

The Development of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy from the Treaty of  
Amsterdam to the Treaty of Lisbon in Light of Securitization Theory

Master's thesis

by

Manuela Osiander

Student number: 4217012

Supervisor: Prof. dr. B. Verbeek

Political Science

Radboud University Nijmegen

21. December 2013

## **Table of Content**

1. Introduction	5
1.1 The EU foreign policy development and its relation to threats	6
1.2 Changing threats as reason for changing policies?	18
1.3 Scientific relevance	10
1.4 Societal relevance	11
1.5 Limitations	12
1.6 Methodology	13
1.7 Outline	14
2. Theoretical Framework	15
2.1 Underlying theoretical concept of foreign policy	15
2.1.1 Foreign policy according to the European Union	16
2.1.2 The idea and realm of foreign policy	17
2.1.3 Foreign policy as reaction on threats	19
2.2 EU and foreign policy in the scientific debate: The need for a new approach	20
2.2.1 Earlier research into EU foreign policy	21
2.2.2 Empirical studies and their focus regarding EU foreign policy	24
2.3 An alternative approach: Securitization theory	25
2.3.1 Basic assumptions	25
2.3.2 The speech act: Securitization of perceived threats	27
2.3.3 The “triangle” of the securitization process	28
2.3.4 Criticism of securitization theory	29
Lack of normativity	29
Problem of definitions	30
Taking position to overcome criticism	31
3. Methodology	33
3.1 “Why so and why not differently?”	33
3.2 What does securitization theory expect to happen?	33
3.3 Measuring threat perception	36
3.4 Discourse analysis	40
3.5 Data generation	43
3.5.1 Operationalization	43
3.5.2 Possible problems regarding operationalization	45
3.5.3 Problems regarding operationalization when using CDA	45
3.6 Selection of units of observation	46
3.7 Investigating the empirical material	48
4. Development of EU foreign policy	50
4.1 Developing a foreign policy – a difficult task	51
4.2 Steps towards the current foreign and security policy of the EU: The “logical” outcome of closer cooperation and growing economic influence?	

4.3 The foreign policy of the EU – expanding tasks and instruments to become more responsible	54
4.4 The organization of the CFSP	55
5. Analysis	58
5.1 Factors that guided the selection of speeches	58
5.2 Procedure of speech analysis	61
5.2.1 Analysis of the (historical) background of the speeches	61
5.2.2 Analysis of the content and the language that was used	70
5.3 Outcome of the speech analysis	71
5.3.1 Impact of threat perception on the Treaty of Nice	82
5.3.2 Impact of threat perception on the Treaty of Lisbon	83
6. Conclusion	84
Literature	89
Appendix A: Questionnaire speeches	99
Appendix B: Time periods	174
Appendix C: Threats	175

## **List of Abbreviations**

CDA	Critical discourse analysis
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CSDP	Common Security and Defense Policy
EC	European Community
EEAS	European External Action Service
EPC	European Political Community
EU	European Union
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
PJCC	Police and Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters
WEU	Western European Union

## **1. Introduction**

Over the years, the European Union has broadened its foreign policy regarding its scope, its influence, the institutional organization and its instruments. Initially, treaties concerning foreign policy cooperation between European countries such as the European Defense Community (EDC) from 1950<sup>1</sup> about a common army or the Fouchet Plans from the early 1960s<sup>2</sup> had the aim to pursue peace within European states and dealt with military issues. But the idea of a common foreign policy and cooperation was already broadened with the Treaty of Rome from 1957, which included economic aspects when it founded the European Economic Community.<sup>3</sup> The next attempt regarding foreign policy was the European Political Cooperation from 1970<sup>4</sup>, a still very intergovernmental and limited way of policy formation. With the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) was established as a first institutional way of foreign policy formation in the EU. In 1999, the post of the High Representative for the CFSP followed the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam, which in turn was changed into the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy with the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009.<sup>5</sup> Six years earlier, the EU Security Strategy had been adopted.

The EU foreign policy has also been broadened to various other policy fields over the years, starting with the idea of pursuing peace and maintaining economic growth - military and economic security. When those early attempts failed, it expanded to fields that are usually not considered “high politics” such as development and environment.

---

<sup>1</sup>The European Defense Community never came into function after the French Parliament rejected its ratification. See: CVCE, The Failure of the European Defense Community

<sup>2</sup>They were also not implemented. See: CVCE, The Fouchet Plans

<sup>3</sup>See: The Treaty of Rome, Part One, Principles, Article 1

<sup>4</sup>See: Europa, Common Foreign and Security Policy

<sup>5</sup>European Union, EU Treaties

## **1.1 The EU foreign policy development and its relation to threats**

It became the dominant view within the EU that if it wants to be horizontally more integrated, to speak with one voice and if it wants to be a stronger union it should become able to carry more responsibility in foreign policy issues.<sup>6</sup> As seen, the EU developed its foreign policy and broadened its possibilities of action on foreign policy issues by changing its treaties. The two approaches, the European Political Cooperation (EPC) and the CFSP set the framework and the rules for the foreign policy of the European Union and therefore also for its military, peacekeeping or police missions.

Concerning the developments in the past six decades since the Treaties of Rome, the nature of threats might have affected the characteristics of the agreements the member states of the European Union have made. Initially these agreements aimed at decreasing the military threat among the member states. The reason stems from the necessity to consider non-military threats between member and non-member states by the foreign policy, especially with the further expansion of the European Union and the changing external borders. For instance, immigration from those neighboring countries has become a changing but always present problem.<sup>7</sup>

In recent years, two major developments of the foreign policy of the EU could be observed: New threats for the EU appeared and terrorism, immigration, economic and environmental issues within and across the borders started to get almost as much as attention as the potential military threat did. Additionally, the EU started to work on its relations to non-member states more profoundly.

---

<sup>6</sup>European Parliament & The Lisbon Treaty

<sup>7</sup>It is related to crimes such as human trafficking, drugs and prostitution. Also from relatively poor member states towards relatively richer ones the migration level increased and therefore in both cases - migration between member states and between non-EU and EU states - the necessity for political measures became stronger. As the member states opened their borders with the Schengen Agreement in 1995, the permeability increased and the fluctuation of people as well, and legal and illegal immigration became more important aspects for the member states. See: European Commission, Home Affairs, Schengen Area.

For instance, the threat coming from terrorist organizations entered the discussion about foreign policy measures. This comes mostly from the threat of international terror organizations but is also linked to immigration. Open borders and the external borders of the EU require special measures and cooperation, especially with non-member neighbor states. Regarding economic issues, they have increasingly reached the focus of the EU foreign policy due to globalization. Nowadays, the EU has broad and detailed contracts and agreements with other geographical areas and countries about trade relations<sup>8</sup> which made the EU one of the most powerful and successful economic regions worldwide.<sup>9</sup> With the rise of the so-called BRIC countries<sup>10</sup> and other industrial regions such as South-East Asia, foreign economic policy of the EU has become even more important to protect the domestic economy and to ensure the competitiveness of the member states. The increased awareness of the cross-border character of environmental problems is also a phenomenon that appeared in the last couple of decades. It is seen as threatening the people and as a danger for the stability of the states and has become part of the foreign policy strategy of the EU. The oil-shock in the 1970s, the Green Revolution and upcoming political groups focusing on environment, but even more the global pollution and harming of nature forced the EU to include environmental strategies in their foreign policy. Questions about border consolidation or identity can also develop towards a threat to the relation between the states and European security as a whole. Greece for example has political tensions with FYROM<sup>11</sup> because of the name “Macedonia”, which threatens peace in this region.<sup>12</sup> Economic competition might as well intensify between states,

<sup>8</sup>For example: Economic Partnership Agreements with several countries worldwide such as Jamaica and Zimbabwe (EU trade relations worldwide) or the regional CARIFORUM agreement with several Caribbean states (European Commission, Agreements, Agreements in Force).

<sup>9</sup>See: Statistical Annex of European Economy, p. 100

<sup>10</sup>BRIC is the abbreviation for Brazil, Russia, India and China.

<sup>11</sup>Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia

<sup>12</sup>The problem is complex: The ancient region of Macedonia contained parts of the present states Greece and FYROM. Nowadays, a region in Northern Greece is called Macedonia but FYROM claims to be the only political entity that is allowed to be called Macedonia. Also, the name Macedonia is related to Alexander the Great. Both countries claim him to be part of their past. Last but not least, the border between FYROM and

but also between regions. For example, France is afraid to lose its competitiveness in the production of agricultural goods to Germany. At the global level, the European Union competes with Asia and the USA. In addition, climate change threatens countries worldwide, but also nuclear weapons can be seen as threatening not only single countries such as Israel or India, but regions and countries around the world.

With the upcoming awareness of the changing nature of the threats, the scope of foreign policy was extended. Recently, the focus shifted towards other tasks such as peacekeeping tasks on the Balkans, but also environmental, humanitarian, economic and so on issues were considered within the foreign policy as having the power of being potentially threatening to the stability of the European Union.

The characteristics of threats have changed decisively. Threats can appear within or between states and can affect states, regions or even the whole world community. Nowadays, international terrorism, growing economies and environmental topics are cross-border phenomena that pose more than only a local, regional or global threat. They can appear at one of those levels and affect others as well.

Therefore, one can come to the following observation: Changes in threats and in threat perception have led to changes and to a broadening of the EU foreign policy.

### **1.2 Changing threats as reason for changing policies?**

The idea is that on the one hand, threats have changed over time. Simultaneously, on the other hand, threats started to be perceived differently. Keeping historical developments in mind, threats could, at the end of the twentieth century, be found on the state level, between and within states, at the regional level and at the global level. They were not limited to affecting only the sphere in which they occurred.

---

Greece is questioned as well.

Regarding this characteristic the research question will focus on in how far the development of the EU foreign policy can be seen as caused or influenced by threats and threat perception. To show this the securitization theory created by Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde<sup>13</sup> will be used. Securitization theory entails a lot of useful instruments to address his issue, which cannot be provided by other approaches. For example, the idea of the speech act can help to determine threat perception and the influence it has on foreign policy. The assumption that is made here is that securitization theory can account for this development because it regards potential threats, how they are perceived and in which way the EU policy therefore changed.

Another major reason to use securitization theory is because other approaches in International Relations have difficulties in explaining this change in EU foreign policy. Rationalists could argue that this change was necessary to keep up the balance of power between the EU and the NATO, but also between Europe and the USA. For them, policy would change according to changes in the balance of power relations, but they do not account for the way in which this inequality leads to specific reactions of states regarding their foreign policy. It could not account, for example, for the militarization of the foreign policy.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, rationalism assumes that national states will not delegate control over such a vital issue to a supranational organization. What can be concluded is that these approaches – as will be shown later in more detail – all lack decisive elements to examine properly the relation between (changing) threats and the (changing) EU foreign policy.

---

<sup>13</sup> Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, 1998

<sup>14</sup> As Alexandre Lambert showed in "Les interventions « militaires » de l'Union européenne dans les Balkans" from 2006, the EU civilian and police missions on the Balkans which started in 2003 became the first military missions of the EU, preceding the following of the UN request for supporting it in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

This was amongst others possible because the EU already declared in the Treaty of Maastricht that a development of its foreign policy towards one that covers military tasks is not excluded. At the 2003 EC summit in Thessaloniki, the European Security and Defense Policy for example was expanded and included from then on the "full spectrum of the "Petersberg Tasks". See: Sjursen , 2006, pp. 169-181

In the Treaty of Lisbon, as shown later under point "5.2 Procedure of speech analysis", possible military reactions are clearly mentioned. See as well: Quille, 2008, p. 5

Securitization theory, however, may offer an explanation. It focuses on threat perception and presentation. An issue is seen as a threat to an actor if it is perceived as a danger to its existence. If an issue can be interpreted to pose an existential threat towards the Union's status quo and its development,<sup>15</sup> it can lead people to talk about an issue as being a threat. This usually works as follows: An influential person makes a so-called speech act in which he talks about an issue as being a threat. If it is successful, the perception of the threat is shared by the speaker's audience. This allows for measures that go beyond normal political procedures.<sup>16</sup> Then, the possibility occurs that the EU sees the necessity to alter its policy to be in a better position to counteract the threat. Hence, a commonly perceived threat leads to common actions in all dimensions of foreign policy.

Therefore, foreign policy changes according to the way issues are *perceived and labeled as threats and accepted* as such by a *broader audience*. This stands in contrast to rationalism, in which the *state defines* threats. Thus, this research seeks to answer the question: Did the CFSP change according to the perception of threat or changed threats?

### **1.3 Scientific relevance**

In the research that has been done so far on European foreign policy, different foci and theories were chosen without paying much attention to the possibilities that securitization theory offers.

Constructivism for example is used to account for a certain foreign policy development by DeBardeleben<sup>17</sup> who sees it as a process that leads to the formation of a foreign policy identity. The main reason for the specific outcome of the policy comes from the reflexive interaction of the member states and actors. Regarding realism, the explanation authors

---

<sup>15</sup>See: Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, 1998, p. 23-26

<sup>16</sup>Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, 1998

<sup>17</sup>DeBardeleben, 2012

provide is different. As Krotz and Maher<sup>18</sup> argue, foreign policy is formed according to considerations about how to improve power relations towards other states. Stone Sweet and Sandholtz<sup>19</sup> neofunctionalism cannot account for a development at all. There are also differences in the topic the authors focused on. Cottey<sup>20</sup> investigated neighborhood policy and regionalism, whereas Zwolski's<sup>21</sup> research was on security after the Lisbon treaty.

Research on the development of the European foreign policy based on changed threat perception with a securitization approach is still missing even though it might be better in explaining the type of change of the EU foreign policy.

#### **1.4 Societal relevance**

The necessity for this research comes from the changing challenges the EU has to face and their effect on the EU. If the assumption is that the perception of new threats is the cause for changing policies, there is a reason to expect that a long-term strategy is unlikely to follow to counteract threats and that ad hoc policy might be more appropriate. The EU is not known for quick decision processes and therefore in theory and in experience often not properly able to react on sudden threats. Member states could therefore start to regard independent strategies to counteract threats to be a good alternative option because it is often quicker to form a position within a country than within the EU. But seeing that the EU is able to form a long-term strategy - a common foreign policy according to changing threats which this thesis tries to show - means that it is possible to react on them in an appropriate amount of time. Therefore, the member states would be willing to give up parts of their foreign policy

---

<sup>18</sup>Krotz and Maher, 2011

<sup>19</sup>Stone Sweet and Sandholtz, 1997

<sup>20</sup> Cottey, 2012

<sup>21</sup> Zwolski, 2012

sovereignty to the EU. Otherwise it would mean that the member states might claim back their competences in certain policy fields and therefore undermine the power of the EU.

Even though some authors, such as Lambert and Larsen<sup>22</sup> already asked the question about the EU and its role as a foreign policy actor, there is still potential to do further research, especially by looking through the lens of securitization theory.

### **1.5 Limitations**

To conduct this research it is necessary to go back to the beginning of this supranational organization and define different time periods, in which threats occurred and foreign policy changed. One could start with the Treaty of Rome from 1957 but that would be on the one hand too extensive and could not be dealt with adequately within the realm of this thesis. On the other hand, the time since the Treaty of Amsterdam until the last treaty, the Treaty of Lisbon, seems to be a more interesting period as the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy was introduced in 1997. This position can be viewed as the personification of the EU foreign policy and therefore as giving this policy a face. The subject of research is to examine a shift in the foreign policy aims, but also the behavior and instruments of the EU which might lead to the conclusion that the EU was becoming more and more concerned with foreign policy issues and increased its foreign policy competences.

A second important limitation is that this thesis will not deal with the complete organization of the foreign policy of the EU after the Treaty of Amsterdam. It will only focus on the Common Foreign and Security Policy. This restriction comes from the character of the EU foreign policy after the end of the Cold War which has a rather diverse and widely structured character. The CFSP is the overarching framework for other policies and instruments such as the European External Action Service (EEAS) or the Common Security and Defence Policy

---

<sup>22</sup> Lambert, 2006; Larsen, 2002

(CSDP). These two are excluded in this research because the changes of the CFSP have influence on these related measures and instruments which means that if the appearance of a threat changes the CFSP, it is likely to do so with the EEAS and CSDP as well. Additionally, external relations exist in other policy fields of the EU, meaning that the change of an economic threat not only has consequences for the CFSP, but for the economic relations outside of it, too. Nevertheless, talking about EU foreign policy in this thesis means to talk about the institutionalized body that forms it and acts it out. Therefore, two cases are in the focus of this research: The content of the CFSP of the Treaty of Amsterdam and of the Treaty of Lisbon.

## **1.6 Methodology**

The method used in this research is discursive analysis because its instruments are adequate to measure the impact of the threat perception on the development of the EU foreign policy, namely the influence of the speech act. It will look at treaties and randomly selected speeches of the heads of states of the United Kingdom, France and Germany, as well as the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy in order to find out which issues were perceived as threats and therefore influenced the foreign policy formation. Here, it is possible to see which issues are seen as being more threatening and influential to the policy because in order to determine how the EU talks about issues defines them as greater or weaker threats or no threats at all.

To clarify the decisions whether or not the EU perceives an issue as a threat, one has to look at the language that is used, for example how the topics addressed were talked about. With this method it is possible to find out what was actually perceived as a threat for the EU, which can be seen as reason for shifts in foreign policy.

The shifts are defined as changes in the definition of aims, tasks, instruments and the organization. If these shifts are thematically related to points mentioned in relation to issues that are seen as threats, then the shifts can be seen as being influenced by threats.

### **1.7 Outline**

This thesis will start with an overview of securitization theory and which approaches it contributes. Next, the methodology on how to investigate the research question will be elaborated upon. Afterwards there will be a short historical summary of the threats and treaties followed by the discursive analysis of selected documents and a conclusion on in how far EU policy changed. By doing so, the research tries to try to find an answer to the question of how to account for the foreign policy change of the European Union.

## **2. Theoretical Framework**

This research aims at accounting for the development of EU foreign policy. It tries to do so by showing that the appearance of new or changes to old threats were perceived as such by the member states of the European Union, which therefore adapted their foreign policy. The focus of this research is on the threat perceptions of Great Britain, France and Germany. The securitization approach of Buzan and Wæver<sup>23</sup> serves as a theoretical basis.

### **2.1 Underlying theoretical concept of foreign policy**

Foreign policy is a broad concept. Depending on the theoretical concept one uses, it entails different elements. If someone addresses the foreign policy of a political actor such as a state, it usually refers to its conscious actions and reactions towards other states and their policies but also to the basic idea behind those relations. The following paragraphs discuss two concepts that help to better understand foreign policy formation, namely constructivism and the agent-structure principle.

In the domain of international relations, foreign policy is defined in different ways. In general, as Christopher Hill<sup>24</sup> describes it from a constructivist view, it refers to official external relations between independent international actors such as states. Wendt<sup>25</sup> keeps it simpler: it depends on what decision makers decide consciously to make of it. This means there is no static definition but it can entail a whole variety of elements and aspects depending on how the actor forms its policy and on which ideas the decision making is based on.

Securitization theory that is used here is close to the constructivist idea because they share the latter's emphasis on ideas and values. The EU is largely based on shared values and ideas, so

---

<sup>23</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 2003

<sup>24</sup> Hill, 2003

<sup>25</sup> Wendt, 1992

following the constructivist logic, the same events and topics should be perceived as threats towards the EU by the politicians. Therefore, this essay is partly based on a constructive view of foreign policy.

According to McGowan,<sup>26</sup> the agent-structure principle is another underlying principle one has to keep in mind while doing foreign policy analysis, including the formation of its aims and instruments. Nevertheless, it is usually not related to constructivism as the agent-structure principle is a static model. Still, in the case of the European Union, the interplay between agents such as the heads of state and other important people in the foreign policy realm and the structure within which the foreign policy is formed and exercised play a role in its determination. It might be the case that the structure is more decisive for the policy formation and that the words of the agents do not play a huge role. If that is the case, it might mean that the speeches featured in this research would not have an effect on the outcome of policy formation.

The connection between the agent-structure principle and securitization theory lays in the acknowledgment of the relation between an actor and the structure. They are seen as related which means the one can have an influence on the other, for example the structure determines the realm of action of the actor or the actor creates the structure. This aspect is decisive for securitization theory because – as will be stated later in more detail – both the structure and the actor are seen as having an impact on the foreign policy.

### **2.1.1 Foreign policy according to the European Union**

It is important to understand how the EU defines the term “foreign policy”. By doing so it becomes clear that the definition has changed and related to it the current foreign policy. Nowadays and after the Treaty of Lisbon, the foreign policy of the EU primarily aims at

---

<sup>26</sup> McGowan, 1989

enabling it to speak and act as one in world affairs. Its organization is aimed at supporting this goal.<sup>27</sup>

Regarding the content, European foreign policy includes a broad variety of tasks that are carried out under the overall idea to preserve peace and security by promoting cooperation between states and by strengthening EU values, including the conducting of peacekeeping missions. The cooperation entails diplomatic partnerships with various regions around the world, but also economic ones. Taken together, this should help, on the one hand to maintain Europe's powerful position in world politics and, on the other hand, promote the economic growth and political stability in other world regions.<sup>28</sup>

### **2.1.2 The idea and realm of foreign policy**

After having considered the elements of constructivism, the agent-structure principle and the definition of foreign policy according to the EU, it is possible to create a concept of foreign policy for this thesis which is based on the following premise: Ideas shape the way a foreign policy concept is built.

These ideas result from and are shaped by the circumstances the foreign policy actor is confronted with. Depending on the world the state finds itself in and the ideas and norms on which the state is constituted, a specific process of policy formation starts and a certain outcome regarding a concept appears. This concept of foreign policy is a guideline for foreign policy actions and determines how a state can or will react towards other foreign actors.

Even though foreign policy is usually referred to as part of diplomatic-military inter-state relations, other domains and actors such as international organizations are more and more

---

<sup>27</sup> The issue of speaking with one voice in the EU is dealt with in the literature, amongst others by Karen E. Smith, 2006, 2010

<sup>28</sup> European Union: Foreign and Security Policy. EU institutions and bodies

taken into consideration while shaping a foreign policy concept. With the increasing interconnection and interdependence between states, as well as the social and normative notions that underlie some policy and state relations, foreign policy is no longer only about war or peace. Global environmental issues are addressed as well when state representatives meet and the economic relations have almost become more important than or even determining political relations. It is a familiar picture of official meetings when representatives of two states are accompanied by representatives of the economy. Regarding the environment, international meetings and agreements, as well as interstate agreements on environmental topics such as global warming or the protection of a certain boarder river region also fall into the realm of foreign policy. Another aspect that is part of that category is of a social nature. Humanitarian aid for example became a huge topic during the last decades and combines foreign policy and social policy.

Regarding the realms of foreign policy that are mentioned in this thesis - diplomatic, military, social, economic and environmental - all of them are more complex than could be presented here. What matters here is that foreign policy should not be regarded as only dealing with military or diplomatic, war-and-peace questions. Although foreign policy is often cast in terms of security it need not refer exclusively to military security. From high importance as well are economic security and stability, the preservation of the environment and social or humanitarian aspects.

In this thesis, the term "EU foreign policy" will be therefore used as referring to certain ideas and instruments - created through the cooperation of EU member states within the institutional organization of the EU - which serve as basis for actions to counteract threats that are perceived as such by the EU officials or important national state leaders.

### **2.1.3 Foreign policy as reaction to threats**

Guaranteeing stability and security for the state incorporates the idea that there are many threats “out there” and that foreign policy can help to mitigate or counteract these threats. Doing so in an effective way requires above all knowing about the threat, which starts with perceiving something as a threat. This entails knowledge about its origin, its mechanism and its potential effect. This knowledge enables politicians and policymakers to prepare to deal with such situations. The perception of something being a threat can start by talking about it in a way that indicates that this issue could have effects that might possibly challenge the stability of one of the foreign policy domains. If this stated opinion becomes the dominating opinion, it is more likely that something will be done to counteract these threats, adapting the foreign policy for example.

Today, a major character of threats is that they can appear in different domains at the same time which means that they can be very complex. The most important aspect of the border-crossing nature of threats is that they work on and between different levels. On a basic level, the threat can appear within a state or on higher levels between states, regions or globally. Moreover, due to globalization, the interconnection and deepening of interdependence between states, threats can occur on the state level but can have an influence on the whole world. For example China’s high level of carbon dioxide emissions not only exacerbates the effects of global warming in China itself but also has an impact for the rest of the world. Also, regional problems such as the growing influence of Islamic radicals in the Middle East can frighten large parts of the world. Not only can the threats have bottom-up effects but also top-down, as the recent global financial crisis has shown. While it affected the whole world, it had unequal impact on different states. Countries like Iceland or Greece were hit much harder than, for example, the USA or Germany.

If these events in its various characters occur or change and/or as a result even disappear, the EU might recognize them as threats and change their foreign policy idea, concept, instruments and realm.

What is interesting about this statement is that it entails the thought that if events were or are not seen as threatening the stability of the EU, the EU did not or does not change its foreign policy to counteract it. This means that the current foreign policy could look differently if issues had been perceived differently. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the way threats were perceived in the EU.

## **2.2 EU and foreign policy in the scientific debate: The need for a new approach**

EU and foreign policy are two topics that have been broadly discussed in science. Realism and other Grand Theories as will be seen have tried to account for various developments using different angles, yet often leaving out important aspects or factors.

Realist theory with its core mechanism based on balance of power is a classical attempt to explain certain behaviors in foreign policy. The use of this mechanism in research about the EU might sound reasonable if one assumes that the EU develops towards becoming a stronger organization in order to tackle threats. Nevertheless, regarding the EU's emphasis on common values and norms, this approach leaves out the complexity of relations and interactions between states and international organizations on the one hand and the multilevel and interacting character of threats and foreign policy issues on the other hand. Additionally, reusing Grand Theories for research on EU foreign policy does not seem to contribute any new findings which should always underlie the interest in research.

Securitization theory instead is a relatively new approach which has not yet been used a lot for this kind of research. New insights are highly probable to occur with a change of lenses.

Therefore the securitization theory of Buzan and Wæver<sup>29</sup> will be used, which recognizes the need to investigate changing definitions of threats and subsequent policies. Also, it is able to account for this mechanism, more precisely for the explanatory mechanism that links the character and the location of an issue that is perceived as threat to changes in foreign policy which are provoked by these perceived threats.

### **2.2.1 Earlier research into EU foreign policy**

Following the argumentation and explaining the choice for securitization theory in this research, it is important to look at the way other approaches dealt with EU foreign policy. This shows on the one hand the way EU foreign policy has been perceived and dealt with by researchers so far, their foci but also the weaknesses of their approaches. On the other hand it can thereby clarify the necessity for an alternative approach provided through the securitization theory.

DeBardeleben, who uses constructivism, sees the formation of a foreign policy as a process that is based on a reflexive interaction between the actors, in which a foreign policy identity is formed by talking, rethinking and debating it. But forming a common idea within the European Union is a difficult task: 27<sup>30</sup> different national foreign policies often tend not to a shared, fixed opinion. It is constantly renegotiated between the member states and is subject to change. Therefore, the EU would be expected to be unable to come up with one position or only with one of a quickly changing nature.<sup>31</sup> According to this idea, it cannot be explained how it was possible that the European Union could come up with a binding approach such as the CFSP. Even though constructivism can account for changes and might expect a

---

<sup>29</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 2003

<sup>30</sup>The number of 27 and not 28 member states comes from the fact that the thesis deals with the time before Croatia joined the EU.

<sup>31</sup>De Barderleben, 2012

development towards a friendly relation between states,<sup>32</sup> it cannot explain the specific development and content of the CFSP. This could be done by using securitization theory and the assumption that the occurrence of threats made these specific changes necessary.

