



EU Actorship in the Non-Proliferation area- An Analysis

Master Thesis
Political Science with a focus on Security Policy
Swedish National Defence College
Author: Ylva Pettersson
Tutor: Bertil Nygren
January 2013

Abstract

The threat of nuclear weapons is depicted by the EU as the potentially greatest threat to security. How then does the EU counter this threat, i.e. what kind of actor is the EU in this area? To answer that question, this paper sets out to discover if the EU is an actor in the non-proliferation area, and if that is positively confirmed, what kind of an actor the EU depicts itself to be. Using the actorship framework, developed by Hettne, Söderbaum and Stålgren, it looks into the regionness, presence and actorship of the EU on this issue, to capture both internal and external aspects. The paper concludes that the EU can be defined as an actor on non-proliferation, and that it depicts itself as having a high level of regionness and presence, and gets a mixed result in the area of actorship. The paper also contributes to the theoretical framework by pointing out three aspects that the framework fails to take into consideration.

Thanks

The author wishes to express her deepest gratitude to Lina Grip, without whom, this paper would not have been written. Also the warmest thanks to Silvia Aue and Cesar Chirino for their invaluable support, and to Jane Dundon, for her generous help. None of them are however to be held responsible for any of the conclusions or judgements expressed in this paper.

Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Research gap and purpose of the study	6
1.2	Research questions.....	7
1.3	Structure.....	7
1.4	Literature review	8
2	Theoretical framework	11
2.1	Regionness.....	11
2.2	Presence	12
2.3	Actorness.....	13
2.4	Definitions	15
2.4.1	Actor	15
2.4.2	Non-proliferation	15
3	Method	16
3.1	Research question number 1	16
3.2	Research question number 2	16
3.2.1	Ideal types	17
3.2.2	Questions to identify actorship	19
3.3	Material.....	20
3.3.1	Limitations	22
4	Analysis	23
4.1	Research question number 1: Is the EU an actor in the non-proliferation area? 23	
4.1.1	Empirical circumstances	24
4.1.2	Conclusions on research question number one.....	26
4.2	Research question number 2: What kind of actor does the EU depict itself to be?	26
4.2.1	The European Security Strategy	26
4.2.2	The WMD strategy	28
4.2.3	1st implementation report of the WMD strategy.....	31
4.2.4	EU Strategy against the proliferation of WMD: Monitoring and enhancing consistent implementation	33
4.2.5	New lines for action.....	34
4.2.6	17th implementation report of the WMD strategy	35
4.2.7	Summary and comparison with the ideal types of actorship.....	37
4.2.8	Conclusions on research question number two	41
5	Discussion	42
6	Concluding remarks	46

Abbreviations

BTWC- Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention

CD- Conference of Disarmament

CFSP- Common Foreign and Security Policy

CODUN- Council Working Party on Disarmament

CONOP- Council Working Party on Non-Proliferation

CTBT- Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty

CWC- Chemical Weapons Convention

EC- The European Community

EEAS- European External Action Services

EMU- European Monetary Union

ESS- European Security Strategy

EU- The European Union

GNP- Gross National Product

HCOC- Hague Code of Conduct

IAEA- International Atomic Energy Agency

MS- Member State (of the EU)

NATO- North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NLA- New Lines for Action

NNWS- Non Nuclear Weapon States

NPT- Treaty for the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

NSG- Nuclear Suppliers Group

NWS- Nuclear Weapon States (China, France, Russia, UK and USA)

PSC- Political and Security Committee (of the Council)

PSI- Proliferation Security Initiative

UN- The United Nations

WMD- Weapons of Mass Destruction

WMD MC- Weapons of Mass Destruction Monitoring Centre

1 Introduction

The European Union (EU), and its predecessors, was founded as a peace project to prevent war between its members, and create a sustainable peace for its citizens. The project to create peace for its citizens has been a very successful one, and in 2012 the EU was awarded the Nobel peace prize for this. In 2003, the EU published its first common security strategy, where the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction was depicted as “the potentially greatest threat to our security” (European Security Strategy, 2003, p. 3) and therefore to the peaceful existence of its citizens. How is the EU working to counter this threat to peace and security against its citizens? What kind of actor is the EU in the non-proliferation area?

Several issues problematize the subject of EU actorship on nuclear non-proliferation. First of all, the EU does not own any nuclear weapons, has never done so in the past, and probably will not in the future. However, two of its member states do possess nuclear weapons (the United Kingdom and France), over which the EU has no jurisdiction. So what makes the EU an actor on nuclear issues?

Another issue complicating matters is that the UK and France, together with the other permanent members of the UN Security Council, are the acknowledged Nuclear Weapon States (NWS), in the framework of the Treaty for the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)¹. All other signatory states, defined as Non-Nuclear Weapon States, NNWS, resign from trying to acquire nuclear weapons, in exchange for access to the benefits of the peaceful applications of nuclear technology (INFCIRC/140). The treaty also stipulates that negotiations should be undertaken in good faith to achieve a cessation of the nuclear arms race, and to undertake measures in the direction of nuclear disarmament, indicating that disarmament and non-proliferation go hand in hand, something that causes discord between the NNWS and the NWS (Kobia, 2008, p. 53). This in

¹ Signed by all states except Israel, India and Pakistan, and withdrawn from by North Korea.

turn is reflected in the way the EU acts, as it have coordinated actions against non-proliferation, but cannot agree on disarmament issues, as the member states have no shared views on that issue, nor a common defence policy. Therefore the EU can only work on non-proliferation issues, but not on disarmament. What it can agree on however is that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a serious threat to security, and that preventive actions must be taken. Non-proliferation is advocated by far more countries than the current holders of nuclear weapons, so possession of these weapons is not a prerequisite for the promotion of non-proliferation. The EU also has an important role to play on this issue, as the EU member states make up a majority of members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG),² 27 out of 46 member states (Bodell, 2012, p. 507).

As the EU has identified the threat of nuclear proliferation as vital to its security, it is highly relevant that the EU acts to counter this threat, and for researchers, to investigate *how* it acts to counter this threat, e.g. what kind of actor it is. One way to discover what kind of actor the EU is in this area, is to examine what kind of actor the EU depicts itself as. By knowing how it depicts itself, we can understand what kind of actor the EU wants to be, and appear as. Knowing what kind of actor the EU depicts itself as enlightens one aspect of what kind of actor the EU is. Therefore a number of key documents in which the EU depicts itself and its actorship will be examined in this paper. In order to look into that question, we have to start by establishing whether the EU qualifies as an actor on this issue.

1.1 Research gap and purpose of the study

This study will contribute by providing further evidence of the EU as an actor in nuclear non-proliferation through a detailed reading of the key policy documents. Previous studies have assessed EU as an actor in the non-proliferation area based on their external behaviour, and neglected to examine the internal element. This paper aims to take both internal and external aspects

² The multilateral trade regime for nuclear material, equipment and technology (Bauer, 2012, p. 376)

into consideration when researching how the EU depicts its actorship, by using the theoretical framework of actorship, developed by Hettne, Söderbaum & Stålgren. It is also relevant to define the EU actorship on non-proliferation issues, as the EU itself has set out to be a global actor (ESS, 2003, p. 1, Grip, 2011, p. 2).

The main aim of this study is to provide an explanation of the specific case of EU actorship in the non-proliferation area, and how the EU depicts itself in that area. A secondary aim is to draw conclusions based on the theoretical framework used in this analysis, which will provide inferences on the theoretical framework itself, and contribute to the theoretical debate on the EU as an actor.

1.2 Research questions

1. Is the EU an actor in the non-proliferation area? If so,
2. What kind of actor does the EU depict itself to be?

1.3 Structure

The introductory chapter presented the subject that will be researched here, the research gap and research questions that guides this paper. In the next section, the theoretical debate that this paper will contribute to, and the context of where the theoretical framework derives from, will be presented. In the second chapter, the theoretical framework of actorship will be described, and the vital concepts dealt with in this paper will be defined. Following the theoretical introduction, the methodology of this paper will be presented in chapter three, as well as the material chosen, and the limitations of this study. In the fourth chapter the analysis will be conducted. First the primary research question will be tackled, where the empirical circumstances will be presented to the reader, and compared to a central definition of what constitutes an actor, to see whether the EU qualifies as an actor in the non-proliferation area. Then the second question will be addressed. The six documents chosen for that task will be analysed to find evidence of regionness, presence and actorness, to see how the EU depicts its actorship. This will be followed by a discussion and finally some concluding remarks.

1.4 Literature review

Many studies have been conducted on the EU as an actor in foreign policy. Some focus on how the EU impacts upon the world around it (Engelbrekt & Hallenberg, 2008), its effectiveness (Ginsberg, 1999, p. 430), while others focus on how the EU acts (Manners, 2002), or should act (Duchêne, 1972, p. 43), how it's foreign policy should be studied (Tonra & Christiansen, 2004, p. 3), the role it has (Elgström & Smith, 2006), its diplomacy (Keukeleire, 2003, pp. 31-56) and further, whether the EU is an example of regional security governance (Kirshner, 2007, pp. 113-131) or a security community (Weaver, 1998), to name but a few orientations.

