Chapter 3

The European Union and International Organizations: A Framework for Analysis

Knud Erik Jørgensen

In his reflections on the future role of the European Union and the United States, the former US ambassador to the EU, Rockwell A. Schnabel, points to a judgment of the former Commissioner for external relations, Chris Patten, "the U.S. and the EU have two decades left to 'shape the world' in the ways we deem best. After that, in his estimation, economic and demographic trends will force us to share that power with the two emerging Asian giants" (Schnabel 2005: 75; see also Patten 2005). Schnabel adds that "His deadline sounds all too realistic to me. Meaning that now is the Atlantic moment, the moment of America and Europe. Will we seize it? (2005: 75). According to an official booklet, 'the European Union believes in seeking multilateral solutions to global problems. It therefore attaches great importance to effective multilateralism, with a strong United Nations at its heart. The UN, with its universal mandate and legitimacy, is uniquely placed to respond to our common challenges' (European Council, 2003: 16). For Robert Cooper, Director-General of External and Politico-Military Affairs for the Council of the EU, 'Multilateralism and the rule of law have an intrinsic value. We value pluralism and the rule of law domestically, and it is difficult for democratic societies - including the USA - to escape from the idea that they are desirable internationally as well…Those who want pluralism and multilateralism to survive have a duty to make the United Nations effective (as the leaders of the democracies strikingly failed to do in the case of the League of Nations)' (Cooper, 2003: 164, 168). These and other citations indicate that the relationship between the European Union and international organizations is crucially important for the future of European and global governance.

Whereas the relationship between the US and multilateral institutions has been extensively examined in the literature, it is less well-known how the EU wants to shape the world in ways 'we deem best'. Research on the relationship between the EU and international organizations is unfortunately in an unsatisfactory state of

affairs. In other words, to the degree there has been research on the topic, it has been more scattered and compartmentalized than comprehensive, systematic and integrated. The prime aim of this volume is to contribute to filling a remarkably wide gap in the literature, i.e., to provide a better understanding of the EU's policy of supporting 'effective multilateralism' and to 'try on for size' a number of potential factors explaining the changing relationship between the EU and international organizations. Some regard the EU itself to be a prominent example of an international organization (Guigner, 2006; Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno, 2003: 15). This basic assumption leads to a specific research agenda, e.g. analyzing the development of inter-organizational networks as well as cooperation, conflict or competition among international organizations. Others take their point of departure in the EU's aspiration to act *in* international organizations not to *be* an international organization. In turn, this perspective explains why the extensive and analytically rich literature on the US and the multilateral system can serve as a valuable source of inspiration (Karns and Mingst, 1990; Ruggie, 1993, 1998; Luck, 1999; Patrick and Forman, 2002; and Foot, MacFarlane, and Mastanduno, 2003). While the volume is agnostic concerning the two options it does lean towards the latter conception and, in any case, prides itself for not leaving the issue to assumptions, conviction or *a priori* conclusions.

The relationship between the EU and international organizations can be thoroughly examined by focusing on four key questions. Margaret Karns and Karen Mingst have developed a particularly useful framework for analysis. They focus on a two-way flow of influence asking the following questions (1990: 1-3):[1]

- How has the use of international organizations as instruments of EU policy changed over time?
- How have the constraints and influence of international organizations on the EU changed over time?
- Why have these changes occurred?
- What are the policy implications for the EU of these patterns of changing influence?

---

[1] I have replaced the US and entered the EU.

In the first section, I explicate the two first questions in order to further explore the EU-international organizations relationship. In the second section, I point to three potential sets of factors of explanation – internal, external and so-called co-constitutive factors – for why relations between the EU and international organizations have changed. In the third section, I conclude and outline perspectives.

A Changing Relationship between the EU and International Organizations

It has often been suggested that the US has an 'instrumental' mindset and the EU a 'process' mindset. In studies of the US and international organizations, it has been a key concern to measure impact on international organizations, that is, the degree to which the US influences concrete policy-making, the institutional set-up of organizations, reforms or closure of organizations. Multilateral institutions are consistently analyzed 'as instruments of American policies' (Karns and Mingst, 1990: 6-8). Impact is also very present in John Ruggie's explication of the concept of multilateralism, though the kind of impact he has in mind is more indirect and institutional than direct and policy instrumental in character, 'it was the fact of an *American* hegemony that was decisive after World War II, not merely American *hegemony*. And that in turn makes the role of multilateralism in the current international transformation of even greater interest' (Ruggie, 1993: 31). Others pay close attention to 'The Impact of the United States on Multilateral Organizations', and emphasize that 'America's decisions to cooperate in multilateral forums will be determined predominantly by the extent to which any specific organization is perceived by important US domestic actors to be an effective and congenial vehicle for the promotion of America's objectives' (Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno, 2003, pp. 14-19). As for multilateral institutions themselves, they will 'continue to operate within the direct and indirect constraints that US instrumentalism imposes' (Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno, 2003, p. 272). Such conceptions do not leave much room for manoeuvre for other actors, the EU included. Instead, the perspective triggers a rather one-sided story. However, the question is whether these studies analyze multilateral institutions accurately. The subsequent sections aim at addressing the issue by means of suggesting a framework for analysis.

The EU's Instrumental Use of International Organizations

Turning to the EU, it is well-known that the 2003 European Security Strategy makes support of international organizations one of the EU's key objectives. Such phrasing suggests a kind of disinterested public service approach that is legion in EU documents and speeches given by EU officials. However, analysts should not refrain from exploring the EU's impact on and influence in international organizations.

