

HOW THE EU CAN SUPPORT REFORM IN BURMA

Jonas Parello-Plesner

SUMMARY

Burma is reforming. After being released from house arrest in November 2010, the leader of the National League for Democracy, Aung San Suu Kyi, is expected to be elected as a member of parliament in a by-election on 1 April. But although this is a momentous event, it risks diverting attention away from important issues that have not yet been resolved. Some European Union member states are now calling for a "big bang" approach – that is, immediately lifting sanctions. This approach is based on the assumption that reforms so far undertaken are "irreversible", as the Burmese government claims. But there are political, legal, historical and practical reasons why the EU should remain cautious

The EU should therefore respond to Burma's changes not by a full and unconditional lifting of sanctions but by taking a gradual and measured approach, which would make clear that the key to full normalisation will be verifiable and irreversible reforms rather than mere promises of them. The EU should use benchmarks and conditionality to ensure that the Burmese government follow up on human rights issues and make further progress on reform. The EU should lead its companies in a race to the top by ensuring that European companies in Burma adhere to binding standards of corporate social responsibility and accountability.

Burma is experiencing swift political changes. But although the speed and scope of developments has gone beyond expectations, there remain important issues that have not yet been resolved. Many political prisoners have been released – but not unconditionally – while others remain in jail. A new labour law has been passed, but the International Labour Organisation (ILO) remains concerned that the related right to bargain collectively has yet to be enshrined in law. Forced labour also remains a serious problem in many parts of the country, and a new plan for its eradication within three years has yet to be put to the test. A new law on freedom of assembly falls short of international standards. Although the regime has agreed ceasefires with many ethnic groups, fighting and atrocities continue in Kachin, Karen and Shan states.

After being released from house arrest in November 2010, the leader of the National League for Democracy, Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi, is running for a seat in parliament in a by-election on 1 April. But although this is a momentous event, it risks diverting attention away from important issues that have not yet been resolved. The promised "irreversibility" of the reform process has yet to be confirmed. Even Aung San Suu Kyi has noted that "until we know that the army is solidly behind the reform movement, we cannot say the process is irreversible". ¹ Moreover,

 $[\]label{lem:condition} \begin{tabular}{ll} 1Z. Linn, "Can Burma's President persuade his army to obey his order?", $Asian Tribune, 4 March 2012, available at http://www.asiantribune.com/news/2012/03/03/can-burma%E2%80%99s-president-persuade-his-army-obey-his-order. \end{tabular}$

although Aung San Suu Kyi leads the democratic opposition, she does not necessarily represent minority ethnic groups.

So far, the EU has already reciprocated the positive steps that have been taken by the Burmese government. In January, EU foreign ministers lifted visa bans on a large part of the current government's leaders. Several European ministers have also visited Burma, including British Foreign Secretary William Hague (a traditional hardliner on sanctions), French Foreign Minister Alain Juppé and Danish Minister for Development Co-operation Christian Friis Bach. All three countries have raised their levels of humanitarian aid to Burma. The European Commissioner for Development, Andris Piebalgs, has also promised new levels of EU assistance approximating to €150 million for the next three years.

The next big question is what to do about the EU's sanctions against Burma. They include an arms and military equipment embargo; trade, export and investment sanctions on the extractive and logging industry; suspension of development aid (only humanitarian aid is allowed); a visa ban and asset freeze on military leadership; and a ban on investment in named state-owned industries². EU foreign ministers will discuss sanctions at a meeting on 23 April and are expected to agree a revision of the existing sanctions regime, which requires unanimity in order to be continued. Provided reform continues, the sanctions are likely to be lifted at some point in the not-so-distant future. In doing so, the EU should articulate benchmarks of progress in the reform process and target its capacity-building efforts and assistance to achieving those benchmarks.