This paper will contribute to the theoretical debate discussing what the EU is (Ohlsson, 2005, p. 17), by looking at one case of this issue. One pioneering researcher on this area (*ibid.*) was Gunnar Sjöstedt, who in 1977 constructed a model for the evaluation of the extent to which the European Community is to be regarded as a genuine actor in the international system (Sjöstedt, 1977, p. 6). Several of the later authors draw from his work in their own research.

Allen & Smith, like Puchala³ (1974, p. 269), claimed that the state-centric approach in world politics is too narrow to study Western Europe's role. Instead they insisted that the role of Western Europe is that of a multi-dimensional presence, especially in the economic sphere (Allen & Smith, 1990, pp. 20, 37). Bretherton & Vogler, who take a constructivist approach to analyzing the construction of EU actorness, later picked up the presence concept. They argue that the interacting processes of presence, opportunity and capability shape the EU's external activities (Bretherton & Vogler, 2006, p. 24), and represent the leading theory of European foreign policy (Peterson, 2008, p. 218).

The theoretical framework that will be used in this paper, by Hettne, Söderbaum and Stålgren, builds on the aforementioned works by Sjöstedt and Bretherton & Vogler. Other scholars who have further developed these theories in a slightly

³ Who developed an alternative to traditional integration theories by advocating the "concordance systems" approach.

different way are Jupille and Caporaso, who, in order to measure EU actorness, developed a framework of 4 concepts of recognition, authority, autonomy and cohesion (Jupille & Caporaso, 1998, pp. 214ff). Building on this framework, Groenleer and Van Schaik claim that the relationship between institutional set-up of the EU foreign policy-making process and the international actorness of the EU is not as strong as it has been claimed. Using two cases of human rights and environmental issues for this purpose, they show that also in policy areas of intergovernmental decision procedures, the EU can act as an effective actor (Groenleer & Van Schaik, 2007, pp. 991f).

Ramon Pacheco Pardo concludes that the EU is not a normative, civilian or ethical power (as an answer to earlier research on how the EU acts), but a “normal” actor, driven by the same goals as any other actor of attaining the highest level of security by influencing the behavior of others (Pacheco, 2012, p. 2), and he uses the EU non-proliferation policy to illustrate this. The evidence of the crucial importance of security for the EU is the European Security Strategy (ESS). The examples that the EU is using force are the economic sanctions against Iran (coercion) and when member states use their militaries in activities (interdiction of shipments) related to the Proliferation Security Initiative, PSI, with full consent of the EU (ibid. pp. 13f). Pachecos study does not however take into consideration the internal aspects of EU actorness, and his explanation therefore misses an important part what constitutes EU as an actor.

Another leading researcher who has looked closer at the EU non-proliferation policies is Clara Portela. She analyses the EU’s role in non-proliferation up until 2003, with a focus on the external actions of the EU. She concluded that the EU was still ineffective as a non-proliferation actor (Portela, 2003, p. 21). She also assesses the WMD strategy, which in her words “bears the potential to allow the EU to become a relevant actor in the field” (ibid. p. 29).

Offering a chronological explanation of the development of the European Community (EC) and the EU’s non-proliferation policies from 1970, Müller and van Dassen concur that the policies exhibit increasing convergence in

intergovernmental processes (Müller & van Dassen, 1997, p. 69). Also offering a chronological description from the first steps towards EU-non-proliferation policies today, Camille Grand offers his views on what initiatives the EU should take to promote non-proliferation further (Grand, 2000, p. 38-50).

Roland Kobia has a legal perspective on the development of EU common non-proliferation efforts, as he argues for a more comprehensive approach by the EU in order to effectively address non-proliferation issues (Kobia, 2008, p. 53). Also with a legal perspective, Eileen Denza contends that the example of their actions towards Iran shows that the EU acts in a constructive way to promote and strengthen the NPT-regime (Denza, 2005, p. 311). Carlo Trezza on the other hand, asserts that the EU will have to intensify efforts both in disarmament and peaceful uses of nuclear energy in order to prevent the weakening of the non-proliferation regime (Trezza, 2007, p. 3).

Analyzing the EU's nuclear diplomacy ambitions in light of the NPT-regime, Sten Rynning reaches the conclusion that the EU contradictorily wishes to be pluralist, while supporting anti-pluralism. In order to be more effective, the EU needs to acknowledge its anti-pluralist bias, and work together with the US to address non-proliferation (Rynning, 2007, pp. 268, 283f).

Lina Grip maps the EU's numerous institutional actors on the non-proliferation area, and concludes that the ability to monitor the coherence of the various non-proliferation programmes is hampered by the institutional architecture, as well as the division between external and internal policy actors (Grip, 2011, p. 17).

2 Theoretical framework

This framework, hereafter called “actorship” was chosen because it will provide for a holistic view, bringing attention to both the internal and external elements of EU politics, that other theoretical views have neglected to do. It can therefore contribute to a better understanding of the EU, and of this policy area in particular. According to its' inventors, the concept of regional actorship is not specifically related to the EU, and serves as an analytical framework in studying the transformation of any region from object to subject, that is with a certain actor capacity in its external relations (Hettne, Söderbaum & Stålgren, 2008, pp. 8, 12). The theoretical framework is the foundation of the analytical tools of ideal types and of the methodological questions to conduct the textual analysis, that will be developed later in this paper, and enables the analysis.

The development of the theoretical framework was originally used to explain the emergence of the actorship of the EU, and the EU's ambitions and experiences in becoming a unified global actor in the policy area of global development, and thereby to provide recommendations on how the EU member states could improve the EU actorship in this field (ibid. pp. 8f, 12).

There are three interacting components of a regionally based actorship, which can compensate for each other's weaknesses:

1. Regionness
2. Presence
3. Actorness (ibid. p.15, 20)

2.1 Regionness

Regionness covers the internal cohesiveness, which includes internal (objective) integration and (subjective) identity formation (ibid. p. 15). Regionalization is a process of region formation by different actors that intensify and converge within the same geographical area, thereby increasing the cohesion and distinctiveness of the region. Regionness is then described as the levels in the process of regionalization. The authors identify the five different levels of

regionness as; regional social space, regional social system, regional international society, regional community and regional institutional polity. The EU has reached the fifth stage (ibid. pp. 15f). As the first four stages are not relevant for the purpose of this paper, they will not be further elaborated here.

The level of regional institutionalized polity is described as having a more fixed and permanent structure of decision-making, and therefore stronger acting capability and actorship (ibid. p. 17). The European Union cooperation since 1991 up until today is the only example of this level of regionness. The economic regionalization of Europe that started in the 1990s, arising out of the internal market project, and implied liberalization, deregulation and orthodox anti-inflammatory policies was spelled out in the Maastricht treaty in 1991. The economic convergences contributed to the increasing regionness, and subsequently the European Monetary Union (EMU) became the main route to integration. The convergence criteria for the EMU, and the criteria of the European Stability and Growth Pact, illustrate the process of regionalization directed from above (Hettne, 2008, p. 11).

2.2 Presence

Presence is created by size, economic strength, military power etc., and is dependent upon the subjective consciousness by the actor of its presence in order to make use of it (Hettne, Söderbaum & Stålgren, 2008, pp. 15, 17). The concept of international presence is used to describe the phenomenon of the bridge between endogenous and exogenous factors, where presence provokes reactions and creates expectations from the outside (ibid. p. 17). It is a complex and comprehensive material variable, depending on the size of the actor, the scope of its external activities, the relative importance of different issue areas, and the relative dependence of various regions upon the European market (Hettne, 2008, p. 5).

Presence, as defined by Hettne, Söderbaum and Stålgren, builds on the work of Bretherton & Vogler who refer to it as the ability to exert influence externally, to

shape the perceptions, expectations and behaviours of others. Presence in their perception is more a consequence of being, than a purposive external action. They present two intimately interconnected factors that determine the reputation and status accorded to the EU by external audiences, i.e. the character and identity of the EU,⁴ and the external, often unintended consequences of the Union's internal policies (Bretherton & Vogler 2006, p. 27ff).

Bretherton and Vogler give three examples of the processes by which presence can be induced when third parties respond to the EU presence in ways that necessitate, in turn, a response by the EU. They are the largely unintended effects of the Common Agricultural Policy, the Single Market, and the impact of the introduction of the Euro (ibid. p. 28f).

2.3 Actorness

Actorness is the capacity to act purposively to shape outcomes in the external world (Hettne, Söderbaum & Stålgren, 2008, p. 15). A growing capacity to act can be the result of a strengthened presence in different arenas. The unique feature of regional actorness is that it is necessarily voluntary, and therefore depends on dialogue and consensus building, rather than coercion (ibid. pp. 18f).

Hettne, Söderbaum & Stålgren (ibid. p. 18) draw upon the work of Bretherton & Vogler's requirements for actorness with reference to the EU. They propose four basic requirements for actorness, which are:

1. Shared commitment to a set of overarching values.
2. Domestic legitimation of decision processes and priorities relating to external policy.
3. The ability to identify priorities and formulate policies
4. The availability of and capacity to utilize policy instruments (Bretherton & Vogler, 2006, p. 30).

⁴ Here identity appears again, indicating the interconnectedness of the three components of actorship.

According to Bretherton and Vogler, shared commitment to a set of overarching values is a relatively unproblematic requirement for the EU, as the Treaty of the European Union set out very clearly the values and principles that the EU and its Member States claim to be committed to (ibid. p. 30).