Realpolitik used in foreign policy might be more likely. This Realpolitik could be exercised according to certain values of the EU, which are necessary to understand the foreign policy according to Manners. But foreign policy is more than a legitimized policy framework for actions which is based on certain ideas that are generated and filtered in discourse as the discussion about its definition has shown.<sup>33</sup>

Other approaches, such as institutionalism or democratic peace theory can be connected to the explanation of the European Union's foreign policy as well. First, institutional theory asserts that the way the EU is organized and the reason behind this organization is crucial in forming policy outcomes. But the institutions themselves are no black boxes that act autonomously. There are many people working in these institutions who are responsible for the content of policies. Institutionalism therefore leaves out the influence of these single actors, within but also outside of EU institutions. By contrast, securitization theory sees the power of the single actor, more precisely the speech actor and can account better for policy changes, including organizational changes of the EU institutions.

Second, the idea of a union of democracies that wants to live peacefully – the basic idea of democratic peace - only deals with one aspect. It can help to explain the creation of the EU but not the changes in their policy. Securitization theory is better in doing so because it is less static. It allows ideas and perceptions to change, for example the perception of threats and in

---

<sup>32</sup>According to Wendt states seek to overcome enmity and rivalry with other states and want to have friendly relations. See: Wendt, 1992

<sup>33</sup>See: DeBardeleben, 2012; Manners, 2006; Larsen, 2002

this way it makes it possible to arrive at different policies over the years, even though the idea about a peacefully shared existence has not changed.

Realism does not focus on norms and ideas. The foreign policy formation of the EU is rather seen as the outcome of the “desire of many Europeans to act autonomously from the United States”,<sup>34</sup> which can be seen as a question of improving power relations. The long dependence on the United States during the Cold War due to the lack of military capacity is according to Larsen<sup>35</sup> the rationalist’s explanation of the development of the EU foreign policy, after the Cold War ended. This is a good start for explaining the actual founding of the CFSP but it still does not provide ideas about why this policy has changed in the years after its founding. It could argue that the support of the USA made the EU more vulnerable, but not against what, because the threat of the Soviet Union was gone by then.

Other authors such as Stone Sweet and Sandholtz looked at the European Union from a neofunctionalist perspective, trying to present the EU as a result of institutions with certain rules and actors that act because of self-interest, rational and materialist calculations.<sup>36</sup> This approach would predict and explain the development of a common foreign policy as a result of cooperation in other fields, as a so-called spill-over effect. Working successfully together in one field at the European level would make the European Union a more powerful organization and create a European identity. Therefore, the idea of working together in other fields, such as foreign policy, becomes more likely to happen. Explanations from the outside such as changed circumstances do not play a role and for that reason they are not looked at, even though one can assume that politicians do not leave out these circumstances when they develop a policy. By using securitization theory, threats from outside are regarded as well as

---

<sup>34</sup>Krotz and Maher, 2011

<sup>35</sup>Larsen, 2002

<sup>36</sup>Stone Sweet and Sandholtz, 1997

possible reasons for a policy development and gives a clearer answer to the question why the CFSP developed the way it did.

### **2.2.2 Empirical studies and their focus regarding EU foreign policy**

Regarding the whole research done so far on the broader field of European foreign policy, different topics besides threats were dealt with. This shows on the one hand the diversity of foreign policy, on the other hand it becomes clear which focus other researchers have. Cottey<sup>37</sup> focuses on the neighborhood policy and regionalism, which he sees as the main focus and realm of EU foreign policy since the 1990s. Likewise, Zwolski<sup>38</sup> looks at the period after 1990. He sees the EU using a holistic security approach since the Treaty of Lisbon, meaning that it includes all relevant fields of foreign policy. Here, the question about the different policy fields that are or should be included in the foreign policy appears. Again on regionalism focuses the work of Zwartje, van Langenhove, Kingah and Maes.<sup>39</sup> It is not about the potential sectors that the foreign policy reaches, but about the territorial influence. A similar idea can be found in Larsen<sup>40</sup>, who asks whether the European Union is becoming a global military actor.

Other attempts to account for the EU foreign policy look at the way the EU is named in research. Cebeci<sup>41</sup> criticized the bias that comes with calling the EU a normative, civilian or transforming power. This kind of bias excludes alternative explanations without justifying the underlying bias and idea. The identity that the researchers attribute to the European Union can be seen as a constructivist way of theorizing, even though other approaches are used for the actual research. What comes with the constant use of such terms is the artificial creation of an

---

<sup>37</sup>Cottey, 2012

<sup>38</sup>Zwolski, 2012

<sup>39</sup>Zwartjes, van Langenhove, Kingah and Maes, 2012

<sup>40</sup>Larsen, 2002

<sup>41</sup>Cebeci, 2012

identity and a “meta-narrative’, which should be avoided doing research. Also, by the constant reuse of such terms, Cebeci argues researchers only reproduce and reconstruct an identity of the EU and its foreign policy.

As can be seen, threats and securitization theory have not yet played a huge role in research. It appears that, unfortunately, securitization theory with regards to EU foreign policy studies has been underestimated so far, even though it can add a lot to the discussion. The following section discusses securitization theory more in-depth.

## **2.3 An alternative approach: Securitization theory**

### **2.3.1 Basic assumptions**

Securitization theory is based on several assumptions and is in general a mode of analyzing processes related to security. It goes beyond the general view that security is a matter of war and peace and therefore a military one. Instead, one of the starting points is that the security of a state and its people consists of several security fields such as economic, social and environmental security besides military security. According to Buzan and Waever, founder of the securitization theory approach of the Copenhagen School, such a broader view on security is necessary because of the growing importance of such fields within international relations.<sup>42</sup>

Building up on the first one, the second assumption is that the more these fields play a role in the relations between states, the more important they are for the stability of these relations but also for the stability of the states themselves. This thought is shared by Buzan and Waever who state that even though the general understanding of security is of a military nature, the survival of the state can be threatened existentially by different issues from different domains.

43

---

<sup>42</sup> Buzan and Waever, 2003, pp. 2-5

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 20

The economic stability of a state and therefore the state itself can be challenged by economic crises, bankruptcy, disadvantageous trade agreements and so on. During the current economic and financial crisis in Europe for example states like Greece but also Iceland are or were facing problems of promotions that threatened the existence of their states. This existence of a state refers in general to the stability and security of it, which is connected to the upholding of individual rights that are connected to military security and economic development, as well as social welfare. Each state defines these aspects differently wherefore each state can perceive different events as threats. Regarding the social sphere migrants as well as other religious or national groups could pose problems. Social tensions and crimes are often perceived to go along when migrants meet the native people of a state and these tensions could grow to become violent, thereby jeopardizing the stability of the state. Environmental issues such as air pollution can bring health risks for people. If people are confronted with such a problem, they might utter their fear about their health and ask the authorities in a more or less aggressive way to act and might even challenge the state's stability.

The third assumption is connected to the previous. Stability is directly linked to security which means that the more stability a state is able to provide for itself the safer it is as well. This is immediately followed by the fourth assumption: If there is a sign that the stability might be harmed, it is in the state's interest to introduce preventive measures. These measures can be of any kind of nature. Potential harm to the security of a state enables it "to use whatever means are necessary to block a threatening development".<sup>44</sup>

This move is called securitization. It means, to use the words of Buzan and Waever, that politics are taken "beyond the established rules of the game",<sup>45</sup> because an issue is seen and

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

presented to be a threat to the existence of a state and therefore a security threat. This again requires special measures by politicians or other authorized and influential persons.

### **2.3.2 The speech act: Securitization of perceived threats**

Threat perception is the essential part of securitization theory and provides an interesting approach regarding the question why a policy has developed towards into one direction and not to another. It is necessary that this happens by an authorized person or actor.

First, this person for example decides if he or she sees the issue as a threat and secondly, utters this view. This speech act is part of the threat perception and manifests it. Without stating that something is seen as being a threat, it is not a threat. Linked to the speech act is a certain type of rhetoric, meaning so much as that the way persons of authority speak about issues is decisive for securitization. More decisive, though, is the broader perception of the threat by the larger audience to which the speaker addresses his view. If the audience – the group of people that legitimates the power of the speaker - does so, the issue can be regarded as securitized. Then, policy changes and extraordinary measures are possible and justified referring to the special character of the issue.<sup>46</sup> The rhetoric the speaker uses is thus important because often it is necessary to refer to the issue as having an extraordinary nature which provides the legitimization and justification of the need for policy changes.

In sum, securitization is the outcome of a speech act that was necessary to get the legitimacy for extreme political measures and as the result of politicians who were possibly unable to use normal political measures to deal with challenging events and processes. By securitizing an issue, politicians enable themselves to adopt unusual methods or change policies, which might be easier than applying existing policies. An existing policy might not be enough to challenge

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 23-26

the new occurring or perceived threats because it was not designed to do so. Therefore, if a new threat is perceived, changing the policy seems to be logical.<sup>47</sup>

The impact the speaker has in this process is clear: If the audience accepts the issue as being a threat, it is a threat. This means it is perceived as being dangerous for the stability and security of the state regardless of the question whether it really has the potential to do so. As soon as it is securitized, it becomes a threat because it invokes the negative consequences that go with it. This might instill fear in the audience, leading to legitimacy of exceptional measures.<sup>48</sup>

### **2.3.3 The “triangle” of the securitization process**

If one looks deeper at Buzan’s and Wæver’s idea about securitization, they classify three units that are important when analyzing the securitization process. These are the referent object (the threatened entity), the securitization actor (the individual acts out the actual speech-act) and the functional actor (the person that is responsible for the consequences of the speech act). Identifying these three units is the first, but a minor step for the analysis of the foreign policy change of the EU, as it determines how likely it is that the securitization theory is able to account for it.

In the case looked upon in this thesis, the referent object is two-fold. The first referent object is European Union as an institution and its stability and security. The other is the member states, because they can be destabilized as a consequence of a destabilized EU. The securitization actors are defined in the next chapter but here it suffices to say that they are high politicians in the EU and several member states. Finding the functional actor is a bit more difficult because it is not a person, but in general all individuals responsible for changes in the EU foreign policy such as the members of the Commission and the Parliament.

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 26-29

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., pp. 29-31

### **2.3.4 Criticism of securitization theory**

#### **Lack of normativity**

Securitization is not without its critics. They do not mainly base arguments against the overall theory but often focus on the normative aspect of the theory or rather on the lack of it.

Aradau<sup>49</sup> for example criticizes that securitization theory does not take into account the normative aspect that occurs when scientists apply it. If a scientist looks at how issues are securitized, he or she subjectively decides what security is and therefore creates a security issue by writing about it. In this normative dilemma it comes down to a co-construction of political reality which means that the scientist is actually responsible for deciding what should be seen as a security issue and what should not by the choice of his or her focus. Charrett<sup>50</sup> comes to a similar conclusion and also points to the missing normative part of securitization theory. According to her, the analysis of securitizing processes and especially the speech act, which might be done using discourse theory, has normative implications. She uses the ideas of Williams,<sup>51</sup> who states that it is very difficult to write about and analyze securitization processes without having an actual influence on the process itself. This would basically be a “particular writing of securitization [that] reproduces exclusionary or harmful acts of securitization”.<sup>52</sup> Writing or even speaking about securitization is therefore seen as contributing to the understanding what securitization is and defines it. Here, the problematic question appears to be how to work with security without “replicating dominant subjectivities”, and how to apply the idea of the Copenhagen School about securitization

---

<sup>49</sup>Aradau, 2004

<sup>50</sup>Charrett, 2009

<sup>51</sup>Williams, 2003

<sup>52</sup>Charret, 2009, p. 11

without “reproducing or legitimizing the potential harmful, neglected or exclusionary securitization of a referent object”.<sup>53</sup>

This is not, however, the way Buzan and Wæver understand their theory. For them, scientists using securitization theory observe the process of securitization and do not judge about the topics, meaning that the scientist is not interested in the question if the securitization of the threats is justified. Therefore, this kind of normative criticism can be countered by pointing on one mistake that is made when someone claims that there is a normative dilemma: Securitization theory – at least according to the Copenhagen School – does not want to answer questions that normative studies answer. Therefore criticizing the lack of normative regards is inappropriate and does not lead to a fruitful debate about an improvement of this securitization theory.<sup>54</sup>

### **Problem of definitions**

Another major point of criticism is the question about the character of the audience. Balzacq<sup>55</sup> approached this question and first classified the audience according to the Copenhagen School as a formal and given category. In his view this is problematic if one takes a second aspect into account: the “reduction of security to a conventional procedure”<sup>56</sup> that depends on the success of the speech act.

Stritzel<sup>57</sup> sees the speech act as being twofold. On the one hand it is an event, on the other hand the outcome of a process of negotiation that took place between the security actor and the audience. This might be problematic for the analysis of the securitization process, as one

---

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., pp. 14-15

<sup>54</sup>See: Floyd, 2006; Aradau, 2004

<sup>55</sup>Balzacq, 2011

<sup>56</sup>Ibid, p. 2

<sup>57</sup>Stritzel, 2007

might expect that, depending on the definition of speech act the researcher uses the outcome of his investigation will be a different one. Also, the researcher might have a different understanding of what the actual audience is, which, Stritzel claims, is not sufficiently clarified in the securitization theory of Buzan and Wæver and also not always clear in the empirics.

Booth<sup>58</sup> criticizes the uncertainty about the characteristic of securitization. He talks about the discussion whether securitization is an intersubjective process or a self-referential act. Securitization as an intersubjective process would mean that an issue is securitized because of an interactive discussion between actors who then agreed on the threatening character of the object. People talk in a special way and therefore securitize an issue. If it is self-referential, it is a single act due to the character of the object. Depending on which character one thinks securitization has, the actors play a larger or smaller role for the research. Vuori<sup>59</sup> deals with the question of how to determine if a securitization was successful, which, according to him, depends on the character securitization has.

### **Taking position to overcome criticism**

All these critics, except the normative criticism, are remarks that every researcher might have to decide upon themselves during their research, as they clearly can influence the outcome.

Regarding most of the criticism, a good understanding of the securitization theory – especially its non-normative character – is very helpful to counter them. As mentioned, if the researcher clearly takes position about what the theory is and how he or she understands the necessary terminology, most of the criticism can be tackled and the research can be done by using a valid theory. Nevertheless, those critics also contribute to the development of the theory.

---

<sup>58</sup>Booth, 2005

<sup>59</sup>Vuori, 2008

In general, securitization theory expects the EU foreign policy to change according to the threat perception of the authoritarian people. This means that there should be a clear relation between the issues addressed as threats by the speech actors and the topics addressed in the treaties. If this is not the case, the assumption of securitization theory does not help explaining the development of EU foreign policy after the end of the Cold War.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 “Why so and why not differently?”**

The “Why so and why not differently” question can be addressed with the help of the securitization theory. Assuming that by identifying issues as threats - and that this view is shared by the people - the authorized person who acted out the speech act brought issues on the foreign policy agenda, thereby determining its direction. This would mean that threat perception is essential for the development of the EU foreign policy.

This chapter looks at the connection between theory and the method used in the research. Hence, it will be a rough description of the research plan. In the fifth chapter the research process will be described in more detail.

#### **3.2 What does securitization theory expect to happen?**

According to the securitization theory, issues that are talked about as threats have the potential to lead to changes of policies. Also, issues that are perceived as threats are seen as being existential threats to the state.<sup>60</sup> This association allows politicians to adopt exceptional measures to counteract them and simultaneously justify those actions. A policy change to something more radical is one possible option. Regarding the foreign policy changes of the European Union, broadening the room to maneuver and consequently the possibilities for action, appears to be quite radical.

The assumption regarding the development of EU foreign policy is dependent on the kind and number of issue addressed as threats:

---

<sup>60</sup>Buzan, 1991, pp. 115-116

If an issue is addressed often –

OR

If an issue is addressed often AND by using rhetoric that may lead to the assumption that the speaker perceived it as an existential threat to the stability of the state or in this case the European Union –

OR

If an issue is addressed by using rhetoric that may lead to the assumption that the speaker perceived it as an existential threat to the stability of the state or in this case the European Union

AND

If the audience is convinced by this speech

AND

If the speaker has a powerful position that enables him to get the trust of the audience that what he or she perceives as threat for them is a real threat –

the issue has the potential to become securitized. Then it allows for exceptional measures such as changes in the realm of foreign policy and foreign policy instruments.

In this research, the part about the audience will not be examined, even though it is a necessary condition for a successful securitization. This comes from the nature of EU policy making, where the people – the audience – do not have direct influence on the decision making or the content of a treaty. Therefore, their opinion about the threats is for the

successful speech act not very relevant. Apart from this reason, the main focus of this thesis is the connection between topics addressed by national politicians and their occurrence in treaties. Additionally, trying to measure the perception of issues as threats by the people of the EU states means either to use existing data or doing an own research about this special topic which is too much for the purpose of this thesis. For pragmatic reasons the audience is therefore not considered in this research.

Based on securitization theory there are various theoretical expectations or scenarios for the outcome of the analysis:

- The process of securitization is successful and the securitized topic becomes part of the foreign and security policy of the EU.
- An issue is perceived as a threat but is not taken into account in the EU policy.
- An issue is not talked about as being a threat but nevertheless the EU foreign and security policy changes.

Another possibility would be that issues which used to be seen as threats are not seen as threats anymore, a so-called “desecuritization”. This could either have no influence on the foreign and security policy, meaning it keeps its status quo, or that it leads to a more limited foreign policy and foreign policy instruments.

In order to state than one or more scenarios occurred, one has to observe that – for the first scenario to be true – the power of the speaker and the rhetoric that was used let the issue occur as a threat. Additionally, it would either explicitly be mentioned in the treaty or indirectly, for example either “islamic terrorism” is mentioned or it is generally referred to “new threats through fundamental ideas”.

Regarding the second scenario, the issue would neither be directly, nor indirectly be mentioned. For the third scenario to become true, the rhetoric used would not lead to the conclusion that the speaker sees the issue as a threat but it is mentioned in the treaty.

What will be left out as well is the question if the person who does the speech act has the legitimized power and authority to make a successful speech act. For this research, only people were chosen whose formal position included a high level of authority and power to decide upon which topics should get on the political agenda. Additionally, these politicians come from countries which - traditionally - have a high impact on EU policy.

As will be explained later, after the end of the Cold War the threat from the Soviet Union decreased, i. e. desecuritized, which lead to the reshaping of the foreign and security policy. Because of the focus of this paper on the foreign and security policy after the Treaty of Amsterdam, desecuritization will not be investigated, even though there is a chance that other threats were desecuritized as well until the Treaty of Lisbon. However, the “non-perception” of threats falls outside the scope of this thesis, which, as said, focuses on (new) threat perceptions and whether these lead to changes in foreign and security policy.

### **3.3 Measuring threat perception**

With the speech act as a decisive step, rhetoric plays an important role. Looking at how issues were talked about and finally labeled as “threats” is necessary. The issue alone is not sufficient to provoke a change in foreign policy. It also depends on the power of speech, on how it is talked about. Therefore, examining the way how certain topics that may catalyze changes in foreign policy were rhetorically addressed can provide support to answer this question.

Besides the rhetoric, the transmitter who does the speech act is crucial for the success of the securitization as well. Official documents or speeches from the EU can be seen as transmitters

of the threat perception. Studying the language used in speeches for example means examining the rhetoric devices the speaker uses to present an issue as a threat to the existence of the EU and to convince the audience of the threat. The identity of the speaker is therefore the next important element. A powerful and influential speaker can more easily convince people with his opinion than someone else. Being an authority to whom power and influence are ascribed means having influential power over the people who in turn legitimate his power. Therefore, it is easier to convince this particular audience of an issue being a threat and of the necessity to introduce measures to counteract them.

While trying to account for the change of the foreign policy of the EU one has to keep in mind that the policy is not only determined by the officials of the EU itself but also by discussions and policy formation within member states. Even though the function of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy personalized the task of carrying out foreign policy towards the outside and tried to improve the visibility of this policy field, the foreign policy itself is by far not exclusively determined by the EU officials. As the EU is an organization whose policy formation is done by discourse within and between the member states who have to come up with a common idea that will be transformed into a policy, those member states play a decisive role in the change of foreign policy. It would be therefore of additional interest to see if the member states focused on the same issues when talking about threats as the EU officials and therefore whether the threat perception of the EU officials is influenced or based on the opinion of the member states.<sup>61</sup>

Furthermore, following this line of thoughts, discourse and talking can lead to the creation of policy, therefore constituting policy. This would fit with the often discussed idea that Europe and the European Union are social constructions. They are created because they were talked

---

<sup>61</sup>Securitization theory does not explicitly discuss that kind of relation but it would expect that if an issue was securitized at the state level, the chances to get securitized at the EU level are higher, as the states have influence on the policy of the EU.

about in certain way: Rhetorically they are a region or an organization with shared values, history and ideas.<sup>62</sup> This leads to the logic consequence of a development of a policy out of discourse.

Thus, discourse analysis seems to be the adequate method for this research. Not only is it important to see what is said in the speeches and how issues are talked about. But even more important is to examine if the way they are talked about might lead to the perception that they are threats. Regarding the characteristic of the speech act, the transmitter of the message and the circumstances surrounding the speech act and the issue are both equally important for the success of the securitization.

Research on this topic is therefore two-fold: On the one hand one must keep in mind the political-historical side, the circumstances of the speech. It is important to see when and how the speeches were made and the issues occurred. For an issue to become a security threat, the circumstances of its occurrence are important. Looking at institutional and political conditions that surround the occurrence of the issue can explain why the issue occurred, to begin with, and, together with the justification in the speech why it was perceived as a threat. It has to be asked how the European Union was organized, how the institutions within the EU were linked and how the power relations were at the time the speech was made. The role and characteristic of the foreign policy at that time are also factors that have to be looked at. If the realm is narrow, not many policy fields are regarded as having the potential to bear issues than might be threats and therefore require a change of the foreign policy. Also, the relevance of foreign policy in general within the EU, its institutional and legal possibilities, limit or extend the way in which threats can be counteracted and therefore the importance that is ascribed to them.

---

<sup>62</sup>See: van Gorp and Renes, 2007; Svarplys and Matulionis, 2010; Tatranksy, 2006; Evans, 2010; Schimmelfennig, 2010

On the other hand, and in the focus of discourse analysis, there is the communicative side. Focusing on the rhetoric, the way one talks about an issue determines the fashion and kind of message that is distributed. Additionally, the legitimacy of the speaker is related to the institutional conditions and its position within them. Those two points, the speaker and the rhetoric, are linked and both are decisive for the success of securitizing an issue. If the speaker is located in a position to which the audience attributes power and legitimacy, his or her words will be more likely heard and discussed. This point is connected to the political-historical side, as this side determines the position and power the speaker can have. Depending on the language s/he uses, the issue is presented in different ways. At first, it is important to see which topics were mentioned at all in the speeches, therefore which ones are generally relevant for the EU. Then, the way he talks about them decides whether it can be labeled as being perceived by him as a threat or not. If the issue is mentioned a lot and addressed in a specific way that makes it clearly seen as a threat by the speaker, it is more likely that it is perceived having harmful and threatening potential by the broader audience. The chance of securitizing it increases.

### **Speech act**

#### **Communicative side/the speech**

##### **Rhetoric:**

- Which issues are mentioned?
- How where issues talked about/addressed?

##### **Transmitter:**

- Speaker: Does the speaker have authorized power/Why does the speaker have this power?
- Source: What is the instrument of the speech act?

### **Political-historical side/circumstances of speech**

- When and how was the speech hold?
  - What were the institutional conditions?
    - organization of the EU
    - role and character of foreign policy
    - institutional organization of foreign policy
- => explaining why issue was perceived as threat

### **3.4 Discourse analysis**

In light of the previous, discourse analysis is the appropriate method to examine if the changes in EU foreign policy can be related to changing threat perceptions. The characteristic of discourse analysis are highly similar to the way how threat perception and the influence of it can be measured.

Discourse analysis is appropriate if the researcher is interested in using texts to conduct his work. By doing so, the researcher looks at texts in a particular way to find out how the language that is used to talk about an issue frames the view and understanding we have of it. Michel Foucault advanced this view and stated that discourse and especially the language used during discourse are decisive for the way the people involved and affected by it comprehend the issue that is talked about.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup>See: Bryman and Cramer, 2004

By talking, the speaker uses specific words or effects to express his opinion on an issue or topic.<sup>64</sup> Doing so means that he creates a view on it that consists of a special concept formed by the linguistic devices he employs. This happens intentionally which means that the speaker pursues a specific purpose with the choice of his language.

Examining speeches or texts therefore means to see which intention the speaker had when he spoke. The choice of topics, words, formulations and the frequency of them determine on the one hand his opinion about the issue. On the other hand the effect s/he wanted to obtain by uttering it can be found out with this way of analysis as well.

Doing discourse analysis requires certain assumptions. The discourse, for example the text, is in the focus of the analysis, but beyond that the context of its creation plays a role as well, which is assumed to be influential and decisive for the outcome of the discourse. Regarding the text, the language that is used reveals a particular world view. Language is therefore constructive which will be addressed later more in depth. Additionally, it is an active tool which helps the speaker to create an opinion, but also to act in the sense that a well-uttered opinion has the potential to influence its audience and therefore provoke the desired effect.<sup>65</sup>

Deciding upon a certain strain of discourse analysis is not an easy task, as it is not clear and often debated where the differences between the different approaches within discourse analysis lay. There is frankly no unquestioned definition of them. Wodak and Weiss<sup>66</sup> see this as strength of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), because if an approach allows for engaging with different theories and variations of methods, it is easier to apply it to a large number of research designs, which are usually very specific. When choosing CDA as method it is therefore highly necessary to point out what theoretical ideas are behind the choice and how

---

<sup>64</sup>Here, talking means uttering an opinion towards an audience in oral, written and visual form and speaker means the person or medium that utters the opinion.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid.

<sup>66</sup>Wodak and Weiss, 2005

exactly CDA can be applied.<sup>67</sup> As a general rule the researcher should ask “What conceptual tools are relevant for this or that problem and for this and that context”.<sup>68</sup> Even though CDA has some presumptions, it is useful to regard each research anew and ask this question. The results of a research about the use of language while speaking about immigrants for example is highly influenced by the speaker and the circumstances of the speech as well as the specific topic. The speaker and the circumstances such as time, place, setting and place in social relation are in each CDA important aspects to be regarded but of course the speaker and the circumstances change.

Furthermore, the field of study to which one applies CDA also determines those points. Discourse analysis has been used for foreign policy analysis before. Kettel<sup>69</sup> analyzed the way British politicians used discourse to justify their strategy concerning the “War on Terror”. It is similar to this research, because both times it is assumed that the way the authorized people speak about a topic can explain and justify the change of policies. Defining threats has also been in the focus. Herschinger<sup>70</sup> looks at the difficulty to define the term “Terrorism” within the UN. This can be seen as a proof that the idea of an issue and the way it is talked about is only successfully distributed, if it is accepted and shared by the audience. Therefore, discourse analysis can be seen as being an acknowledged method to account for the change of policies, especially when it is assumed that this change occurred due to a specific way of talking about issues.

---

<sup>67</sup>Bryman and Cramer, 2004

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 125

<sup>69</sup>Kettel, 2013

<sup>70</sup>Herschinger, 2013

### **3.5 Data generation**

A discourse analysis that provides the necessary results to answer the research question needs a research plan that provides the necessary conditions to gain useful results. Having decided upon the question and the underlying theoretical assumption, the research has to be designed accordingly.

