

LSE EEAS Conference 2013 – Confirmed Speakers’ Abstracts (Interim)

The EEAS, EU External Assistance and Development Aid: Institutional Dissonance or Inter-service Harmony?

Isabelle Tannous, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Berlin.

The Lisbon Treaty left future arrangements for the coordination of EU external assistance and development aid largely undecided. Only after entry into force of the European External Action Service (EEAS) did the coherence of varying organisational settings begin to be addressed. The thrust of this contribution centres on strategic planning and programming of the EU’s foreign aid instruments for 2014-2020: the European Development Fund (EDF), the Development Instrument (DCI) and the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI). The contribution outlines the controversies over management of the decision-making cycle, competence between Council, Commission and the EEAS and management of the tools of technical assistance, enlargement and development aid. It examines the reorganisation of management between the EEAS, the new DG DEVCO and the EU delegations, covering the vital issues of legal competence and line management and addressing the conceptual issue of whether ‘external relations’ are separate, complementary or a substantial part of ‘foreign policy’. The contribution thus also assesses the general impact of ‘external relations’ for overall EU foreign policy and reviews alternative future paths for EU foreign relations. It analyses the problems and prospects for a coherent fusion of intergovernmental and supranational aspects of the EU’s foreign relations and provides an account of how the EEAS mid-term review contributes to the much-vaunted enhanced coherence of the EU’s impact abroad.

The EEAS and Crisis Management: security issues and post-Westphalian diplomacy

Allison Weston, EU Military Staff, EEAS

This contribution looks at the institutional innovations and bureaucratic struggles that led first to the creation of Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) structures and then to their partial integration in the European External Action Service (EEAS). In particular, we focus on the convergence of military and civilian functions – and consequently the relationship between military and civilian actors – that is constitutive of the EEAS project. Since 2000, the European Union has developed political-military bodies and administrative units to deal with civilian and military crisis management under CSDP. Most have now been integrated in the EEAS, although Member States remain in control of key capabilities. The EEAS has also not fully integrated Commission services dealing with election monitoring, development and humanitarian aid. In comparison to domestic crisis management machineries, this leads to the unusual situation where the Military Staff is part of the “European foreign ministry”, but the Political and Security Committee and some key crisis management tools are outside it. In addition, the EEAS has not yet put in place a system of military attachés in EU delegations, which in several hotspots remain dominated by

development officials – another departure from the traditional model. We analyze these institutional decisions that have important consequences for a comprehensive approach to crisis management in the light of a political sociology of institutions.

Creating ‘esprit de corps’: recruitment and staff perceptions in the EEAS

Ana Juncos, Lecturer at Bristol University

Karolina Pomorska, Marie Curie Fellow at University of Cambridge

The creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS) begs the question of whether EEAS officials are developing an *esprit de corps* – understood as the emergence of shared beliefs and values among the individuals within a group and their desire to achieve a common goal – and how this might be achieved. Since the EEAS is composed of officials originating from different institutions (the European Commission, the Council General Secretariat and the Foreign Ministries of the Member States), there are clear challenges associated with aggregating different beliefs and values within the Service. The contribution analyses the attitudes of officials towards their own institution and its role in creating European Foreign Policy, as well as their general views on the role of the European Union in the world. This allows us to see whether EEAS officials hold similar or diverging views on these topics and whether there are trends related to their institution of origin or nature of employment (military vs. civilian, permanent staff vs. seconded national diplomats). Secondly, the contribution examines five factors that have the potential to promote organisational *esprit de corps*: communication, leadership, public image, trust and training. The contribution concludes that the first two years of operation of the Service do not bode well for the emergence of an *esprit de corps* and that this might undermine the coherence and effectiveness of the EEAS itself.

Diplomatic Training in the EU

Simon Duke, EIPA, Maastricht.

Institutional issues should be seen in the context of the existential identity crisis of the EU in its external relations, a crisis related to the euro crisis but not the cause of it. This contribution concentrates on the composition of the EEAS, specifically the gender and geographical balance aspects. There are clear legacy imbalances, but the issue is how to correct perceived imbalances and the impact upon the Service of existing trends and efforts to counteract them. The contribution focuses on how training has contributed to progress. It argues that there is a lack of overall strategy and there remain open questions about the anticipated ‘socialisation’ effect of training. The contribution questions whether a unified diplomatic culture or common mindset is possible in the EEAS, suggesting that the psychological challenges of creating common mindsets may have been underestimated.

[Full-Text.](#)

Effective multilateralism and the EU Delegation in Vienna

Lars-Erik LUNDIN

Efforts to support effective multilateralism were undertaken by the European Union in several multilateral contexts in Vienna both before and after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty; notably in the IAEA and the OSCE. This contribution analyses whether the Lisbon Treaty brought about change. The contribution outlines some ‘automatic’ changes that followed from the entry into force of the Treaty and others that will only be effectively implemented once there is practical follow-up in Brussels and the political will in capitals to do so. The contribution highlights weaknesses and strengths in the new arrangements, and argues that increasing effective multilateralism will depend on a series of necessary conditions going beyond the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty. The Lisbon Treaty has provided the European Union with an important new basis to promote its values and interests in Vienna, and this contributes significant support to the international community’s efforts in key areas under negotiation there. The potential for the EU to be a key actor after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty is more easily visible in Vienna than in the other main ‘multilateral’ capitals. The institutional legal setting, in terms of mixed or shared competences, was less complicated in Vienna than in Geneva or New York, so less time was spent on procedural issues.