Domestic legitimation of decision processes and of priorities relating to external policy is a more problematic requirement, as the EU insists on adherence to democratic principles by Member States and third parties, while itself suffers a democratic deficit. Also, as EU policies increasingly affect the daily life of individuals, the EU will be more dependent upon public consent (ibid. p. 30).

The third requirement, the ability to identify priorities and formulate policies, is captured by the concepts of consistency and coherence.

Consistency concerns the extent to which policies of Member States are consistent with each other and complementary of those of the EU (ibid. p. 31).

Coherence refers to the internal policy processes. For the EU, it relates to the coherence between the policy areas, which was previously divided by the pillar structure (ibid. pp. 32f).

The fourth requirement is the availability of, and capacity to utilize policy instruments. The policy instruments are categorized into political (diplomacy/negotiation), economic (incentives/sanctions), and military means. The EU also has access to civilian policing and judicial measures that can be deployed externally (ibid. pp. 33ff, 207).

For the EU, actorhood is related to the issue of competence, in other words who has the right to decide what (Hettne, Söderbaum & Stålgren. 2008, p. 18). EU is a strong actor in the area of trade, but in security the question of its competence is highly controversial. The most problematic requirement for the EU is that of domestic legitimation, in view of the democratic deficit of the EU (ibid. p. 18).

2.4 Definitions

2.4.1 Actor

The definition that has been chosen for the purpose of this paper is:

To be an actor is the same thing as to possess a quality, which is here called *actor capability*. The object equipped with this quality is a unit in the international system [...] it has a minimal degree of separateness – and it has a minimal degree of *internal cohesion*. If these conditions are fulfilled we could say that the unit has autonomy [...] Autonomy is to be regarded as a basic condition for the existence of an international actor [...] But given that the unit is autonomous the specific and decisive criterion for the determination whether or not a certain unit is or is not an actor is its possession of what has here been called actor capability [...] The actor capability is, in principle, a measure of the autonomous units capacity to behave actively and deliberately in relation to other actors in the international system (Sjöstedt, 1977, p. 15f, original emphasis).

2.4.2 Non-proliferation

The concept of non-proliferation was originally used with the intention of preventing further states from acquiring nuclear weapons, but now also includes actions taken to prevent non-state actors from accessing these. In the European Security Strategy, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is identified as a key threat to the EU. In it, the concept includes the possibility of a WMD arms race, especially in the Middle East; advances in biological sciences that may increase the risk of biological weapons being used; attacks with radiological and chemical weapons; the spread of missile technology; and a scenario of terrorist groups acquiring weapons of mass destruction (ESS, 2003, pp. 3f). Therefore the concept of non-proliferation comprises all actions taken to counter these threats. This is the definition of the concept on non-proliferation chosen for this paper. It will later be explained why this paper will only deal with the nuclear side of non-proliferation.

3 Method

3.1 Research question number 1

To clarify if the EU qualifies as an actor on the non-proliferation field, the empirical settings of the EU on this matter will be presented. The empirical information will then be compared to a central definition of an actor, provided by Gunnar Sjöstedt, and already presented above. The empirical findings will then be used to determine whether the EU qualifies as an actor in this area, which is a prerequisite for the second research question. For this purpose, literature on the subject will be consulted, which will be elaborated further under the material chapter.

3.2 Research question number 2

The study will be conducted through an in-depth textual analysis against a model of ideal types, guided by the theory of actorness. The method that will be undertaken in the examination of what kind of actor the EU portrays itself to be, in researching the EU documents, is a qualitative text analysis, as described by Peter Esaiasson et al. (2004, Ch. 12). This method consists of asking questions to the text, and the questions will be empirical indicators of the phenomenon that is being studied (ibid. pp. 233f, 239). The questions are formulated by the author of this paper, and are constructed to indicate when evidence of regionness, presence and actorship are found in the documents analyzed.

The questions to the texts, in order to characterize the type of actorship the EU constitutes, will be further elaborated after the ideal types below, and are developed based on the theoretical framework. Explanations to what they indicate will be given subsequently throughout the analysis.

These findings will then be compared with six ideal types, also developed by the author of this paper. The ideal types will serve as an analytical tool, providing two polarizing extremes of the phenomenon that is under examination. These ideal types will reflect the optimal fulfilments of the concepts, as well as the least

fulfilment thereof (ibid. pp. 155ff). That way, the characterization of EU actorship in all three categories can be evaluated, to get a coherent view of the EU's intentions as an actor in the non-proliferation area. The ideal types will be constructed based on the theoretical assumptions above.

3.2.1 Ideal types

3.2.1.1 *Ideal types of regionness*

Optimal

The ideal type of optimal regionness would imply that the internal integration is complete, and all actions taken are done so in cooperation within the EU.

No national initiatives are taken in this area, but if they were, they would be fully consistent with the policies and goals of common strategy, and only further enhance the internal integration. All actions taken depend upon full consensus of all member states. The identity formation would be complete, meaning that there would be a strong common identity (on this area), and no signs of differing views would be found.

Minimal

The ideal type of minimal regionness would imply that there would be none, or very little internal integration on this area. Actions are taken on a national basis, with different and contradictory aims. There would be no indications of common identity, but rather signs of differing identities between member states. There would be a lack of common achievements, as cooperation would be hampered by the lack of common actions.

3.2.1.2 *Ideal types of presence*

Optimal

Optimal fulfilment of the presence concept would be a large actor, taking advantage of its size to push its goals forward. The size of the actor is actually only one factor. Awareness of its (relative) size, and the effective utilization of this position, is the optimal way of making use of presence.

Minimal

Minimal presence would be an actor's lack of awareness of its relative power, and not getting anything decided the way it advocates for. Not having access to negotiations, e.g. not being recognized as a party to international fora, and therefore not being able to exercise power, is also an ideal type of minimal presence.

3.2.1.3 *Ideal types of actorness*

Optimal

Optimal actorness is achieved when the region has completely harmonious values, and common policies based on those values. The legitimacy of the governance is so strong that it is not even questioned, or rather, is highly legitimized by its citizens. There is a high consistency in the external actions between individual member states and the EU, and between the different policy areas within the EU. This indicates well-defined priorities, and goes back to the shared values. The governors have access to several policy instruments, and know how to use them in a coherent and fruitful way.

Minimal

The ideal type of minimal actorness means no shared values, and no policies on how to formulate actions. The governance lacks legitimacy, and is constantly challenged. The member states and the EU work towards different goals in foreign policy, and the priorities between them vary. Also, the work carried out in different policy areas (former pillars) is also exposing differences in aims in the different areas. Policy instruments might be available, but not used in a proper way, and therefore not effective.

3.2.2 Questions to identify actorship

The questions that will be used to identify how the EU depicts its actorship were developed by the author of this paper, and are based on the theoretical assumptions presented in the theoretical framework.

3.2.2.1 Questions to identify Regionness

To differentiate between internal integration and consistency (which falls under the actorness concept), internal integration will be defined as actions with an internal focus, between or among EU and member states. Consistency on the other hand, will be measured by actions with an external focus.

The questions that will be asked to the texts to identify the internal integration are:

- How is the internal work described in the text?
- Is it characterized by cooperation or competition?
- Which are the internal actions?
- Is there any common EU regulation in this area?
- Are there any common policies on internal actions in this area?

To identify any identity formation the questions to the texts will be:

- What gives away a description of the citizens of the EU?
- Are any adjectives used to describe common characteristics of the EU, its citizens or beliefs?

3.2.2.2 Questions to identify Presence

Any evidence of taking advantage of its size or negotiation position will be taken as a sign of a conscious presence. Indications of interpretations of third parties views of the character or image of the EU will also be taken as signs of this concept.

The questions that will be asked to the texts to indicate presence are:

- Are there any signs of the EU consciously taking advantage of their negotiation position by the EU?
- Are there any signs of interpretations of third parties views on the image of EU?
- What are the economic or political advantages of the EU in any negotiating situations?

3.2.2.3 Questions to identify Actorness

The questions that will be asked to the text to discover the actorness in the EU will be:

- Are there any common policies on external actions?
- Are there any indicators of common perceptions, interests or values?
- Which actions are being taken externally?
- Are there any formulations or wordings that indicate an intention to domestically legitimize its actorness?
- Are there signs of consistency or inconsistency in the actions between the EU and the member states in the external actions and towards third parties?
- Are there signs of incoherence or coherence between the different institutions within the EU dealing with external actions, i.e. the Council, the Parliament, the Commission?
- What are the instruments that the EU possesses, and which of them are being used?

3.3 Material

For the first research question, where the empirical settings of EU on this issue will be presented, previous research will be consulted. This material was chosen with a critical treatment of the sources, and selected as it constitutes the central literature on this area. The chosen authors and their conclusions have already been presented in this paper under the literature review chapter. Clara Portela is a leading researcher in this field, and her work is often referred to by other

researchers. Roland Kobia has worked with these questions within the EU, and Peter van Ham and Lina Grip are two prominent researchers on this issue. In some cases, information from the websites of the European External Actions Services (EEAS) and the Commission were also consulted.