#### **3.5.1 Operationalization**

First, an operationalization of what has to be measured has to be done. Here, something interesting can be observed: The research question of how to account for one specific development of the EU foreign policy first needs to define the term “threat” and answer the question “What is a threat”. By using securitization theory the term is already defined as an issue that has the potential to endanger the stability and therefore security of the existence of a state or - in the present research – the European Union. Using the general understanding of national security<sup>71</sup> events such as military conflicts, economic crisis, social tensions and environmental catastrophes are seen as threats and are therefore relevant.

This leads to the second step, which is to decide upon criteria to determine when an issue is talked about as threat and when not. The most obvious criterion would be frequency. The more often an issue gets into the focus of speeches, the more attention is paid to it and the more important it seems to be. One could count how often it was mentioned in one speech or in how many speeches it was mentioned. But frequency alone is not sufficient and appropriate to label an issue as “threat”, especially when one regards the language used and the position of the speaker as important as well. As the language used is decisive, using discourse analysis to examine the speech act is useful. For a speech act to be successful, it does not primarily depend on how often an issue is addressed as threat but how it is addressed. Here, the words

---

<sup>71</sup>The five most commonly used sectors in security analysis and international relations are the military, political, economic, societal and environmental sector. See: Albert and Buzan, 2011

and concepts the speaker uses about an issue has to be regarded and is far more decisive for the success than the frequency. This is also the reason why frequency does not play a role in the analysis later.

Other expressions should be operationalized as well, even though the securitization theory already provides definitions for them.

One of them is the speech actor. Without summarizing again what was said about him or her in the second chapter, the speech actor is the one that holds the speech. S/he does not necessarily have to be responsible for what is said but must have a position that provides him or her with the power that the content of the speech, 1) reaches a large and/or relevant audience and 2) that this audience supports the view of the speaker. This authority can be gained in different ways. Either it was earned or ascribed. The speech actors in this thesis gained their authority by winning democratic elections or by being appointed. Both times, they have legitimized responsibilities and power. His/her authority is therefore decisive for reaching an audience and convincing them of the threat.

This audience is not a fixed group of people. Audience and speech actor are connected and the audience depends on the speech actor and the occasion of the speech. It is usually a group of people or even an individual that legitimize the power position of the speaker. In general, it is enough if there is a power-relation between audience and the speaker in which it is irrelevant if the power was given voluntarily to the speaker or by force as long as the words of the speaker influences the audience. If this is the case, if the perception of a threat by the speaker makes the threat a real threat to the audience, there is on the one hand the power relation between the two parties proven; on the other hand the issue is securitized.

A securitized issue and therefore threat allows for radical changes in policy. These changes can be of a large variety. Usually the securitization of an issue allows the politician to take

radical measures and even to go to war in the most extreme case. Changes in policies therefore refer to measures that are taken especially to counteract the threat. In the political world nowadays a “measure” can be a law, an agreement, a treaty; it can be legally binding or voluntarily. But usually an idea is linked to a measure on which it is based. A policy therefore consists of aims and measures that are taken to reach the aim. The securitization of an issue can therefore change the aim of a policy and also the measures that are taken to achieve it.

### **3.5.2 Possible problems regarding operationalization**

Knowing in general what a threat is does not mean that issues that are perceived as a threat necessarily meet those criteria. Nevertheless, it is important to stick to this definition to have a basic idea about the characteristic of a threat. If it is clear when an issue that is dealt with is more than an issue but also a threat, it is easier to find data to conduct the research. Still, it is possible that issues that are talked about as threats do not meet the criteria of threats and that those who do meet the criteria are not talked about at all or any more. Therefore, issues that have been perceived as threats before the European Union decided to form an own foreign policy underlie this policy, but do not have to be explicitly mentioned. Counteracting this problem can be done by having a closer look at treaties and documents that define foreign policy goals because one may assume that the overall goal is to preserve security and stability. So, these documents are likely to address what is seen as threat.

### **3.5.3 Problems regarding operationalization when doing CDA**

Wodak and Weiss address one problem that occurs during the operationalization process in CDA, namely the so-called “mediation between the social and the linguistic”,<sup>72</sup> which means that sociological and linguistic approaches need to be related and applied in combination while doing CDA. For this research, sociology is relevant as far as it concerns the process

---

<sup>72</sup>Wodak and Weiss, 2005, p. 124

around the speech act. The relation between the speaker and the audience has to be taken into consideration in order to account for the power that a speech act can have. Understanding this relation and the organization of the EU in this example can also be viewed from a sociological perspective. Looking at the aspects relevant for the discourse through a sociological lens therefore supports the understanding of the linguistic and correlates with it. This makes it unclear which one is more important.

### **3.6 Selection of units of observation**

Two major sources of documents will be the basis of this research: Speeches and treaties.

Speeches are seen as the performance of the speech act. Even though the speaker usually is not the writer of the speech, it can be strongly assumed that the ideas presented cohere with the view of the speaker since speeches are usually designed to present his or her opinion. Nevertheless, this is not a problem for the analysis because one can assume that the speech reflects what the politician thinks. Also, the speech itself is not sufficient for the speech act. An influential and powerful speaker is necessary in combination with the speech act to achieve a successful securitization. The selected speeches should additionally address threats that fit to the general understanding of threats and should be delivered by a legitimate and authorized, as well as powerful and influential person.

Treaties and documents provide a collection of ideas and aims about foreign policy and describe changes in it. Several different decisive treaties were signed in the past that enacted new and different foreign policy realms and instruments. If an issue was newly perceived as a threat and if this threat is presented as possibly very harmful and to be able to have changing influence on the foreign policy, then it should be mentioned in the treaties.

To account for changes it is important to look at the time before and during the assumed change. As new treaties often entail new aims and laws and therefore change the way the

European Union was organized and focused before, examining foreign policy aims and institutional possibilities in treaties can contribute to answering the question. We can find this out by firstly, examining whether they have changed from treaty to treaty and secondly, if this change is related to the way it was talked about threats. As the foreign policy of the EU changed a lot during its existence and only recently received a personalized representative which can be seen as the authorized person that can do the speech act, this research will focus on the time period after the first High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy came into power in 1999. This position was created with the earlier 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam. The research now wants to see if the threat perception changed the way the CFSP was organized, especially the threat perception before the Treaties of Nice and Lisbon.

Measuring threat perception can be done by looking at speeches by persons with authority. These persons can be either high officials of the European Union or persons directly and exclusively concerned with foreign policy. Due to the change of the way foreign policy was institutionally organized within the European Union, speeches by Javier Solana, the first High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy will be regarded.

As it was concluded above, not only the EU officials themselves are concerned with foreign policy formation. The member states are more or less imposing or influencing the policy, especially the most powerful member states France and Germany. The United Kingdom can also be included in this list, but has in general a restricted view of an extension of the EU foreign policy realm. Therefore, as already assumed, their view on issues might influence the view of the EU and finally the policy. Examining speeches of the political leaders of those countries in the time period under investigation is necessary.

### **3.7 Investigating the empirical material**

Focusing on the time between the Treaty of Amsterdam and the Treaty of Lisbon, as well as the levels of the EU and the three countries, there are four politicians and various speeches to be looked at. First, on the EU level, Javier Solana, High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy from 1999 until 2009 can be seen as the first personalized representative of the EU foreign policy and therefore an authoritative person, whose speeches have the potential power to become speech acts. Second, regarding the chosen member states, speeches from each chancellor in Germany, the Prime Minister in Great Britain and the president in France will be looked at. Because it can be assumed that not only the ideas of the member states influence the policy of the EU but also that the member states themselves are influenced by each other, it is interesting to see if the chancellor etc. from a certain time share the same idea about threats and if their idea(s) are then shared by the EU representative.

Therefore, 24 speeches will be selected that were done by the contemporary heads of state and the High Representative during overlapping periods in power. The high number comes from this overlapping as it can be seen in the table.<sup>73</sup> Every possible combination has to be considered individually, which means that for the time when Schröder, Chirac and Blair were in power but Solana was not, and also for the time the three of them and Solana were in power different speeches have to be examined. This comes from the assumption that the presence or absence of Solana might cause differences in the topic and rhetoric of the speeches by the heads of state. By doing so, it can be made sure that relations and common positions are seen and therefore common threat perceptions are recognized.

After looking at the speeches it is decisive to see what the treaties defined as foreign policy issues, tasks and measures. By doing so it is possible to judge if the threat perception had an influence on the foreign policy formation. If issues that were talked about as being threatening

---

<sup>73</sup>See: Table 1

are mentioned in the foreign policy part of the new treaty, it can be seen as being successfully securitized, as far as the foreign policy changed towards a more powerful one. Therefore, the Treaty of Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon are important documents as well.

The selection of speeches and treaties comes from the mechanism securitization theory entails to account for changes which will be investigated by using discourse analysis. Several questions<sup>74</sup> have to be asked regarding the sources. With this method it is possible to point out those patterns and relations which are expected to lead to a change in foreign policy. Also, it is important to find a profound justification of the way the foreign policy of the European Union took in its development. By following the scheme of questions that represent both attributes of discourse analysis and securitization theory, this method investigates the empirical material in such a way that the researcher can draw conclusions and decide whether the expectations of the securitization theory were met or not.

---

<sup>74</sup>See: Appendix A

#### **4. Development of EU foreign policy**

Talking about the foreign and security policy of the EU requires some further clarification. In this research the focus is on the Common Foreign and Security Policy. Nevertheless, the EU knows more ways to cover these fields.

The foreign policy in general tries to cover many fields. In general, foreign and security policy used to be concerned with military issues such as threats from other countries and the prevention of or answer to those threats. Nowadays, the realm of the EU foreign and security policy increased. Eliassen explains that issues such as terrorism, social unrest and societal inequalities started to be considered in the foreign and security policy due to the changing international system as well. Thus, a foreign and security policy had to become broader, in order to also include “soft security”.<sup>75</sup>

These objectives are not only limited to the CFSP but were also part of national policies and the European Community. Finding a red thread throughout history regarding the development of EU foreign policy is therefore a difficult task.

##### **4.1 Developing a foreign policy – a difficult task**

Logically, due to the growing number of member states it is difficult to find a common denominator regarding *what* the foreign policy should be about in general and *how* it should be acted out. Theorists argue from a realist perspective that this has to do with unwillingness to cooperate and to give up national sovereignty, especially military sovereignty to protect the own state. Intergovernmentalists would argue that large states insist on the dominance of their policy within the EU and therefore produce a different kind of lacking cooperation.<sup>76</sup> Hill,<sup>77</sup> as

---

<sup>75</sup>Soft security can be understood as non-military means of ensuring peace and stability such as diplomacy, monetary and economic measures. See: Eliassen, 1998, pp. 2-5

<sup>76</sup>Smith, 2003, pp. 4-5

<sup>77</sup>Hill, 2003

seen earlier, represents the constructivist view. It uses strong national ideas that do not give precedence to European ideas as the main reason for problems in foreign policy formation at the European level.

To understand the reasons for the long-lasting and difficult process of EU foreign policy formation, it is necessary to trace its development back to the beginning of the EU itself.

One of the explanations of the development of EU foreign policy comes from Sjöstedt.<sup>78</sup> He argues that as long as the EU had common objectives, there were opportunities to develop a common foreign policy. Until 1970 there was no official EU foreign policy, but the countries realized that with its growing economic influence, there also comes a growing political influence and responsibility. This was particularly important because of the upcoming enlargement in that time. There was also a fear that some countries might have turned to communism, lest they join the Union.<sup>79</sup>

This is only one explanation for the upcoming of EU foreign policy. Depending on the researcher's focus it might be a constructivist, a realist or institutionalist view. Factors such as the ongoing globalization and interdependence between states, the growing influence of non-state actors such as the NATO on world politics and the enlargement might all play a role.

#### **4.2 Steps towards the current foreign and security policy of the EU: The “logical” outcome of closer cooperation and growing economic influence?**

As mentioned in the previous part, one possible explanation for the upcoming of an EU foreign policy might be the idea of Sjöstedt. It will be used here as example to illustrate how the development of the foreign policy can be explained until the formation of the CFSP. Other

---

<sup>78</sup>Sjöstedt, 1977

<sup>79</sup>The countries are Greece, Spain and Portugal. They all had military regimes and when they ended it was feared that the communist influence could become large.

authors and ideas are regarded as well to have a contrast to the explanation of the securitization theory.

It is a fact that the EU started with the idea to promote peace and because of economic interests. As it grew quickly regarding its economy, its political influence became larger as well if one takes into account the power that the economy plays in politics. The EU engaged in trade among its member states and beyond. It thus had an interest in enlargement, because of economic but also because of political reasons. Therefore, a guideline or at least an idea about its relations to its neighboring countries had to be created.

In 1970 the European Political Cooperation served as the framework for its foreign policy cooperation and was extended and further defined in various other reports with the aim “to match their growing economic voice”.<sup>80</sup> More decisive for the definition of a common foreign policy and especially its aims was the Single European Act in 1987, such as speaking with one voice and the protection of independence and common interests regarding democracy and human rights.<sup>81</sup> With the creation of the Single European Market from 1987 until 1993, there was a development towards an even tighter cooperation. At the same time the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe defined a framework regarding foreign policy.<sup>82</sup> From then onwards and especially after the 1993 Treaty of Maastricht the closer economic cooperation seemed to contribute to the creation of a “grown we-feeling”<sup>83</sup> that went beyond the economic sphere and together with the other factors mentioned previously, this brought the states further together.

---

<sup>80</sup>Smith, 2003, p. 8; See: Luxembourg Report 1970, Copenhagen Report 1973, London Report 1981

<sup>81</sup>Smith, 2003, p. 11

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., p. 20

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 9

Common economic goals through closer cooperation, Ginsberg claims, were the reason for this development. They came up with common and shared foreign policy ideas as well because they were already used to cooperate and knew that they can trust each other. On the political level, a policy idea developed that represented their “shared perception of European interests”. Similar to Ginsberg, Eliassen<sup>84</sup> explains that “it is impossible to have an effective economic policy without simultaneously also possessing a coherent foreign policy and a credible security policy” due to the very nature of the construction of our globalized and intertwined world.

With the actual creation of the CFSP, the Treaty of Maastricht was a mile stone in the development of a common foreign policy. Also, the cooperation was institutionalized and rules and mechanisms to streamline the cooperation in this field were set up.<sup>85</sup> This happened during a time when the end of the Cold War changed the power relations in the world and the biggest threat for Europe, the Soviet Union, did not longer exist. Additionally, the United States and NATO started to reduce their activities of protection in Europe.<sup>86</sup> Still, until the Treaties of Amsterdam and Nice the EU worked on an own foreign policy and its goals and objectives were defined more precisely.

In general, from the Treaty of Maastricht onwards, the foreign policy objectives, as well as instruments and realms, were promoted and expanded. Smith refers to this development as a process that has been legalized in the sense of clearer rules that reached the status of laws.<sup>87</sup>

Even though the foreign policy of the EU does not include active measures to fight threats as Smith argues, creating a stable environment contributes to it. Human rights and democracy

---

<sup>84</sup>Eliassen, 1998

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., p. 12

<sup>86</sup>For a similar argumentation see: Eliassen, 1998, p. 4

<sup>87</sup>Smith, 2003, p. 37

are seen as having the same potential according to the EU and therefore the power to protect the EU from threats.

Nevertheless, as this thesis aims to examine if threat perception is decisive for the change of foreign policy, the assumption has to be made that EU foreign policy – at least to a certain extent – serves for threat prevention.

#### **4.3 The foreign policy of the EU – expanding tasks and instruments to become more responsible**

The Brussels Treaty from 1948 was the first attempt after the Second World War to create a defense alliance in Europe.<sup>88</sup> It was about mutual defense and later, in 1954, it served as a foundation for the creation of the WEU.<sup>89</sup> Other attempts for a common defense policy, the European Defense Community and the European Political Community, a cooperation between EDC and ECSC, were not successful as mentioned before. Nevertheless, the idea of closer political cooperation became more dominant. As mentioned, in 1970 the Luxembourg Report founded the European Political Cooperation. From then onwards, foreign ministers were supposed to meet regularly, to discuss and to coordinate their positions about them, including agreements on common actions. In 1973, the Copenhagen Report allowed for even more meetings. With the 1981 London Report, the European Commission was finally incorporated into the EPC and could influence it more. In the WEU, defense ministers started to meet regularly from 1984 onwards.

A far more important step was the European Single Act in 1986, which allowed the EPC to consider security aspects from a political and economic point of view. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, the idea for a Common Foreign and Security policy became more present and

---

<sup>88</sup>It consisted of Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France and the United Kingdom.

<sup>89</sup>The WEU included Italy and Germany as well.

urgent. The super power Soviet Union collapsed, after which the United States expected the European states to stand on their own feet. This marked a new orientation of power in world politics. European states were no longer simply the allies of the United States against the Soviet Union. They could now become a super power as well if they were able to act unanimously, especially regarding foreign policy.<sup>90</sup>

The 1991 Treaty of Maastricht was the necessary step to finally institutionalize a foreign policy concept by founding the Common Foreign and Security Policy, which replaced the EPC. The Council of Ministers, based on the meetings of the foreign ministers during the time of the EPC could now do more than only decide upon positions. It could work on joint actions that could be proposed by the Commission which were financed through the EU budget. So the discussions and positions were not the only outcome of the meetings anymore. The EU now also acted upon their words. With the Petersberg Declaration in 1992 a closer cooperation between WEU and EU was established, followed two years later by an agreement between the NATO and the WEU about the use of NATO assets.<sup>91</sup> The next step that followed was the Treaty of Amsterdam. Since this is part of the analysis, it will be covered in the next chapter.

#### **4.4 The organization of the CFSP**

Before moving on to the analysis one could argue that up until the Treaty of Maastricht, threats seemed not to have played a crucial role for the development of the CFSP. The main security issue – protection against military threats – was secured by another state or even the NATO, thus the EU efforts at that time to protect itself against military threats was quite small. Changing threats and threat perception as forcing element for changes in the foreign

---

<sup>90</sup>Compare to: Eliassen, 1998, p. 5

<sup>91</sup>Smith, 2003, pp. 37-47

and security policy are unlikely to be the driving motor behind the development during the time of the Cold War.

Building on this line of thoughts, the logical consequence would be that with the end of the intensive active military support by the United States and with the changing nature of threats, the EU had to change its foreign and security policy to a large extent to answer to this change. This would fit to the initial hypothesis of this thesis.

The next paragraph will be about how the CFSP was initially set up when it was established with the Treaty of Maastricht.

The Treaty of Maastricht established the three pillar system organization of the European Union and actually gave the EU its name. The three pillars consisted, first, of the European Community – the official name of the organization until the Treaty of Maastricht – which included the European Coals and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community, second, the CFSP, and third the Police and Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters (PJCC). Tasks, instruments and institutions were divided among the three, which was supposed to simplify the work on different policy fields. Focusing more on the second pillar, the CFSP pillar, the treaty allowed member states from now on to engage in joint actions that were decided upon by intergovernmental decision making processes that basically worked with unanimity. Regarding foreign policy, the CFSP pillar seemed to carry a lot of responsibilities, but nevertheless, tasks such as enlargement or the European neighborhood policy and therefore relations to other European countries were dealt with by the European Commission, i. e. the first pillar.<sup>92</sup> International crime, to take another example, was a task of the PJCC. What comes clear by this simple illustration is that even though an attempt was

---

<sup>92</sup>European Union, Foreign and Security Policy

done to make clear cuts between responsibilities and tasks, the three pillars nevertheless had overlapping policy fields.<sup>93</sup>

To that end, the next chapter treats two aspects. Firstly, it considers how the aims, instruments and organization of the CFSP have changed. Secondly, it will examine if this change can be related to threats and, more precisely, to changes in threat perception.

---

<sup>93</sup>Europa: Treaty of Maastricht on the European Union

## **5. Analysis**

In the previous chapter it became clear that for a long time economic interests were in the focus of the European Union and that it took until the end of the Cold War before a real CFSP developed. Even though it was then established as one of the three pillars that formed the EU for more than a decade, it had not yet reached its final form and was changed several times in the treaties of Amsterdam, Nice and finally Lisbon.

One of the reasons for the later changes of the pillars were the changing environment and the prospect of enlargement but also the awareness that the treaty signed in Maastricht had not yet reached the form it initially should have had. The most plausible explanation for change, however, of the three, is the reason mentioned first: the post-Cold War environment made changes in threats and threat perception inevitable

### **5.1 Factors that guided the selection of speeches**

The question how to measure changes in threats and their perception is not an easy task and has already been addressed in the third chapter. This chapter applies the methods set out there, and presents the empirical results of the research. The method that was chosen is discourse analysis. By examining how people talk about issues it should be possible to see if they perceive them as threats. Keeping in mind the theoretical underlying idea based on the securitization theory by Buzan and Wæver, these people need to have a certain position that provides them with influence over ones that legitimized their powerful position to be able to make an issue securitized. Without this position, there can be no securitization and therefore no allowance to change policies.

The objects of analysis are therefore speeches by powerful politicians. Politicians that usually have the most influence are presidents, prime ministers or chancellors of countries, i. e. the

heads of state. Their opinions give guidelines for politics and therefore influence it. What they think and say about issues is decisive for the way these issues are treated.

When deciding which presidents etc. from which countries should be selected for the analysis, it was helpful to keep in mind that not all EU member states have de facto the same influence on policy making. The countries which are very powerful regarding the foreign and security policy formation of the EU, the big three founding countries – France, Germany and the United Kingdom – were chosen not only because of the size of their population, but also because of their diverging economic and political interests.

The UK is the closest ally of the USA in Europe and therefore has a foreign and security policy that tries to balance between national, European and US-interests. This means that European interests are not always the ones that are supported. Germany used to be a great power until the end of the Second World War. Together with France it established an alliance within Europe which helped Germany reach its former status again by the end of the twentieth century and both countries - especially Germany - are the engine of the EU economy. Additionally, France, like Great Britain, has a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council, and therefore has a powerful position as well.

The leader of these three countries changed over the course from the Treaty of Amsterdam to the Treaty of Lisbon. For this reason speeches by Helmut Kohl, Gerhard Schröder and Angela Merkel were chosen for Germany; for Great Britain speeches by Tony Blair and Gordon Brown; and for France speeches by Jacques Chirac and Nicolas Sarkozy. Additionally, since one could assume that not only the speeches of national leaders influenced the CFSP, but also that the way the leaders perceive threats could be related or influenced by another leader's perception, it is useful to form a matrix of combinations of leaders.<sup>94</sup> If one considers the possibility that at a time when, for example, Tony Blair and Gerhard Schröder, respectively

---

<sup>94</sup> See: Table 1

the two center-left prime minister and chancellor, were in power, their ideas about threats were more similar than during the time when the center-right Angela Merkel was chancellor, speeches from both times should be chosen. Even though this is not at the center of this research, it should be kept in mind, as a result of which the number of units of analysis is quite large.

Choosing which speeches exactly should be considered was the next step. For the analysis, speeches had to be found that fit in the several columns shown in Table 2. Therefore, it was necessary to find more than one speech for certain politicians. When speeches were found, the ones that explicitly dealt with foreign policy were preferred for the analysis. It was not always possible to find speeches that precisely dealt with European foreign and security policy as it was the case with the speeches by Javier Solana. As the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, his main tasks dealt with the current policy, with current threats, with achievements that had been reached, and with future tasks. Therefore, his speeches gave quite clear an overview of his position. If there were no speeches found that fit this criteria, they should at least have addressed topics related to foreign policy. This could have been either the case when the politicians gave general statements about tasks that have to be done or in reviews of a past year.

When it comes to the other politicians it was basically difficult to find speeches on this topic. Even though Prime Ministers, Chancellors or Presidents hold speeches about various topics and policy fields and also deliver rallying speeches, it was not an easy task to find speeches that specifically dealt with the specific topic of European foreign and security policy. The selected speeches were usually only partially about foreign or security policy. They were often delivered at special occasions or events, for instance at the beginning of a new legislative period, or a speech about a year that had passed. Nevertheless, even though only certain parts of the speeches were relevant, positions could be determined.

The speech selection was therefore for a certain extend random. In general there was only a limited amount of speeches found or accessible, which is related with the time they were hold. During the late 1990s the internet was not used as much as it is now, so speeches of that time were often not uploaded or published online. Or, if the politician was no longer in office, his or her speeches were more difficult to find as well, as they were deleted from their official homepages. Asking directly at the politician's offices was neither successful.

Therefore, from the speeches that were found, these ones were preferred that mainly addressed foreign policy issues. If such speeches were not found, the ones were chosen that – at least to a certain extend – allowed for conclusions about foreign policy positions.

## **5.2 Procedure of speech analysis**

As explaining in the methodological part, the focus of the analysis of the speeches was twofold: it looked, first, at the (historical) background of the speech and speaker, and secondly at the language that was used.

### **5.2.1 Analysis of the (historical) background of the speeches**

The analysis of the background was based on facts surrounding the speech. Clarifying the speaker and his or her position was part of the analysis of every speech. This served several purposes. First, as already stated, the position and influence of the speaker had to be of a certain level to make their perception being influential on actual policy.

The German chancellor is not the head of states. Nevertheless, he or she has wide powers regarding policy and politics on the domestic, but also the international domain. On the domestic domain s/he is responsible for forming a government. Connected to this task is the competence to set guidelines for the work of the different ministries and therefore the basic direction and aims for the domestic foreign policy.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>95</sup>Die Bundeskanzlerin, Kanzleramt, die Aufgaben der Bundeskanzlerin

The attitude and behavior of German governments can in general be seen as Europe-friendly. It can therefore be assumed that the domestic foreign policy does not in general contradict the European foreign policy. On the contrary, one might think that both are quite similar. Ideas about foreign policy and especially threats against Germany reflect in the same moment ideas about foreign policy and threats against Europe. Because of this reason and the role of Germany in Europe, its threat perception is likely to be decisive in influencing the foreign and security policy of the EU.

In France, the power of the presidents is a bit different. He can appoint the Prime Minister with whom he has to work together in many fields, such as the appointment of ministers. In general, the French president also sets the direction of the policy of his term in office.<sup>96</sup>

Even though the role of the French Prime Minister is *de jure* a strong one and the president has to work a lot together with him or her, internationally s/he is *de facto* not important when it comes to policy formation. The French President represents the French policy and is heard and consulted by his or her counterparts from other countries when it comes to questions about cooperation. As France sees itself as an important player in world politics due to its colonial history and especially in European policy due to its former and present population size and economic power, it could be assumed that the French president sees France as an important part of Europe, whose threats are at the same time threats for Europe.

Similarly, the British Prime Minister has – as the chancellor in Germany and the president in France – the right to appoint the members of the government. Additionally, he or she gives the direction and the main guidelines for the policy that the various ministries act out.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup>Elysée, Le rôle du Président

<sup>97</sup>Government UK, Prime Minister, Responsibilities

The UK has a special role within Europe because of its characteristic as a union consisting of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Forming a position of the UK therefore actually means representing the opinion of four countries. As a close ally of United States, as mentioned, it often has to balance between supporting US, European or domestic interests which are not always clear. Nevertheless, threats towards the UK as member of the European Union might be seen as potentially affecting the other members as well and therefore the threat perception of the British Prime Minister could influence the foreign and security policy of the European Union.

Second, the circumstances of the speech might play a role. Depending on the occasion of the speech different topics were addressed and as stated before, it was not always possible to find speeches that explicitly dealt with foreign policy topics. Often it was the case that the politicians hold speeches whose main topics were not possible threats. For example, in Tony Blair's Leader speeches domestic policy was more in the focus than international threats. In Gerhard Schröder's speech at the North Atlantic Council, European foreign and security was not the main topic. These examples show that the salience of the topics related to security issues and the European foreign and security policy vary, and are in some speeches not explicitly mentioned. Nevertheless, as threats can come from different political domains and can have a lot of different forms, in all those speeches security issues were more or less frequently addressed.