In terms of membership and financial contribution, the EU-25 often has a significant share in IOs. The obvious point of departure is membership of the EU/EU-25 in international organisations. In this context, it is worthwhile specifying 'share of IO membership' and form of 'representation' (none, mixed or exclusive competence). Also the status of the European Community (represented by the European Commission) is important. Take a few illustrative examples: The EU/EU-25 has 25 members of the OSCE's total of 55 member states, i.e. 45.5 per cent of all OSCE members are EU member states. The Commission is a permanent observer in the UN and a full member of FAO. As mentioned, formal representation is the point of departure but we should not dwell for too long at the issue. In this context, one should note that there is an informative legal scholarship available on the issue (REFS). Concerning financial contribution, i.e. share of the budget of international organisations (when relevant also the share of specific but significant programmes, e.g. UNDP or UN peace keeping operations), please briefly describe.

Figure 1.1. EU-25 membership of international organizations

Given the EU's great formal representation in many IOs, one could perhaps expect a strong instrumental linkage between the EU and specific organizations. In other words: What does the EU want specific IOs to be or to do? According to the EU, what is the function of the IO or what should the function be? Is the EU happy with the performance of specific IOs? Currently, several IOs are in a process of institutional reform (REFS). Does the EU have clearly stated preferences as regards the reform process or the outcome? Which role does the EU play in these reforms? Has the EU proactively initiated reforms or responded to reforms initiated

by non-EU states. As we know by now, the EU was largely incapable of speaking with one voice in the case of UN Security Council reform (*Chaillot Paper* 2005). Instead we witnessed the old image of a European polyphony suggesting several and contradictory outcomes. What does the case of the OSCE reform process tell us? Similarly, it is unlikely that the IMF and the World Bank will be governed in the same fashion for ever? In this context, it is worthwhile asking whether the informal US-EU deal about 'balancing' directors/CEO's of the IMF/WB is sustainable? In the context of the WTO, the EU has worked hard on putting the Singapore issues on the agenda, yet so far without much success (Damro, 2006).

Impact can be measured on five dimensions: the institutional design, policy-making processes within the IO, activities of specific IOs, institutional reform (in the following the OSCE will serve as an example). Given the EU-25's membership of the OSCE, the EU's financial contribution to the budget of the OSCE, and the EU's policy/policies vis-à-vis the OSCE, the following question is crucially important: Does the EU have an impact on the OSCE as such, on agenda setting, policymaking, and on the activities of the OSCE?[2] When the OSCE was created in 1995, did the EU have an impact on the decision to institutionalize the CSCE process? Did the EU have an impact on the 'tasking' of the OSCE? Did the EU have impact on the institutional design of the OSCE? Finally, does the EU 'bifurcate' policy-making, in the sense of supporting the involvement of the OSCE, while in parallel being involved itself? An example: the EU supports the OSCE's involvement in the Caucasus. However, at the same time the EU is engaged in developing a neighbourhood policy vis-à-vis the eastern and southern arches of neighbours, the Caucasus included (van Ham, 2005). Hence, one could claim that the EU pre-empts the role of the OSCE, slowly squeezing the organisation out of business. In contrast, one could also claim that the EU demonstrates the type of 'double-layered' diplomacy - multilateral and bilateral strategies in parallel – that has characterized US foreign policy for years. In this perspective, there is nothing to deplore, except if one believes in an exclusive OSCE competence or in a neat and watertight division of labour between the EUI and the OSCE.

---

[2] Contributors writing on the WTO substitute the OSCE with WTO, etc.).

The case of UN financing illustrates this point. Among intersections between the EU and the UN system, the financial flow is very significant. The EU (and its member states) is the biggest financial contributor to the general UN budget and many of the specialized agencies. However, the EU's capacity in translating financial means into political ends seems rather limited. In other words, the power that potentially could flow from this source seems to evaporate in the hands of the EU and its member states. Concerning international financial institutions, the EU has for years aimed at strengthening its impact. These institutions are somehow special in the sense that both the IMF and the World Bank operate on the basis of weighted voting. While the US is the single largest state contributor, the EU-25 collectively contributes about twice the amount of the US and controls (collectively) more than one third of all votes. However, the EU's voting power is diluted amongst several voting constituencies that also include non-EU member states. Therefore, the financial input is not reflected in political impact. The design of the international financial institutions as well as concrete policy-making is grossly determined by the US and the launch of the Euro seems not to have changed this. The structural inability of the EU-25 to make use of financial power is intriguing. However, with a few notable exceptions, the topic has not caught the attention of scholars (McNamara and Meunier, 2002; Smaghi, 2004; Horng, 2004, Pisani-Ferry 2005).

The final part of the chapter addresses the issue of impact. Despite the absence of the notion European interests from the official vocabulary, analysts should assess the degree to which the EU influences international organizations. The EU declares that in several UN policy fields, it is a frontrunner. Against this background one wonders whether the theory of hegemonic stability is going to experience a renaissance among European policy makers and policy analysts. In a broader perspective, it is the significant variation of impact across policy fields that should attract attention and analytical energy – as demonstrated in this volume.