For the second research question, where the text analysis will be conducted, six key documents were chosen. They were chosen out of the large range of strategies, statements, common positions, joint actions, regulations, council decisions and implementation reports etc. that the EU has published on this issue. To limit the scope of the analysis to what is feasible within the perimeters of this paper, six key documents were selected as the representative documents of the EU actorship, and its depiction thereof. The European Security Strategy and the WMD strategy were chosen because they imply the selected course of action for the EU, and are the foundations for how the EU addresses this issue. They were also adopted at the same time to emphasize the linkage between both (Portela, 2004, p. 2). The 2008 New lines for action document was conceived to draw back attention to the subject, and increase actions against proliferation, and it will be examined because of the increased importance it places on this issue. It also puts a lot of attention on the internal work, and will therefore provide information on the regionness side of EU actorship. However, looking solely at the policy strategies will not tell us if this course of action was actually implemented. Therefore two implementation reports of the WMD strategy, the first and the seventeenth (at time of writing the latest one) will be examined as they will provide an indication of whether the actions were taken, and on whether the instruments introduced in the strategy were used. Finally, the document "EU Strategy against the proliferation of WMD: Monitoring and enhancing consistent implementation" was chosen as it provides internal revision of the EU actions and actorship on this issue. In all, three strategies, one council conclusions and two implementation reports make up the material that will be analyzed to answer research question number two of how the EU depicts its actorship.

All of the above-mentioned documents are public, and several are strategies of how the EU sets out to act. That could imply that the image portrayed in them could be more positive and aspirational than realistic, as the actor is characterised by the actor itself. The documents were however chosen because they represent what the EU can unite upon, and how it wishes to portray its actorship. As this paper sets out to investigate how the EU depicts itself, this is the material best suited to achieve this purpose.

3.3.1 Limitations

The scope of this research is limitation to the policy area of non-proliferation. While this is only one of the policy areas of the common foreign and security policy (CFSP), it has specific policy tools and particular implications, and is therefore the sole focus of this paper. An additional limit to the scope of this paper is that it will deal with nuclear non-proliferation, and not the whole WMD concept, which also includes chemical, radiological and biological weapons, and missiles. The EU has published an action plan on strengthening the chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear security in the European Union (15505/1/09, 2009). Looking into that aspect too would open up the door to including the threat of terrorism, as well as the other aspects of weapons of mass destruction, and make the scope of this paper not feasible within its perimeters. The nuclear issue is also the one where the EU focuses most of its non-proliferation efforts. This paper will therefore be dealing with non-proliferation to state and non-state actors, but not terrorism per se, and will only focus on the nuclear side of the concept. In some places of the analysis, the international legal regimes against biological and chemical weapons however will be mentioned, but only as an indicator of the many different fora the EU is active in.

The time limits are set to explain the actorship of today, even though the theory claims to encompass a historical perspective. This implies that historical aspects will be taken into consideration, but actorship in previous periods will not be researched here. The timely limits of EU actorship will be drawn in 2003, when the EU published its strategy against the proliferation of WMD, and can therefore

be claimed to construct the particular setting for actorship on this issue. Also, it has been stated by others that it was not possible to speak of a coherent European policy, or that the EU was a cohesive force in this area before 2003 (Ahlström, 2005, p. 30), which further motivates this delineation. The end of the period researched here is August 2012, when the, at the time of writing this paper, latest implementation report was published.

Another interesting question to research would be to measure the effectiveness and outcomes of the EU's work on non-proliferation. But as Peter van Ham mentions, a methodology to do so would have to be developed, and in the meantime, it would be "dangerously wrong to equate money spent with results achieved" (Van Ham, 2011, p. 9). Also, as interesting as that would be, the focus of this paper is to investigate what kind of actor the EU depicts itself to be, and the results will therefore not be taken into consideration in this paper.

4 Analysis

4.1 Research question number 1: Is the EU an actor in the non-proliferation area?

To be able to say something about EU actorship on the issue of non-proliferation, the first step is to decide whether the EU qualifies as an actor on this issue. To do that we will return to the definition borrowed from Gunnar Sjöstedt, who defines it as;

To be an actor is the same thing as to possess a quality, which is here called *actor capability*. The object equipped with this quality is a unit in the international system [...] it has a minimal degree of separateness – and it has a minimal degree of *internal cohesion*. If these conditions are fulfilled we could say that the unit has autonomy [...] Autonomy is to be regarded as a basic condition for the existence of an international actor [...] But given that the unit is autonomous the specific and decisive criterion for the determination whether or not a certain unit is or is not an actor is its possession of what has here been called actor capability [...] The actor capability is, in principle, a measure of the autonomous units capacity to behave actively and deliberately in relation to other actors in the international system (Sjöstedt, 1977, p. 15f, original emphasis).

Then we shall examine the empirical circumstances, to provide information on whether these criteria are met in this policy area. This section is also intended to serve the purpose of giving the reader a background on how this policy area has evolved and emerged within the EU.

4.1.1 Empirical circumstances

Initial steps towards a common external policy were taken in 1981, when a working party on non-proliferation was set up within the European Political Cooperation, although its role was only formalized in the Single European Act in 1986. The Treaty on European Union, and the creation of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, and the subsequent enhancement of instruments and mechanisms helped the development of the EU's role in non-proliferation. In 1990 the first high-level document on non-proliferation, the Dublin Declaration, was published. Since then the EU has gradually increased its activity in the non-proliferation domain, broadly categorized into efforts aimed at strengthening existing regimes, and approaches to regional proliferation issues. (Portela, 2003, p. 3, 5, Van Ham, 2011, p. 1) Between 1994 and 2003 the EU did not launch any major initiatives, but a Common action in 1995 on the participation of the EU in the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, which involved the European Commission, the European Council and the European Parliament working together and streamlining their positions (Kobia, 2008, p. 35).

In October 2003, Javier Solana, the High Representative of the CFSP, appointed Annalisa Giannella as his personal representative on WMD proliferation, and in December, the WMD strategy was published (Van Ham, 2011, p. 3). Since then the Council has published reports every six months on the implementation of the WMD strategy (Van Ham, 2011, p. 4, Website; EEAS: The fight against proliferation of WMD).

The Lisbon Treaty introduced a High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and a Vice President of the European Commission post, first held by Catherine Ashton, charged with ensuring unity, consistency and effectiveness

of all EU policies with external ambitions. She was charged with implementing the CFSP, and is assisted by the European External Action Services (Website; EEAS: The fight against proliferation of WMD, Grip, 2011, p. 3). The Lisbon Treaty also introduced the post of European Council President, first held by Herman Van Rompuy. They both share the task of representing the EU's external non-proliferation policies in international fora (Grip, 2011, p. 3). The EEAS, in addition to supporting the High Representative, prepares policies for the Council and Commission, and ensures consistency between different policy areas. They have permanent chairs in the Council working groups on non-proliferation issues, and are responsible for assessing the implementation of the non-proliferation strategies. With the Lisbon Treaty, the personal representative was housed in the EEAS, where she presides over one of the directorates dealing with non-proliferation (ibid. p. 6f).

The Council adopts the EU's non-proliferation strategies, policies and conclusions, is responsible for the financial implementation of the CFSP budget and the Instrument for Stability. The European Parliament is involved in non-proliferation policies through its political oversight, budgetary authority and legislative capacities, and the Commission draws up the legislative proposals, and has responsibility for managing and carrying out the budget and the implementation of policies and programmes (ibid. pp. 3ff).

Dual-use exports control regulates exports of items that can have both civilian and military aims, and therefore contribute to clandestine WMD programs under the auspices of peaceful pretexts. Within the EU, this matter was initially considered as falling under national security, but was decided by the European Court of Justice to adhere to the jurisdiction of the common commercial policy (Michel, 2008, pp. 41f), and falls therefore under the Trade Directorate General of the Commission (Website; European Commission, trade topics, dual-use).

4.1.2 Conclusions on research question number one

Returning to the initial research question of whether the EU is an actor on this issue, the criteria of a minimal degree of separateness and internal cohesion, and actor capabilities have to be met. Regarding separateness, evidence is found in the empirical circumstances that a minimal degree is achieved. As the issue is evidently handled on the EU level, with the EEAS preparing policies, and the Commission drawing up legislative proposals, this criterion is considered as reached. Internal cohesion is indicated in the joint actions and the WMD strategy, where common grounds are found and articulated, signalling at least some minimal degree of this criterion. The examples of the Common action in 1995, and the biannual publications on the implementation of the WMD strategy that follow up the work that has been undertaken, suggests that the EU can, and does, behave actively and deliberately to achieve their common policies, and therefore also fulfils the actor capabilities criterion. Consequently, it is argued here that the EU *can* be regarded as an actor on this issue, and we therefore turn to research question number two.

4.2 Research question number 2: What kind of actor does the EU depict itself to be?

To answer that question, the six chosen documents, and the significant quotes therein will be portrayed. These quotes were identified with the questions posed to the text, as described in the methodological chapter.

4.2.1 The European Security Strategy

“As a union of 25 states with over 450 million people producing a quarter of the world’s Gross National Product (GNP), and with a wide range of instruments at its disposal, the European Union is inevitably a global player” (ESS, 2003, p. 1).

This quote indicates the EU’s will to be an actor, and even a “global player” on this issue, indicating a common will, or policy of the EU. The motivation of this actorness is the size of the population, economic powers and means available, making it too big NOT to be an actor. This quote therefore indicates the

awareness of the economical and political size, and the possibilities of taking action on that premise, which constitutes the criterion for presence.