Connected to the occasion of the speech are also the circumstances regarding what happened in the world at the time of the speech. One has to look at what the main topics were while the speech was held, e. g., if there were conflicts or other important happenings because these events get into the focus of the politicians and arouse their interest or their concern. Not everything that happened around the time of a speech was reflected in the speeches but nevertheless, occasionally these events seem to be interesting or of importance for the

speakers and were more or less intensively talked about as being threatening. Politicians make a selection of topics and events and decide for which ones they see the necessity to be talked about in more detail and to be heard by a broader audience. A long-term security issue during the Cold War was, for example, the nuclear threat, which diminished after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Therefore, it was in the center of the politician's attention. Another example is the terrorist attacks of 9/11 which was an event that got into the focus of the politicians and influenced their speeches as well as their perception of threats. Still, another example is global warming, but in contrast to the 9/11 attacks, it is a long-term problem that does not take place at one moment or within a specific time frame. This leads to the conclusion that it might be helpful to see the topics addressed in the speeches in the contemporary context without attributing it too much importance and without forgetting that long-term problems are often not constantly in the focus of the attention of politicians.

Third, the organization of the EU and especially of the CFSP at the moment of the speech plays a role in the process of securitizing topics. Before the introduction of the CFSP, the foreign and security policy of the EU was organized quite loosely and did not have the same binding function as the CFSP currently does. Additionally, especially in the 1990s the Treaties of Maastricht, Amsterdam and later Nice changed the organization of the EU in general a lot. The CFSP became one of the three major parts of the European Union and developed towards an independent part of it. Initially it was still very much connected to the Commission, which meant that its aims and so on were directed by it. Only with the further development of its organization due to the amending treaties of Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon it became more independent and visible.

The Treaty of Maastricht established the CFSP as a policy that is formed and acted out in cooperation between the member states and the EU and that covers "all areas of foreign and social policy". The main instruments they can use to implement the policy are joint actions

that should be supported by all member states. Generally speaking, the national foreign policy of the member states should not contradict the CFSP aims of the Union. The Council serves as place of discussions between the member states and, in case of problems, as mediator to come to a common denominator. If no common position can be found, the Council can decide unilaterally. In general, it provides the guidelines of the policy. Additionally, it can decide which topics should become subjects of joint actions. If necessary, the framing of a defense policy had to be done with cooperation of the WEU. But not only has the WEU played a role. NATO policy should be regarded by the CFSP as well and should not contradict it. As representative of the policy the Presidency has to make sure that the politics decided within the CFSP is implemented correctly. If the Presidency has questions on the main aspects of the policy it should consult the European Parliament.<sup>98</sup>

As there were needs for amendments to the Treaty of Maastricht, the Treaty of Amsterdam already provided a number of changes in the organization of the CFSP. Regarding the huge amount of documents that build the foundation of the EU – from the Treaties of Rome to Paris until Maastricht - it was seen as necessary to establish a better structure of all the laws and decisions that had been made so far. Only if the impact of the old laws and treaties was clear and it was distinct which connection between the old and the new treaties exist, it would have been possible to work properly on the future enhancement of the treaties and therefore of the EU.

A second necessity for the Treaty of Amsterdam came from developments in Europe. The Treaty of Maastricht with the establishment of the CFSP could be seen as a consequence of the end of the Cold War. The CFSP was established, but was still not an autonomously working institution. Regarding the problems the EU had to react to and dealt with before, during and after the War in Yugoslavia at the beginning of the 1990s, it became obvious that

---

<sup>98</sup>Articles of the Treaty on European Union concerning the CFSP (Maastricht, 7 February 1992)

the way the CFSP came into power in 1993 lacked potential to answer these kinds of problems. The major enhancement was done by introducing the position of the High Representative of the Common Foreign and Security Policy who should personalize the EU foreign policy and make it more visible. Concerning other institutions such as the European Parliament and the Commission, their tasks and duties changed as well but are of minor regard in this research.

A third point was the expectation of an enlargement of the EU after the eastern European countries became independent and Yugoslavia was split up in several new states. These new countries should be bound closer to the Union and in case of several new member states, it seems plausible to regard the current structure and organization of the EU and ask whether it would be capable of working with a lot more member states, opinions and ideas.

Closer cooperation was the major and common motive of all the amendments that were done by the Treaty of Amsterdam. Especially in the second pillar a lot changed. Two major points were in the focus of the change of the CFSP: First, the cooperation between the member states and more precisely the problems to decide unanimously and second, the visibility of the policy. Both were changed and the most obvious improvement was the introduction of the High Representative, whose position Javier Solana held until 2009.<sup>99</sup>

The role of the Council changed in a way in which became not only responsible for setting guidelines but also for decisions regarding common strategies for areas in which the member states have the same interests. These decisions are voted upon by qualified majority, which is also used for common positions and joined strategies. Connected to the qualified majority voting process is the possibility of a member of the Council to oppose adaptations of decisions if there are reasons of the national policy. “Constructive abstention” was introduced which gave member states the possibility to let a decision be accepted without having the

---

<sup>99</sup>Nikolaidis, Moravcsik, 1999

obligation to implement it. Also, the position of the High Representative was introduced, who, at the same time became secretary-general of the Council. The responsibilities connected to this position entail the planning and monitoring of actions and developments. Concerning security and defense issues, the “Petersberg Tasks” extended the realm of this policy. These "Petersberg Tasks" stipulated that humanitarian, peace-making and rescue tasks as well as crisis management including combat forces became part of the CFSP. In general, for the implementation of the CFSP, the Presidency could now negotiate with other partners to make international agreements with the Council having the final word on it.<sup>100</sup>

Reasons for the Treaty of Nice are similar to those of the Treaty of Amsterdam. Even though the challenges of the possible future enlargement of the EU were one of the reasons for the work on the Treaty of Amsterdam, the work was completed with the signing of this treaty. Precisely, the Commission needed to be reshaped as well as the voting procedure and organization of the Council, especially regarding the qualified majority voting that should be used more often.

Firstly, as negotiations have started with numerous eastern and southern European countries in the late 1990s, their future accession came closer and problems towards the current structure of the EU became more obvious. Therefore, a reorganization and restructuring of the institutions became inevitable and even more urgent. The EU and especially the Commission had to be made able to work with more than 15 member states and opinions. For instance, changes were made regarding voting procedures which also simplified changes in the EU, as a majority vote is more likely to be achieved and vetoes lose the power they used to have when decision making was done by unanimity. Another reason for the changes in the Commission and voting procedure was the fear of small member states not to be heard because of the dominance of the bigger ones. Their impact on votes should be reduced so that small and

---

<sup>100</sup>Maganza, 1998, pp. 176-180

future member states were satisfied and saw a chance to defend their interests against the bigger ones. This fear also influenced the enhancement of qualitative majority voting. It was changed so that it was not possible to win a vote by a coalition of large member states only. The outcome was a complicated voting and weighting system.

Secondly, future integration should be made possible and easier. The Treaty of Maastricht and the Treaty of Amsterdam were the basic treaties towards a larger but also more integrated Union with more tasks and the first adaption of this basic idea due to changed circumstances and developments. The Treaty of Nice might be seen as correcting and tackling the last obstacles before the EU family could be extended to almost the double size. One of the major changes was the reform of the European Commission. It was reduced to one Commissioner per member state and the division of tasks was based on a rotation system and equality. Additionally, qualitative majority voting between the member states was regarded as being useful and more appropriate in several areas such as trade and industrial policy instead of an overall insistence on unanimity. A similar decision was made regarding the number of members of the European Parliament that should not extend 732 parliamentarians in the future. The last major change in the first pillar was the redistribution of votes in the Council of Europe.

The vote by qualified majority in CFSP tasks mainly affected the Council especially when it came to the appointment of special representatives or when a decision had to be made about *a joint action or common position*. *These instruments could from now on be used for non-military* or non-defense issues to achieve enhanced cooperation regarding these fields. In addition, a new body was introduced as well, namely the Political and Security Committee (PSC). Its tasks regard mainly crisis management operations. Their political control and

strategic direction was now in the hands of the PSC who received this responsibility from the Council.<sup>101</sup>

When it comes to the thematic focus of the CFSP, the Treaty of Nice states the following in Article 1 of Part One, Substantive Amendments:

*“The common foreign and security policy shall include all questions relating to the security of the Union, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy, which might lead to a common defence, should the European Council so decide. It shall in that case recommend to the Member States the adoption of such a decision in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements.”<sup>102</sup>*

The Treaty of Nice changed the Security and Defense Policy within the CFSP insofar that it should work on the military capacity of the EU including the establishment of permanent military and political structures. Additionally, it should takeover tasks of the WEU, such as crisis management.<sup>103</sup>

For the moment, with the Treaty of Lisbon the changes to the CFSP came to an end. The High Representative received more responsibilities and became the Vice-President of the Commission. He or she was from then on supported by the European External Action Service, which consisted of officials from the member states, the Commission and the Council. Their function is to help with the implementation of the CFSP.<sup>104</sup>

Another task of the High Representative was, after the end of the pillar structure, to ensure that the both EU institutions among themselves as well as regarding their relation to the member states were coherent. From this treaty onwards, the Common Security and Defense

<sup>101</sup>European Parliament, Foreign policy: aims, instruments and achievements.

<sup>102</sup>Treaty of Nice

<sup>103</sup> Press release database

<sup>104</sup>European Parliament, Foreign policy: aims, instruments and achievements.

Policy has been part of the CFSP as well, to be better implemented, for example, regarding peace-keeping missions for example. The “Petersberg Tasks” were extended as well and now made the CFSP responsible for

*“...joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their territories.”<sup>105</sup>*

Concerning the cooperation between the member states in the case of necessity for defense, the new “mutual assistance article” was introduced that obliged member states to help others. This cooperation should be in line with NATO obligations and the UN Charter. Related to that is the “mutual solidarity clause” that concerns assistance in case of a terrorist-attack, a natural or man-made disasters.<sup>106</sup>

### **5.2.2 Analysis of the content and the language that were used**

Next, the content and the language used were in the focus. Here it was important to see what the overall topic of the speech was. As mentioned, sometimes the speeches were not primarily about foreign and security policy or the EU. Depending on the occasion, the speech could have mainly focused on domestic policy, as it is for example the case with Tony Blair’s Leader’s Speech from 2006, on defense policy as the speech of Jacques Chirac from 2001 to the Institute of Higher National Defence Studies, or on a past period as it was the case in Angela Merkel’s speech at the end of the German EU Presidency in 2007. These different foci have probably have influenced the way and intensity the politicians talked about threats,

---

<sup>105</sup>Quille, 2008, p. 5

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., pp. 3-9

especially regarding the sectors where the threat occurs. One can assume that a speech that was primarily about military issues was more likely to address military threats or that leader's speeches about the domestic situation mentioned more social problems and threats. This is an explanation for the mentioning of certain threats and the leaving-out of others. Also, the deeper purpose of the speech - should it convince the audience of something or is it only story-telling – might influence the content and the way issues were addressed as threats. If the speaker seeks an aim with the speech, for example to promote a certain policy, it can be helpful to point out the necessity of it by presenting a problem that cannot be solved without this policy, which would fit to securitization theory. In that sense it could also be helpful to see if the topics that were addressed were linked to certain events as it was the case with 9/11 and the threat through terrorists mentioned in the speech by Gerhard Schröder from 2001.

After finding out these important facts of the speeches, the language was looked at. Here, the focus was on the parts of the speeches that dealt with foreign policy or security topics. Parts like the introduction of speeches usually had no relevance for the analysis and were left out. In general it was examined which countries were mentioned in which relation, which words for threats or problems were used and from which sector they come, with which adjectives these nouns were related and which verbs defined what needs to be done. Instead of counting the frequency of the words used it is more important to come to a conclusion about whether the words that are used describe issues as threats. If the analysis shows that issues were addresses as being threats, then the next step is to see if these topics were relevant for the CFSP and its change.

### **5.3 Outcome of the speech analysis**

The first step of summarizing the outcome of the speech analysis will be to provide a short overview of the analysis of the language for each speech. As the choice of speeches was made

according to overlapping terms in power, the summary will be done the same way. Each column <sup>107</sup> provides a systematic overview. As there are six of them, the summary will be done in this numerical order and when the moment of the introduction of a new treaty is reached, it will be investigated if the part of the new treaty about CFSP reflects what the politicians in their speeches have addressed.

Column 1: (Amsterdam) Kohl<sup>108</sup> – Chirac – Blair:

In the time period of the first column which starts with the signing of the Treaty of Amsterdam in October, 1997 and ends with the end of Helmut Kohl's term in power, several events took place in Europe and the world. The Belfast Agreement was signed between the governments of Great Britain, Ireland and the majority of Northern Irish parties, even though later there were further bombings by the Real IRA. Pakistan launched nuclear tests and a permanent international criminal court was created. Also, the UN sent weapon inspectors to Iraq to prevent the USA to take military actions there and the war in Kosovo started.

Helmut Kohl saw as major challenges the possible enlargement of the EU, but also the Agenda 2000 and totalitarian ideologies. Cooperation "in common institutions" and European unification were necessary to keep peace and to "solve numerous common problems". Terrorism is explicitly mentioned as a threat, but topics such as international crime and the drug mafia are addressed as well<sup>109</sup>

The speech of Jacques Chirac that was analyzed dealt with the breaking out of the war in Kosovo, which was the main topic of the speech. He talks about barbarism and the horror of

---

<sup>107</sup>See: Table 1

<sup>108</sup>Due to difficulties finding online material regarding a speech from Helmut Kohl for the time the Treaty of Amsterdam was signed until the end of his time in office one year later, a speech from the time shortly before the signing was used. It was made sure that a position regarding threats could be found out. As Kohl's successor Schröder was the chancellor at the time the Treaty of Amsterdam came into power and the Treaty of Nice was signed, his views can be regarded as more relevant anyway.

<sup>109</sup>Kohl (1997)

war that the Kosovo was about to face. This should be prevented by Europe, whose aim it was to uphold peace and the values of freedom, tolerance and democracy. The OSCE and the Security Council are mentioned as partners in this task.<sup>110</sup>

The British Prime Minister names a “number of serious challenges” caused by “irresistible forces of history and human invention” such as the global economic crisis whose “challenge is real”. Also, challenges with regards to Kosovo and Kyoto protocol “can only be met by standing stronger together”. A reformed Europe in this sense can also help trade, prosperity, the environment or in the cooperation on cross-border crime.<sup>111</sup>

#### Column 2: (Amsterdam) Schröder – Chirac – Blair:

The year of major interest for this column was 1999, a year which was marked by re-escalating violence on the Balkans. A war in Kosovo broke out which led to strikes by the NATO. A common European currency, the euro, was introduced on the stock market. Also, Asia faces a major financial crisis.

Against this background, Gerhard Schröder calls in his speech for a closer political cooperation to prevent countries from a “return to nationalism and rivalry”, but also “new models for European politics” were required by the introduction of the euro and the upcoming enlargement of 2004. Regarding the CFSP, he believed that it was necessary for foreign trade and international monetary policy to become part of it, and in general called for a revision of the Treaty of Amsterdam. The “European failure in Bosnia” threatened the reputation of the EU. Other “urgent questions” are about the “fight of border-crossing organized crimes”, migration and asylum problems and illegal immigration.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup>Chirac (1998)

<sup>111</sup>Blair (1998)

<sup>112</sup>Schröder (1999a)

Jacques Chirac talks about various topics of interest. He addresses, amongst others, worldwide trade rules, the protection of the environment, social norms and the consumer protection as issues that call for closer cooperation. Racism, drugs and organized crime as well as environment issues are permanently on the agenda. Conflicts in Central Africa for example demand a closer cooperation between the EU, African Union and the UN, but he also takes organizations such as the World Bank or the UNESCO into consideration. There are too many regional tensions and internal conflicts that are not acceptable.<sup>113</sup>

One of the main issues Tony Blair mentions is the war in Kosovo, where “awful crimes” happen and “the evil” of ethnic cleansing, systematic rape and mass murder reappears. He addresses the changing world and globalization that “transformed economies and working practices”, which became a “political and security phenomenon”. Therefore, he sees a necessity “to cooperate across nations”. Other topics such as financial instability in Asia, poverty in the Caribbean or environmental degradation “can only be addressed by international cooperation”. Also, due to moral purposes, he sees a need to fight dictators such as Saddam Hussein or Slobodan Milosevic because they pose a threat to “international peace and security”. Additionally, topics such as changes in technology, crime or drugs require that “a search for solutions becomes global”.<sup>114</sup>

### Column 3: (Amsterdam) Schröder – Chirac – Blair – Solana:

The speeches analyzed for this column are from the same year as the ones from the previous column with the difference that they were held when Javier Solana began his function as High Representative and end with the signing of the Treaty of Nice. At that time, Slobodan Milosevic and other high people from the military and politics were indicted in Den Haag for war crimes and crime against humanity in Kosovo at the International Criminal Tribunal for

---

<sup>113</sup>Chirac (1999a)

<sup>114</sup>Blair (1999)

the former Yugoslavia. Dagestan experienced a short war and the euro officially replaced the currencies of twelve member states, creating the Eurozone.

Gerhard Schröder's speech deals a lot with the Kosovo-conflict and the need for the EU to be able to maintain peace within its borders. He talks about the necessity of a new strategic concept regarding the ESDP such as more independence and a larger capacity to act and for a closer cooperation within the community of states. This comes from the new uncertainties and instabilities due to terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons and tests, drug trafficking, immigration and fundamentalism. These challenges have to be tackled together because of the mutual dependence of the states, so Schröder says. For him, this also includes bodies such as the NATO, the UN and the OSCE. European integration is a topic as well. All this leads to the necessity for changes in political and military structures of decision making, and the necessity for new instruments to recognize and manage crises.<sup>115</sup>

Jacques Chirac talks about the necessity of the French army to pursue its missions in regions such as former Yugoslavia, Africa and East-Timor to maintain peace. He says that the European Union formed the basis for common actions to prevent and manage crises, which gives hope for the stability of the European construction and the continent. Nevertheless he knows it would be a long and difficult task.<sup>116</sup>

Tony Blair speaks about problems related to globalization such as the fast economic development that "brings fears". Also, topics such as drugs and environmental pollution, nuclear weapons and immigration are seen as "challenges", which does not necessarily mean that these are perceived as threats as well. Nevertheless, he calls for "renewing the institutions of international cooperation and of building alliance between main players" to "maintain international peace and security". This is needed because of "international issues" such as

---

<sup>115</sup>Schröder (1999b)

<sup>116</sup>Chirac (1999b)

AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, crime and drugs, global warming, the destruction of the environment and religious division. It is interesting to pay attention to the point about the religious division, because together with nuclear proliferation, Blair actually calls this issue a threat to peace. He sees the need for “nations to cooperate together”.<sup>117</sup>

At the very beginning of his time in office as the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Javier Solana made clear what he expected from the CFSP and why these expectations should be met. He talked about threats such as terrorism, international drug dealing, money laundering and the spread of AIDS, which he called “new globalized problems and responsibilities”. Regarding the realm of these threats, he saw some of them as “limited and regional security threats”, whereas others are considered “transnational problems” which all require to be controlled better.<sup>118</sup>

#### Column 4: (Nice) Schröder – Chirac – Blair – Solana:

Regarding this time period, both the terrorist-attacks of 9/11 in the United States and the 2005 terrorist attacks in Madrid were a major issue, but also the enlargement of the EU in 2004. With George W. Bush, a new American president was inaugurated in 2001 who two years later, with the help of the UK amongst others, invaded Iraq. Still in 2001, the NATO went to Afghanistan to fight Al-Qaida. Former war criminals from the Yugoslavian War such as Slobodan Milosevic got into the world’s focus as they were captured or taken to court. Diseases such as SARS frightened the world and the consequences of climate change began to become more conscious to the people. The Kyoto protocol went into force in 2005 and in the same year, North Korea announced the possession of nuclear weapons.

---

<sup>117</sup>Blair (2000)

<sup>118</sup>Solana (1999)

All these events might have played a role in the speeches of the politicians. In the selected speeches, Gerhard Schröder mentioned 9/11 and international terrorism and spoke about close cooperation. By using expressions such as “faceless barbarism” and “aimed at the entire civilized world” he frames the attacks in a very negatively way and sees the local attacks in a far more international context. He talks about “new forms of threats”, requiring the development of a comprehensive concept for the prevention of these threats and for the management of such crisis. Such a concept could be a joint action, including military forces and the cooperation with NATO.<sup>119</sup> Before the 9/11 attacks the crisis in the Balkans was called a “matter of serious concern”, which made South East Europe remaining a “crucial issue”. In this context he mentions the CFSP to enhance the EU’s capability to ensure security. Weapons of mass destruction were also mentioned as “potential new threats” and the issue of disarmament and control was related to international agreements. He talks about “partnership” and wants to strengthen the “transatlantic relationship”.<sup>120</sup>

Jacques Chirac sees in his speech no “direct threat to Europe’s frontiers” but other problems. In his view, globalization makes crises in other parts of the world dangerous for Europe as well. Additionally, he acknowledges the “changing nature of threats” caused by, for example, new technologies linked to the globalization problem. He also addresses the “danger of ballistic proliferation” that call for “new security requirements” in which the UN play a role.<sup>121</sup> Only a few weeks later after the attacks of 9/11, he speaks about them as “heinous crimes” and calls for taking “part in action aimed at neutralizing these networks”, mentioning “victims of the tragedy” and the “necessity and urgent priority” as justification to do something about it. Challenges to be “resolved together” come from more areas such as the economy and the environment. International crime asks for the “speeding up” of the “establishment of a

---

<sup>119</sup>Schröder (2001a)

<sup>120</sup>Schröder (2001b)

<sup>121</sup>Chirac (2001a)

common judicial area”. The mafia and immigrants are mentioned in this context as well. As a conclusion, he comes up with the European defence idea which needs military staff, for which reason EU policy in the fields of defence and foreign policy must be worked on.<sup>122</sup>

The British Prime Minister at that time, Tony Blair, addressed in the speech that was used for this “column” several issues. He points to the nature of global threats, which are “real and existential”. In this context he addresses weapons of mass destruction as an “imminent threat to Britain” that might be used by terrorist groups. Ethnic cleansing is mentioned alongside regions that require extra attention, such as the Balkans, Iraq, Sierra Leone, Kashmir and Afghanistan. “Self-defence” is the key word here that should protect against a huge “network of individuals” mainly related to terrorists. To do something against it is an “international obligation”, and for these reasons the “security threat” has to be challenged.<sup>123</sup>

Javier Solana, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy addresses more diverse topics such as the “imbalance between North and South” that is “growing dangerously”. In addition, he mentions terrorism and its radicalization, as well as the enlargement which “demand for a strong Europe rising around the world”. “Its role as a global leader” and “vector of peace and democracy across the world” were estimated. “International crime”, “environmental catastrophes” as well as “man-made disaster all call for a “strengthening of the CDP”.<sup>124</sup>

#### Column 5: (Nice) Merkel – Chirac – Blair – Solana:

Regarding the next time frame, the enlargement in 2007 with two additional member states – Bulgaria and Romania – as well as the shutdown of oil supply from Russia towards Germany

---

<sup>122</sup>Chirac (2001b)

<sup>123</sup>Blair (2004)

<sup>124</sup>Solana (2005)

via Belarus were important topics. Montenegro declared its independence in 2006 and Israel and Lebanon fought a war a year later.

Not all of these issues were in the focus of the speeches that were analyzed. Angela Merkel for example refers to “challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century” such as globalization and “new threats”, for example coming from terrorism or “social challenges”. What she does as well is to point out that the EU treaties have to adapt “to changed circumstances”. Kosovo and the western Balkans, as well as the Middle East and different ways of cooperation to “drive forward the peace process” there, is a major concern for her as well. Energy and climate protection are, according to her, the “two greatest challenges facing humanity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century” as she says.<sup>125</sup>

Chirac talked about nuclear deterrents as “threats against peace”, to which he adds “radical ideas” and “fanaticism” or in general “all kinds of crazy things”. He also mentions the constant change of the world with “new power centers” that “emerge quickly”. In this context, nuclear or biological and chemical weapons and in general the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a “real threat for international peace and security”. “Increasing interdependence of European countries” or “effects of globalization” influence the way how to react on these issues.<sup>126</sup>

For Tony Blair, threats come from the economy but also from social division. Keywords such as energy, environment, immigration, terrorism globalization, climate change and organized crime are also on his mind in his speech, which are called “problems and conflicts of the wider world”. States have to “join together to defeat them”. This includes conflicts in the Middle East, Lebanon, Africa or the Sudan as well.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup>Merkel (2007a)

<sup>126</sup>Chirac (2006)

<sup>127</sup>Blair (2006)

Regarding the speech of Javier Solana from this time period, he also speaks about a “focus on new challenges” with a future that is “uncertain and contested”. Environmental challenges such as global warming but also demographic pressures caused by migration are such “new security threats” and “global challenges”. He talks about cooperation and new kinds of relationships towards other countries such as the Iran to solve problems, for example the Middle East conflict. Also, he shows himself concerned about the “broader relations to the Muslim world” and terrorism. “Comprehensive political strategies” must be built up in order to be able to tackle the “international problems”, that are “too complex for one country”. In general, he calls for closer cooperation among states to “defend Europe’s interests”.<sup>128</sup>

Column 6: (Nice) Merkel – Sarkozy – Brown – Solana:

During the next period, the financial crisis that affects states all over the world begins. Soon Greece, Ireland and other Southern European countries got into financial trouble. The ICJ is dealing with processes against war criminals from former Yugoslavia such as Milan Milutinović. On the oil market the price for a barrel exceeds the \$ 100 threshold and pirates off the Somalian coast hijack ships.

Merkel’s focus in her speech during that time is on European integration and the need for a reform of the treaties. This would create “major advantages” regarding the “capacity to act” in, for example, the field of climate protection. “Joint efforts” and a “closer cooperation by police on fighting cross-border crime” and “illegal immigration in EU” are needed. Acting jointly is also important to “meet major challenges of humanity” such as “dangers posed by climate change”. The “war of violence”, AIDS, malaria or tuberculosis are also spoken about as having the necessity to be “fought successfully”.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup>Solana (2006)

<sup>129</sup>Merkel (2007b)

For Nicolas Sarkozy, the “fight against terrorism” and “obscurantist barbarism” is important in order to “protect France from the direct threat of terrorism”. This fight is named as “main challenge”. He talks about a “radically new situation” that necessitates the creation of a “new international order in the world” that “deal[s] with global problems”. The countries he mentions are on every continent, from Syria to Angola, Brazil, Russia and Africa. He talks about the “advent of a new era” in which the main challenges, such as the financial crisis and the “excesses of a financial capitalism”, have to be faced. Hunger riots, food scarcity, high energy prices and nationalism are used in this context as well. As “challenges of the twenty-first century” he names environmental, energy and financial stability. The EU and NATO therefore have to work together more closely. Also, the EU “can play a decisive role in seeking solutions for global problems” such as illegal immigration, and most importantly for “long-term issues” such as energy and climate.<sup>130</sup>

In the UK, the Prime Minister Gordon Brown also talks about the financial crisis. According to him, “globalization threatens to become values-free and rules-free” and thereby causing problems. He mentions financial instability, environmental degradation, violent extremism and extreme poverty which have to be “addressed urgently” by “the world coming together”. In addition, he talks about several other crises such as the oil price crisis and the climate change crisis. These events can happen anywhere and “can have an impact on what happens everywhere”. He also mentions the fight against global recession, climate chaos, unemployment, insecurity, poverty and hopelessness. In light of the financial crisis, he concludes that the banking system and the markets need to be reformed, which is the “challenge for our generation”.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> Sarkozy (2008)

<sup>131</sup> Brown (2009)

Javier Solana provides an overall overview of EU foreign and security policy in his speech and addresses all regions of the world as being in the focus of this policy. He sees, among others, climate change, terrorism, energy security, piracy and cyber security as challenges and threats to security. They have to be met by implementing better internal EU cooperation and improved coordination.<sup>132</sup>

### **5.3.1 Impact of threat perception on the Treaty of Nice**

The major changes from the Treaty of Amsterdam to the Treaty of Nice were mentioned above: In general, the CFSP is broadened and includes “all questions related to the security of the Union”.<sup>133</sup> Joint actions or common positions are also possible for non-military and non-defence topics and are aimed at enhancing the cooperation in fields beyond these two. Also, the PSC started dealing with crisis management operations and the framing of a common defence policy. Compared to the analyzed speeches, one can state that one point was adopted in the CFSP: The threats and challenges the politicians talked about came from more than one policy field, i. e. they were more than military threats. Drug trafficking and mainly environmental issues are clearly not in the military or defence policy field. With the broadening of the CFSP and especially the new possibility to form joint actions and common position to policy issues that are not related to military or defence issues, these new or different threats could now be dealt with in the CFSP as well now. Issues coming from social, environmental and economic fields can be included now. As the politicians clearly spoke about them as threats, they saw a necessity in dealing with them as such and might have acknowledged that they require the same attention from the EU as military threats do. Also, the politician’s call for closer cooperation was considered and played a huge role in the change of the policy.