International Organizations influencing EU policies and policy-making
EU policies and policymaking processes may have been influenced by international organizations. Martha Finnemore (1996, see also Kelley, 2004) has

demonstrated how international organizations can 'teach' states what they (really) want, and influence the definition of national interests or state preferences. Her cases include UNESCO, the International Red Cross and the World Bank, yet the book is otherwise state-centric, which implies that the EU is excluded from analysis. However, Finnemore's approach and findings suggest that we should look for international organizations teaching the EU. In several policy fields, the EU has been an inexperienced newcomer for whom teaching and nursing is crucially important in the process of defining European interests. Examples include relations between the EU and the WHO (Guigner, 2006), the EU and the WTO (de Burca and Scott 2000) and the fact that EU politics of conditionality vis-à-vis East and Central Europe has largely been copied from the World Bank. In other policy fields, the EU has experienced a 'melt down' of a policy and subsequently received advice on best practice from international organizations. One example is EU development policy which in 1998 was severely criticized by the OECD and subsequently reformed (REFS). Another example is NATO serving as a very experienced mentor, teaching the EU a lesson on international security. The transfer of Javier Solana from NATO to the EU has been highly instrumental in facilitating processes of learning (de Witte, 2004; Varwick ed., 2004).

However, the flow of influence from IOs is not unproblematic. Ben Rosamond (2007) has demonstrated how discourses on globalization often have an EU-domestic origin, yet globalization is framed as an external factor that we should either greet or fear. For instance, former Commissioners Chris Patten and Pascal Lamy welcomed, even praised globalization, whereas Directorate-General (DG) Agriculture regards globalization as an external threat against which the EU should build a protective shield. Furthermore, when officials at DG Trade take an issue to the level of international organizations, they influence at the same time the domestic balance of power between promoters of and protectors against globalization. Similarly, the launch of the 2001 "Everything but Arms" initiative influenced simultaneously the position of both domestic and international actors in trade and agriculture. The method of making or taking an issue 'international' is well-known in the literature on national foreign policy, yet hardly cultivated concerning EU foreign policy.

Finally, though several international organizations have been teaching the EU what it wants, there have been cases in which the flow of influence has been reversed over time. Thus, the relationship between the WHO and EU has for years been highly asymmetrical in favour of the WHO, yet the institutional balance of power seems to be changing (Guigner, 2006).

Contending Potential Explanations of Change

Margaret P. Karns and Karen Mingst explore patterns of changing instrumentality and influence in the light of the image of declining US power. In the late 1980s, it was a fairly common perception that American power was declining and Karns, Mingst and their team analyse how the US handled this decline as regards multilateral institutions (Karns and Mingst, 1990).[1] The context of Stewart Patrick and Stepard Forman's *Multilateralism and US Foreign Policy* and Rosemary Foot, S. Neil MacFarlane and Michael Mastanduno's *US Hegemony and International Organizations* is the contemporary unilateralism/multilateralism schism, which was lurking during the Clinton Administration and rapidly surfaced during the George W. Bush Administration. These studies raise important questions about the relationship between power, perceptions of power, and support for multilateral institutions.

Specific IOs are not of equal importance to the EU across time. An example: the EU has had a long relationship with the IAEA. However, since WMD have been singled out as a main threat to European security, the IAEA has become an increasingly important IO for the EU. The diplomacy of the EU-3 vis-à-vis Iran since 2003 has also increased the instrumentality of the IEAE, that is, the EU wants the IAEA to do certain things. An example of declining instrumentality is possibly the OSCE. To the best of my knowledge the EU has never made use of the exit strategy, i.e. quitting an IO. By contrast, the US did (temporarily) quit UNESCO (cf. Coate, 1990), and some US policy-makers (e.g. Richard Perle) are threatening to exit the UN ("if not reform, then quit").

Power remains a key dimension. Some argue that Europe is weak and therefore pursues multilateral strategies (Kagan, 2003). Others argue that the image of increasing international clout is what adequately characterizes the contemporary

role of the EU in world politics (Moravcsik, 2002; Reid, 2004). In any case, a research agenda on the EU and multilateralism should take the contested assessment of European power into consideration. The question remains: why does the EU choose to support (effective) multilateral institutions? In the three following sections, internal, external and constitutive factors will be examined as potential factors capable of explaining emerging EU practice concerning international organizations.

From a different perspective, Robert Kagan argues that multilateral strategies reflect power or, rather, the absence of power, that is, weakness. Because Europe is weak, Europe pursues multilateral strategies: 'Their tactics, like their goal, are the tactics of the weak' (Kagan, 2003). Joseph Grieco (1997) also argues that small (weak) states prefer multilateralism. Kagan presents a somewhat flawed argument. First, he overlooks the fact that the US was not particularly weak when multilateral strategies were introduced after the Second World War (Schake and Becher, 2002; Nau, 2002; Ruggie, 2003b). Second, he overlooks the fact that the EU, along with multilateral strategies, also cultivates bilateral relations and occasionally engages in unilateral action. It is somewhat surprising that Kagan takes rhetoric coming out of Brussels at face value. In essence, Kagan presents a version of the well-known dispute between realism and idealism-liberalism. He employs realist arguments against idealism and claims that Europe plays the part of idealism-liberalism (coming from Venus), whereas the US plays the part of realism (coming from Mars), without critically examining actual policy. John Mearsheimer (1995) uses a similar approach directed against liberal thinking of all sorts (see also Krauthammer, 2004).

Internal Factors

Concerning changing patterns of US engagement, Karns and Mingst conclude that domestic political factors explain changing support for multilateral institutions significantly better than external factors, such as variation in the international distribution of power. Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno also find that domestic factors determine policy towards international organizations, most notably American exceptionalism, 'when based on a definition that emphasizes US beliefs that its national values and practices are universally valid and its policy positions

are moral and proper and not just expedient' (Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno, 2003, p. 268; on American exceptionalism, see Ruggie, 2003b). Similarly, John Ruggie highlights the role of domestic values, images and principles as well as domestic institutions (Ruggie, 1993).