“The increasing convergence of European interests and the strengthening of mutual solidarity of the EU makes us a more credible and effective actor” (ibid. p. 1). This quote indicates that the EU has common values and interests, and that they are increasingly converging, indicating the actorness of the EU. The mutual solidarity mentioned is interpreted as an indication of identity formation of the Europeans, as this quote implies that there is solidarity and hence some kind of sense of commonality between Europeans. The last part of the sentence, about this making the EU a more credible and effective actor, is interpreted as a common value, and an indication of the EU’s desire to be an actor in this field.

Regarding what the EU has been doing to address the threats before the ESS states “It has pursued policies against proliferation over many years” (ibid. p. 6) and then mentions strengthening the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), measures to tighten export controls, and promoting universal adherence and strengthening multilateral treaty regimes and their verification provisions to exemplify what has been done (ibid. p. 6). This quote is interpreted as a sign of actorness, as it demonstrates that common actions have been taken, and common instruments are being used like political and economic instruments to counter proliferation of WMDs. These actions illustrate that actions taken from 2003 were not initiated at that time (as noted in the empirical settings), but are now incorporated into a pronounced strategy.

“Proliferation may be contained through export controls and attacked through political, economic and other pressures while the underlying political causes are also tackled” (ibid. p. 7). This quote indicates that the EU has access to several different instruments to tackle proliferation, which is a sign of actorness. It also suggests that the cause of proliferation is something underlying which also has to be tackled to prevent proliferation, indicating a common perception of what the core issue is, and therefore signifies actorness.

4.2.2 The WMD strategy

As the European Security Strategy makes clear, the European Union cannot ignore these dangers. WMD and missile proliferation puts at risk the security of our states, our peoples and our interests around the world. Meeting this challenge must be a central element on the EU's external action (15708/03, 2003, p. 2).

This quote illustrates several aspects of EU actorship. It clarifies why the EU needs to be an actor on this issue, because it simply cannot ignore this threat. It also illustrates common features of the EU, which constitutes identity formation criteria of regionness, when it speaks of *our* states, *our* peoples and *our* interests, indicating the common features and interest of this common group. The identity is however portrayed as pluralist, as the people are mentioned in plural, which is also the case for interests, indicating that the citizens are not a unified group, and that several characteristics and interests exist within this identity. Clarifying that these actions must be a central element of the EU's external actions is also indicating the importance of these common policies, indicating the priority of actorship on these issues. It can also be interpreted as a way of legitimizing EU's actorship on this issue to the domestic audience, as the EU assumes actorship over these crucial security issues, and therefore is interpreted as aiming for domestic legitimation.

Also describing the identity formation of the regionness is the quote that "The European Union has special strengths and experience to bring to this collective effort" (ibid. p. 9). It illustrates that the EU as a unit has specific characteristics, and competences indicating its traits as an actor.

"Proliferation of WMD and means of delivery is a growing threat to international peace and security" (ibid. p. 3). Under this chapter the acquisition of WMD by states or non-state actors, the spread of nuclear, biological, chemical weapons, and their means of delivery are mentioned as direct and indirect threats to the EU and its wider interests (ibid. pp. 3f). This shows that the EU has common perceptions of the threat, and therefore indicates actorship by the EU.

“- our conviction that a multilateralist approach to security, including disarmament and non-proliferation, provides the best way to maintain international order...” (ibid. p. 5). This quote exhibits the commonality of this claim, therefore interpreted as a shared value. It also shows that the shared value is the multilateral approach, which is even described as “the cornerstone of the European strategy for combating proliferation of WMD” (ibid. p. 6). The policy to pursue this aim is to promote implementation and universalization, as well as improving the compliance verification systems of the existing disarmament and non-proliferation norms, including the NPT, the IAEA Safeguard agreements and protocols, the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), the Hague Code of Conduct (HCOC) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Also the role of the UN Security Council is emphasized as the final arbiter in cases of non-compliance with the above-mentioned norms (ibid. p.6). This quote illustrates the EU’s shared interests and values of promoting and supporting the existing international treaties and institutions. It also indicates the way that the EU will work to counter proliferation, and which means it considers effective to this end. In fact, the mere existence of a shared WMD strategy supports claims that the EU has shared values on this issue, since the document in itself is a compilation of common values and policies to be taken in external actions.

“Promotion of a stable international and regional environment is a condition for the fight against proliferation of WMD” (ibid. p. 7). The best solution to prevent proliferation is that “countries should no longer feel that they need them” (ibid.), and that political solutions should be found to the problems that make countries want WMDs. This section is indicative of the shared values of the EU that international security and stability are the best ways to ensure that proliferation does not happen, and therefore contributes to the actorness of the EU.

“Close cooperation with key partners is crucial for the success of the global fight against proliferation” (ibid. p. 8), and the partners that are mentioned are the US, Russia, Japan, Canada, the UN, and NATO. This citation indicates a shared value of the importance of cooperation with great powers on this issue, and also

indicates a direction for common policies, both constituting the actorness of the EU.

We have a wide range of instruments available: multilateral treaties and verification mechanisms; national and internationally-coordinated export controls; cooperative threat reduction programmes; political and economic levers (including trade and development policies); interdiction of illegal procurement activities and, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the UN Charter (ibid. p. 8).

Also, positive and negative security assurances and assistance programmes (ibid. pp. 7f) are mentioned in the strategy. All of the above mentioned tools indicate that the EU has access to a lot of instruments for this task, indicating its actorness. Identified in the quote above are political, economic, judicial and military tools, but the political and diplomatic preventative measures “form the first line of defence against proliferation” (ibid. p. 5), indicating that they are the most important tools for the EU. Later documents will tell us if and which of these instruments are actually being used.

“Making the EU a leading co-operative player in the export control regimes by co-ordinating EU positions within different regimes...” (ibid. p. 10), indicates that the EU is aware of its position and size in international fora, and will take advantage of that fact by coordinating its positions to achieve its aims. This is a sign of the actorship quality of presence, and that the EU is consciously taking that into consideration.

To enhance and strengthen export control policies and practices, enhanced information exchange, council Directives on improving the control of high activity radioactive sources, strengthened EC and national legislations on pathogenic microorganisms and toxins, and the adoption by the member states of common policies related to criminal sanctions for illegal export, brokering and smuggling of WMD related material (ibid. pp. 10ff) are all internal actions to be taken. This indicates a variety of internal actions to align and enhance competitiveness of the EU work, and is interpreted as internal integration contributing to the regionness of the EU.

The signs of increasing coherence within the EU found in the WMD strategy, are the intentions to “integrate the WMD non-proliferation concerns into the EU’s political, diplomatic and economic activities and programmes, aiming at the greatest effectiveness” (ibid. p. 13) and the intention to mainstream non-proliferation policies, inter alia, by using a non-proliferation clause in agreements with third countries (ibid.). These two actions are interpreted as coherence as they aim to increase the unity between the different sectors of EU activities. Furthermore, the inclusion of the WMD-clause in agreements does also add to the coherence of EU policies in different areas.

4.2.3 1st implementation report of the WMD strategy

As it is the first implementation report, many of the points made in the document are proposed actions to be taken, rather than actually executed actions, e.g. a proposal for assistance programmes, suggested meeting with Chinese authorities on export controls and a reflection that more consideration should be given to EU initiatives in the field of biological weapons (10448/04, 2004, pp. 7, 11f). As they are only at the planning stage at this time, and this paper is interested in the actions that the EU manages to coordinate and decide upon, these intended actions will therefore not be further discussed here.

EU coordination has been systematically organized prior to and, where necessary, during the meetings of the export control regimes, facilitating agreements on EU statements at regime meetings as well as EU proposals on certain issues... (ibid. p. 8)

This quote demonstrates that the EU coordinates its positions in the export control regime meetings, which indicates common policies and external consistency and exemplifies the actorness criteria. The coordination of EU positions in such fora could also indicate that the EU is consciously taking advantage of its negotiation position, and therefore indicate the presence-criteria of the EU, which cannot however be confirmed by this quote. EU initiatives constituted the groundwork for a modernization of the NSG’s outreach activities, and the inclusion of catch-all mechanisms into their guidelines (ibid. p. 9).

Also in the area of export controls, internal integrations is demonstrated in the implementation of the “Peer review”, including visits to all (then) 25 member states, interim reports, and the bringing to light of “best practices” of the implementation of the common regulation (ibid. p. 10), as they all aim to improve the internal work.

In the area of supporting international initiatives aimed at the identification, control and interception of illegal shipments, the EU made a public statement in support of PSI, and circulated a note including a preliminary assessment of the Community competences (ibid. p.17). The public statement is interpreted as a use of the diplomatic (political) tool, as it is aimed at reinforcing the global non-proliferation efforts and regimes. The note containing a preliminary assessment is apprehended as an attempt to increase coherence, and also to increase the comprehension of the EU coherence by third parties, and therefore pertains to its actorness.

Personal Representative has participated in several Council geographical working group meetings, in order to promote awareness to the Strategy as well as the insertion of the non-proliferation clause in agreements with third countries (ibid. p.19).

This quote also highlights the efforts made to increase coherence between different policy areas within the EU, as the Personal Representative’s efforts are aimed at increasing knowledge about, and inclusion of this issue within other areas of the EU policies. It therefore qualifies as actorness. The non-proliferation clause was inserted in an agreement with Tajikistan (ibid. p. 20), which further illustrates the efforts of coherence of the EU, as the clause is actually being used in agreements concerning other issues than non-proliferation, and the use of economic instruments.