---

<sup>132</sup> Solana (2009)

<sup>133</sup>Treaty of Nice

### **5.3.2 Impact of threat perception on the Treaty of Lisbon**

Compared to the threats and challenges that the politicians mentioned before the signing of the Treaty of Nice, the threats spoken about in the time afterwards and before the Treaty of Lisbon are not very different from each other.<sup>134</sup> Therefore, an actual change in the policy should not be expected, because these issues were already been addressed in the Treaty of Nice, for which reason no changes should be necessary. Nevertheless, the Treaty of Lisbon provided some changes for the CFSP. Mainly the inclusion of the "Petersberg Tasks"<sup>135</sup> expanded the tasks in which the CFSP could get involved in. One can recognize that they fit with the threats and issues the politicians spoke about in the analyzed speeches such as peacekeeping and humanitarian aid. Nevertheless, stating that another broadening of the CFSP took place because of the perception of similar threats is a difficult case to make.

---

<sup>134</sup> See: Appendix C

<sup>135</sup> Quille, 2008, p. 5

## **6. Conclusion**

After having read what politicians perceived as threats and how the CFSP of the EU changed, it became obvious that at first glance, the perception of threats did not have an impact on the development of the CFSP. Neither in the text of the Treaty of Nice nor in the text of the Treaty of Lisbon were the topics explicitly addressed in the way that they were mentioned in the speeches. Having a closer look at the outcome and at the three<sup>136</sup> expectations that were expressed in chapter 3, namely

- The process of securitization is successful and the securitized topic becomes part of the foreign and security policy of the EU
- An issue is perceived as a threat but is not taken into account in the EU policy
- An issue is not talked about as being a threat but nevertheless the EU foreign and security policy changes

a more detailed conclusion can be drawn about the outcome.

The first expectation could not be met. A lot of topics such as terrorism or global warming were seen as threatening, challenging or at least as problematic by the politicians, but as explained, there was no direct relation with changes in the CFSP. Nevertheless, the common perception of these threats led to the common conviction that a closer cooperation was needed, which actually influenced the changes of the CFSP and its organization.

Regarding the second expectation, it is more difficult to find an answer. As stated, the threats are not mentioned explicitly in the treaties which means it is not possible to say which threats actually contributed to the need for closer cooperation, to an enhancement of the instruments

---

<sup>136</sup> Excluding the possibility of desecuritization

and organization of the second pillar, and which threats did not. The question whether the second expectation is met is therefore inconclusive.

With regards to the initial hypothesis, it appears that the third expectation is met the closest. As stated, it cannot be said that there is a direct connection between the threats and their perception, as such, and the changes in the CFSP. So if one assumes that the threat perception did not have an impact, their perception as such is irrelevant and the outcome – changes in the CFSP – is completely independent of threat perception at all.

What these conclusions mean is that the expectations of securitization theory were generally not fulfilled. Even if the expectations were met partially, they were only met with a number of restrictions. It can be concluded that the explanatory power of securitization theory was weaker than expected. The fourth chapter showed how the foreign policy of the EU developed before and after the end of the Cold War. Even though the reasons for the development after 1990 mentioned in the literature were closely linked to the changing environment and therefore also to changing threats and the necessity to meet them, this could not be proven without doubts with securitization theory.

But what could be seen is that one of the points that most of the politicians saw as crucial, a closer cooperation regarding foreign policy between the EU states but also globally, connected the enhancement of all the treaties since the Treaty of Maastricht. Therefore, the topics themselves did influence the development but rather occurred because of a general perception of the need for closer cooperation. In turn, this call for closer cooperation could be seen as a perceived necessity to tackle more diverse and complicated threats in more policy fields.

Still, this answer is not very satisfying as it actually does not confirm the expectation of securitization theory. One explanation for the outcome can be the criteria used for the

selection of the documents for the analysis. It was assumed that the politicians talk about threats and that therefore these topics can have an impact on the development of the CFSP. As shown, this relation could not be confirmed. The decision to use speeches for the analysis and the specific speeches that were analyzed might have played a role concerning the outcome. Choosing a different type of documents is difficult though as a speech analysis requires analyzing speeches. Nevertheless, the selection of the single speeches could be changed and therefore the outcome. If there was better access to speeches especially about EU foreign policy, then the randomly selected speeches could have been chosen from a larger variety of speeches that deal with EU foreign policy.

Another reason could come from the actual organization of the EU. In the treaties, the policies are usually only roughly described, and broad definitions were given about what should be included in the CFSP. What is more decisive for the impact of threat perception on the CFSP is their acknowledgment through its policy measures. If joint actions or common statements, the two major policy instruments, mainly deal with the perceived threats, these topics could be considered to have an impact on the development of the CFSP.

Even though the choice of countries and politician was justified by profound reasons, a different choice could have led to different outcomes. What is doubted is that a different choice could have led to a positive outcome, a clear relation between the threats addressed in the speeches and the CFSP. The ministers of foreign affairs would have been a rational alternative to the state leaders to be the speech actors, as foreign policy is their domain. But then the next problem would appear: Their power within the European Union is due to its structure quite small. Regarding the choice of the countries the argumentation would be similar. A positive outcome would not be expected.

Alternative explanations for the outcome are related to these points. Instead of looking at how the treaties have changed and if they have changed according to threats addressed in speeches, one could have regarded the instruments and how they were acted out. If new regulations, laws and instruments were implemented and if they had addressed the topics that were talked about as threats then one could have come easier to the conclusion that the assumption of securitization theory was met.

Regarding the theory that was used, it can be stated that in this research the impact of the speech act might have been overestimated. It would be worth a consideration and a theoretical investigation if the securitization theory only works for states and international organizations or for supranational organizations as well. Due to the special way the EU is organized it might be possible that this character of shared responsibilities and sovereignty regarding several policy fields, and therefore shared authorities as well, is too problematic for the securitization theory to work. The EU and its member states have clear rules about which policies will be regulated domestically and which ones at the EU level. This seems to clear responsibilities and also authorities but the difficulty is somewhere else. Even though the sovereignty belongs to the EU which means it gives the guidelines, national politicians are at first responsible to contribute to a discussion and then to implement the policy. Defining authoritarian persons that are capable of doing the speech act is therefore not an easy task, as national and EU politicians both have influence on the EU policy. One could then assume that in the case of the research that was done here, the wrong authoritarian persons were chosen and that not the national politicians but the EU politicians would have had the influence to make a successful speech act. Also, the lack of a proper audience forces the researcher to leave out a crucial part of the speech act. The audience could have been operationalized as all EU citizens or EU politicians or other high state-leaders of EU-member states for example. The problem was that the EU citizen's influence on EU policy is quite small for which reason shared perception

of threats between the citizens and the state leaders that were used for the research could have been ignored for a good reason. This problem, the lack of influence of the audience on policies, might be problematic for other researches as well, as this crucial part of securitization theory has to be left out and therefore the successful explanation of a change in policies with this theory will be more difficult. Therefore, several questions regarding securitization theory have to be addressed anew by theorists: What are the limits of the theory? Which consequences do the limits have for the use of the theory? Which cases cannot be considered and why? How can the theory overcome these limits?

The initial hypothesis that threat perception leads to changes in foreign policy can in general not be verified with this research. The findings nevertheless provide substance for further research, but first the hypothesis must be altered and made more precise. What was observed is the following: The perception of threats was in general the same for the three countries. The common opinion about threats made the politicians think that it was necessary to work closer together to be able to act efficiently on them. In order to work closer together – especially within the legal framework of the EU – the concept of the CFSP had to be changed. Therefore, the initial hypothesis gets an added condition, so that a new hypothesis for future research could be formulated as “The common perception of threats leads to the common conviction that – in order to deal with these threats – the CFSP has to change”.

Hence, for further research it would be helpful to look at joint actions and common positions for the analysis. The research would then not be about the question if threat perception has changed the definition of the CFSP, but if and how new threats influence the actual policy making within the CFSP.

## Literature

### Books

Balzacq, T. (2011) *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. Oxford/New York: Routledge.

Buzan, B., Wæver, O. and de Wilde, J. (1998) *Security: A new Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner.

Hill C. (2003) *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sjöstedt, G. (1997) *The External Role of the European Community*. Westmead: Saxon House.

Smith, K.E. (2003) *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

### Edited volumes

Booth, K. (ed.) (2005) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Buzan, B. and Wæver, O. (2003) *Regions and Powers – The Structure of International Security*. In: Smith, S. (ed.) *Cambridge Studies in International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bryman, A. and Cramer, D. (2004) Constructing Variables. In: Hardy, M. and Bryman, A. (eds.) *The Handbook of Data Analysis*. L.A.: Sage, pp. 17-34.

Eliassen, K. A. (1998) Introduction: The New European Foreign and Security Policy Agenda. In: Eliassen, K. A. (1998) (ed.) *Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union*. London: Sage, pp: 1-18.

Wodak, R. and Weiss, G. (2005) Analyzing European Union Discourses, Theory and Applications. In: Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (ed.) *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 121-135.

### Articles

Albert, M. and Buzan, B. (2011) Securitization, Sectors and Functional Differentiation. *Security Dialogue* 42(4-5): 413-425.

Aradau, C. (2004) Security and the Democratic Scene: Desecuritization and emancipation. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 7(4): 388-413

Cebeci, M. (2012) European Foreign Policy Research Reconsidered: Constructing an 'Ideal Power Europe' through Theory? *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 40(3): 563-583.

Cottey, A. (2012) Regionalism and the EU's Neighbourhood Policy: The limits of the possible. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 12(3): 375-391.

DeBardeleben, J. (2012) Applying Constructivism to Understanding EU-Russian Relations. *International Politics* 49(4): 418-433.

- Evans, R.J. (2010) What is European History? Reflections of a Cosmopolitan Islander. *European History Quarterly* 40(4): 593-605.
- Floyd, R. (2006) Securitization Theory and Securitization Studies. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 9(1): 53-61.
- Herschinger, E. (2013) A Battlefield of Meanings: The Struggle for Identity in the UN Debates on a Definition of International Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 25(2): 183-201.
- Kettel, S. (2013) Dilemma of Discourse: Legitimizing Britains' War on Terror. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 15(2): 263-279.
- Krotz, U. and Maher, R. (2011) International Relations Theory and the Rise of European Foreign and Security Policy. *World Politics* 63(3): 548-579.
- Lambert, A. (2006) Les interventions "militaires" de l'Union européenne dans les Balkans. *Relations Internationales* 125: 59-72
- Larsen, H. (2002) The EU – A Global Military Actor? *Cooperation and Conflict* 37(3): 283-302.
- Maganza, G. (1998) The Treaty of Amsterdam's Changes to the Common Foreign and Security Policy Chapter and an Overview of the Opening Enlargement Process. *Fordham International Law Journal*, 22(6): 174-186.
- Manners, I. (2006) Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40(2): 235–58.

- McGowan, P. (1989) State Agents, International Structures, and Foreign Policy Behavior: Thinking Seriously about Foreign Policy Behavior. *International Affairs Bulletin* 13(3): 39-54.
- Nikolaidis, K. and Moravcsik, A. (1999) Explaining the treaty of Amsterdam: Interests, Influence, Institutions. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 37(1): 59-85.
- Schimmelfennig, F. (2010) The Normative Origins of Democracy in the European Union: Toward a Transformationalist Theory of Democratization. *European Political Science Review* 2(2): 211–233.
- Schmidt, V. A. (2013) Democracy and Legitimacy in the EU Revisited: Input, Output and ‘Throughput’. *Political Studies* 61(1): 2-22.
- Sjursen, H. (2006) What kind of power? *Journal of European Public Policy* 13(2): pp. 169-181
- Smith, K. E. (2006) Speaking with one voice? European Union Co-ordination on Human Rights Issues at the United Nations. *Journal of common market studies* 44(1): 113-137.
- Smith, K. E. (2010): The European Union at the Human Rights Council: speaking with one voice but having little influence. In: *Journal of European public policy*. 17(2): 224-241.
- Stone Sweet A. and Sandholtz W. (1997) European Integration and Supranational Governance. *Journal of European Public Policy* 4(3): 297–317.
- Stritzel, H. (2007) Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond. *European Journal of International Relations* 13(3): 357-383.

- Svarplys, A. and Matulionis, A. (2010) Construction of European Identity in the European Union's Cultural Politics. A Common European cultural heritage. *Filosofija-Sociologia* 21(4): 298-309.
- Tatransky, T. (2006) European citizenship policy: Trying to Stimulate the Citizens' Sense of Belonging to the European Union. *Polish Sociological Review* 156(4): 489-503.
- Van Gorp, B. and Renes, H. (2007) A European Cultural Identity? Heritage and Shared Histories in the European Union. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 98(3): 407-413.
- Vuori, J. A. (2008) Illucutionary Logic and Strands of Securitization: Applying the Theory of Securitization to the Study of Non-Democratic Political Orders. *European Journal of International Relations* 14(1): 65–99.
- Wendt A. (1992) Anarchy Is What States Make of It. The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*. 46(2): 391-425.
- Williams, M.C. (2003) Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics. *International Studies Quarterly* 47(4): 511-531.
- Zwartjes, M., Van Langenhove, L., Kingah, S. and Maes, L. (2012) Determinants of Regional Leadership: Is the European Union a Leading Regional Actor in Peace and Security? *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 12(3): 393-405.
- Zwolski, K. (2012) The EU and a Holistic Security Approach after Lisbon: Competing Norms and the Power of the Dominant Discourse. *Journal of European Public Policy* 19(7): 988-1005.

Internet sources

Articles of the Treaty on European Union concerning the CFSP (Maastricht, 7 February 1992), [http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2002/7/3/15c19d1e-bc26-45a2-9008-21546628fa31/publishable\\_en.pdf](http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2002/7/3/15c19d1e-bc26-45a2-9008-21546628fa31/publishable_en.pdf), accessed 3 August 2013.

Charrett, C. (2009) A Critical Application of Securitization Theory: Overcoming the Normative Dilemma of Writing Science. ICIP Working Papers., [http://www20.gencat.cat/docs/icip/Continguts/Publicacions/WorkingPapers/Arxiu/WP7\\_AN\\_G.pdf](http://www20.gencat.cat/docs/icip/Continguts/Publicacions/WorkingPapers/Arxiu/WP7_AN_G.pdf), accessed 17 June 2013.

CVCE, The Failure of the European Defense Policy. [http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2011/10/7/38ec6c23-d27f-436e-86fc-5801d776ec20/publishable\\_en.pdf](http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2011/10/7/38ec6c23-d27f-436e-86fc-5801d776ec20/publishable_en.pdf), accessed 8 August 2013.

CVCE, The Fourchet Plans. [http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1997/10/13/c7c2b3f9-cf51-4a8e-874a-d6c3eda5125a/publishable\\_en.pdf](http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1997/10/13/c7c2b3f9-cf51-4a8e-874a-d6c3eda5125a/publishable_en.pdf), accessed 8 August 2013.

Die Bundeskanzlerin, Kanzleramt, Aufgaben der Bundeskanzlerin. [http://www.bundeskanzlerin.de/Webs/BKIn/DE/Kanzleramt/Aufgaben/aufgaben\\_der\\_kanzlerin\\_node.html](http://www.bundeskanzlerin.de/Webs/BKIn/DE/Kanzleramt/Aufgaben/aufgaben_der_kanzlerin_node.html), accessed 3 August 2013.

Elysée, Le rôle du Président. <http://www.elysee.fr/la-presidence/le-role-du-president/>, accessed 3 August 2013.

EU trade relations worldwide. [http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/june/tradoc\\_149622.jpg](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/june/tradoc_149622.jpg), accessed 9 August 2013.

Europa, Common Foreign and Security Policy.

[http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/institutional\\_affairs/treaties/amsterdam\\_treaty/a19000\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/amsterdam_treaty/a19000_en.htm),

accessed 13 April 2013.

Europa: Treaty of Maastricht on the European Union.

[http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/institutional\\_affairs/treaties/treaties\\_maastricht\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/treaties_maastricht_en.htm),

accessed 29 July 2013.

European Parliament & the Lisbon Treaty.

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/0042423726/Parliament-and-the-Lisbon-](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/0042423726/Parliament-and-the-Lisbon-Treaty.html;jsessionid=7148C34C56B1703FBDF05699D5D1062D.node2)

[Treaty.html;jsessionid=7148C34C56B1703FBDF05699D5D1062D.node2](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/0042423726/Parliament-and-the-Lisbon-Treaty.html;jsessionid=7148C34C56B1703FBDF05699D5D1062D.node2), accessed 13 April 2013.

European Union, EU Treaties. <http://europa.eu/eu-law/treaties/>, accessed 8 August 2013.

European Commission, Home Affairs, Schengen Area. [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/)

[we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/), accessed 4 August 2013.

European Commission, Public Opinion. [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm),

accessed 15 August 2013.

European Parliament, Foreign policy: aims, instruments and achievements.

[http://circa.europa.eu/irc/opoce/fact\\_sheets/info/data/relations/cfsp/article\\_7190\\_en.htm](http://circa.europa.eu/irc/opoce/fact_sheets/info/data/relations/cfsp/article_7190_en.htm),

accessed 3 August 2013.

European Union: Foreign and Security Policy. EU institutions and bodies.

[http://europa.eu/pol/cfsp/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/pol/cfsp/index_en.htm), accessed 29 July 2013.

Government UK, Prime Minister, Responsibilities.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/ministers/prime-minister#responsibilities>, accessed 3 August

2013.

Press release database, Memo/03/23, Summary of the Treaty of Nice.  
[http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_MEMO-03-23\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-03-23_en.htm), accessed 20 July 2013.

Statistical Annex of European Economy.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/publications/european\\_economy/2012/pdf/2012-11-07-stat-annex\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/2012-11-07-stat-annex_en.pdf), accessed 9 August 2013.

Treaty of Nice. [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/12001C/htm/C\\_2001080EN.000101.html](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/12001C/htm/C_2001080EN.000101.html), accessed 10 August 2013.

The Treaty of Rome.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/emu\\_history/documents/treaties/rometreaty2.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/emu_history/documents/treaties/rometreaty2.pdf), accessed 13.04.2013.

Quille, G. (2008) The Lisbon Treaty and its implications for CFSP/ESDP. Policy Department External Policies.  
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/200805/20080513ATT28796/20080513ATT28796EN.pdf>, accessed 3 August 2013.

### Speeches

Blair, T. (1998) Leader's Speech. Blackpool. 29 September.

Blair, T. (1999) Doctrine of the International Community. Chicago. 24 April.

Blair, T. (2000) Speech to the Global Ethics Foundation. Tübingen. 30 June.

Blair, T. (2004) Prime Minister Warns of Continuing Global Terror Threat. Sedgefield. 5 May.

Blair, T. (2006) Leader's Speech. Manchester. 26 September.

Brown, G. (2009) Global Rules, Global Values. London. 31 March.

Chirac, J. (1998) Opening of the conference of negotiations about the future of Kosovo. Rambouillet, 6 February.

Chirac, J. (1999a) Summit of the presidents of French-speaking states. Moncton. 3 September.

Chirac, J. (1999b) Address to the army. Paris. 31 December.

Chirac, J. (2001a) Defense-Speech to the institute of Higher National Defense Studies. Paris. 8 June.

Chirac, J. (2001b) Regional Forum Future of Europe. Montpellier. 4 October.

Chirac, J. (2006) President Jacques Chirac's speech during his visit to naval and air strategic forces. Landivisiau - Ile Longue / Brest. 9 February.

Kohl, H. (1997) Speech on being awarded "Vision for Europe" prize by Edmond Israel Foundation. Luxembourg. 17. September

Merkel, A. (2007a) Speech to the European Parliament. Strasbourg. 17 January.

Merkel, A. (2007b) Speech to the European Parliament reviewing the German EU Presidency. 18 February.

Sarkozy (2008) Sixteenth Ambassador's Conference. Paris. 27 August.

Schröder, G. (1999a) Annual dinner of the foundation for the preservation of Nieuwpoort. Den Haag. 19 January.

Schröder, G. (1999b) Meeting of commanders of the Bundeswehr. Hamburg. 20 December.

Schröder, G. (2001a) Labour Party Conference, Brighton. 1 October.

Schröder, G. (2001b) North Atlantic Council. Brussels. 13 June.

Solana, J. (1999) The Development of a Common European Security and Defence Policy – The Integration Project of the Next Decade, Remarks. Berlin. 17 December.

Solana, J. (2005) Speech at the Institut d'études politiques. Paris. 18 April.

Solana, J. (2006) Europe's answer to the global challenges. Copenhagen. 8 September.

Solana, J. (2009) Address to the European Parliament on the EU common, security and defence policy. Brussels. 18 February.

## Appendix A: Questionnaire speeches

Kohl (1997)

### A) Circumstances

#### 1. Who is the speaker?

##### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Helmut Kohl

##### 1.2 What is his/her function?

Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany

#### 2. Who is the audience?

##### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Edmond Israel Foundation, speech on being awarded “Vision for Europe” price, Luxembourg

##### 2.2 When was the speech done or signed?

17.07.1997

#### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

##### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

##### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Bill Clinton’s second term as US president starts, Tony Blair becomes Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Russian-Chechen peace treaty, riots in Albania, NATO-Russia Founding Act, the British sovereignty over Hong Kong ends and is handed back to China, Flood in Poland, Scotland votes to create own parliament, Iraq disarmament crisis

## B) Content

### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

Importance of Europe for peace and stability, enlargement of European Union, common currency and market, common idea of Europe

### 2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Economic, political, military

### 3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Getting the award “Vision for Europe”, pointing out decisive role of Europe in keeping peace and stability, stressing importance for further economic cooperation regarding necessity of common currency

### 4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Plans about further enlargement, introduction of Euro planned

### 5. How is it talked about threats?

#### 5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Major challenges, enlargement, Agenda 2000, century of extreme contradictions, wars and new beginnings, internecine conflicts, European unification, countless people died in two world wars, refugees, expellees, totalitarian ideologies, horrible disaster, Europe and the world, yoke of communism, former enemies, peace and reconciliation, among the nations of Europe, can be secured over the long term, democracy and respect of human rights, European unification, cooperation, people’s longing for peace, contact and cooperation in common institutions, bulwark of lasting peace, difficult issues and problems to resolve, process of European integration, ensure peace and freedom, economies more competitive, ability to solve numerous common problems, critical voices, great objective, horrible scenes from former Yugoslavia, East-West conflict, evil spirits of the past, growing economic integration, international crime, drug mafia, threat posed by terrorism, live in peace and freedom, prosperity and social security, Amsterdam

Treaty, moved process of European unification a significant step forward, enlargement to the east, guarantor for peace, security and prosperity on our continent, Maastricht Treaty, move forward with enlargement of EU, regardless of all the other problems we will have to resolve at same time within the existing Union, united Europe, economic and monetary union, logical and necessary complement, European single market, monetary union, become a community based on economic stability, economic importance, political project, peace and freedom based system, cultural dimension, common foreign and security policy

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Challenges, enlargement, Agenda 2000, century, contradictions, wars, beginnings, conflicts, unification, people, world wars, refugees, expellees, ideologies, disaster, Europe, world, yoke, communism, enemies, peace, reconciliation, nations, Europe, democracy, respect, human rights, unification, cooperation, people's longing, contact, cooperation, institutions, bulwark, issues, problems, process, integration, freedom, economies, voices, objective, scenes, Yugoslavia, East-West conflict, spirits, past, integration, crime, drug mafia, threat, terrorism, prosperity, security, Amsterdam Treaty, step, east, guarantor, continent, Maastricht Treaty, EU, problems, time, Union, economic and monetary union, complement, single market, community, stability, importance, project, system, dimension, common foreign and security policy

#### 5.1.2 Adjective which point out how the topic was perceived

Major, extreme, new, internecine, European, countless, totalitarian, horrible, former, secured, common, lasting, difficult, competitive, numerous, critical, great, horrible, former, evil, growing, international, social, significant, existing, united, economic, monetary, logical, necessary, political freedom based, cultural, common

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Died, can, resolve, ensure, solve, posed, live, moved, have to resolve, become, based on

Blair (1998)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Tony Blair

1.2 What is his/her function?

Prime Minister of Great Britain

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Leader's speech, Blackpool

2.2 When was the speech done?

29.09.1998

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

19 European nations forbid human cloning, weapon inspectors in Baghdad by UN to prevent actions from USA, reelection of Prime Minister Rasmussen in Denmark, Belfast Agreement is signed between Irish and British governments and most of the parties in Northern Ireland, Pakistan launches nuclear tests, permanent international criminal court created, bombings in Northern Ireland by Real IRA

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Speech about what Labour party wants to do during its time in power and what they have already achieved, relation to Scotland and Northern Ireland, addresses social and economic problems in Great Britain, new era in EU with mostly center-left governments, position in EU

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Economic, social, political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out achievements and stating further plan and position of Labour Party to convince its members

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Agreement with Northern Ireland

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Number of serious challenges, foreign countries, year of challenge, finding security and stability in a world pushed ever faster by irresistible forces of history and human invention, world so fast, so competitive, spectre of global economic crisis, capitalism, permanent revolution, challenge is real, third way, we manage change together, challenge business, one answer to challenge, rock of stability, new rules of public spending and borrowing, Northern Ireland cast a beacon of hope across the globe, terror finally lost its power to divide and instead unified, British, Irish and Americans standing together, peoples in Africa and Asia a 25 per cent increase in aid and development, many starving and destitute, have hope, battle of values, Gerhard Schroeder, politics of fairness were finished, that only losers cared about social justice, 13 EU countries have centre-left government, to combat injustice, in the era a new agenda, economies that compete on knowledge, societies based on inclusion not division, countries that are internationalist not isolationist, our way of reconnecting people, debates on devolution and Europe are happening together, round the world, nations are reshaping their identity as national states look at their future place in the world, strength will come from reform, facing up this its challenge, Kyoto, Kosovo, challenge can only be met by standing stronger together, Russia can affect our economy's confidence, what a crisis in Europe could do, should be positive and constructive in Europe, make the

Euro succeed, reform Europe, winning that battle, EU helps trade, promote prosperity, save environment, cooperate on cross-border crime, United States

