonwealth of Independent States. The reasons for some decline of OSCE influence, the problem of OSCE reforming.

**Reading:**

1. Hopmann P., Terrence: An evolution of the OSCE's Role in Conflict Management // Europe's new security challenges / Ed. by H. Gartner, A. Hyde-Price, E. Reiter. – London, 2001. – pp. 219-254.
2. Kemp, Walter: Targeting its Constituency: Political Will, Public Relations, and the OSCE // Ibid. – p. 255.

## **VI External relations of the EU.**

### **European policies toward key regions and actors.**

EU-Mediterranean. EU's policy in the Middle East. EU and the Iranian issue. EU and the problems of African continent. EU's priorities in Latin America. Russia-EU relations. EU-CIS countries. EU policy in Asia-Pacific (relations with Japan, China, Korea, India, ASEAN etc.). EU and the North Korean issue. EU and developing countries etc.

**Readings:**

1. Smith H. European Union Foreign Policy. What it is and What it does? - London, 2002. – 299 pp.

2. Elgstrom, Ole: *The European Union's Roles in International Politics* (Routledge/ECPR Studies in European Political Science). – Routledge, 2006. - 260 pp.
3. *European Union Foreign and Security Policy: Towards a Neighborhood strategy* / Ed. by Roland Dannreuther. – New York, 2004. – 226 pp.
4. Brogi, Alessandro: “Competing Missions”: France, Italy, and the Rise of American Hegemony in the Mediterranean. // *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (September 2006), Pp.741-770.
5. Youngs, Richard: European approaches to security in the Mediterranean // *The Middle East Journal* 57.3 (Summer 2003): 414(18).

### **Course requirements and students responsibilities:**

1. *Reading and class participation*: Students are expected to have done the reading for each week ahead of the lecture. They are required to attend classes regularly and participate in class discussion. They will be graded on class participation.
2. *Presentations*: Students are required to give 15 minutes presentations on external relations of the EU.
3. *Papers*: Students are required to write up and elaborate their presentations into short final papers (10 pages), where they will also summarize and critically analyze the readings.
4. *Exams*: Students are expected to provide an answer to one of the following questions.

### **Questions for final exam**

1. History of political integration in Europe
2. Institutions of the EU. Decision-making in the sphere of foreign policy
3. Contemporary foreign and security policy of France
4. The main directions of German foreign policy
5. Priorities of British foreign policy
6. Foreign and defense policy of Spain
7. Key priorities of Italian foreign policy
8. The main directions of Common foreign policy of the EU
9. Transatlantic relations: Cold War period
10. Transatlantic relations after the end of Cold War
11. European and American security strategies: differences in approaches
12. Europeanism and Atlantism in foreign policy of the EU
13. The development of European integration in security and defense sphere
14. History of the Western European Union (WEU)
15. NATO in European security architecture
16. Activity of OSCE