The EU's foreign policy chief, Catherine Ashton, is also due to visit Burma in late April, by which time the byelections will have taken place and the role of the opposition in general, and of Aung San Suu Kyi in particular, will be clearer. Before she visits Burma, Ashton is due to participate in the EU-ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) foreign ministers' meeting in Brunei on 26–27 April. This meeting will be an opportunity for the EU to co-ordinate its approach to Burma with its ASEAN partners. In particular, they could take a joint stance on development assistance and on foreign investment, guided by the highest standards of accountability and corporate social responsibility.

The EU now has a unique chance to take a coherent approach to sanctions in line with clear and agreed benchmarks, increasing options for institutional capacity-building and development assistance, and shaping a new sustainable-business approach to investing in Burma. EU member states have an opportunity to redefine their relationship with Burma using benchmarks that will ensure that European engagement benefits all Burmese. An EU approach that

displays more caution than optimism would indicate to partners that Europe is able to act progressively without engaging in a Burmese "gold rush", and will help secure a reform path that is progressive and irreversible.

The presumption of irreversibility

EU debates about Burma have long been framed in terms of a polarised debate between engagement on the one hand and sanctions on the other. But the real choice now is between an immediate and wholesale lifting of sanctions and a steady incremental approach. Those member states previously against sanctions are now calling for a "big bang" approach – that is, immediately lifting sanctions. This approach is based on the assumption that reforms so far undertaken are "irreversible", as the Burmese government claims. But there are political, legal, historical and practical reasons why the EU should be cautious about these claims.

Political

Although there are reformers within the government and the ruling elite, their position is by no means secure. A gradual approach to lifting sanctions will support their efforts as long as it is combined with closer scrutiny to support the sustainability of those efforts. There are also groups of stakeholders in top positions that see the changes underway as being against their interest, particularly if reform touches more deep-rooted issues such as the military's role in the economy.

Legal

Reforming legislation takes time, especially when it is done through a relatively new parliament. The recently adopted labour law, with its inherent flaws, displays that. The ILO's committee of experts has expressed serious concerns surrounding freedom of association, forced labour and trade union registration. The government's argument that law and order concerns allow the suspension of the right to freedom of association is a cause for concern. Similarly, political prisoner release, though welcome, was not unconditional. The prisoners were released under section 401 of the criminal procedure code rather than under an unconditional amnesty, so their sentences still stand. Other laws, including on investment and freedom of expression, fall below international standards. Civil and political rights are not guaranteed and the legal framework has not improved. The most prominent example of the reversibility of current reforms is that, under article 445 of the constitution, the government still has impunity for acts committed for reasons of state security.

The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) is another case in point. A body set up in part to respond to UN rapporteur Tomas Ojea Quintana's call for a Commission of

² The withdrawal of preferential market access (under the Generalised System of Preferences) in the 1990s due to forced labour issues is effectively out of EU member states' hands. A global review is underway that requires consultation with the ILO and would only result in trading preferences being reinstated in 2014.

Inquiry into possible international crimes, it has yet to show that it has the independence, capacity or procedures to support its mandate. Its chair, U Win Mra, has made public statements claiming independence from the government, though he also stated in February 2012 that the commission would not look into "human rights violations and atrocities supposed to be committed against ethnic groups". Even the NHRC's initiation, by a government notification rather than a legislative act, calls into question its legitimacy. Most conspicuously absent is the UN requirement that such national human rights bodies follow a mandate based on universal human rights standards. Instead, the NHRC explicitly takes its mandate from the rights expressed in the 2008 Burmese constitution.

Historical

Burma watchers and internal experts note the similarities between recent events and the professed opening in the early 1990s, which was followed by a crackdown, increased violence and an extended period of isolation. The international community has to be wary of this potential and keep the pressure on the government to reform. Burma's upcoming chairmanship of ASEAN may signify that it is rejoining the international community, but it does not give it carte blanche for normalised relations. The historical evidence also highlights the reputational risk at stake for the EU. Premature lifting of sanctions might be followed by limited or no further progress on reforms and a reassertion by hardliners or an escalation of serious human rights abuses in ethnic areas. All or any of these possibilities might put the EU in the awkward position of having to re-impose sanctions that it had prematurely lifted.