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topics

Number, challenges, countries, challenge, security, stability, world, forces, history, invention, spectrum, economic crisis, capitalism, revolution, challenge, third way, business, rock, stability, rules, spending, borrowing, Northern Ireland, beacon, hope, globe, terror, power, British, Irish, Americans, Africa, Asia, 25 per cent, increase, aid, EU countries, government, injustice, era, new agenda, economies, knowledge, societies, inclusion, division, countries, internationalist, isolationist, way, people, debates, devolution, Europe, nations, identity, states, place, strength, reform, challenge, Kyoto, Kosovo, Russia, economy's confidence, crisis, Euro, battle, trade, prosperity, environment, crime, United States

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Serious, foreign, faster, irresistible, fast, competitive, permanent, real, together, social, entre-left, new, stronger, positive, constructive, cross-border

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Finding, pushed, manage, challenge, cast, lost, divide, unified, standing, increase, starving, destitute, have, finished, cared about, combat, compete on, based on reconnecting, happening, round, reshaping, look, come, facing up, be met, standing together, affect, could do, should be, make, reform, winning, helps, promote, save, cooperate

Blair (1999)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Tony Blair

1.2 What is his/her function?

Prime Minister of Great Britain

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Doctrine of International Community

2.2 When was the speech done?

24.04.1999

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

4. Helsinki Summit a week before; War in Kosovo and NATO strikes in Yugoslavia, EURO introduction, Kurdish extremists take over embassies in Europe, Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic join NATO, financial crisis in Asia

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

International community, more cooperation, Kosovo War, necessity for military actions, globalization and growing interdependence, no to isolation, focus on principles of doctrine of international cooperation, international security

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military, economic, political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Calling for closer cooperation and pointing out values on which cooperation in mentioned areas should be based on

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Kosovo War, financial crisis in Asia

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Kosovo, unspeakable things are happening in Europe, awful crimes, reappeared, ethnic cleansing, systematic rape, mass murder, situation, wider context, economic, political, security, isolation, not one can doubt that NATO's military action is justified, just war, based on values, cannot let the evil of ethnic cleansing stand, must resist until it is reversed, appeasement does not work, evil dictator, right to take this action, clear objectives, going to succeed, cessation of combat activities, withdrawal of Serb military, police and paramilitary force, deployment of international military force, return of refugees and unimpeded access for humanitarian aid, political framework for Kosovo, Milosevic, campaign will take time, international force, no alternative to military action, summit in Washington, Clinton, our unity, our absolute resolve, Marshall plan for Kosovo, Montenegro, Macedonia, Albania, Serbia, democracy, need a framework for security of whole of the Balkans, need to assist war crimes tribunal, bring to justice those who have committed these appalling crimes, global interdependence, range of changes, end of Cold War, changing technology, spread of democracy, world has changed, more fundamental way, globalization, transformed economies and working practices, political and security phenomenon, isolationism, necessity we have to cooperate, across nations, caused on the other side of the world, financial instability in Asia, Poverty in Caribbean, conflict in Balkans, more refugees in Germany and US, problems can only be addressed by international cooperation, internationalist, participate in global markets, cannot ignore new political ideas in other countries, innovate, conflicts, violation of human rights, secure, new world, rules for international cooperation new ways of organizing our international institutions, rebuilding a devastated world, Bretton Woods, UN, NATO, EU, becoming increasingly interdependent, new doctrine of international community, mutually dependent, international endeavor, partnership and cooperation, global environment, global security and disarmament issues, intense international cooperation, global financial crisis, Kyoto, environmental degradation, constant reminders, serious and sustained way, G7, EU and US, working more closely together, globalization, competing internationally, companies and economies grow and succeed, based on rules, Asian financial crisis, impact on Brazil, need to modernize international financial architecture, transparency as keystone for reform, monetary and fiscal policy, improve financial supervision, more effective ways of resolving crisis, key challenges, Russia, affect us all, early agreement, provide macro, economic stability, avoid hyper-inflation, develop a long-term

strategy, delivering humanitarian aid, deterring attacks on defenceless people, backing up UN resolutions and occasionally engaging in major war, Gulf War, problems, ruthless men, Saddam Hussein, Slobodan Milosevic, vicious campaign against sections of their own community, win the conflict, dictator to be threatened with military force, US, strongest state, need to get involved in affairs, shoulder burdens and responsibilities, NATO summit, establish new framework, no longer is our existence as states under threat, actions are guided by a more subtle blend of mutual self interest and moral purpose in defending values we cherish, pressing foreign policy problem, identify circumstances in which we should get actively involved in other people's conflicts, non-interference, genocide, threats to international peace and security, problems become global, competitiveness, changes in technology, crime, drugs, family breakdown, search for solution becomes global, coping with same issues, rapid economic and technological change, changing family and community mores, bringing peace to Northern Ireland, Good Friday Agreement, remaining obstacle

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Kosovo, things, Europe, crimes, cleansing, rape, murder, situation, context, economic, security, isolation, NATO, action, war, values evil, cleansing, appeasement, dictator, action, objectives, cessation, combat activities, withdrawal, Serb military, police, paramilitary force, deployment, military force, return, refugees, access, aid, framework, Kosovo, Milosevic, campaign, time, force, alternative, action, summit, Washington, Clinton, unity, resolve, Marshall plan, Kosovo, Montenegro, Macedonia, Albania, Serbia, democracy, framework, security, whole, Balkans, war crimes tribunal, justice, crimes, interdependence, range, changes, end, Cold War, technology, spread, democracy, world, way, globalization, economies, working practices, security phenomenon, isolationism, necessity, nations, world, instability, Asia, Poverty, Caribbean, conflict, Balkans, refugees, Germany, US, problems, cooperation, internationalist, markets, ideas, countries, conflicts, violation, human rights, rules, cooperation, ways, organizing, institutions, rebuilding, Bretton Woods, UN, NATO, FU, doctrine, community, endeavor, partnership, cooperation, environment, security, disarmament, issues, cooperation, crisis, Kyoto, degradation, reminders, way, G7, EU, US, globalization, companies, economies, rules, financial crisis, impact, Brazil, need, architecture, transparency, keystone, reform, policy, supervision, crisis, key challenges, Russia, agreement, stability, hyper-inflation, strategy, aid, attacks, people, UN resolutions, Gulf War, problems, men, Saddam Hussein, Slobodan Milosevic, campaign, sections, community, conflict, dictator, force, US, state, affairs, burdens, responsibilities, NATO summit, framework, existence, blend, self interest, purpose, values, foreign policy problem, circumstances, conflicts, non-interference, genocide, competitiveness, changes, technology, crime, drugs, family breakdown, search, solution, family, community mores, Northern Ireland, Good Friday Agreement, obstacle

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Unspeakable, awful, ethnic, systematic, wider, economic, political, security, military, justified, just, evil, international, humanitarian, political, absolute, appalling, global changing, fundamental, political, security, financial, new, political, devastated, interdependent, mutually dependent, international

endeavor, intense, environmental, constant reminders, serious, sustained, closely, monetary, fiscal, effective, early, macro, economic, long-term, defenceless, occasionally, major, ruthless, vicious, strongest subtle, mutual, moral, foreign, rapid

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Happening, reappeared, doubt, based on, cannot stand, must resist, reversed, does not work, take, going to succeed, will take, need, assist, bring, have committed, has changed, transformed, working, cooperate, caused, be addressed, participate, cannot ignore, innovate, secure, rebuilding, becoming, working together, competing, grow, succeed, modernize, improve, affect, provide, avoid, develop, delivering, deterring, backing up, engaging, win, involved, shoulder, establish, guided, defending, cherish, pressing, identify, get involved, become, coping with, bringing

Blair (2000)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Tony Blair

1.2 What is his/her function?

Prime Minister of the United Kingdom

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Global Ethics Foundation, Tuebingen University

2.2 When was the speech done?

30.06.2000

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Inconclusive peace talks between Israel-Syria, Vladimir Putin is elected President of Russia, Israel withdraws IFD forces from Lebanon, South Korean President Kim Dae-jung visits North Korea to participate in the first North-South presidential summit.

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Global challenges, the role of community in the state, the tasks of the international community, role of religion

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Social, political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out the situation in Great Britain, call for closer cooperation to solve problems in the world

#### 4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Globalization

#### 5. How is the topic talked about?

##### 5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Progress in Northern Ireland, engagement, dialogue, built a future of peace and harmony, dependence on another, internet, continuous change, age of anxiety, greatest economic technological and social upheaval, globalization, economic phenomenon, economic progress, material well-being, brings fear, drugs, grow up sexually, frightening, constant pressure and threat, greater individual freedom, opportunities, choices, good schools, environmental pollution, safe streets, international level, world trade agreements, nuclear weapon control, traditional right that fears the immigrant, conflict, managing change, embrace change, challenge is to use power of the community, attain full employment in Europe, problems are not just lack of work, often living in a culture of poverty, drug abuse, low aspirations, family instability, big issues facing trade, finance, environment,, nuclear proliferation, organised crime and drugs can be tackled today by nations acting alone, renewing the institutions of international cooperation and of building alliance between main players, United States, United Nations, Bosnia, Congo, Angola, Afghanistan, save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, strength to maintain international peace and security and to practice tolerance, live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, social progress, better conditions, develop a doctrine of international community, mutual rights and mutual responsibilities, problems are shared and our societies and economies threatened where no understanding to resolve these problems exists, free trade, China, WTO, G8, roll back diseases, AIDS, malaria, TB, crime and drugs are international issues, scale of the threat we face, EU, fight against crime, strike at the heart of the drug and crime, destruction of our environment, tackling global warming, renewable energy, need to find sustainable ways, bridging the global gap between rich and poor, Cold War, threat of nuclear proliferation, nuclear war, global implications of information and biotechnology, common problems, mutual responsibilities, mutual gains, nations to cooperate together, do our best to overcome the religious division that still threaten our peace, value the role religions play in promoting peace, ignorance creates fear which creates conflict, individual threads at its back, faiths, solidarity, justice, peace and dignity, crisis shared, crisis halved, traditional values and change are not enemies but friends, more peaceful secure and prosperous world

##### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Progress, Northern Ireland, engagement, dialogue, future, peace, harmony, dependence, internet, change, age, anxiety, technological, upheaval, globalization, phenomenon, progress, well-being, fear, drugs, pressure, threat, freedom, opportunities, choices, schools, pollution, streets, level, trade, agreements, weapon, control, right, immigrant, conflict, change, challenge, power, community, full employment, Europe, problems, lack, work, culture, poverty, drug abuse, aspirations, instability, trade, finance, environment, proliferation, crime, drugs, today, nations, institutions, cooperation, alliance, players, United States, United Nations, Bosnia, Congo, Angola, Afghanistan, generations, scourge, war, strength, peace, security, tolerance, peace, neighbors, progress, conditions, doctrine, community, rights, responsibilities, problems, societies, economies, understanding, problems, free trade, China, WTO, G8, diseases, AIDS, malaria, TB, crime, drugs, issues, scale, threat, EU, fight, crime, strike, heart, drug, crime, destruction, environment, warming, energy, ways, gap, rich, poor, Cold War, threat, proliferation, war, implications, information, biotechnology, problems, responsibilities, gains, nations, best, division, peace, value, role, religions, peace, ignorance, fear, conflict, threads, faiths, solidarity, justice, peace, dignity, crisis, values, change, enemies, friends, world

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Continuous, greatest, technological, social, economic, sexually, frightening, constant, greater, individual, safe, international, nuclear, traditional, low, big, nuclear, organised, alone, together, good, social, better, mutual, shared, free, global, renewable, sustainable ways, rich, poor, common, religious, individual, shared, halved, traditional, peaceful secure, prosperous

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Built, brings, grow up, fears, managing, embrace change, attain, living, facing, tackled, acting, save, maintain, practice, live, develop, shared, resolve, tackling, find, bridging, cooperate, do, threaten, play, promoting, creates, shared, halved

Blair (2004)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Tony Blair

1.2 What is his/her function?

Prime Minister of Great Britain

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Prime Minister warns of continuing global terror threat, Sedgefield

2.2 When was the speech done?

05.03.2004

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events took place in that time?

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer becomes Secretary-General of the NATO, World Social Forum in Mumbai, Micheil Saakaschwili becomes president of Georgia

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

War against Terror, war in Iraq, Afghanistan, justification, role of intelligence service

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Reminding people about necessity for those wars, justifying decisions

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

War in Afghanistan, Iraq

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Issue, economy, jobs, living standards, health, education, crime, nature of this issue over Iraq, gravity of war, continued engagement, civilians in Iraq, nature of global threat, Britain and round the world, real and existential, expose it and fight it, now ignore this threat, difficulties it causes, intelligence, WMD, claim, develop long-range strategic missiles, UN rules, imminent threat, preparing to attack us, fear, dictatorial states, uses weapons of mass destruction, sucked into a conflict, devastation, traded right round the world, terrorist groups, cause of death and destruction on mass scale, remote threat, far away, terrorism, war to enforce compliance with UN Resolutions, imminent direct threat to Britain, war was lawful, Kosovo, ethnic cleansing, ethnic Albanians, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Iraq posed no direct, imminent threat to Britain, characterization of threat, urgent, have to act, regime change, justification for war, threat is the issue, mortal danger of mistaking the nature of the new world in which we live, our world is changing, economy, technology, culture, threat not conventional, challenge of different nature, world's security, altered crucially the balance of risk, international relations, armed interventions, self-defence, intervening on humanitarian grounds, inter-dependend world, self-interest was allied to interests of others, seldom conflict in one region of world not contaminate another, Sierra Leone, Chechnya, Kashmir, Afghanistan, extremism, religious fanaticism, develop nuclear weapons, long-range missiles, network of individuals, President Bush, September 11, astonishing, terrible, wicked tragedy, barbaric murder of innocent people, declaration of war by religious fanatics, chemical, biological, nuclear weapons of mass destruction, terrorists prepare to bring about Armageddon, cruel and tyrannical, chaotic and corrupt state, prevent terrorists, exploiting their chaos and

capability, Malaysia, Near East, Africa, Gulf, Europe, North Korea, Iran, Islamic extremists, mutual enmity towards West, Al Qaida, Terrorists in Russia, global threat to security was clear, act to eliminate, international obligations, take the risk, risk of new global terrorism, interaction with states or organizations or individuals proliferating WMD, Iran, North Korea, Libya, monstrously premature to think the threat has passed, risk remains, murdering innocent Iraqis, brutal dictatorship, fanaticism, all the fighting, threat cannot be defeated by security means alone, value of human spirit, best defence of our security lies in spread of our values, global threat needs global response based on global rules, threatened right to act, duty and right to prevent threat materialising, fight aggressions and injustice, puts at risk security and way of life, dilemma, justice and security, tackling security threat, poverty, Africa, Palestine, United Nations, spread values of freedom, democracy, rule of law, religious tolerance, justice for oppressed, threat is there and demands attention

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Issue, economy, jobs, living standards, health, education, crime, nature, issue, Iraq, gravity, war, engagement, civilians, Iraq, nature, threat, Britain, world, difficulties, intelligence, WMD, claim, missiles, UN rules, fear, states, weapons, conflict, devastation, right, terrorist groups, cause, death, destruction, mass scale, terrorism, compliance, UN Resolutions, Britain, Kosovo, cleansing, Albanians, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Iraq, characterization, regime change, justification, issue, danger, nature, economy, technology, culture, challenge, security, balance, risk, relations, interventions, self-defence, grounds, self-interest, interests, others, conflict, region, Sierra Leone, Chechnya, Kashmir, Afghanistan, extremism, fanaticism, nuclear weapons, missiles, network, individuals, President Bush, September 11, tragedy, murder, people, declaration, mass destruction, terrorists, Armageddon, state, chaos, capability, Malaysia, Near East, Africa, Gulf, Europe, North Korea, Iran, extremists, enmity, West, Al Qaida, Terrorists in Russia, security, obligations, risk, terrorism, interaction, organizations, Iran, North Korea, Libya, Iraqis, dictatorship, fanaticism, fighting, value, human spirit, defence, security, spread, response, rules, right, duty, aggressions, injustice, way of life, dilemma, justice, security, poverty, Africa, Palestine, United Nations, freedom, democracy, rule of law, tolerance, justice for oppressed, attention

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Continued, global, real, existential, long-range, strategic, imminent, dictatorial, remote, far away, direct, lawful, ethnic, urgent, mortal, new world, not conventional, different, crucially, international, armed, humanitarian, interdependent, seldom, religious, nuclear, long-range, astonishing, terrible, wicked

tragedy, barbaric, innocent, chemical, biological, nuclear, cruel, tyrannical, chaotic, corrupt, Islamic, mutual, new, monstrosly, premature, brutal, human

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Expose, fight, ignore, causes, develop, preparing, uses, sucked, traded, enforce, posed, have to act, mistaking, live, changing, altered, intervening, allied to, contaminate another, prepare, bring, prevent, exploiting, act to eliminate, take, think, has passed, defeated, needs, prevent, puts, tackling, spread, demands

Blair (2006)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Tony Blair

1.2 What is his/her function?

Prime Minister of the United Kingdom

2. Who is the audience?

2.1. What is the occasion of the speech?

Leader's speech, Manchester

2.2. When was the speech done?

26.09.2006

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

25

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Russia cuts natural gas to Ukraine over a price dispute, President of Iran Mahmoud Ahmadinejad confirms that Iran has successfully produced a few grams of low-grade enriched uranium, Declaration of Independence of Montenegro after a referendum, Lebanon War, North Korea declares first nuclear test, Ban Ki-moon new Secretary-General of UNO, Lebanon war

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

End of Labour leadership in Great Britain, achievements, history of leadership

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

National/international social and economic problems, military/political internationally,  
military national

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Summing up leadership of Labor, achievements, what still need to be done, what Tories  
might not be able to do

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

International conflicts in Middle East, terrorism, national high unemployment and bad  
health supply

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

New threats facing Britain in the future, faced daunting challenges, boom and bust  
economies, social division, country culturally and socially behind, aching for  
change, their worries our worries, economic efficiency and social justice are not  
opposites but partners in progress, opportunities, insecurity, China, India, energy,  
agenda, environment, immigration, terrorism, shut our front door on problems and  
conflicts of wider world, globalization, climate change, organised crime, suicide  
bombers, rich possibilities of globalization, security in the face of its threats,  
changing world by using power, global warming, greatest long-term threat to our  
planet's environment, scarce energy, threaten our country's economy, renewable  
sources, responsibility for greenhouse gas reduction, meet Kyoto targets,  
technology, public services, world is changing fast, mass migration, organised  
crime, reconcile liberty with security, idea of liberty is not keeping pace with  
change in reality, global struggle against terrorism without mercy or limit, attack  
on our way of life, global, growing, Egypt, Algeria, Indonesia, India, Pakistan,  
Turkey, victims, fought by extremists, tolerance, respect, peaceful coexistence,  
join together to defeat them, global change, Northern Ireland, Israel, Palestine,  
peace, Middle East, Lebanon, Africa, Sudan, would act

### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Threats, Britain, future, challenges, boom, bust, economies, division, country, change, worries, efficiency, justice, opposites, partners, progress, opportunities, insecurity, China, India, energy, agenda, environment, immigration, terrorism, front door, problems, conflicts, world, globalization, climate change, crime, suicide bombers, possibilities, security, face, threat, planet, energy, economy, sources, responsibilities, greenhouse gas reduction, Kyoto, targets, technology, services, world, mass migration, crime, liberty, security, idea, pace, struggle, terrorism, mercy, limit, attack, way of life, Egypt, Algeria, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Turkey, victims, extremists, tolerance, respect, coexistence, Northern Ireland, Israel, Palestine, peace, Middle East, Lebanon, Africa, Sudan

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

New, daunting, social, culturally, socially, economic, social, wider, organized, rich, changing, global, long-term, scarce, renewable, public, fast, peaceful

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Facing, faced, boom, bust, aching, shut, threaten, changing, reconcile, keeping, growing, fought, join, defeat, would act

Brown (2009)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Gordon Brown

1.2 What is his/her function?

Prime Minister of the United Kingdom

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Global Rules, Global Values, London

2.2 When was the speech done?

31.03.2009

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

27

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Slovakia becomes member of the EURO-Zone, Russia shuts off all gas supply to Europe through Ukraine, War in Gaza, first trial at International Criminal Court is hold, Icelandic government and banking system collapses, Former Serbian president Milan Milutinović is acquitted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia regarding war crimes during the Kosovo War, (The International Criminal Court (ICC) issues an arrest warrant for Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Darfur

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Enduring values and virtues inherited from past which must infuse ideals and hopes for future, call for transformation of financial sector and economy towards a more value-based system that is able to ensure equality and prevent future crises

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?  
Financial, social
  
3. What is the purpose of the speech?  
Convincing people that financial and economic system needs to be more based on values
  
4. How is the topic related to the current situation?  
Financial crisis
  
5. How is the topic talked about?  
5.1 What words and expressions are used?

G20 summit, enduring values, enduring virtues, must infuse our ideals and hopes for the future, first financial crisis, financial system must be founded on same values as family lives, globalization threatens to become values-free and rules-free, shared global rules founded on shared global values, scope and speed of today's global change throws up problems, condemn millions around the world, unsustainable, insecure and unfair life, four great global challenges, must address urgently, financial instability, environmental degradation, violent extremism, extreme poverty, challenges, none of them can be addressed by one country or one continent acting alone, can be met and mastered without the world coming together, shared global values, oil price crisis, financial crisis, climate change crisis, not at a moment of change, world of change, global sourcing of goods, now depend on each other, happens anywhere can have an impact on what happens everywhere, raises anxieties and questions, danger, dangerous protectionism, people's fears, global economy that has brought so much global insecurity, global opportunity, crisis is global in source and global in scope, worldwide changes happens so fast, instead of a global free market threatening to descend into a global free for all, must reshape our global economic system, respects the values, actually need s practice of most of our private sector to be adopted by all of our private sector, bring our financial markets into closer alignment, values held by families and business-people, clean up the global banking system, market that is free, never values-free, society that is fair but not laissez-faire, across the world, agree global economic rules, markets cannot become just the enemy of the good society but enemy of good economy too, markets depend upon which they do not create, supporters of free markets, save free markets from most dogmatic of free marketers, markets needs morals, challenge for our generation, formulate global rules for our financial and economic systems that are grounded in our shared values, shared moral sense, shared global ethics, moral sentiment, analysis which says we must seize the opportunity of this crisis to reject materialism in all its

forms, pursuit of growth and prosperity, spreading freedom so that ever more people can live the lives they choose, leaders of G20 fighters against global recession, against climate chaos, against unemployment, insecurity poverty and hopelessness, clean up our banking systems, curb the use of tax havens and introduce principles for pay and bonuses so that instead of banks serving themselves they serve the people, reshape global financial system, prevent crises like this happening again, low-carbon revolution, Africa, identify, name and help shape the changes of this new global age in the interests of people

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

G20 summit, values, virtues, ideals, hopes, future, crisis, system, values, family lives, globalization, rules, scope, speed, change, problems, millions, world, life, challenges, instability, degradation, extremism, poverty, country, continent acting alone, oil price crisis, financial crisis, climate change crisis, moment, sourcing, goods, anxieties, questions, danger, protectionism, people's fears, economy, insecurity, opportunity, source, scope, financial market, system, practice private sector, alignment, families, business-people, banking system, society, rules, enemy, supporters, marketeers, morals, generation, rules, sense, ethics, sentiment, analysis, opportunity, materialism, forms, growth, prosperity, freedom, lives, leaders, fighters, recession, climate chaos, unemployment, poverty, hopelessness, banking systems, tax havens, principles, pay, bonuses, banks, people, crises, revolution, Africa, age, interests, people

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Financial, values-free, rules -free, shared, founded, unsustainable, insecure, unfair, great, environmental, violent, extreme, alone, global, dangerous, worldwide, fast, free, economic, adopted, closer, fair, dogmatic, grounded, shared, new

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Infuse, threatens, become, throws up, condemn, address, acting, met, mastered, coming together, depend on, happens, can have, raises, brought, threatening, descend, reshape, respects, needs, bring, held, clean up, agree, become, create, save, formulate, says, seize, reject, spreading, live, choose, curb, introduce, serving, serve, reshape, prevent, identify, name, help, shape

## Chirac (1998)

### A) Circumstances

#### 1. Who is the speaker?

##### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Jacques Chirac

##### 1.2 What is his/her function?

President of France

#### 2. Who is the audience?

##### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Opening of the conference about the future of Kosovo

##### 2.2 When was the speech/treaty done or signed?

06.02.1998

#### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

##### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

##### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Human cloning forbidden in 19 European states, UK hands sovereignty of Hong Kong to PR of China, Beni-Ali massacre in Algeria with hundreds of people killed, Scotland votes in favor of having its own parliament, Iraqi disarmament crisis, Wales votes for creation of National Assembly for Wales, 121 states sign at treaty that prohibits both manufacturing and deploying anti-personnel land mines, US Senate passes Resolution 71 about "take all necessary and appropriate actions to respond to the threat posed by Iraq's refusal to end its weapons of mass destruction programs", Kosovo conflict starts

## B) Content

### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

Kosovo conflict

### 2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military

### 3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Encourage and convince audience of necessity for peace in this region

### 4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Conflict in Kosovo starting

### 5. How is the topic talked about?

#### 5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Kosovo, vivre dans le paix (living in peace) dans le respect de leurs personnes et de leur droit (in respect for their persons and their rights), la poursuite de la tragédies du passé ou l'espoir de vie qui prend forme (the pursuit of the tragedies of the past or the hope of the live that is about to form), les horreurs de la guerre (the terror of war), visage de la barbarie (the face of barbarism), un nouvel horizon, l'Europe (a new horizon, Europe), l'idée d'une guerre au Kosovo nous est insupportable (the idea of war in Kosovo cannot be supported for us), réconcilier les nations enemies (reconciled the antagonized nations), valeurs de liberté, de démocratie et de tolérance qui constituent le fondement de l'Union européenne (values of freedom, democracy and tolerance that constitutes the base of the European Union), la paix sur notre continent (peace on our continent), Conseil de Sécurité (Security Council), communauté internationale (international community), pour faire triompher le droit, la justice et la paix. (to make law, justice and peace triumphing), OSCE, déploiement international (an international deployment), la France...conflits dans l'ex-Yougoslavie, prendra

toutes ses responsabilités (France takes its responsibilities in the conflicts in ex-Yugoslavia, Serbes et Albanais du Kosovo (Serbs and Albanians from Kosovo), vengeance et à un cycle sans fin de violences (vendetta and an endless cycle of violence), autonomie substantielle du Kosovo (substantial autonomy of Kosovo)

#### 5.1.1 Nouns

Kosovo, peace, respect, persons, rights, pursuit, tragedies, past, hope, live, terror, war, face, barbarism, horizon, Europe, idea, nations, values, freedom, democracy, tolerance, base European Union, peace, continent, Security Council, community, law, justice, peace, OSCE, deployment, France, conflicts, ex-Yugoslavia, Serbs, Albanians, vendetta, cycle of violence, autonomy

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives

New, antagonized, international, endless, substantial

#### 5.1.3 Verbs

Living, form, cannot be supported, reconcile, constitute, make, triumphing, takes

Chirac (1999a)

## A) Circumstances

### 1. Who is the speaker?

#### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Jacques Chirac

#### 1.2 What is his/her function?

President of France

### 2. Who is the audience?

#### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Summit of French-speaking countries

#### 2.2 When was the speech/treaty done or signed?

03.09.1999

### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

#### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

#### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Human cloning forbidden in 19 European states, UK hands sovereignty of Hong Kong to PR of China, Beni-Ali massacre in Algeria with hundreds of people killed, Scotland votes in favor of having its own parliament, Iraqi disarmament crisis, Wales votes for creation of National Assembly for Wales, 121 states sign a treaty that prohibits both manufacturing and deploying anti-personnel land mines, US Senate passes Resolution 71 about "take all necessary and appropriate actions to respond to the threat posed by Iraq's refusal to end its weapons of mass destruction programs", Kosovo conflict starts