4.2.4 EU Strategy against the proliferation of WMD: Monitoring and enhancing consistent implementation

This document introduces a WMD Monitoring Centre (WMD MC) to cover the day-to-day implementation of the WMD strategy, further develop the WMD strategy, assure coherence of assistance programmes, and participate and support in contacts with third countries and organizations (16694/06, 2006, pp. 6f). It also states the importance of coherence and consistency of the EU and its MS, in wordings like “It is therefore crucial to enhance coherence in the overall contributions made by the EU and its Member States in order to further improve synergies and avoid possible duplication” (ibid. p. 3) and “through this liaison function, the Council and the Commission, working together within the WMD MC, would be in a position to present to the outside a perfectly unified EU position on all matters related to WMD” (ibid. p. 8). This text indicates that coherence and consistency between the EU institutions and the member states is important, and can be improved; thereby appertaining to the actorness of the EU.

In the introduction of the document, reference is made to the terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom and Spain, and followed up by “For the credibility of the Union, everything possible therefore needs to be done to monitor the implementation of the Strategy to look for ways to improve consistency of its implementation” (ibid. p. 2). This quote is identified as serving the purpose of domestic legitimation, by proving that the improvement of EU actions, and full implementation of the WMD strategy would prevent terrorist attacks in Europe using WMDs, which therefore justifies and legitimizes EU actions on this issue.

4.2.5 New lines for action

The New lines for action (NLA) document has a strong emphasis on internal integration, creating common policies, and on promoting the convergence of practices between the member states. Actions that will be taken to improve internal work include adoptions of codes of professional conduct, improvement of national export control procedures, strengthening consultation and international instruments and cooperation in terms of consular vigilance (17172/08, 2008, p. 7). A high-level training course will also be set up to “encourage the dissemination of a common European administrative culture of combating proliferation...” (ibid. p. 23). Also, a plan will be adopted to provide the European institutions, the member states and the Council with guidance on working in synergy in implementing the WMD strategy (ibid. p. 6), and work will be done to improve “the coordination of all the EU’s players and resources” (ibid. p. 24). All these actions aim to improve internal integration, increase cooperation and promote common policies and even of a common culture among the administrative staff, and are therefore identified as contributing to the regionness of the EU.

Another big area of increased cooperation and common undertakings mentioned in the new lines for action, is the combat against tangible transfers of technology, goods and equipment, where a common regulation is in place, and measures are taken such as exchange of experience, coordination between agencies, producing standard information documents and raising awareness within the EU (ibid. pp. 14f). All of these actions indicate that there is a common regulation, and also that work in this area is characterized by cooperation and therefore regionness.

“Weapons of mass destruction which may be in the hands of states of concern or terrorists/non state actors constitute one of the greatest security challenges which Europeans may ever face” (ibid. p. 3, original emphasis). This quote indicates a common perception of the threat, which is now even described as one of the greatest ever to be facing Europeans and this shared value (concern) contributes to the actorhood of the EU.

The aim of increased consistency is discovered in the wording "harmonization of the EU member States' positions in international fora... will be sought more effectively" (ibid. p. 19, original emphasis). This is interpreted as a sign of the will to further increase the consistency between EU member states, and thereby increasing their influence. The creation of a document to define geographical priorities for EU cooperation with third countries, that will be validated by the Council working party on Non-Proliferation (CONOP), Council working party on Disarmament (CODUN) and Political and Security Committee (PSC) (and thereby the member states), (ibid. p. 20), is also interpreted as increasing consistency in the EU common actions towards third countries.

4.2.6 17th implementation report of the WMD strategy

Since the establishment of the European External Action Service, the high representative together with her EEAS staff, are taking over the work in this area previously handled by the rotating presidency (2012/C 237/01, 2012, p. 1). This brings with it the consequence that the report focuses primarily on external action, and does not discuss further coordination within the EU. The high representative and her representatives are working in international non-proliferation and disarmament for a, "seeking to ensure continuation of an active and visible EU role" (ibid. p.1), indicating the importance of coherence in foreign policy, and of the actorness criteria.

External policy areas where the EU has worked energetically, actively participated and promoted ratification or implementation include the 2012 NPT Review Conference, within the IAEA, for the CTBT, the Conference of Disarmament (CD), on the regional issues of Iran and North Korea, the CWC, BTWC and the HCoC (ibid. pp. 2ff). All of these actions imply that the EU takes common external action, and contributes to the international regimes in accordance with the WMD strategy, and therefore aims at consistent external actorness.

Some internal integration is however mentioned. The EU Non-Proliferation Consortium of independent (European) non-proliferation think tanks produce working papers on the implementation of the WMD strategy (ibid. p. 5), and imply that European think tanks are increasing cooperation in their field. This indicates internal integration and regionness by the EU.

Another area that indicated both internal and external actions is the United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 and export controls.

The EU therefore boosted its support to third countries with a view to assisting them [...] by organizing together with UNODA and the 1540 Committee a number of regional workshops, and by carrying out bilateral visits (ibid. p.6).

These actions, together with a technical assistance programme directed at neighbouring countries demonstrate the external actions taken by the EU, using both diplomatic and economical tools, and thereby activeness. The EU common regulation on dual-use export controls has been amended by two new regulations (ibid.), indicating the furthering of the internal common regulations and work, and regionness of the EU.

The use of its financial resources, the CFSP budget and the Instrument for Stability are mentioned in the report, e.g. to support the IAEA, its Nuclear Security Fund and Low Enriched Uranium Bank (ibid. p. 1f). These are signs that the EU has a budget for these issues, and uses the economical instrument.

4.2.7 Summary and comparison with the ideal types of actorship

Summary of the analysis above

	Regionness	Presence	Actorness
ESS	Identity formation	Presence	Common interests Common values Common actions Instruments
WMD strategy	Identity formation Internal integration	Presence	Common policies Domestic legitimacy Shared values, perceptions and interests Instruments Coherence
1st implementation	Internal integration	Presence	Consistency Instruments Coherence Common actions
EU monitoring			Coherence Consistency Domestic legitimacy
NLA	Internal integration		Common perceptions Consistency
17th implementation	Internal integration		Coherence Common actions Instruments

In the ESS, regionness is found in the second quote where the increasing convergence of European interests and the strengthening of mutual solidarity is mentioned. This wording indicates that the interest and solidarity is not yet complete, as in the ideal case of regionness, but that mutual interests and solidarity exists and is increasing. Presence is found in the first quote, where the awareness of the economical and political size of the EU makes the foundation for taking advantage of this position in negotiations and in an international context. The quote does not however give away whether the EU has or does take advantage of their size, which would be evidence of optimal presence.

Actorness is found on several occasions in this strategy. It is indicated in the will to be a global actor, i.e. common interests, that common actions have been taken, access to common instruments, and a common perception of what the security threat is. In these three areas, these quotes indicate a quite high level of actorness.

As concluded above, the mere existence of a WMD strategy is clear evidence of common perceptions and values on this issue, which indicates actorness. In the WMD strategy, evidence of regionness, presence and actorness is found. Regionness is manifested in the identity formation when it speaks of *our* states, *our* peoples and *our* interests, indicating a common pluralist identity in formation, and when it describes the special characteristics of the European Union, indicating a personality of the Union as a whole. Particularly the last aspect is interesting, as it indicates that not only the citizens of the European Union, but the Union itself has traits of its own, which would indicate a strong case of regionness on the issue of identity formation. Concerning internal integration, the strategy mentions different actions to align and enhance the competitiveness of the internal work. It also demonstrates that there are common directives, and a high level of integration, but the strategy states that it still has many aspects to increase coordination on.

Presence is found when the strategy mentions the coordination within export control regimes to make the EU a leading player. This shows a high level of presence compared to the ideal types, as there is a high level of consciousness of the EU position. Actorness is indicated in the numerous shared values, policies and the common perception of the threat. It is also exhibited in the list of instruments available to the EU, covering political, economical, judicial and military tools. The coherence criterion of actorness is indicated when the strategy mentions the intention to mainstream non-proliferation policies in other activities and programmes. A bid for domestic legitimation was found in the strategy, when the EU claims responsibility for preventing WMD proliferation. This is not however strong evidence thereof. The shared values and policies, as well as the number of instruments available point to a high level

of actorness, whereas the coherence is only intended to be improved, and therefore not judged as very high by this formulation.

In the first implementation report, regionness is indicated when a peer review and best practices of implementing the common regulation on export controls are mentioned as efforts to increase the internal integration. This is, as in the WMD strategy, evidence of a high level of internal integration, as there are common regulations that all MS have to follow. It still shows that the implementation can be improved however. Presence is indicated as the EU coordinates its positions to facilitate agreements and proposals in export control regime meetings. This is strong evidence that the EU is aware and taking advantage of its presence, and therefore compares to a high level on the ideal types. Concerning actorness, the document indicates common policies and external consistency in export control regimes, work by the Personal Representative to increase coherence, and that the economic and diplomatic tools were used as the WMD clause was inserted into an agreement, and public statements were used to support international regimes. This leads to the conclusion that common policies, external consistency and the instruments used indicate a high level of actorness, whereas coherence can still be improved, and is therefore not as high.