Practical

The lack of real reform should act as the primary incentive for caution. There are reports from Kachin state of ongoing atrocities, which may constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity. In addition, ongoing fighting in Shan state and confusion over ceasefire agreements in Karen state do not tally with statements by officials in March that almost all planned ceasefires were in place. According to the "Peace Plan" presented by Burmese President U Thein Sein in parliament on 1 March, ethnic groups will be allowed to form political parties, join parliament and contribute to amending the constitution. But nothing so far indicates that there will be elections before the next planned one in 2015. Even then, the military will still hold 25 percent of seats and thus have an effective veto on constitutional amendments. A peace plan that doesn't tackle the role of the military in politics is unlikely to have any chance of long-term success.

A gradual and measured approach to lifting sanctions

Given these ongoing issues, the EU should reject the "big bang" approach and instead take a gradual and measured approach to Burma. EU foreign ministers should not be hasty in lifting sanctions, which would remove what EU leverage remains and leave reformers inside Burma's government without the prospect of further international recognition of their efforts. A gradual approach to lifting sanctions would demonstrate support for the situation on the ground and for the promising steps already taken, and make clear that the key to full normalisation will be verifiable and irreversible reforms rather than mere promises of them.

In particular, the EU should set benchmarks for further democratic and economic reform and explain what steps would lead to the full removal of sanctions. These should include some of the basic legal reforms that would allow for freedom of association and speech, the rule of law and investment in line with international standards. According to such a benchmarked approach, the EU might lift some sanctions in April (the ban on development assistance should go, so that capacity-building by European actors can be pursued) but leave in place the arms embargo, the asset freeze and the visa ban on top military strongmen.

Restrictions should remain on the export of equipment, or related financial or technical support for the timber industry and mining of metals or gemstones (imports of which are also banned), and the prohibition of EU firms from entering into joint ventures with, or holding securities in, Burmese firms in these sectors. Their lifting would require evidence of credible reforms to international standards on labour laws, budget management and environmental protection.

The EU should also apply conditionality in relation to progress on democracy, human rights and the rule of law. The EU's development assistance should be linked to the governance situation in the country and to political dialogue with Burmese authorities, as recommended in the EU's recent statement on development policy.³ In particular, decisions about the level of development assistance should be made with reference to:

- access for the International Committee of the Red Cross to prisons and lists of prisoners, and the immediate and unconditional release of remaining political prisoners;
- an end to human rights violations, military attacks on civilians and military impunity;
- unrestricted humanitarian access for the UN and other humanitarian agencies to ethnic areas.

Other measures

In addition to taking a gradual and measured approach to lifting sanctions, the EU could support the transition in Burma through other measures on corporate social responsibility and accountability, democracy and ethnic conflicts, and donor co-ordination.

A race to the top on corporate social responsibility and accountability

European firms are potentially big investors in Burma. They should enter the Burmese market with high and jointly agreed standards on transparency and accountability (particularly as local legislation is inadequate) and thus beat China and other investors in a race to the top of setting business standards with social accountability. These standards should reflect OECD guidelines, the UN's Global Compact, extractive industry disclosure regulations and the EU's non-financial disclosure guidelines on corporate social responsibility. In this way, the EU would be taking practical steps to avoid the pitfalls it has witnessed in other countries that are rich in natural resources but do not have the capacity to fully benefit from revenues generated. This approach will strike fertile ground in Burma, where public protests triggered by environmental and local concerns on a large Chinese-led dam project led to subsequent government suspension of the project and was another of the budding signs of reform.