## B) Content

### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

Fields of cooperation between francophone countries

### 2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Social, Military

### 3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Creating a We-feeling, encouraging further cooperation

### 4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Annual meeting of the francophone countries

### 5. How is the topic talked about?

#### 5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Négociations sur les règles du commerce international (negotiations about the international rules of trade), l'accès des pays en développement aux principaux marchés (access of development countries to principal market), la promotion des normes sociales (promotion of social norms). la protection de l'environnement (protection of environment), la sécurité des consommateurs consumer protection), l'avenir de la diversité culturelle dans le monde (future of cultural diversity around the world), devons prendre l'habitude de travailler ensemble sur toutes les autres questions où la coopération et la solidarité peuvent faire bouger les choses (need to get used to work together in all other questions where cooperation and solidarity can move/change things), le racisme (racism), la drogue (drug), le crime organisé (organized crime), la lutte pour l'environnement, (the fight for the environment), permanente et nécessaire (permanent and necessary) , pour le respect des droits de l'Homme (for the respect of human rights), conflits (conflicts), l'Afrique Centrale (Central Africa),souffre de façon incompréhensible et absurde (suffer in an uncomprehensible and absurd way), Nations Unies et de l'Organisation de l'Unité Africaine (United Nations, African Union), nous devons tout faire pour que cessent des conflits d'un autre âge et pour que revienne enfin la paix (have to do everything that stops the conflicts of another age and to bring

back peace), met en œuvre d'utiles programmes de perfectionnement des institutions et de renforcement de l'Etat de droit (to implement programs to make the states institutions and the state of law better), trop de tensions régionales, de conflits internes, de coups de force inacceptables, de processus démocratiques inachevés témoignent de ce chemin à parcourir (too much regional tensions, internal conflicts, coups of unacceptable force, a democratic process which still has not ended), pour progresser, nous devons aller plus loin dans trois directions (to make progress, we have to go further than in three directions), Banque Mondiale, UNESCO, UE, Commission européenne (World Bank, UNESCO, EU, European Commission), G7

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Negotiations, rules of trade, access, development countries, market, promotion, norms, protection of environment, consumer protection, future, diversity, world), questions, cooperation, solidarity, things, racism, drug, organized crime, fight, environment, respect, human rights, conflicts, Central Africa, way, United Nations, African Union, everything, conflicts, age, peace, programs, states institutions, state of law, tensions, conflicts, coups, force, process, progress, directions, World Bank, UNESCO, EU, European Commission, G7

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

International, principal market, social, cultural, around, together organized, incomprehensible, absurd, better, regional, internal, democratic, further

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Get used, work, move, change, suffer, have to do, stops, bring, implement, make, has not ended, have to go

Chirac (1999b)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Jacques Chirac

1.2 What is his/her function?

President of France

2. Who is the audience?

2.2 What is the occasion of the speech?

New Years Speech to Armed Forces

2.3 When was the speech done?

31.12.1999

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Helsinki Summit a week before; War in Kosovo/ NATO strikes in Yugoslavia, EURO introduction, Kurdish extremists take over embassies in Europe, Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic join NATO, financial crisis in Asia, peace treaty signed in Kosovo, Scottish parliament is opened, short war in Dagestan, East Timor voted for independence from Indonesia, Macau is handed over from the Portuguese to the Chinese, Vladimir Putin becomes President of Russia after Boris Yeltsin resigned

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Encouraging the army members in necessity of military operations

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Encouragement

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Conflicts in Timor, Kosovo, Africa

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Nos armées sont aujourd'hui largement sollicitées en ex-Yougoslavie, en Afrique, au Timor Oriental et sur le territoire national (our armies are largely demanded and active in ex-Yougoslavia, Africa, East-Timor and on national territory), maintien de la paix (to maintain peace), la lutte contre les effets dramatiques de la tempête et de la marée noire qui ont frappé notre pays (the fight against the dramatic effects of the storm and the black flood that knocked on our country), Union européenne (EU), jeté les bases d'une capacité d'action commune pour la prévention et la gestion des crises (made the base of the capacity of common actions for the prevention and the management of the crisis), d'espoir pour la construction européenne et la stabilité du continent (the hope for the European construction and the stability of the continent), sera long et difficile (will be long and difficult)

5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Armies, ex-Yugoslavia, Africa, East-Timor, territory, peace, fight, effects, storm, flood, EU, base, capacity, actions, prevention, management, crisis, hope, construction, stability, continent

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Largely, demanded, active, national, dramatic, black, common, long, difficult

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Maintain, knocked, made

## Chirac (2001a)

### A) Circumstances

#### 1. Who is the speaker?

##### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Jacques Chirac

##### 1.2 What is his/her function?

President of the Republic

#### 2. Who is the audience?

##### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Institute of Higher National Defence Studies, Paris

##### 2.2 When was the speech done?

08.06.2001

#### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

##### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

##### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

George W. Bush is sworn into office, UK foot-and-mouth crisis, Slobodan Milosevic surrenders to police special forces, Silvio Berlusconi becomes Prime Minister for the second time, mass riots by Serb nationalists in Bosnia and Herzegovina, The People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation sign the Treaty of Good-Neighborliness and Friendly Cooperation

### B) Content

#### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

Assessing risks and challenges for France of transitional period, globalization and nuclear weapons call for definition of new conditions for stability and security

#### 2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Assessing risks and challenges that France, the EU and its allies have to tackle and therefore getting support for it, reducing nuclear armament,

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Balkan Wars, terrorist attacks in France, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Assess risks and challenges for France of this transitional period, difficult to define new conditions for stability and security, war, stronger feeling of security in relation to external threats, grown more distant, different area, military confrontation within EU inconceivable, end of cold war, erased feeling of direct threat to Europe's frontiers, hotbeds of tension, globalization, interests can be affected by a crisis, regardless where it breaks out in the world, not have to fight on national territory, operated in many external theatres, universal values we uphold were under threat, Balkans, more distant, United Nations, changing nature of the threats, new technology, reducing distances, carry violence of confrontations taking place far away, proliferation-related risks, weapons of mass destruction, dangers of ballistic proliferation, new security requirements, NATO Summit, defining new security requirements, peace, freedom is a permanent struggle, security, fundamental and complementary pillars, rule of law, Europeanization of defence capability, nuclear deterrence, human rights, international security, disarmament, United Nations Charter, Security Council, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, instrument for stability, renounce nuclear weapons, nuclear disarmament

5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Risks, challenges, France, period, conditions, stability, security, war, feeling, relation, threats, area, confrontation, EU, end, cold war, feeling, threat, Europe's frontiers, hotbeds, tension, globalization, interests, crisis, world, territory, values, Balkans, United Nations, nature, technology, distances, violence, confrontations, place, risks, weapons, mass destruction, dangers, proliferation, security requirements, NATO Summit, peace, freedom, struggle, security, pillars, rule of law, Europeanization, defence capability, deterrence, human rights, disarmament, United Nations Charter, Security Council, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, instrument, nuclear weapons, nuclear disarmament

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Transitional, difficult, new, stronger, external, more distant, different, military, inconceivable, direct, regardless, national, universal, were under threat, changing, new, far away, proliferation-related, ballistic, permanent, fundamental, complementary, nuclear, international

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Assess, define, grown, erased, can be affected, breaks out, not have to fight, operated in many uphold, reducing, carry, taking place, defining, renounce

## Chirac (2001b)

### A) Circumstances

#### 1. Who is the speaker?

##### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Jacques Chirac

##### 1.2 What is his/her function?

President of the Republic

#### 2. Who is the audience?

##### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Future of Europe Regional Forum

##### 2.2 When was the speech done?

04.10.2001

#### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

##### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

##### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

George W. Bush is sworn into office, UK foot-and-mouth crisis, Slobodan Milosevic surrenders to police special forces, Silvio Berlusconi becomes Prime Minister for the second time, mass riots by Serb nationalists in Bosnia and Herzegovina, The People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation sign the Treaty of Good-Neighborliness and Friendly Cooperation., 27<sup>th</sup> G8 summit in Genoa, terror attacks in the USA

### B) Content

#### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

Attacks of September, 11<sup>th</sup>, terrorism and role of France and Europe to counteract, cooperation between Europe and USA necessary, also for economic growth, protection of environment, security within and outside borders, development of EU Foreign Policy, upcoming enlargement

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?  
Military, economic, environmental, political
  
3. What is the purpose of the speech?  
Showing ambition of France to participate in fight against terrorism, call for cooperation in actions against terrorism, to promote economic growth, to protect environment, for a common judicial area, for common security area
  
4. How is the topic related to the current situation?  
Attack of September, 11<sup>th</sup> and terrorism, globalization, debate about greenhouse gas effects, upcoming enlargement
  
5. How is the topic talked about?
  - 5.1 What words and expressions are used?  
Heinous crimes, not stay on the sidelines in the fight against terrorism, Osama bin Laden, networks, attacks, take part in action aimed at neutralizing these networks, dismantle them, presumed terrorist movements and organizations, active at military level, participation I actins means being involved, victims of the tragedy, perpetrators of terrorist attacks of 11 September will commit new crimes, Europe's existence is plain for all to see, necessity and urgent priority, certain threats become clearer, duty sharing same values and same interests to come together, cooperate, to develop values, live and put them into practice, problems our societies are coming up against, the challenges, can be resolved only by joining together, combining efforts, trusting each other, economic growth, wider world, protect us, weapon, coordinating economic policies, dependent on growth, environment, quality of life, individual countries can't combat greenhouse gas or oil slicks, rethink agricultural practices, ensure food safety, redraw map of industrial sites at risk, challenges, must be tackled on European scale, security, inside and outside borders, state determine to enforce law and its statutes throughout its territory, protecting citizens, international terrorism, barbarity, networks, international organizations, partners, United States, developing cooperation between intelligence agencies, speeding up establishment of a common judicial area, terrorists, Mafia, criminal organizations, drug and people traffickers, harmonize conditions, would-be immigrants, ensure effective control of a common external border, Russia, unify customs and border police services, common security area, genuine power in world, European defence, Tony Blair, Saint-Malo, Defence Europe, contribute to peace in world, Europe, Military Staff, force projection capability, intelligence machinery, defence dimension, foreign policy, increasingly visible, heeded, expected, Macedonia, Middle East, Durban Conference, genuine European diplomatic effort, becoming promoter of peace,

promoting world solidarity, need to fight effects of terrorism, identify causes, fanaticism, humiliation, justice, urgent priority

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Crimes, sidelines, fight, terrorism, Osama bin Laden, networks, attacks, part, action, neutralizing, movements, organizations, level, participation, victims, tragedy, perpetrators September, existence, necessity, priority, threats, values, interests, practice, problems, societies, challenges, efforts, growth, world, weapon, policies, environment, quality of life, countries, greenhouse gas, oil slicks, food safety, map, sites, risk, challenges, scale, security, borders, state, law, statutes, territory, citizens, terrorism, barbarity, networks, partners, United States, cooperation, intelligence agencies, establishment, area, terrorists, Mafia, drug and people traffickers, conditions, immigrants, control, external border, Russia, customs, border police services, security area, power, world, defence, Tony Blair, Saint-Malo, Europe, peace, Military Staff, force projection capability, machinery, defence dimension, foreign policy, Macedonia, Middle East, Durban Conference, promoter, solidarity, causes, fanaticism, humiliation, justice, priority

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives that point out how the topic was perceived

Heinous, aimed at, military, new, plain, certain, clearer, same, challenges, economic, wider, individual, agricultural, European, inside, outside, common, judicial, criminal, would-be, effective, external, genuine, foreign, increasingly visible, heeded, expected, diplomatic, urgent, industrial

#### 5.1.3 Verbs that point out actions related to the topic

Not stay, take part in, dismantle, presumed, means, being involved, will commit, see, become clearer, sharing, to come together, cooperate, develop, live, put into practice, coming up against, can be resolved, joining together, combining trusting, protect, coordinating, can't combat, rethink, ensure, redraw, must be tackled, enforce, protecting, developing, speeding up, harmonize, ensure, unify, contribute, force, becoming, promoting, need, identify

## Chirac (2006)

### A) Circumstances

#### 1. Who is the speaker?

##### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Jacques Chirac

##### 1.2 What is his/her function?

President of the Republic

#### 2. Who is the audience?

##### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Visit to naval and air strategic forces

##### 2.2 When was the speech done or signed?

09.02.2006

#### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

##### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

25

##### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Russia cuts natural gas to Ukraine over a price dispute

### B) Content

#### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

International peace is threatened, nuclear weapons are threat, US and European joint deterrence force seen presented as idea

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out nuclear threat towards peace and stability in Europe, stressing capacity that Europe has to defend itself in case of necessity, proposing joint deterrence force

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Ongoing, permanent nuclear programs from North Korea/Iran seen as threats

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Fundamental mission for our independence and security, nuclear deterrent, bipolar world, threats against peace, radical ideas, clash of civilizations, cultures, religions, spread in many countries, horrible attacks, crimes, fanaticism, all kinds of crazy things, things could be even worse, war on terror, priorities, can't limit our security and defence issues to this necessary combat, world changes constantly, new power centers emerge quickly, characterized by emergence of power reaffirmations, possessions of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons, Security Council, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missiles, real threat for international peace and security. Most traditional risks of regional instability, prevention, when it's necessary force must be used, intervention beyond borders, nuclear deterrent, support, general and complete disarmament, prohibiting production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, integrity of our territory, protection of our population, free exercise of our sovereignty, perception of these interests changes with evolution of world, increasing interdependence of European countries, effects of globalization, security of our strategic supplies of the defence of allied countries, interests to be protected, take into account threats or blackmails, nuclear deterrent, deterring fanatic terrorists, weapons of mass destruction, damages to a great power, regional power, flexibility and reaction capacity of our strategic forces, capacity to act, nuclear forces, nuclear means, not-to-be-used weapons, still a threat for the leaders, development of an anti-missile system, defends the US and European continents, ambitious idea, joint deterrence force, common defence

5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Mission, independence, security, deterrent, world, threats, peace, ideas, clash, civilizations, cultures, religions, countries, attacks, crimes, fanaticism, kinds, things, war, terror, priorities, security, defence issues, combat, world, power centers, emergence, power reaffirmations, possessions, weapons, Security Council, proliferation, weapons, mass destruction, missiles, threat risks of, instability, prevention, force, intervention, borders, deterrent, support, disarmament, production, fissile material, integrity, territory, protection, population, exercise, sovereignty, perception, interests, evolution, interdependence, countries, effects, globalization, supplies, interests, blackmails, terrorists, damages, power, flexibility, reaction capacity, forces, capacity, means, leaders, development, system, continents, idea, deterrence force, defence

#### 5.1.2 Adjective that point out how the topic was perceived

Fundamental, nuclear, bipolar, against, radical, horrible, crazy, worse, necessary, constantly, new, quickly, characterized, biological, chemical, real, international, traditional, regional, beyond, general, complete disarmament, free, increasing, European, strategic, allied, protected, take into account, fanatic, great, strategic, not-to-be-used, ambitious, joint, common

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Spread, could be, can't limit, changes, emerge, must be used, prohibiting, changes, take into account deterring, act, defends

Kohl (1997)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Helmut Kohl

1.2 What is his/her function?

Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Edmond Israel Foundation, speech on being awarded “Vision for Europe” price, Luxembourg

2.2 When was the speech done?

17.07.1997

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Bill Clinton’s second term as US president starts, Tony Blair becomes Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Russian-Chechen peace treaty, riots in Albania, NATO-Russia Founding Act, the British sovereignty over Hong Kong ends and is handed back to China, Flood in Poland, Scotland votes to create own parliament, Iraq disarmament crisis

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Importance of Europe for peace and stability, enlargement of European Union, common currency and market, common idea of Europe

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Economic, political, military

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Getting the award “Vision for Europe”, pointing out decisive role of Europe in keeping peace and stability, stressing importance for further economic cooperation regarding necessity of common currency

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Plans about further enlargement, introduction of Euro planned

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Major challenges, enlargement, Agenda 2000, century of extreme contradictions, wars and new beginnings, internecine conflicts, European unification, countless people died in two world wars, refugees, expellees, totalitarian ideologies, horrible disaster, Europe and the world, yoke of communism, former enemies, peace and reconciliation, among the nations of Europe, can be secured over the long term, democracy and respect of human rights, European unification, cooperation, people’s longing for peace, contact and cooperation in common institutions, bulwark of lasting peace, difficult issues and problems to resolve, process of European integration, ensure peace and freedom, economies more competitive, ability to solve numerous common problems, critical voices, great objective, horrible scenes from former Yugoslavia, East-West conflict, evil spirits of the past, growing economic integration, international crime, drug mafia, threat posed by terrorism, live in peace and freedom, prosperity and social security, Amsterdam Treaty, moved process of European unification a significant step forward, enlargement to the east, guarantor for peace, security and prosperity on our continent, Maastricht Treaty, move forward with enlargement of EU, regardless of all the other problems we will have to resolve at same time within the existing Union, united Europe, economic and monetary union, logical and

necessary complement, European single market, monetary union, become a community based on economic stability, economic importance, political project, peace and freedom based system, cultural dimension, common foreign and security policy

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Challenges, enlargement, Agenda 2000, century, contradictions, wars, beginnings, conflicts, unification, people, world wars, refugees, expellees, ideologies, disaster, Europe, world, yoke, communism, enemies, peace, reconciliation, nations, Europe, democracy, respect, human rights, unification, cooperation, people's longing, contact, cooperation, institutions, bulwark, issues, problems, process, integration, freedom, economies, voices, objective, scenes, Yugoslavia, East-West conflict, spirits, past, integration, crime, drug mafia, threat, terrorism, prosperity, security, Amsterdam Treaty, step, east, guarantor, continent, Maastricht Treaty, EU, problems, time, Union, economic and monetary union, complement, single market, community, stability, importance, project, system, dimension, common foreign and security policy

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Major, extreme, new, internecine, European, countless, totalitarian, horrible, former, secured, common, lasting, difficult, competitive, numerous, critical, great, horrible, former, evil, growing, international, social, significant, existing, united, economic, monetary, logical, necessary, political freedom based, cultural, common

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Died, can, resolve, ensure, solve, posed, live, moved, have to resolve, become, based on

Merkel (2007a)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Angela Merkel

1.2 What is his/her function?

Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Speech to the European Parliament, Strasbourg, reviewing the German EU Presidency

2.2 When was the speech done?

17.01.2007

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

27

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Bulgaria and Romania become members of the EU, Slovenia joins EURO zone, Ban ki- moon becomes UN Secretary-general, Russia-Belarus oil dispute cuts oil supply to Germany, Poland, Ukraine

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Diversity, freedom, tolerance in Europe, Europe can only succeed together, need for constitutional treaty, challenges the new treaty must address, relation to USA, Russia, Africa, talking about key challenges for foreign and security policy, need for innovation and tolerance for development

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Political, social, environmental, military, economic

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out the program and aims of the German presidency and convincing audience of importance of those topics

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

German EU presidency, reform or constitutional treaty negotiated, Bulgaria and Romania new member states

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

European unification, safeguards freedom, paves way for prosperity, end of Cold War, extending, renovating building, greatness, uniqueness, essence of Europe, plurality, diversity, express opinions freely, freedom to believe, freedom of enterprise, freedom of artists, living peacefully with and being there for another, harmony among nations, ECSC, Treaties of Rome, Maastricht Treaty, vision for a common Europe, embrace tasks we face today, only succeed if we join forces, challenges of 21<sup>st</sup> century, globalization, threat posed by new dangers, terrorism, peace, security, draft of constitutional treaty, European treaty, scope to act, treaties must be adapted to changed circumstances, resolve ratification crisis surrounding constitutional treaty, political, economic, social challenges are formidable and tangible, FSP, Kosovo, stability, western Balkans, Middle East, EU, drive forward peace process, cooperation with US, UN, Russia, Middle-East Quartet, sustainable development, Iran's nuclear program, successful development in Afghanistan, military and civilian efforts, shape events in neighborhood, neighborhood policy, Black sea region, Central Asia, Doha Round, too much at stake, developing countries, EU-US summit intensification of transatlantic economic partnership, global competitiveness, removing trade barriers, common transatlantic market, Partnership and Cooperation Agreement, cooperation on energy issues, relationship with Russia, difficult issues, media, civil society, Russia's conflict with its neighbors, G8, global climate convention, more closely with EU on energy and climate policy, energy and climate protection two greatest challenges facing humanity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Africa, invest politically and economically, key challenges in foreign and security policy, tackle challenges by joining forces, EU Minister for Foreign Affairs, safeguarding prosperity, growth, employment, social security, preserving and developing model of European welfare state in face of globalization, social Europe with strong economy, deals responsibly with

environment, jobs top priority, issue of energy, challenges of foreign and security policy, of climate, energy, research policy, dismantling bureaucracy, enlargement, neighborhood policy

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Unification, freedom, way, prosperity, end, Cold War, building, greatness, uniqueness, essence, Europe, plurality, diversity, opinion, freedom to believe, freedom of enterprise, freedom of artists, harmony, nations, ECSC, Treaties of Rome, Maastricht Treaty, vision, tasks, today, forces, challenges, 21<sup>th</sup> century, globalization, threat, dangers, terrorism, peace, security, draft, treaty, scope, circumstances, ratification crisis, FSP, Kosovo, western Balkans, Middle East, EU, peace process, cooperation, US, UN, Russia, Middle-East Quartet, development, Iran, nuclear program, development, Afghanistan, efforts, events in neighborhood, neighborhood policy, Black sea region, Central Asia, Doha Round, developing countries, EU-US summit, intensification, partnership, competitiveness, trade barriers, market, partnership and cooperation agreement, issues, media, civil society, G8, neighbors, climate convention, energy policy, climate policy, energy protection, climate protection, challenges, humanity, Africa, key challenges, forces, EU Minister for Foreign Affairs, prosperity, growth, employment, security, model, welfare state, globalization, economy, responsibility, environment, jobs, priority, research, bureaucracy, enlargement

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Freely, peacefully, common, new, constitutional, changed, constitutional, political, economic, social, formidable, tangible, sustainable, nuclear, successful, military, economically, social, strong

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Safeguards, paves, extending, renovating, express, living, embrace, succeed, join, posed, act, adapted, resolve, drive, shape, removing, facing, invest, tackle, joining, safeguarding, preserving, developing, deals

Merkel (2007b)

## A) Circumstances

### 1. Who is the speaker?

#### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Angela Merkel

#### 1.2 What is his/her function?

Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany

### 2. Who is the audience?

#### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Speech to the European Parliament, Brussels, reviewing the German EU Presidency

#### 2.2 When was the speech done?

27.06.2007

### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

#### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

27

#### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Bulgaria and Romania become members of the EU, Slovenia joins EURO zone, Ban ki-moon becomes UN Secretary-general, Russia-Belarus oil dispute cuts oil supply to Germany, Poland, Ukraine, ICJ finds Serbia guilty in not prevention the massacre of Srebrenica, signing of a border treaty between Latvia and Russia, Yushchenko dissolves parliament and second Ukrainian revolution, heat wave in Greece with deaths and wildfires and almost collapsing electricity grid

## B) Content

### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

Review of German EU Presidency, difficulty to reach agreement on Treaty of Lisbon, new elements of the treaty, need to act together to get further

### 2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Inform and stress importance of achievements of Reform treaty, call for cooperation

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Two more member states, treaty of Lisbon is about to be signed

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Peace and freedom, democracy, rule of law, European integration, strengthened, defended, striven for and consolidated, EU Council, starting position difficult, ratified Constitutional Treaty, danger, paralysis and risk of division, indescribable repercussions, managed to avoid situation, citizens' fear, European superstate, Reform Treaty, major advantages, capacity to act, climate protection, energy solidarity, progress in policy making, EU's external action, greater need for a coherent foreign policy, speak with one voice, wants to assert its interests in the world, appoint High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Council for Foreign Affairs, justice and home affairs, joint efforts to combat cross-border crime, achieve only with European alliance, closer cooperation by police on fighting cross-border terrorism, crime, illegal immigration in EU, act jointly and purposefully, meet major challenges of humanity, dangers posed by climate change, G8, UN, US, Russia, Japan, Canada, climate protection goals, long-term importance, energy crisis, ensure that Earth remains habitable planet, fewer forced to leave homes because of war or violence, Aids, malaria, tuberculosis can be fought successfully

5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Peace, freedom, democracy, rule of law, integration, EU Council, starting position, Constitutional Treaty, danger, paralysis, risk, division, repercussions, situation, citizens' fear, superstate, Reform Treaty, advantages, capacity, protection, solidarity, progress, policy making, action, need, foreign policy, voice, interests, world, High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Council for Foreign Affairs, justice affairs, home affairs, efforts, crime, alliance, cooperation, police, terrorism, immigration, EU, challenges, humanity, climate change, G8, UN, Russia, Japan, Canada, climate protection, goals, importance, energy crisis, Earth, planet, homes, war, violence, Aids, malaria, tuberculosis

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Difficult, indescribable, major, external, greater, coherent, foreign, cross-border, European, closer, illegal, jointly, purposefully, long-term, habitable, successfully

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Strengthened, defended, striven for, consolidated, ratified, managed, avoid, speak, want, assert, appoint, combat, achieve, act, meet, pose, ensure, remain, force, leave, fought

## Sarkozy (2008)

### A) Circumstances

#### 1. Who is the speaker?

##### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Nicolas Sarkozy

##### 1.2 What is his/her function?

President of the Republic

#### 2. Who is the audience?

##### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Sixteenth Ambassadors' Conference

##### 2.2 When was the speech done?

27.08.2008

#### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

##### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

27

##### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Cyprus and Malta introduce the EURO, price of petroleum is above 100\$ per barrel, Iran launches rocket into space, Kosovo declares independence, Fidel Castro announces resignation as president, rising food and fuel prices lead to riots in the Third World, Dmitri Medvedev becomes president of Russia, referendum in Ireland against Treaty of Lisbon, 34<sup>th</sup> G8 summit in Japan, Karadzic is arrested, Pirates hijack German, Polish and Japanese ships off the Somalian coast, Russia recognizes Georgian breakaway republics

### B) Content

#### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

France relations, achievements and future plans for relations and activities with and in other countries and with other international organizations

#### 2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military, economy, political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out the position of France and stating importance of pursuing current course

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Afghanistan mission, increasing influence of China, Brazil, Russia, India, Middle East conflict, conflict in Georgia, climate change and conference in Copenhagen, French EU presidency