In the “EU strategy: monitoring and enhancing consistent implementation” document, evidence of actorness is found. Firstly, the importance of coherence and consistency in order to improve synergies and avoid duplications indicates awareness of the importance to act as one unitary actor, and to improve the external work. Secondly, reference to internal legitimation is apprehended as the document makes reference to the terrorist attacks in UK and Spain, and by that claims that the implementation of the WMD strategy is for the credibility of the Union. This would legitimize EU actions on this issue, and therefore that the EU is trying to legitimize its actions internally. Compared to the ideal types of actorness, increasing coherence and consistency is not strong evidence of how far the work is actually coherent and consistent yet, and therefore not proof of high actorness. The attempt to legitimize actions internally reaches higher on the

actorness scale, but it does not tell us whether the citizens agree, and therefore does not indicate optimal actorness.

The New Lines for Action mentions several actions to be taken that will increase internal cooperation such as training, providing guidance, exchanging experience and producing standard information. Also the common regulation on the combat against transfers and technology is mentioned, that indicates a high level of regionness on this issue, as common legislation has already been decided upon. The actions indicate that work is being carried out in a cooperative manner, which also indicates high levels of regionness compared to the ideal types. The quote stating that WMD in the hands of terrorists is one of the greatest security threats that Europeans will ever face shows that there is a common perception of the threat, indicating a high level of actorness. The aims to increase consistency of the member states in international fora, and towards third countries suggests that improvements can still be made, and therefore signifies not such a high level of actorness compared to the ideal types.

In the seventeenth implementation report, evidence of regionness and actorness were found. The common regulation on dual-use goods, already mentioned as the export control regulation, was amended, and a consortium of non-proliferation think tanks was set up to increase cooperation. The amendment of the regulation indicates a high level of regionness, and the consortium of think tanks implies higher levels of cooperation within the EU. External actions were taken in the international fora, and within the technical assistance programmes, which also means that both diplomatic and economical instruments were used. This indicates quite high levels of actorness, as external actions were taken, proving that the EU uses its instruments at hand and as indicated in the WMD strategy. The evidence that the EU has a budget and financial instruments also solidifies the actorness, as the economical tool has been institutionalized as a fixed budget, and therefore more formalized. The new External Action Services also works to ensure continuation of the work carried out before, indicating that the work is characterized by coherence, which indicates a high level of actorness.

4.2.8 Conclusions on research question number two

In summary, a high level of regionness was signalled in all documents where it was mentioned except in the European Security Strategy. Especially the internal integration, where common regulations exist, and work is characterized by cooperation, exhibits high scores on the regionness scale. The conclusion is therefore that the EU portrays itself to have a high regionness.

Strong evidence of the EU using its presence was indicated in two documents, both referring to the context of export control regimes. As mentioned in the introduction, member states of the EU compose more than half of the members of the NSG regime, which could therefore provide the proper settings for using the EU presence, as evidenced in the documents. High presence is also depicted by the EU.

The results on the actorness factor is however miscellaneous. The ESS, WMD strategy and the New Lines for Action signal high levels of shared values, perceptions, and interests. The indicated level of domestic legitimacy, in the two cases identified was, to say the least, meager. In the words of Bretherton and Vogler, the domestic legitimacy is the most problematic requirement for the EU, and reference to this issue in these public documents on foreign policy was therefore not very likely. Consistency was demonstrated as ranging from not so high to strong, but is at least judged as an indication of the importance of this matter to the EU, although it can still be improved. Equally, coherence was qualified as ranging between weak and high, making a final judgment on the classification difficult. Regarding the policy instruments, there was evidence in the documents of the EU using the political and the economical ones. As stated in the WMD strategy, the military one would only be used as a last resort, which was therefore not yet the case. The use of the political and economical instruments and a dedicated budget is nevertheless judged as a strong indication of actorness, as these are the instruments that the EU set out to use. Therefore, the ability to interpret how the EU intends to portray its actorship is more complicated. The wide array of results found in the documents provide a complex image.

5 Discussion

The most interesting results of this analysis were the ones under the actorness category, which differed a lot. The actorness category itself is the widest one, encompassing many different aspects of the foreign dimension of actorship, and to find the greatest varieties under this heading is therefore not that surprising. The wide array of replies however indicates that EU's depiction of its actorness, i.e. its external dimension, is not found to be completely unified (yet).

Several of the documents demonstrate the importance of consistency and coherence between the different institutions and the member states, and the intention to improve on these issues. This could indicate a lack of consistency/coherence that these official documents cannot comment upon since they are official. It could also be the case that this is the way to improve work once it has already been established, without criticizing, or with the realization that things can always be improved until they are perfect (whatever that would be, a nuclear free world?).

It could be claimed that the construction of common identity (regionness) and interests are in a way serving as internal legitimation (actorness) by the EU, since there are several examples of identity and interest-definitions in the examined documents. This would again signal the interconnectedness of the three components of actorship, as Bretherton and Vogler already pointed out the connection between presence and external identity. What Hettne, Söderbaum and Stålgren were discussing was the internal democratic deficit of the EU, which was however not likely to be mirrored in these official foreign policy documents, and concern the EU as a whole, rather than in one policy field.

On the issue of internal integration, export controls was a good example of far reaching coordination, where common regulations exists, and cooperation is steadily taking place to enhance efficiency and coherence. This however falls under the jurisdiction of trade policy, as mentioned under the empirical circumstances, and is therefore not entirely treated as a security issue.

Regionness on this issue can therefore be argued to pertain to the trade area instead of the non-proliferation area. The actorship on an issue area does not however need to be mutually exclusive. The fact that the EU tries to coordinate its actions and its coherence outwards, only strengthens the claim that the export controls are still a constitutive part of the non-proliferation efforts of the EU, and proof of its coherence, no matter where they are handled.

It is difficult to measure actorship, since it is not the equivalent of results achieved, as Van Ham pointed out. Therefore the EU could be using its diplomatic tools, but not get further adherence to the international regimes. It could also be the case that the reality of what actually takes place in Brussels is not as good as indicated in these policy documents. To take this into consideration, the two implementation reports were also examined to see whether policies and actions were consistent in its depictions. It was however not the intention of this paper to measure or evaluate the actions, but to provide an interpretation of the actorship, which is, as van Ham concluded, not dependent on the actual result.

Since the Lisbon treaty changed the outlook of EU foreign policy, a new kind of actor could have developed. However, as seen in the 17th implementation report, the work has been carried out in order to ensure continuation of the policies, which supports the idea that the actorship has not changed, whereas the actor might have. Whether this is the case or not was not within the scope of this paper, and therefore cannot be answered here.

The analytical method of textual analysis undertaken here could be criticized for its high reliance on subjective interpretations, which therefore also this paper could be accused of. It has however throughout the formulation of this paper been in the consciousness of the author, who has therefore continuously kept to the method chosen, and all the evidence has been motivated all through the analysis, in order to incite intersubjectivity.

The employment of ideal types contributed to the examination by offering a good yardstick, on which to measure how high the actorship criteria had been fulfilled,

and were very helpful for the analysis. They did not however provide substantial indications of when these criteria were completely filled, like when comprehensive common legislations would be accomplished.

One strength of the theoretical perspective that was chosen for this paper is that it takes into consideration both internal and external factors, something that the other theories and examinations of EU non-proliferation policies do not. It is however not all encompassing and misses the cases of national cooperation that is not realized under the auspices of EU, but still consolidates and contributes to the actorship of the EU conceived by third countries. One example of this is the example of actions related to the PSI by the member states, and with full consent of the EU, as mentioned by Pacheco Pardo. It only deals with what the EU can produce together, and how far the EU institutional integration has come. As noted by Müller & van Dassen, and Groenleer & Van Schaik, functional actorship with 27 member states does not necessarily mean EU institutional convergence, but can be achieved when the member states have high intergovernmental cooperation.

The theoretical framework also only partially takes into consideration external influences on the shaping of EU actorship, as the presence criteria cover the bridge between external and internal factors. It can therefore tell us about how the EU uses its position within the international context, but misses how the international structures impacts on the EU. This variable could not however have been explained with the method used for this examination, and remains an area for further (constructivist) research. It also misses the external unintended results of EU actorship, as only the intended impact of the EU is covered by the presence criteria. This means that important parts of EU actorship, such as its role model status and standard setting work for other actors cannot be accounted for with this theoretical framework.

The choice to use EU public policy documents for the second research question is crucial to the results presented here. Any other material chosen would have ensued a different result, and it would not have been able to provide better

answers to the research questions posed here. Public policy documents can be suspected of displaying a very positive image of the issue at stake, which is already discussed in the material chapter, but provide a portrayal of the EU's intentions, which is what was under investigation here. Using other literature on this matter would however have affected the examination with that author's own opinions or interpretations, which is why that was not a better option.

After concluding that the EU is an actor in this area, researching how the EU depicts its actorship can tell us several things. The depiction can tell us about the intentions of the EU, and its ambitions as an actor. It can also later on be compared to the results that the EU exhibits on this issue, to compare whether they correspond. It also provides us with a deeper knowledge of what the EU is, and how it sees itself. Therefore, the results of this study provide a further explanation of the EU as a non-proliferation actor, and contribute to the understanding of the EU in this policy area, and to the theoretical debate about what the EU is. The theoretical framework was helpful in providing a portrayal of what ambitions the EU has.