In order to improve corporate social responsibility and accountability, the EU should:

- convene an EU-Burma summit under the auspices of High Representative Catherine Ashton that would bring together businesses and NGOs. The aim would be to require European companies to adhere to the full set of international corporate social responsibility guidelines. This could develop further the work currently being undertaken by trade unions and NGOs in developing a binding framework for business and human rights in Burma. The EU would be a natural champion for such a novel and proactive approach, which would also be in line with current legislative proposals on extractives disclosure (which are similar to, if not more potentially more targeted than, those in US legislation such as the Dodd-Frank Act). The EU should seek to extend this approach to other international companies and co-operate with the US, Japan and ASEAN.
- improve transparency and accountability in gas and oil revenues. Burma has large oil and gas revenues, which could secure for it a sustainable future. But, at the moment, revenues from oil and gas circulate in obscure circuits outside official budgets. European capacity-building should work

towards transparency and furthermore work for the establishment of a national fund that could transfer revenues directly into health and social services and infrastructure improvements that would benefit the whole population.

Democracy and ethnic conflicts

As the new relationship with Burma develops, the EU should exert pressure on both the government and the opposition to deliver on ethnic reconciliation as an integral part of the democratisation agenda. The European External Action Service might also be called upon to employ its conflict prevention and mediation instruments towards Burma. The EU could also try to play a distinctive mediation role by using some of its eminent peace negotiators such as Martti Ahtisaari, who mediated in Aceh in 2004.

Donor co-ordination

Development assistance is now flooding into Burma. Donor co-ordination and trilateral co-operation with ASEAN will be essential to avoid duplication of resources and to ensure that aid targets the most essential areas, and to ensure that agreed standards are followed and that implementation is transparent. In leading the drive for increased development assistance, the EU has a responsibility to ensure effective co-ordination and, in particular, to increase humanitarian assistance to ethnic areas. A particular area of concern is the Burmese refugees on the Thai border where support also from the EU seems to be dwindling while the situation for a return to Burma isn't yet ready. This is creating the possibility of refugees returning to unsafe ethnic conflict zones or an increase of illegal economic activity in Thailand.

About the author

Jonas Parello-Plesner is a Senior Policy Fellow at the European Council on Foreign Realtions. Previously, he was Director of a development NGO with activities in Asia and served as Denmark's Senior Advisor on China and North East Asia from 2005-2009. He is also on the editorial board of RÆSON, a Danish international affairs magazine. He is the co-author of *The Scramble for Europe* (with François Godement and Alice Richard, 2011) and *China's Janusfaced response to the Arab revolutions* (with Raffaello Pantucci, 2011).

Among members of the European

former prime ministers, presidents,

European commissioners, current

and former parliamentarians and

cultural figures from the EU member

President and CEO, A. J. Aamund A/S and Chairman of Bavarian Nordic A/S

ministers, public intellectuals,

business leaders, activists and

states and candidate countries.

Asger Aamund (Denmark)

Urban Ahlin (Sweden) Deputy Chairman of the Foreign

Affairs Committee and foreign policy spokesperson for the Social Democratic Party

Martti Ahtisaari (Finland)

Chairman of the Board, Crisis Management Initiative; former

Chairman, Centre for American Studies; Chairman, Enciclopedia

Gustavo de Aristegui (Spain)

Dora Bakoyannis (Greece) Member of Parliament; former Foreign

Professor of Economics at the Warsaw School of Economics; former Deputy

Leszek Balcerowicz (Poland)

Governor, National Bank of Poland; former Prime Minister

Roland Berger (Germany) Founder and Honorary Chairman, Roland Berger Strategy Consultants

Erik Berglöf (Sweden)Chief Economist, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Jan Krzysztof Bielecki (Poland)

Chairman, Prime Minister's Economic Council; former Prime Minister

Henryka Bochniarz (Poland) President, Polish Confederation o

Svetoslav Bojilov (Bulgaria) Founder, Communitas Foundation and President of Venture Equity Bulgaria Ltd.