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Fight against terrorism, values, freedom, human rights, obscurantist barbarism, protect French from direct threat of terrorism, source lies largely in part of the world, fight against terrorism, main challenges, avoid a confrontation between Islam and the West, extremists, duty to help and encourage force of moderation and modernity in Afghanistan, military presence, strengthened, Malta, Cyprus, Americans, Canadians, Turks, stabilize Afghanistan, prevent a regime allied, strengthen our presence, comprehensive civilian and military approach, increased coordination of aid, necessary cooperation of Pakistan, progress achieved, nuclear weapons, upsurge of terrorism in our democracies, not give in to terrorists, fight them, ensure their own security, major changes, changing at an accelerated pace, era of relative powers, United States, China, India, Brazil, Russia, radically new situation, new international order the world needs in order to deal with global problems still has to be invented, values and interests are essential, more room to act and increased her ability to wield influence, NATO summit in Bucharest, European defence project, Polish, Middle East, fear, peace agreement, including security arrangements, relations with the other partner in peace, Israel, Syria, Libya, Mediterranean summit, Barcelona Process, will to reach a good compromise, can't have the same European policy today as 20 years ago, blind to balance in Europe if you think we can build a European ideal denying importance of Commission and Parliament, systematic dialogue with all our partners, United Kingdom, Central and Eastern Europe, relations had grown more distant, make its voice heard, Lisbon Treaty, massive and multifaceted aid packages, loyal friend, Africa, politics, perceptions are important, South Africa, Angola, Nigeria, systematic revision of our defence agreements, reduction of our military bases, strengthen training of regional African peacekeeping units, cooperate with UN, African Union, sub-regional organizations in order to resolve conflicts, support democratic regimes and defend human rights, Mauritania, human rights, foreign policy priority, concern at every moment, solution to Darfur, protect hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons, France worked for peace, to defend human rights, operations raging from Afghanistan to Cote d'Ivoire, Lebanon, Kosovo, promote peace, democracy, freedom, defence of human rights, Russia, China, progress that remains to be made with respect to freedoms and democracy,

fighting in Georgia, Darfur, Iran, global economy, can ensure peace in world without having possibility of discussing with China and Russia, victims from hell, advent of a new era, globalization and main challenges facing, financial crisis, excesses of a financial capitalism that has got scandalously off track, tax havens, emerging countries, at permanent disconnect between the growth of OECD countries and that of the emerging countries, can at EU level to promote the growth of European economy, dozen speculators endanger world growth, raw material prices, Haiti, Guinea, hunger riots, scarce, expensive energy, inevitable constrains, civilian nuclear energy, nationalism, entering a now globalized job market, new economic situation, behalf of free trade, new concert of powers, become much harder to seek satisfactory compromises on global issues, environmental to energy and financial stability, challenges of the twenty-first century, boost to Security Council, international system is fragmented to the point that there is no comprehensive vision to be found anywhere, global security issues, arbitrate on all the major economic, environmental, social and trade issues

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Fight, terrorism, values, freedom, human rights, barbarism, French, threat, source, part, world, challenges, confrontation, Islam, West, extremists, duty, force, moderation, modernity, Afghanistan, military presence, Malta, Cyprus, Americans, Canadians, Turks, regime, presence, approach, coordination, aid, cooperation, Pakistan, progress, weapons, upsurge, democracies, security, changes, pace, era, powers, United States, China, India, Brazil, Russia, situation, order, problems, values, interests, room, ability, influence, NATO summit, Bucharest, European defence project, Middle East, fear, peace agreement, security arrangements, relations, partner, peace, Israel, Syria, Libya, Mediterranean summit, Barcelona Process, compromise, policy, 20 years, Europe, ideal, importance, Commission, Parliament, dialogue, partners, United Kingdom, Central and Eastern Europe, relations, voice, Lisbon Treaty, aid packages, friend, Africa, politics, perceptions, South Africa, Angola, Nigeria, revision, defence agreements, reduction, bases, training, peacekeeping units, UN, African Union, organizations, conflicts, regimes, Mauritania, foreign policy, priority, concern, moment, solution, Darfur, hundreds of thousands, refugees, persons, Cote d'Ivoire, Lebanon, Kosovo, democracy, defence, fighting, Georgia, Iran, economy, possibility, victims, hell, advent, globalization, main challenges, crisis, excesses, capitalism, track, tax havens, countries, disconnect, growth, OECD countries, EU level, speculators, raw material prices, Haiti, Guinea, hunger riots, scarce, energy, constrains, nuclear energy, nationalism, job market, situation, free trade, compromises, issues, stability, challenges, twenty-first century, boost, Security Council, system, point, vision, security issues

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Human, obscurantist, French, direct, largely, main, military, allied, comprehensive, civilian, military, increased, necessary, nuclear, own, major, accelerated, relative, radically, new, global, essential, good, systematic, distant, massive, multifaceted, loyal, important, systematic, military, regional, sub-regional, democratic, solution, displaced, financial, emerging, permanent, raw, scarce, expensive, inevitable, civilian, harder, international, fragmented, comprehensive, arbitrate, economic, environmental, social

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Protect, lies, fight, avoid, help, encourage, stabilize, prevent, strengthen not give in, ensure, accelerated, needs, deal, invented, act, increased, wield, including, reach, can't have, balance, think, build, denying, grown, make, heard, cooperate, resolve, support, defend, protect, worked, raging, promote, remains, to be made, ensure, without having, facing, endanger, entering, become, seek, to be found

Schröder (1999a)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Gerhard Schröder

1.2 What is his/her function?

Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Annual dinner of the foundation for the preservation of Nieuwpoort, Den Haag

2.2 When was the speech done?

19.01.1999

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Helsinki Summit a week before; War in Kosovo and NATO strikes in Yugoslavia, EURO introduction, Kurdish extremists take over embassies in Europe, Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic join NATO; Ciampi new President in Italy; Barak new Prime Minister of Israel; Indication of Milosevic and other in Den Haag for war crime and crime against humanity in Kosovo; Mohammed VI becomes king of Morocco; short war in Dagestan; coup d'état in Pakistan; Yeltsin resigns: earthquakes in Athens, Turkey; Storms in France, Switzerland and Germany

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

New foundations for European Integration, necessity to do more to work on enlargement and integration, to speak more with one voice to be successful

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Social, economic/financial political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Having a humorous speech about a topic related to the EU, pointing out necessity for further integration

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Introduction of EURO, planned enlargement, upcoming Germany presidency

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

European political phase of change, require new models for future, aim to secure lasting peace between member states by economic integration, common economic bonds, close political cooperation, return to nationalism and rivalry, other challenges and problems, urgently need new models for European politics, introduction of EURO, most important integrating step, consequence nobody can fully assess at this time, extension of European Union, fundamental challenge, unforeseeable consequences of the EURO, changes with connection to EU enlargement, far reaching losses of direction of European politics, high unemployment has priority, stability pact, introduction of EURO dramatic consequences on Europe's position in world, foreign trade policy, international monetary policy, insufficiently prepared for its international role in foreign and security policy sense, expect limited improvements from Amsterdam, foreign trade and international finance policies force CFSP worthy its name, further European failure as in Bosnia threatens to damage lastingly reputation, fight of border-crossing organized crimes, solutions for the urgent question of migration, migration and asylum problems, secure perspective, fight decisively the illegal immigration and abuse of the right to asylum, achieved jointly, reform of agricultural and structural policies, fair division of financial burden, solving institutional problem from Amsterdam, fundamental revision of Treaties

### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Phase, change, models, future, peace, member states, integration, bonds, cooperation, nationalism, rivalry, challenges, problems, politics, introduction, EURO, step, consequence nobody, time, extension, European Union, change, connection, enlargement, losses, direction, unemployment, priority, stability pact, position, world, trade policy, foreign and security policy, improvements, Amsterdam, trade, finance policies, CFSP, failure, Bosnia, reputation, fight, crimes, solutions, question, migration, migration problems, asylum problems, perspective, immigration, abuse, right, asylum, reform, division, burden, problem, revision, Treaties

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

European, political, new, lasting, economic, urgently, important, fully, fundamental, unforeseeable, far reaching, high, dramatic, foreign, international, insufficiently, security, limited, worthy, lastingly, border-crossing, urgent, decisively, illegal, jointly, agricultural, structural, fair, institutional, fundamental

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Require, aim, secure, return, need, assess, reaching, expect, threatens, damage, solving, secure

Schröder (2001a)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Gerhard Schröder

1.2 What is his/her function?

Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

North Atlantic Council, NATO HQ, Brussels

2.2 When was the speech done?

13.06.2001

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

George W. Bush is sworn into office, UK foot-and-mouth crisis, Slobodan Milosevic surrenders to police special forces, Silvio Berlusconi becomes Prime Minister for the second time, mass riots by Serb nationalists in Bosnia and Herzegovina

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Strengthening the transatlantic relationship NATO-EU to tackle challenges such as FYROM situation and threat caused by weapons of mass destruction

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military, political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out importance of strengthening relationship between Europe and NATO, showing German position and call for further actions

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Instability in FYROM, discussion about actions against weapons of mass destruction

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Strengthening transatlantic relationship, fundamental to peace and security, democratic stability, economic prosperity, situation in Balkans, matter of serious concern, South East Europe, remains crucial issue, coordination, joint action, Belgrade, violent actions, Albanian rebels, FYROM, Europe, substantial results, preserve, NATO, goal, efforts to bring peace, partnership and solidarity, CFSP, enhance EU's capability, security policy, strengthen Alliance, close and early coordination, review structures developed to ensure security, potential new threats, weapons of mass destruction, means of delivery, require comprehensive response, Germany, possible defensive measures, contain or prevent threats, disarmament, arms control, non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament, international agreements

5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Strengthening, relationship, peace, security, stability, prosperity, situation, Balkans, matter, concern, South East Europe, issue, coordination, action, Belgrade, rebels, FYROM, Europe, results, NATO, goal, efforts, peace, partnership, solidarity, CFSP, EU, capability, security policy, Alliance, structures,

security, threats, weapons of mass destruction, means, delivery, response, Germany, measures, disarmament, arms control, non-proliferation, agreements

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Transatlantic, fundamental, democratic, economic, serious, crucial, joint, violent, Albanian, substantial, close, early, potential, new, comprehensive, possible, nuclear, international

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to topic

Remain, preserve, bring, enhance, strengthen, review, ensure, require, contain, prevent

## Schröder (2001b)

### A) Circumstances

#### 1. Who is the speaker?

##### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Gerhard Schröder

##### 1.2 What is his/her function?

Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany

#### 2. Who is the audience?

##### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Labour Party Conference, Brighton

##### 2.2 When was the speech done?

01.10.2001

#### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

##### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

##### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

George W. Bush is sworn into office, UK foot-and-mouth crisis, Slobodan Milosevic surrenders to police special forces, Silvio Berlusconi becomes Prime Minister for the second time, mass riots by Serb nationalists in Bosnia and Herzegovina, The People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation sign the Treaty of Good-Neighborliness and Friendly Cooperation., 27<sup>th</sup> G8 summit in Genoa

### B) Content

#### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

Attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup>, new threat, new measures/concept necessary, stronger role for Europe, stronger political, economic, cultural cooperation, consequences for policies from threats, peace in Middle East

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military, economic, social, political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out solidarity, explaining threat, stressing necessity for deeper cooperation, pointing out consequences for policies, showing solidarity, stressing cooperation and further necessities to enhance it

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

9/11, on-going Middle East crisis

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Comprehensive coalition, international terrorism, cooperated closely, endeavor, necessary, important, talks, Russia, Egypt, Iran, Pakistan, Clash of Civilizations, terrorists, jointly take up, fight against terrorism, our one world, terrorist attacks, September 11<sup>th</sup>, changed and united our world, faceless barbarism, aimed at entire civilized world, attack on freedom of every individual, freedom to live and work without fear, terrorist attack, UN, demonstration of unity, political area, greater security for all members, new forms of threat, advocate successful form of cooperative security, development cooperation, develop a comprehensive concept for prevention and management of crisis, cooperation on security issues, political, economic, cultural cooperation, breakthrough towards peace in Middle East, Israel's, Peres, Palestinian, Arafat, conflict, securing international peace inevitably, greater European responsibility, collective defence against attacks by states, collective fight against terrorism, necessitates joint actions, more security and stability, more complex world, terrorism, instability, defence actions, aggressions of states, law enforcement, security services, military forces, consequences, changing political conditions, Transatlantic Partnership, basis of security, joint security, Europe, Russia, strengthen capacity to act, NATO, act in security policy terms, longterm sustainable equal partnership, American, closer

security cooperation, improve international cooperation, international terrorism, advance reform process

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Coalition, terrorism, endeavor, talks, Russia, Egypt, Iran, Pakistan, Clash of Civilizations, terrorists, fight, terrorism, world, terrorist attacks, September 11<sup>th</sup>, barbarism, freedom, individual, fear, attack, UN, demonstration unity, area, security, members, forms, threat, development cooperation, concept, prevention, management, crisis, security issues, breakthrough, peace, Middle East, Peres, Arafat, conflict, peace, responsibility, defense, states, joint actions, stability, world, instability, defense actions, aggressions, law enforcement, security services, military forces, consequences, conditions, partnership, basis, joint security, Europe, Russia, capacity, NATO, security policy, terms, security cooperation, reform process

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Comprehensive, international, closely, necessary, important, jointly, faceless, entire, civilized, political, new, successful, cooperative, political, economic, cultural, inevitably, greater, collective, complex, changing, longterm, sustainable, equal, closer

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Cooperated, changed, advocate, develop, securing, strengthen, act, improve, advance

Solana (1999)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Javier Solana

1.2 What is his/her function?

High Representative of the EU for the Common Foreign and Security Policy;  
Secretary-general of WEU

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

EU-Commission/Institut for European Politic; Conference; The Development of a  
Common European Security and Defence Policy – The Integration Project of the  
Next Decade, Berlin

2.2 When was the speech done?

17. December 1999

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

15

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Helsinki Summit a week before; War in Kosovo and NATO strikes in Yugoslavia,  
EURO introduction, Kurdish extremists take over embassies in Europe, Hungary,  
Poland and the Czech Republic join NATO; Ciampi new President in Italy; Barak  
new Prime Minister of Israel; Indication of Milosevic and other in Den Haag for  
war crime and crime against humanity in Kosovo; Mohammed VI becomes king  
of Morocco; short war in Dagestan; coup d'état in Pakistan; Yeltsin resigns:  
earthquakes in Athens, Turkey; Storms in France, Switzerland and Germany

## B) Content

### 1. What is the topic of the speech?

“The Development of a Common European Security and Defence Policy – The Integration Project of the Next Decade”, EU-NATO relation regarding missions

### 2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military, social, institutional, globalization

### 3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Debate about better integration of CFSP, developing an effective CFSP, need for effective instruments, Europe’s engagement should be with NATO and not replace it

### 4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Treaty of Amsterdam into power, Helsinki summit... Europe should become “more assertive in its reactions to international crisis”, good cooperation between EU and WEU

### 5. How is the topic talked about?

#### 5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Threat, globalization, terrorism, international drug dealing, money-laundering, spread of AIDS, new globalized problems and responsibilities, challenges, no more threat of an ultimately and global totally destructive conflict, limited and regional security threats, crises, human suffering, regional instability, adaption at national level to face challenges, increasing globalization, insecure, threatened by events, no control over them, transnational problems require transnational solutions

#### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Globalization, terrorism, international drug dealing, money-laundering, spread of AIDS, conflict, security threats, crises, human suffering, control, regional instability, problems, solutions

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

New, globalized, ultimately, totally, destructive, limited, regional, increasing, insecure, threatened

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Face, require

Solana (2005)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Javier Solana

1.2 What is his/her function?

High Representative of the EU for the Common Foreign and Security Policy;  
Secretary-general of WEU

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

Institut d'études politiques Paris

2.2 When was the speech done?

18.04.2005

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

25

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

EU enlargement, new constitution for EU, terrorism (attack in Madrid), Mahmoud Abbas new president of Palestine, George Bush's second term as US-President starts, ETA car bomb detonation in Madrid, storm in Northern Europe, North Korea announces possession of nuclear weapons, Kyoto Protocol goes into effect, death of Pope John Paul II

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Importance of a new EU constitution to keep up stability and peace inside and outside of Europe and to keep Europe together; CFSP important part in it for example regarding civil or military mission on the Balkans; renewal of founding act with constitution to strengthen EU, peace and prosperity, political integration, defense, external actions

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Political, military

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Informing and convincing people of necessity of a new treaty/constitution for the EU

4. How is the topic related to the current situation

New member states, plan to have a new constitution because 25 member states need new regulations, old ones not enough anymore, actions on Balkan showed that other instruments are necessary to avoid another paralysis and to make Europe more powerful, especially regarding the uprising of China and Russia as well

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Uncertain, brutal, less secure and stable, imbalance between North and South, growing dangerously, zones of instability spreading, terrorists, own political agenda, radicalization, fragile democracy, gnaw, enlargement, demand for a strong Europe rising around the world, its role as a global leader, main vector of peace and democracy across the world, civil and military missions, rapid reaction and effective action, guided by principle of effectiveness, strengthen military capacity, capable of coming to rescue, generating greater security inside and outside our borders, providing development to the poorest, international crime, environmental catastrophes, successful with speaking with one voice and acting together, crises, history, geography, Russia, China, relations, Africa, degree of autonomy of DF, effectiveness of action, diplomatic level, peace and prosperity at stake, cooperation, defense, terrorist attack, natural or man-made disaster, strengthening of CDP

5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Imbalance, North, South, zone, terrorists, agenda, radicalization, democracy, enlargement, demand, Europe, world, leader, vector, peace, missions, reaction, action, effectiveness, capacity, security, development, crime, catastrophes, voice, crises, history, geography, Russia, China, relations, Africa, degree, autonomy, DF, effectiveness, level, prosperity, state, cooperation, defense, attack, disaster, CDP

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Uncertain, brutal, secure, stable, dangerously, political, fragile, strong, rising, global, guided, capable of, international, environmental, successful, together, terrorist, natural, man-made

#### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Grow, spread, gnaw, demand, guide, strengthen, generate, provide, speaking, acting

## Solana (2006)

### A) Circumstances

#### 1. Who is the speaker?

##### 1.1 What is his/her name?

Javier Solana

##### 1.2 What is his/her function?

High Representative of the EU for the Common Foreign and Security Policy;  
Secretary-general of WEU

#### 2. Who is the audience?

##### 2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

University of Copenhagen, “Europe’s answer to the global challenges”

##### 2.2 When was the speech done?

08.09.2006

#### 3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

##### 3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

25

##### 3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Russia cuts natural gas to Ukraine over a price dispute, President of Iran Mahmoud Ahmadinejad confirms that Iran has successfully produced a few grams of low-grade enriched uranium, Declaration of Independence of Montenegro after a referendum, Lebanon War, North Korea declares first nuclear test, Ban Ki-moon new Secretary-General of UNO

### B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Europe's role in the world, relation EU-Denmark, new challenges for young generation, Europe's answer to the global challenges

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military, political

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out Europe's role, future challenges, achievements so far: making audience conscious that they themselves have to build on Europe and contribute to its future development towards an even better and more important player in international stuff; showing that Europe is very active and successful in keeping up international peace

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Different missions of EU worldwide at the moment, position to Lebanon war

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

Agenda, Europe's role in the world, focus on new challenges, concrete actions, future uncertain and contested, system change, partnership, civilian crisis management around the world, special responsibility, abroad, economic future, tough global market, environmental challenges, global warming, demographic pressures, migration, integration, new security threats, global challenges, global impact increasing, declarations, implementation of common policies, nationalist extremists, doctrine, ESS, arrangements, operations, EU special representatives, common strategy culture, Iran, dialogue, cooperation, relationship, new kind of relationship, build the necessary confidence, Lebanon, crisis, region, permanent peace, enhance regional standing, Israeli-Palestinian conflict, concerned about broader relations to Muslim world, radicalizing impact of status quo, peace, security, development, global challenges, migration, terrorism, energy, Sudan, grave concern, violent incidents, tensions rising, comprehensive political strategy, promoting human rights to develop credible external energy policy, all areas, tackle them together, problems too complex for one country, partnership, international problems, vulnerable, responsibilities, defend Europe's interests

### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

Agenda, Europe, role, world, focus, challenges, actions, future, system, change, partnership, crisis, management, responsibility, future, market, warming, pressure, migration, integration, security, threats, impact, declarations, implementation, policies, extremists, doctrine, ESS, arrangements, operations, EU, representatives, strategy, culture, Iran, dialogue, cooperation, relationship, kind, confidence, Lebanon, region, peace, standing, relations, Muslim, status quo, peace, development, terrorism, energy, Sudan, concern, incidents, tensions, strategy, human rights, policy, areas, problems, country, partnership, interests

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

New, concrete, uncertain, contested, civilian, around, special, abroad, economic, tough, global, environmental, demographic, nationalist, common, necessary, permanent, regional, broader, grave, violent, comprehensive, credible, external, complex, vulnerable

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Build, enhance, radicalizing, rising, promoting, develop, tackle, defend

Solana (2009)

A) Circumstances

1. Who is the speaker?

1.1 What is his/her name?

Javier Solana

1.2 What is his/her function?

High Representative of the EU for the Common Foreign and Security Policy;  
Secretary-general of WEU

2. Who is the audience?

2.1 What is the occasion of the speech?

European Parliament, on the EU Common, Security and Defense Policy

2.2 When was the speech done?

18.02.2009

3. What happened in the world at the time of the speech?

3.1 How many member states did the EU have at that time?

27

3.2 What major events were in the focus of the politicians?

Slovakia becomes member of the EURO-Zone, Russia shuts off all gas supply to Europe through Ukraine, War in Gaza, first trial at International Criminal Court is hold, Icelandic government and banking system collapses, Former Serbian president Milan Milutinović is acquitted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia regarding war crimes during the Kosovo War, the International Criminal Court (ICC) issues an arrest warrant for Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Darfur, Albania and Croatia are admitted to the NATO, G20 summit about financial crisis in London, North Korea launches rocket, earthquake in L'Aquila, Swine Flue

B) Content

1. What is the topic of the speech?

Debate about CFSP and ESDP, achievements so far, what needs to be done, EU-NATO relations

2. Where can the topic be located between the sectors used in security analysis?

Military, political, environment

3. What is the purpose of the speech?

Pointing out issues that should play a role in debate

4. How is the topic related to the current situation?

Debate about CFSP and ESDP, ATALANA, piracy current problem off the coast of Somalia, Lisbon Treaty, Afghanistan

5. How is the topic talked about?

5.1 What words and expressions are used?

CFSP, ESDP, much progress, European way of doing things, civilian and military missions, Europe, Asia, Middle East, Africa, crisis prevention, comprehensive approach, crisis management, large and diversified tool box, rapid response capability, role as global actor, Lisbon Treaty, more effective, European values, human rights, rule of law, international law, effective multilateralism, internal cooperation, values, action, construction of EU, ESS 2003, direction, 2008 report, reinforcement, incorporating threats and challenges we face in today's world, climate change, terrorism, energy security, piracy, cyber security, ATALANTA, development on an integrated civilian-military strategic planning capability, crisis management, efficient, flexible, able to adapt to new realities, military action, civilian action, Afghanistan, civilian and military capabilities, problems, speed required, NATO, Kosovo, important issue, Pakistan, special representative, more engagement, more efficiently and improve coordination, very serious problem, energy, non-proliferation

### 5.1.1 Nouns which point out the topic

CFSP, ESDP, progress, way, things, missions, Europe, Asia, Middle East, Africa, prevention, approach, crisis management, tool box, response capability, actor, Lisbon Treaty, values, rights, law, multilateralism, cooperation, actions, construction of EU, ESS, direction, report, reinforcement, threats, challenges, world, climate change, terrorism, energy security, piracy, cyber security, ATALANTA, development, planning capability, realities, action, Afghanistan, capabilities, problems, speed, NATO, Kosovo, issue, Pakistan, representative, engagement, coordination, problem, energy, non-proliferation

### 5.1.2 Adjectives which point out how the topic was perceived

Civilian, military, comprehensive, large, diversified, rapid, global, effective, European, human, international, effective, internal, integrated, civilian-military, strategic, efficient, flexible, able, new, military, civilian, important, special, serious

### 5.1.3 Verbs which point out actions related to the topic

Doing, incorporating, face, planning, adapt, require

## Appendix B: Time periods

Column	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Treaty</b>	Amsterdam (02.10.1997*)	Amsterdam	Amsterdam	Nice (26.02.2001)	Nice	Nice
<b>Germany</b>	Kohl (27.10.1998°)	Schröder	Schröder	Schröder (22.11.2005)	Merkel	Merkel
<b>France</b>	Chirac	Chirac	Chirac	Chirac	Chirac (16.05.2007)	Sarkozy
<b>UK</b>	Blair	Blair	Blair	Blair	Blair (27.06.2007)	Brown
<b>EU</b>			Solana	Solana	Solana	Solana (01.12.2009)

Table 1

\* Treaties: Date indicates the signing of the treaty

° Politicians: Date indicates the end of their term in office

Combinations:

Amsterdam – Kohl (1997) – Chirac (1998) – Blair (1998)

Amsterdam – Schröder (1999) – Chirac (1999a) – Blair (1999)

Amsterdam – Schröder (2000) – Chirac (1999b) – Blair (2000) – Solana (1999b)

Nice – Schröder (2001a/2001b) – Chirac (2001a/2001b) – Blair (2004) – Solana (2005)

Nice – Merkel (2007) – Chirac (2006) – Blair (2006) – Solana (2006)

Nice – Merkel (2007) – Sarkozy (2008) – Brown (2009) – Solana (2009)

## Appendix C: Threats

Abbreviations of the nature of threat:

M = military

S = social

En = environmental

E = economic

P = political

O= other categories

<b>Country/Person</b>	<b>Threats perceived before the Treaty of Nice</b>	<b>Threats perceived before the Treaty of Lisbon</b>
<b>Germany/ Kohl</b>	(M) Terrorism  (S) International crime Drug mafia  (P) Totalitarian regimes EU enlargement Agenda 2000	
<b>Germany/ Schröder</b>	(M) War Terrorism Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction Tests of nuclear weapons  (S) Border-crossing organized crimes Migration Asylum problems Illegal immigration Drug trafficking Rivalry  (P) Fundamentalism Nationalism	(M) International terrorism Weapons of mass destruction

<b>Germany/Merkel</b>		<p>(M) Terrorism War of violence Slowed down peace process on Balkans/Middle East</p> <p>(En) Energy supply Climate change</p> <p>(S) AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis Social challenges Cross-border crime Illegal immigration</p> <p>(O) Globalization</p>
<b>France/Chirac</b>	<p>(M) War</p> <p>(EN) Environmental issues</p> <p>(S) Racism Social norms Drugs Organized crime</p> <p>(P) Regional tensions Internal conflicts</p>	<p>(M) Ballistic proliferation Nuclear deterrents Biological, chemical, nuclear weapons Proliferation of weapons Terrorism</p> <p>(En) Greenhouse gases</p> <p>(S) International crime Mafia Illegal immigrants Radical ideas Fanaticism</p> <p>(P) New power centers</p> <p>(O) Globalization New technologies</p>
<b>France/Sarkozy</b>		<p>(M) Terrorism</p>

		<p>(E) Financial crisis/financial capitalism High energy prices</p> <p>(EN) Climate change Energy scarcity</p> <p>(S) Hunger riots/food scarcity Illegal immigration</p>
<b>Great Britain/ Blair</b>	<p>(M) War (Proliferation of) nuclear weapons</p> <p>(E) Global economic crisis Financial instability</p> <p>(EN) Climate change Environmental degradation/pollution Global warming</p> <p>(S) Cross-border crimes Ethnic cleansing Systematic rape Mass murder Immigration AIDS Malaria Tuberculosis Religious division Crimes Drugs Poverty</p> <p>(P) Dictators</p> <p>(O) Changing world Globalization Changes in technology</p>	<p>(M) Weapons of mass destruction Terrorism Conflicts in Middle East/Africa</p> <p>(E) Economy</p> <p>(EN) Energy Environment Climate change</p> <p>(S) Ethnic cleansing Social division Immigration Organized crime</p> <p>(O) Globalization</p>

<p><b>Great Britain/ Brown</b></p>		<p>(M) Violent extremism</p> <p>(E) Financial crisis/instability Global recession Oil price crisis</p> <p>(EN) Environmental degradation Climate change/chaos</p> <p>(S) Extreme poverty Insecurity Hopelessness. Unemployment</p> <p>(O) Globalization</p>
<p><b>EU/Solana</b></p>	<p>(M) Terrorism</p> <p>(S) International drug dealing Money laundering AIDS</p>	<p>(M) Terrorism and radicalization of terrorism Middle East conflict</p> <p>(E) Energy security</p> <p>(EN) Global warming/climate change Environmental catastrophes</p> <p>(S) International crime Demographic pressure/migration</p> <p>(P) Imbalance between North and South EU enlargement Piracy Cyber security</p> <p>Man-made catastrophes</p>