Interest groups and private companies constitute a factor that should not be dismissed. Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno (2003, p. 9) believe that the influence of 'interest-groups' is 'potentially conside Furthermore, when the OECD reviewed EU development policy in a highly critical fashion, was the study an autonomous OECD initiative or did (some) EU member states ask the OECD to evaluate the performance of DG Development? Finally, Pisani-Ferry points out that there is an intricate relationship between inside and outside dimensions of European governance, "The main difficulty the EU has top solve is the internal redistribution of power that will follow a redefinition of its external representation" (2005).

Traditionally, the political system of an international player has been among the most popular potential and most significant factors explaining foreign policy. What would this look like from a European perspective? The EU's political system is notoriously complex and dynamic (Hix, 1999).[2] Furthermore, the EU polity is itself characterized by elements of multilateralism, and presumably these elements are most widespread in the field of foreign affairs. This kind of intersecting multilateralism is a convenient fact, particularly when policymakers present reasons for political action, and not least when such political action consists of supporting the UN and the multilateral system. It is equally convenient when self-images are contrasted to images of others. Then the argument goes: we support the UN because we have multilateral genetic codes or important experiences with multilateral processes. Others, and particularly the one significant other, have no such codes and no such experiences. In the case of the EU, factors 'active' in studies on the US seem relevant yet insufficient. The reason is that member states constitute a significant part of the EU's domestic environment and, at the same time, are among the constituent parts of most international organizations.

Fraser Cameron notes that the EU's preference for multilateralism pre-dates the Iraq crisis: 'Partly because of its own history and constant intergovernmental negotiations, Brussels has been more willing than Washington and many other countries to work through international organizations. The EU itself is an example of multilateralism at work' (Cameron, 2004, pp. 157-8). Indeed, in most examples of official EU reasoning, this domestic-international linkage is a recurrent theme. The former Development Commissioner, Poul Nielsson, provides an illustrative example, 'The European Union knows better than most that multilateral processes tend to be slow and difficult, and rarely do their results satisfy every participant' (cited in Jørgensen, 2003). Could it be then that the mode of diplomacy – multilateralism – rather than specific European values and principles, is at the heart of the EU's foreign policy identity?

The role of the political system comes in a second version. It is well known that the projection of domestic institutions and practices in foreign policy is a common phenomenon. The constitutional treaty negotiations displayed many examples of member states trying to project their domestic institutions. France, for example, originally proposed the Fourth Republic as a model (strong executive and a weak parliament). With respect to the US and multilateralism, it has been argued that the multilateral system launched after the Second World War was modelled on US domestic institutions (Goldstein, 1993). Similarly, the EU has consistently been presented as a model for other regional groupings. The argument has been, 'We have been successful in creating a security community, an integrated economy and a system of dense political coordination. Imitate us and you – ASEAN, Mercosur, etc. - will be successful too.' From time to time and increasingly so, the EU has also been presented as a model for the emerging world polity and for global governance: 'Copy this successful regional arrangement and introduce it at the global level' (see Jørgensen and Rosamond, 2002).

Divisions within the executive branch are pronounced, not least because the executive branch is bifurcated in Europe. That is, apart from the EU institutions characterized by their internal divisions, the EU has 25 ministries of foreign affairs, 25 ministries of defence and 25 prime ministers/heads of state. If seen as a comprehensive system, this is wonderland for bureaucratic politics. The fact that

not even the traditional engine of European integration, France and Germany, has managed to make the structures of the ministries of foreign affairs Euro-compatible suggests the persistence of significant bureaucratic politics at the member state level (Güssgen, 2002; Hocking and Spence, 2004). At the same time, the multilateral system is inherently an inter-state institution, created by and for states. From time to time most EU member states, some more than others, forget about their multilateral genetic codes and enjoy the power, pride and prestige resulting from being an international actor. Changing configurations of mixed, exclusive and absent competence as regards representation in international institutions makes a most difficult exercise – as all the chapters here show again and again. This suggests the usefulness of liberal intergovernmentalism, not least if the third component – institutional design – concerns member state preferences on international organizations (Hill, Laatikainen and Johansson-Nogués all 2006).

The notion of political culture is one of these ubiquitous notions that are intuitively relevant yet difficult to catch in terms of substance. Nonetheless, let us try to focus on two different but overlapping aspects. Both have important things to say about the relationship between domestic politics and EU behaviour towards international organizations. First, discursive structures have been identified as a strong explanatory factor, that is, discourses about the UN and international organizations are relatively stable structures determining legitimate and illegitimate political speech. In Europe, the UN is part of a discursive structure on international cooperation and development connoting something positive. Hence, political reasoning questioning the basic value of the UN has a hard time whether such reasoning takes place at national, EU or international level. Similarly, international law and treaties are regarded as constitutive elements of international society. The notion of global responsibility and obligations that cannot be questioned because they are owed to both one's self and others, plays a key role in European discourse, and part of the multilateral system is seen as instrumental for achieving the objective of international development (on EU's lack of response to such responsibility, see Karagiannis, 2004).

Second, the role of values, images and principles in EU foreign policy has been analyzed and could help illuminate EU behaviour in international organizations

(Lucarelli and Manners, 2005). When Robert Cooper points out that 'multilateralism has intrinsic value', and Javier Solana claims that European values inform foreign policy-making, both illustrate perfectly well how values, images and principles have a function in reasons for political action.