The Public Diplomacy Role of the EEAS: Crafting a Resilient Image for Europe

Mai’a Davis Cross, ARENA Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo

The Council Decision establishing the EEAS endowed it with a clear public diplomacy role to be conducted “solely with the interest of the Union in mind.” In other words, the EEAS has a formal mandate “to enhance the visibility of the EU as a whole, promote a better understanding of EU’s actions and positions and exert a positive influence on how the EU is perceived in partner countries.” Public diplomacy can involve a large range of activities from long-term cultural engagement and educational exchange to spur-of-the-moment damage control during crises. Even though the EU as an actor has proven to be highly resilient – indeed it has not only weathered existential crises, but has actually become more integrated over time – its *image* has not been very resilient. This contribution examines the public diplomacy tools and initiatives at the disposal of the 141 EU delegations around the world, and shows the extent to which the EEAS has tried to craft a resilient image for Europe. Thus far, the EEAS has not been very successful despite the EU’s relatively strong (and growing) foreign policy presence, but I argue that there is a lot of potential for improvement as the EEAS becomes more established.

Towards an EU consular policy?

Ana Mar Fernández Pasarín, associate professor, UA Barcelona and Sciences Po Paris

This contribution defines, characterises and explores the development of EU consular diplomacy within the context of the emergence and gradual empowerment of the EU's diplomatic system overseas. It examines the objectives, dimensions and instruments of consular policy in light of broader developments in EU diplomatic practice and representation over the last decade, in particular since the Lisbon Treaty reform. The main argument is that European integration has been a catalyst for structural change and innovation in the working of member states' consular services, which have become part of networks of intergovernmental co-operation and have been increasingly bound by harmonised EU rules and practices. It is too early, however, to conclude that this process of change has paved the way for the consolidation of a fully-fledged European consular space. For the moment, the integrated management of consular affairs continues to be a mainly state-controlled process. Member states have not given up control of the pace and nature of changes in the practice of integrated diplomacy.

[*Full Text.*](#)

International Law and the EEAS: the Vienna Convention and international diplomatic practice

Sanderijn Duquet, KU Leuven

This contribution addresses some of the problems that the EU's emergence as a diplomatic actor raises for international diplomatic law. In a first part, the legal framework under which the EU operates to conduct diplomatic relations with third States and international organisations will be examined. The analysis focuses on (1) the arrangements, legal or political, created between the Union and its diplomatic partners to engage in formal international relations; (2) the application of customary diplomatic law by the EU; and (3) the relationship between activities of Union Delegations and national codes of conduct and diplomatic practices. Subsequently, the contribution assesses the interplay between the EU and international diplomatic law in diplomatic settings in third countries, by focusing on a number of practical issues: (1) the legal status of the EU's diplomatic staff and premises abroad; (2) the diplomatic treatment the EU is receiving from national governments; and (3) the mandate of 'EU ambassadors' to perform diplomatic functions under international law. Third, the contribution re-visits the foundations of diplomatic law in light of these developments. More concretely, the EU's reading and interpretation of the VCDR and its inherent principles of State sovereignty, non-interference and reciprocity is reviewed. This allows the authors, in a final part, to address the issue of the adequacy of the VCDR as a legal framework for conducting international relations and protecting the interests of the Union and its citizens.

European Law and the EEAS: New Legal Competences in EU Diplomacy

Ramses Wessel, University of Twente

The functioning of the EEAS not only depends on political factors related to the political will of the Member States or turf battles between the Institutions, but also on the legal competences the new body enjoys on the basis of the EU Treaties and secondary legislation. This contribution will analyse the current EU legal provisions with a view to establishing their impact on the functioning of the EEAS. It will look at the legal aspects of the institutional organization of the EEAS and the Union Delegation as well as at the division of competences between the EU institutions and the Member States in terms of external representation. With the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the EU formulated clear global ambitions. The EEAS is to contribute considerably to attaining the new goals and allowing the EU to establish “the first structure of a common European diplomacy” (*Consular and Diplomatic Protection: Legal Framework in the EU Member States*, Report of the EU CARE project, December 2010). Yet, the EU is not a state and the newly established rules and regulations naturally reflect the fact that the EU is not exclusively competent in its external relations. In many case competences are shared with the Member States, or even still exclusively connected to state sovereignty. This Contribution will point to the legal and political dilemma’s resulting from this complexity. Finally, the succession of the European Community by the European Union changed the nature of the latter. The Lisbon Treaty confirmed the EU’s legal personality which again makes it more difficult to use the term ‘European Union’ as a label for the collectivity of the Member States. This Contribution will analyse the internal legal rules on the division between the EU and its Member States, which in practice has gained importance in relation to the EU representation in other international institutions.

[Full Text.](#)