Emma Bonino (Italy) Vice President of the Senate; former EU

Member of Parliament and spokesperson for foreign affairs and

Former European Commission Ambassador to the USA; former Prime

Ian Buruma (The Netherlands)

Private Employers – Lewiatan

Carl Bildt (Sweden)

Foreign Minister

Commissioner

Netherlands)

Han ten Broeke (The

John Bruton (Ireland)

Minister (Taoiseach)

Member of Parliamen Gordon Bajnai (Hungary)

Prime Minister

Deputy Director, E

Lluís Bassets (Spain)

Marek Belka (Poland)

Giuliano Amato (Italy)Former Prime Minister and vice
President of the European Convention;

Council on Foreign Relations are

Erhard Busek (Austria) /52 Chairman of the Institute for the Danube and Central Europe **ECFR**

Jerzy Buzek (Poland)Member of the European Parliament; former President of the European Parliament; former Prime Minister

Gunilla Carlsson (Sweden) Minister for International Development

Cooperation

Maria Livanos Cattaui (Switzerland)

Former Secretary General of the International Chamber of Commerce

Ipek Cem Taha (Turkey) Director of Melak Investments/

Carmen Chacón (Spain)

Journalist

Former Minister of Det **Charles Clarke**

(United Kingdom) Visiting Professor of Politics, University of East Anglia; former Home Secretary

Nicola Clase (Sweden) Ambassador to the United Kingdom; former State Secretary

Daniel Cohn-Bendit (Germany) Member of the European Parliame

Robert Cooper (United Kingdom) Counsellor of the European External Action Service

Gerhard Cromme (Germany) Chairman of the Supervisory Board of the ThyssenKrupp

Daniel Daianu (Romania) Professor of Economics, National School of Political and Administrative Studies (SNSPA); former Finance

Massimo D'Alema (Italy) President, Italianieuropei Foundation; President, Foundation for European Progressive Studies; former Prime Minister and Foreign Minister

Marta Dassù (Italy) Under Secretary of State for Foreign

Ahmet Davutoglu (Turkey) Foreign Minister

Aleš Debeljak (Slovenia) Poet and Cultural Critic

Jean-Luc Dehaene (Belgium) Member of the European Parliament; former Prime Minister

Gianfranco Dell'Alba (Italy) Director, Confederation of Italian Industry (Confindustria) - Brussels office; former Member of the European

Pavol Demeš (Slovakia) Senior Transatlantic Fellow, German Marshall Fund of the United States (Bratislava)

Kemal Dervis (Turkey) Vice-President and Director Economy and Development tor of Global

Tibor Dessewffy (Hungary) President, DEMOS Hungary

Hanzade Doğan Boyner

(Turkey) Chair, Doğan Gazetecilik and Doğan

Andrew Duff (United Kingdom) Member of the European Parliamen

Mikuláš Dzurinda (Slovakia)

Hans Eichel (Germany) Former Finance Minister

Rolf Ekeus (Sweden) Former Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission on Iraq; former OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities; former Chairman Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, SIPRI

Uffe Ellemann-Jensen

(Denmark) Chairman, Baltic Development Forum; former Foreign Minister

Steven Everts (The Netherlands) Adviser to the Vice President of the European Commission and EU High Representative for Foreign and Security

Tanja Fajon (Slovenia) Member of the European Parliament

Gianfranco Fini (Italy) President, Chamber of Deputies; former Foreign Minister

Joschka Fischer (Germany) Former Foreign Minister and vice-Chancellor

Karin Forseke (Sweden/USA) Business Leader; former CEO Carnegie Investment Bank

Lykke Friis (Denmark) Member of Parliament; former Minister for Climate, Energy and Gender

Jaime Gama (Portugal) Former Speaker of the Parliament; former Foreign Minister

Timothy Garton Ash (United Kingdom) Professor of European Studies, Oxford

Carlos Gaspar (Portugal) Chairman of the Portuguese In International Relations (IPRI) Institute of