Patrick and Forman (2002) have a particularly strong interest in explaining why the US has an ambivalent attitude to multilateral cooperation, and they want to assess the costs and benefits to the US of this ambivalent engagement. While there seem to be good reasons to ask such questions concerning contemporary US politics it is an open question whether it is equally relevant concerning the EU and international organizations. Perhaps ambivalent engagement is not an exclusive American feature: after all, EU member states are often highly ambivalent concerning the question of whether or not to give the EU a strong role in the multilateral system and, furthermore, whether multilateral solutions to global problems should be tried. This kind of 'squared' ambivalence is likely to have its own pattern of costs and benefits, but due to limited research we do not know precisely what the balance is in the EU case. It is clear however, that the inability of reaching a European agreement on UN reform significantly harms the EU's efforts at promoting effective multilateralism, in particular because it demonstrates that the EU's own multilateral machinery is far from being 'effective' (Ortega, 2005).

Within principal agent theory, the EU tends to be treated as an 'agent' for the 'principal' member states. Hence, PAT is the extension of intergovermentalism by other means. In this volume, we assume the EU to be the principal and IOs to be the agents. This assumption is analytically convenient but obviously there are examples where the assumption does not reflect reality. E.g. it seems that relations between the EU and the World Bank have the characteristics of an IO-IO relationship.

Finally, Patrick and Forman (2002) focus on the ambiguity of US interest in international organisations, i.e. they address the multilateralism-bilateralism-unilateralism trilemma in the making of foreign policy. Though the EU professes to support the multilateral system, inhabited by numerous IOs, the EU does cultivate both multilateral and bilateral relationships. Concerning EU member

states, do they display an ambiguity that is similar to the one characterizing the US? If yes, how does the pattern of ambiguity have an impact on the performance of the EU?

External Factors

Studies of the US and international organizations conclude that domestic factors are among the strongest explanatory factors. However, this should not dissuade us from including external factors in our 'factor portfolio', especially because the EU case might lead to different conclusions.

The international distribution of power is often the first explanatory factor that comes to mind. In explanations of state behaviour informed by structural realism, the change from Cold War bipolarity to post-Cold War polarity plays an important role. However, neorealists have great difficulty in reaching a consensus position as regards the key independent explanatory variable: do we now have a unipolar or multipolar world (Waltz, 2000). This problem apart, and though it is one of the state-centric approaches par excellence, it may nonetheless be possible to factor in the EU, for instance asking whether not the end of the Cold War constitutes the permissive variable that allows the EU to significantly upgrade its international engagement, including the sponsorship of international organizations (cf. Carlsnaes, Sjursen and White eds., 2004).

Presumably neither multilateral organizations nor multilateral systems constitute a power-free zone. According to John Ikenberry the United States, 'has systematically used multilateral agreements as tools of grand strategy and world order building' (Ikenberry, 2002: 122). In other words, it is misleading to separate issues of grand strategy from issues related to international organizations. Furthermore, he emphasizes US ambivalence about multilateral institutions precisely exactly because multilateralism for a leading state is about losing something and winning something else. Then he asks a significant question, 'Why did the United States seek to establish order after World War II in Western Europe through multilateral commitments while pursuing a series of bilateral security agreements in Asia?' The essence of his answer is that power relations between the leading state (the US) and the subordinate states differed: 'The basic difference

between Asia and Europe … was that the United States was both more dominant in Asia and wanted less out of Asia' (…) 'In Europe, the United States had an elaborate agenda for uniting the European states, creating an institutional bulwark against communism, and supporting centrist democratic regimes' (Ikenberry, 2003: 58). During the last decade, all three US rationales for Cold War transatlantic multilateralism have disappeared: communism has disappeared, democratic regimes have been consolidated in Western Europe (and introduced in Central and Eastern Europe). Furthermore, if Europe were to become more united politically, Europe would constitute not only a strong partner but also a potential rival to the United States.[3] It is tempting to suggest that in the future the US will handle the world more equally, that is, Asia in the past (and present) provides a model of the future world order.[4] Ikenberry argues in this way that multilateralism reflects asymmetrical power relations.

When applying Ikenberry's argument to the EU, we should ask four key questions: What does the ends-means relationship look like? To what extent, if at all, is the EU ambivalent about multilateralism? How dominant is the EU? What does the Union want from the major world regions? In this perspective, the European Union's promotion of 'effective multilateralism' may be based on a fatal misreading of opportunities. It does not have a grand strategy or, rather, it has too many (multiple member-state determined strategies) and, consequently, they cannot be 'grand'. There is no clear hierarchy between strategy and tactics. It follows that the Union cannot use multilateral agreements as tools of grand strategy. In short, when applying Ikenberry's argument to the EU, all sorts of problems emerge. Further analysis is required to determine whether these problems are worse for the EU or for Ikenberry's argument. Essentially the jury is still out: the chapters in this book demonstrate both increasingly close ties between the EU and UN - something that is an anomaly in Ikenberry's state-centric world – and the continuity of member states' ambivalent attitudes to effective European representation at the UN. Spanish and Italian opposition to German permanent membership of the Security Council can also be interpreted as a relative gains logic that is alive and kicking.

Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno point to the possible influence of other governments on US behaviour towards multilateral organizations. In explanations of EU foreign policy concerning international organizations, the external factor, 'other governments', also seems highly relevant. Furthermore, we may also include 'other organizations', as in efforts by ASEAN to influence EU policy on Myanmar, or OAU efforts to influence EU policy on the Sudan/Darfur crisis. Among other governments, the US can be singled out as a particularly important other. As Ivo Daalder notes, the US veto in 2000 of the EU's IMF director-candidate demonstrated instant American power yet had also more lasting effects. According to the German diplomat Michael Steiner, 'The way this case was handled tells us something about how the United States now thinks it can throw its weight around as the world's most powerful nation…It really is a demonstration of how the United States lacks sensitivity towards its allies, and the response has been to unite the Europeans more than ever against American bullying' (cited in Daalder, 2001).[5] In general, the EU's embrace of effective multilateralism may have been caused by the Union's own genetic codes, yet the Bush Administration's preference for selective multilateralism has been instrumental in activating these codes. However, the war over Iraq and many other cases demonstrate that US pressure on Europe does not always breed European unity. Hence, it is an important analytical objective to determine under what circumstances the European Union opts for unity and diversity, when feeling the diplomatic efforts of other governments or organizations.

Alexander Wendt (1999) has forcefully pointed to the importance of international social structures in explanations of state behaviour. The theory leads one to expect that international interaction during the last decade has prompted the EU to make a priority of the multilateral system. It is in this context significant that 'multilateralism' has become a contested concept, in particular because it indicates that the US and the EU have different visions of world order and consequently different ideas concerning which means to apply in order to achieve desirable political ends (Kupchan, 2002; van Oudenaren, 2003; Eide, 2004; Koops, 2004). According to the 2003 European Security Strategy, one of the Union's key objectives is the pursuit of effective multilateralism and support for international organizations, above all the UN. This illustrates well the deeply-embedded

differences between US and EU conceptions of multilateralism. For the Union, multilateralism is both a means and an end in its own right and, hence, a key component of world order (understood as the domestication or the legalization of world politics). In other words, the hypothesis is that had the US not been ambivalent or excessively instrumentally minded, the EU would not have launched its high-profile endeavour in support of multilateralism.

In a more specific manner, Ronald Jepperson, Alexander Wendt, and Peter Katzenstein (1996) have argued for the existence of an important causal impact flowing from the international cultural environment to identity, interest and policy. An application of their theory to the case of EU policy-making amounts to a research agenda in its own right. The reason for including their theory in the present context is that it raises some intriguing questions about explaining the EU's policy on supporting international organizations by reference to some foundational multilateral identity.

Constitutive Factors

Our search for explanatory factors has so far been structured by the inside/outside dichotomy. The distinction may still be relevant and it may also be applicable when analysing EU behaviour towards international organizations. However, if there is anything to studies of globalization and Europeanization, then the distinction is in severe trouble and the search for complementary perspectives should begin. At an abstract level, Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall have made a plea for constitutive, structuration approaches in studies of relations between international institutions and states. Instead of beginning with the 'interest, powers, and choices of already constituted state actors' they suggest integrating agent-centric and institution-centric approaches, preferably by means of bracketing (Duvall and Wendt, 1989). <EXPAND> It should be possible to translate this abstract reasoning into a concrete research agenda that is capable of conceptualizing the EU as actor, institution and arena. In the following, I present three illustrative examples of constitutive factors before I arrive at tentative conclusions.

<Bull's definition of international society EU shapes and is shaped by international society>

First, it is significant that Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno regard the performance of multilateral institutions to be as much an internal as an external factor to the US (Foot, MacFarlane and Mastanduno, 2003: 13). While performance as such is a factor that is external to the US, American perceptions of performance constitute an internal factor. This solution raises two important issues. Is it possible to analyse performance as such? And, is it possible or desirable to factor out a constituent member of an institution, for instance the US, when analyzing the performance of the institution as an external factor? (REF). While there are pros and cons to solutions to these problems, a possible third way might be comparative studies. In a comparative perspective, the performance of, say, the UN may be perceived in significantly different ways. Research on the EU and multilateralism could contribute to such comparative studies and thereby reduce the risk of case-biased findings.

Furthermore, when the OECD reviewed EU development policy in a highly critical fashion, one might ask whether the study was an autonomous OECD initiative or if (some) EU member states ask the OECD to evaluate the performance of DG Development, i.e., commissioned a report (REF). Finally, Pisani-Ferry points out that there is an intricate relationship between inside and outside dimensions of European governance, "The main difficulty the EU has to solve is the internal redistribution of power that will follow a redefinition of its external representation" (see Chapter X). <EXPAND>

In conclusion, we should take note of the serious problems and challenges that flow from attempts at assessing multilateralism from a constituent actor perspective. Most scholars in their effort to evaluate effectiveness or influence of a particular actor tend to dichotomize the international organization and the actor whose influence they want to explore. Yet, international organizations are constituted by these very member states. When we analytically split off constituent parts from the organizations, we are in some sense erasing an important, fundamental part of any international organization. These problems are even

further complicated when we begin analyzing the EU. On the one hand, the EU is most often not formally a constituent part of most international organizations. On the other hand, the EU can in practice be regarded as a *de facto* constituent member of several international organizations that has been recognized as such by both EU member states and other members of the international organizations.

Conclusion and Perspectives

In Europe, multilateralism and international organisation trigger predominantly positive connotations and are related to images of international cooperation and world order. Similarly, the existence of international society is considered a fact of life. This basic belief is being reflected in European approaches to the multilateral system.