Does this paper cover the whole non-proliferation actorship, and do these documents constitute sufficient basis for conclusions on the EU actorship? This paper never claimed to be all encompassing, but to look at the depicted actorship from the chosen theoretical framework, and from what could be discovered with a textual analysis. The findings in this paper can however contribute to the theoretical debate on EU actorship, as this case provided evidence to conclude that the theoretical framework of actorship fails to include national cooperation not realized under the auspices of the EU, the impacts of the international structures on the EU, and the unintended results of EU actorship.

The fact that the EU does not possess any nuclear weapons, and cannot agree on disarmament policies, is hampering the EU's ability to act and be an actor in this area. It is highly relevant to promote non-proliferation, even if you have no access to nuclear weapons. Is it however possible to be a credible actor of non-proliferation if you are not at the same time promoting disarmament, since the

two go hand in hand according to the NPT? This question will be left for further (normative) enquiries.

6 Concluding remarks

This textual analysis has provided us with an understanding of how the EU sees itself as an actor, by showing us how the EU depicts its actorship, looking at both internal and external facets. It was concluded that the EU can be considered an actor on this issue, and that it demonstrates a will for strong actorship on regionness and presence, but a mixed result on the actorness side. It can be argued that the EU is an actor, sees itself as an actor, and wishes to portray itself as a strong and coherent actor. This conclusion fulfils the primary aim of this paper to provide an explanation of the specific case of EU actorship in the non-proliferation area. As for the result of what the EU can accomplish as an actor, further studies will have to be consulted and undertaken. Bringing back these results to the theoretical discussion of what the EU is, and to the secondary aim of this study, it was concluded here that the theoretical framework fails to take into account the implications of external factors, unintended results, and intergovernmental actions taken between the members of the region.

References

- Ahlström, Christer, (2005) "The EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction" in Kile, Shannon N ed., *Europe and Iran, Perspectives on Non-proliferation*, SIPRI Research Report No. 21, Oxford University Press, Norfolk
- Allen, David & Smith, Michael, (1990), "Western Europe's presence in the contemporary international arena", *Review of International Studies*, no. 16, pp. 19-37
- Bauer, Sibylle, (2012) "Developments in the Nuclear Suppliers Group", in SIPRI Yearbook, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Bodell, Nenne, (2012) "International security cooperation bodies" in SIPRI Yearbook, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Bretherton, Charlotte & Vogler, John, (2006) *The European Union as a Global Actor*, Second edition, Routledge, Oxon
- Denza, Eileen, (2005) "Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: The European Union and Iran", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, no. 10, pp. 289-311

- Duchêne, Francois, (1972) "Europe's role in World Peace", in Mayne, Richard ed., *Europe Tomorrow*, 16 Europeans look ahead, Fontana, London
- Elgström, Ole & Smith, Michael, (2006) *The European Union's Roles in International Politics; Concepts and analysis*, Routledge, Oxon
- Engelbrekt, Kjell & Hallenberg, Jan eds. (2008) *The European Union and Strategy; An emerging actor*, Routledge, London
- Esaiasson, Peter et al., (2004) *Metodpraktikan; Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*, Andra upplagan, Nordstedts Juridik AB, Stockholm
- Ginsberg, Roy H., (1999) "Conceptualizing the European Union as an International Actor: Narrowing the Theoretical Capability-Expectations Gap", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 3, September 1999, pp. 429-454
- Grand, Camille, (2000) "The European Union and the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", *Chaillot Papers*, Institute for Security Studies Western European Union, No. 37, January 2000
- Grip, Lina, (2011) "Mapping the European Union's Institutional Actors Related to WMD Non-proliferation", *Non-Proliferation Papers*, No. 1, May 2011, EU Non-Proliferation Consortium
- Groenleer, Martin L.P. & Van Schaik, Louise G., (2007) "United we Stand? The European Union's International Actorness in the Cases of the International Criminal Court and the Kyoto Protocol", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 5, pp. 969-998
- Hettne, Björn, Söderbaum, Fredrik & Stålgren, Patrik, (2008) "*The Eu as a Global Actor in the South*", Report No. 8, June/2008, Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies, Stockholm
- Hettne, Björn, (2008) "EU as a Global Actor: An Anatomy of Actorship", *Panel IV:I The EU as an International Actor I*, Friday 25 April, 09.00-10.30, as the EU international Affairs Conference 2008, Grande Salle/ Grote Zaal
- Jupille, Joseph & Caporaso, James A., (1998) "States, Agency, and Rules: The European Union in Global Environmental Politics" in Rhodes, Carolyn, *The European Union in the World Community*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Colorado
- Keukeleire, Stephan, (2003) "The European Union as a Diplomatic actor: Internal, Traditional, and Structural Diplomacy", *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Vol. 14, no. 3, (September 2003), pp. 31-56.
- Kirchner, Emil J., (2007) "European Union; The European Security Strategy versus national preferences" in Kirchner, Emil J. & Sperling James eds. *Global Security Governance*, Routledge, Oxon
- Kobia, Roland, (2008) "The EU and Non-Proliferation; Need for a Quantum Leap?", *Nuclear Law Bulletin*, Issue 81, June 2008, pp. 31-53
- Manners, Ian, (2002) "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 235-258
- Michel, Quentin, (2008) "The European Union Dual-use Export Control Regime", *Esarda Bulletin*, No. 40, December 2008, pp. 41-45
- Müller, Harold & van Dassen, Lars, (1997) "From Cacophony to Joint Action: Successes and Shortcomings of the European Nuclear Non-Proliferation Policy", in Holland, Martin ed., *Common Foreign and Security Policy; the Records and Reforms*, Pinter, London
- Ohlsson, Kristina, (2005) "EU – En accepterad aktör i fredsprocessen i Mellanöstern" in Ekengren, Magnus ed. *EU:s många utrikespolitiska ansikten*, Försvarshögskolan, Stockholm

Pacheco Pardo, Ramon, (2012) "Normal Power Europe: Non-Proliferation and the Normalization of the EU's Foreign Policy", *European Integration*, Vol. 34, No. 1, January 2012

Peterson, John, (2008) "The EU as a Global Actor", in Bomberg, Elisabeth, Peterson, John & Stubb, Alexander eds. *The European Union, How Does it Work?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Portela, Clara, (2003) "The Role of the EU in the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons The Way to Thessaloniki and Beyond", *PRIF Reports No. 65*, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt

Portela, Clara, (2004) "The EU and the NPT: Testing the New European Nonproliferation Strategy", *Disarmament Diplomacy*, Issue No. 78, July/August 2004

Puchala, Donald J., (1974) "Of Blind med, Elephants and International Integration", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 267- 284

Rynning, Sten, (2007) "Peripheral or Powerful? The European Union's Strategy to Combat the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", *European Security*, Vol. 16, Nos. 3-4, September-December 2007, pp. 267-288

Sjöstedt, Gunnar, (1977) *The External role of the European Community*, Saxon House, Farnborough

Tonra, Ben & Christiansen, Thomas eds. (2004) *Rethinking European Union foreign policy*, Manchester University Press, Manchester

Trezza, Carlo, (2007) "The EU between Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", *ISPI Policy Brief*, Global Watch, Issue No. 51, April 2007

Van Ham, Peter, (2011) "The European Union's WMD Strategy and the CFSP: a Critical Analysis", *Non-Proliferation Papers*, EU Non-Proliferation Consortium, No. 2, September 2011

Weaver, Ole, (1998) "Insecurity, security and asecurty in the West European post-war community", in Adler, Emanuel & Barnett, Michael eds. *Security Communities*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

EU Official documents

10448/04, "EU Strategy against proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction – Draft Progress Report on the implementation of Chapter III of the Strategy", Brussels, 10 June 2004, available at: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/documentation/documents/index_en.htm#Bookmark4

15505/1/09, The Council of the European Union, "Council conclusions on strengthening chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) security in the European Union -an EU CBRN Action Plan- Adoption", Brussels, 12 November 2009, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/crisis-and-terrorism/securing-dangerous-material/index_en.htm

15708/03, Council of the European Union, "Fight against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction- EU Strategy against the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction", Brussels, 10 December 2003 , available at: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/documentation/documents/index_en.htm#Bookmark4

16694/06, Council of the European Union, "EU Strategy against the proliferation of WMD: Monitoring and enhancing consistent implementation", Brussels, 12 December 2006, available at: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/documentation/documents/index_en.htm#Bookmark4

17172/08, Council "Council Conclusions and new lines for action by the European Union in combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems", Brussels, 17 December 2008, available at:

http://eeas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/wmd/index_en.htm

2012/C 237/01, Council "Six-monthly Progress Report on the implementation of the EU Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (2012/I)", Seventeenth implementation report, available at:

http://www.eeas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/documentation/documents/index_en.htm#Bookmark4

ESS "European Security Strategy: A Secure Europe in a Better World", Brussels, 12 December 2003, available at:

<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/eeas/security-defence/european-security-strategy?lang=en>

Other official documents

INFCIRC/140, 22 April 1970, "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", available at:

<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Treaties/npt.html>

Websites

EEAS: The fight against proliferation of WMD, available at:

http://eeas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/wmd/index_en.htm

Consulted 28 November 2012

European Commission, Trade topics, Dual-Use

<http://ec.europa.eu/trade/creating-opportunities/trade-topics/dual-use/>

Consulted 21 December 2012