Without a significant degree of consensus among member states and EU institutions, the EU's aspiration to play a role in the multilateral system will have a hard time; without such a role, there will be no potential conflict with the US concerning the deeds and vices of multilateralism. In the second part of the chapter, I search for explanatory factors. Existing studies of the US and multilateralism will serve as a useful point of departure. It is truly astonishing to realize the degree to which it makes sense to use such state-centric studies as a source of inspiration for analysing the EU's changing relations with international organizations. Among internal factors, I focused on five promising factors (interest groups, the political system, the executive, political culture, military weakness). Among external factors, the chapter examines four potential factors (distribution of power, other governments, international interaction and international organizations). In order to escape the inside/outside dichotomy, I included a section on so-called constitutive factors. They contribute to a potentially more nuanced understanding, but more conceptual and theoretical reflection is necessary before we can arrive at solid conclusions. It is difficult at this stage of research on the changing relationship to conclude which factors that help explain changes. The factors have to be tried out in empirical studies and the following chapters have designed to do precisely this.

Finally, while I acknowledge the usefulness of existing analytical frameworks designed for studies of state behaviour towards international organizations, I would like also to point to some of their limits. One such limit is not inherent to the studies as such, but refers to the need to adapt existing analytical frameworks for research on EU policy on international organizations. A second limit is perhaps most pronounced in studies of the US and multilateralism. Comparative studies of a range of actors would alleviate some of the limits and biases, particularly if new studies were based on a plurality of conceptions. In other words, the application of the European formulae - unity in diversity – within research would potentially make a valuable difference.

References

Aggestam, Lisbeth (1994) *A European Foreign Policy?* PhD thesis, Stockholm: Department of Political Science.

A Secure Europe (2003) *A Secure Europe in a Better World*, Brussels: The Council Secretariat.

Ash, Timothy Garton (2003) 'Anti-Europeanism in America', accessed at http://www.hooverdigest.org

A World Player (2004) *A World Player. The European Union's External Relations*, Brussels: DG Press and Communication.

Cameron, Fraser. (2004) "After Iraq: The EU and Global Governance" *Global Governance* Vol. 10, No. 2: 157-163.

Coate, Roger A. (1990) 'Changing Patterns of Conflict The United States and UNESCO', in Margaret P. Karns and Karen A. Mingst eds., *The United States and Multilateral Institutions*, London: Routledge.

Cooper, Robert (2003) *The Breaking of Nations. Order and Chaos in the Twentieth Century*, London: Atlantic Books.

Cowhey, Peter F. (1993) Elect Locally – Order Globally: Domestic Politics and Multilateral Cooperation, in John Ruggie ed. *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Daalder, Ivo, H. 'The United States and Europe: From Primacy to Partnership?', in Robert Lieber, ed., *Eagle Rules? Foreign Policy and American Primacy in the 21st Century*, New York: Prentice Hall 2001.

de Burca, G. and J. Scott (2000) *The Impact of the WTO on EU Decision-Making*, Jean Monnet Working Paper, Harvard Law School

Duvall, Raymond and Alexander Wendt (1989) "Institutions and international order", in Ernst-Otto Czempiel and James Rosenau (eds.), *Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges* (Lexington: Lexington Books).

Eide, Espen Barth (2004) *'Effective Multilateralism': Europe, Regional Security and a Revitalised UN*, London: The Foreign Policy Centre.

Ferguson, Niall (2004) The End of Europe, speech at the American Enterprise Institute, March 1, 2004.

Finnemore, Martha (1996) *National Interests in International Society*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fomerand, Jacques. 'Recent UN Textbooks: Suggestions from an Old-Fashioned Practitioner', *Global Governance*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2002, pp. 383-403.

Foot, Rosemary, S. Neil MacFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno eds. *US Hegemony and International Organizations,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Ginsberg, Roy H., *The European Union in International Politics: Baptism by Fire*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002.

Goldstein, Judith (1993) 'Creating the GATT Rules: Politics, Institutions, and American Policy', in John Ruggie ed. *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Gregory, F. and Stack, F. (1983) 'The European Community and International Institutions', in J. Lodge ed., *Institutions and Policies of the European Community*. London: Pinter.

Grieco, J. (1990) *Cooperation among Nations. Europe, America and Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Guigner, Sebastien, 'The EU's Roles in Public Health within a Saturated Space of International Organizations: The Interdependence of Roles', in Ole Elgstrøm and Mike Smith, eds., *The European Union's Roles In International Politics*, London: Routledge, 2006.

Güssgen, Florin (2002). *Resources for Europe? The Transformation of Foreign Service Organisation(s) in France and Germany in the light of the Construction of a European Diplomatic Capability (1970-2001)*, PhD thesis, Florence: European University Institute.

Hix, Simon (1999) *The Political System of the European Union*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Hocking, Brian and David Spence (eds.) (2003). *Foreign Ministries in the European Union. Integrating Diplomats*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Horng, Der-Chin (2004) The European Central Bank's External Relations with Third Countries and the IMF, *European Foreign Affairs Review* 9: 323-346.

Ikenberry, G. John (2003) 'Multilateralism and U.S. Grand Strategy' in Stewart Patrick and Stepard Forman (eds.) *Multilateralism and U.S. Foreign Policy. Ambivalent Engagement*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Jepperson, Ronald, Alexander Wendt and Peter Katzenstein (1996) "Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security", in Peter Katzenstein ed. 1996. *The Culture of National Security* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Jørgensen, Knud Erik (1995) Basic International Institutions, Pseudo-Institutions and the Institutions Called States, *Cooperation and Conflict* 30: 83-95.

Jørgensen, Knud Erik and Ben Rosamond, 'Europe: regional laboratory for a global polity?' in Morten Ougaard and Richard Higgott eds., *Towards a World Polity*, London: Routledge, 2002.

Jørgensen, Knud Erik and Katie Laatikainen (2004) The EU@UN, paper prepared for the Second Pan-European Conference on EU Politics, Bologna, 22-24 June.

Kagan, Robert (2003) *Paradise and Power. America and Europe in the New World Order*, London: Atlantic Books.

Karagiannis, N (2004) *Avoiding Responsibility. The Politics and Discourse of European Development Policy*, London: Pluto Press.

Karns, Margaret P. and Karen A. Mingst (1990) *The United States and Multilateral Institutions*, London: Routledge.

Kelley, Judith (2004) International actors on the domestic scene: membership conditionality and socialization by international institutions, *International Organization*, 58(3): 425-457

Koops, Joachim Alexander (2004) 'Effective Multilateralism': The Future of the EU's External Identity in a System of Trilateral Security Governance, paper

Kratochwil, Friedrich (1994) 'Preface' in Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward D. Mansfield eds. *International Organization: A Reader*, New York: HarperCollins.

Krauthammer, Charles (2004) *Democratic Realism. An American Foreign Policy for a Unipolar World*, Washington: AEI Press.

Krause, Joachim (2004) Behind European Views, *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 27, Issue 2, pp. 43-60.

Krause, Keith (2002) Multilateral Diplomacy, Norm Building and UN Conferences: The Case of Small Arms and Light Weapons, *Global Governance* 8:247-263.

Kupchan, Charles (2002) The End of the West, *The Atlantic*, November.

Laatikainen, Katie and Karen E Smith (eds.), *Intersecting Multilateralisms: The European Union at the United Nations* (Palgrave forthcoming 2006).

Pisani-Ferry, Jean (2005) 'The Accidental Player: The EU and the Global Economy' (available at www.pisani-ferry.net)

Lucarelli, Sonia and Ian Manners eds. (2005) *Values, Images and Principles in EU Foreign Policy*, London: Routledge.

Luck, Edward C. (1999) *Mixed Messages: American Politics and International Organization 1919-1999*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

McNamara, Kathleen and Sophie Meunier (2002) Between national sovereignty and international power: what external voice for the euro?, *International Affairs* vol 78, 2002, pp. 849-868.

Mearsheimer, John (2003) The False Promise of International Institutions*, International Security*

Moravcsik, Andrew, *The Choice for Europe*, London: UCL Press, 1999.

Moravcsik, Andrew (2003)

Nau, Henry (2002) *At Home Abroad. Identity and Power in American Foreign Policy.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Nye, Joseph (1990) *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, New York: Basic Books.

Oudenaren, John van, 'What is Multilateral?', *Policy Review,* No. 117, February, 2003.

Patrick, Stewart and Shephard Forman eds. (2002) *Multilateralism and US Foreign Policy: Ambivalent Engagement*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Pfaff, William, *International Herald Tribune*, 3 July, 2003.

Posen, Barry, 'ESDP and the Structure of World Power, *The International Spectator*, vol. 39, 2004, pp. 5-17.

Reid, T.R. (2004) *The United States of Europe. The New Superpower and the End of American Supremacy*, New York: The Penguin Press.

Richardson, John. (2002) "The European Union in the World—A Community of Values" *Fordham International Law Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 1: 12-35.

Rosamond, Ben, *Globalization and the European Union*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006.

Rosenau, James (1995) Governance in the Twenty-first Century, Global Governance, vol. 1, nr. 1, pp. 13-43

Ruggie, John G. ed. (1993) *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Ruggie, John G. (1998) *Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization*, London: Routledge.

Ruggie, John G. (2003a) This Crisis of Multilateralism is Different, speech
delivered at the UNA-USA National Forum on the United Nations,
26 June, 2003.

Ruggie, John G. (2003b) American Exceptionalism, Exemptionalism and Global
Governance, outline of a chapter for Michael Ignatieff ed. *American
Exceptionalism and Human Rights*, Princeton: Princeton University
Press

Schake, Kori and Klaus Becher, 'How America Should Lead', *Policy Review*, no.
114, August-September, 2002.

Smaghi, Lorenzo Bini (2004) A Single EU Seat in the IMF, *Journal of Common
Market Studies* 42(2): 229-48.

Waltz, Kenneth (2000) Structural Realism after the Cold War, International
Security 25: 5-41

Weiss, Tom (2000) Governance, Good Governance and Global Governance:
Conceptual and Actual Challenges, *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 21, Number 5, pp.
795-814.

Wendt, Alexander (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Witte, Pol de (2004) Partnership or Rivalry: a View from Practice, paper prepared
for the Kiel Conference: Die Beziehungen Zwischen NATO und EU: Partnership,
Konkurrenz, Rivalität, 20-21 September.

Young, Alasdair R., 'Punching Its Weight? The EU's Use of the WTO Dispute
Resolution', in Ole Elgstrøm and Mike Smith, eds., *The European Union's Roles
In International Politics*, London: Routledge, 2006.

---

[1] To be sure, the image of decline was contested (Nye, 1990) and the disappearance of the Soviet Union did much to enforce his argument.

[2] If the EU's political system was a federal system, it was probably as decentralised as it could be without losing its essence as a system.

[3] According to William Pfaff, 'A prominent theme of neoconservative writing and television talk is that a Franco-German-dominated European Union, rebuilt according to the new Giscardian constitution currently under debate, threaten to become "superpower Europe" and a mortal danger to the United States' (*International Herald Tribune*, 2 July 2003). See also Ash, 2003.

[4] By contrast, Henry Nau (2002), makes a plea for transforming US-Asia bilateral relations into a multilateral relationship.

[5] After leaving *Auswärtiges Amt*, Michael Steiner joined Solana's office and was closely involved in outlining the European Security Strategy.