Teresa Patricio Gouveia (Portugal) Trustee to the Board of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation; former Foreign Minister

Heather Grabbe (United Kingdom) Executive Director, Open Society Institute – Brussels

Charles Grant (United Kingdom) Director, Centre for European R

Jean-Marie Guéhenno (France) Director of the Centre on International Conflict Resolution, Columbia University (New York); Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution; former Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping

Fernando Andresen Guimarães

Operations at the UN

(Portugal) Head of the US and Canada Division, European External Action Service

Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg **(Germany)** Former Defence Minister

István Gyarmati (Hungary)

President and CEO. International Centre for Democratic Transition

Hans Hækkerup (Denmark) Chairman, Defence Commission former Defence Minister

Heidi Hautala (Finland) Minister for International Development

Steven Heinz (Austria) Co-Founder & Co-Chairman, Lansdowne Partners Ltd

Annette Heuser (Germany) Executive Director, Bertelsman Foundation Washington DC

Diego Hidalgo (Spain) h newspaper El со-тоиnder ot Spanišl País; President, FRIDE

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer (The Netherlands) Former NATO Secretary General

Danuta Hübner (Poland) Member of the European Parliament; former European Commissioner

Anna Ibrisagic (Sweden) Member of the European Parliament

Jaakko Iloniemi (Finland) Former Ambassador and former Executive Director, Crisis Management

Toomas Ilves (Estonia)

Wolfgang Ischinger (Germany) Chairman, Munich Security Conference; Global Head of Government Affairs Allianz SE

Minna Järvenpää (Finland/US) International Advocacy Director, Open Society Foundation

Mary Kaldor (United Kingdom) sor, London School of Economics

Ibrahim Kalin (Turkey) Senior Advisor to the Prime Minister of Turkey on foreign policy and public diplomacy

Sylvie Kauffmann (France) Editorial Director, Le Monde

David Koranyi (Hungary) Deputy Director, Eurasia Center of the Atlantic Council of the United States; former under-Secretary of state and advisor to the Prime Minister

Olli Kivinen (Finland) Writer and columnist

Ben Knapen (The Netherlands) Minister for European Affairs and International Cooperation

Gerald Knaus (Austria) Chairman of the European Stability Initiative and Carr Center Fellow

Caio Koch-Weser (Germany) Vice Chairman, Deutsche Bank Group; former State Secretary

Bassma Kodmani (France) Executive Director of the Arab Reform Initiative

Rem Koolhaas (The Netherlands) Architect and urbanist; Professor at the Graduate School of Design, Harvard

Bernard Kouchner (France) Former Minister of Foreign Affairs

Ivan Krastev (Bulgaria) Chair of Board, Centre for Liberal

Aleksander Kwaśniewski

(Poland) Former President

Mart Laar (Estonia)

Minister of Defence; former Prime

Miroslav Lajčák (Slovakia) Managing Director for Europe and Central Asia, European External Action

Service: former Foreign Minister **Alexander Graf Lambsdorff**

(**Germany**) Member of the European Parliament

Pascal Lamy (France) Honorary President, Notre Europe and Director-General of WTO; former EU Commissioner

Bruno Le Maire (France)Minister for Food, Agriculture & Fishing

Mark Leonard (United Kingdom) Director, European Council on Foreign

Relations

Juan Fernando López Aguilar

(Spain)Member of the European Parliament; former Minister of Justice

Adam Lury (United Kingdom)

Emma Marcegaglia (Italy) President, Confindustria

David Miliband

(United Kingdom)
Member of Parliament; Former Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs

Alain Minc (France)President of AM Conseil; former chairman, Le Monde

Nickolay Mladenov (Bulgaria)

Foreign Minister; former Defence Minister; former Member of the European Parliament

Dominique Moïsi (France) Senior Adviser, IFRI

Pierre Moscovici (France) Member of Parliament; former Minister for European Affairs

Nils Muiznieks (Latvia) Director, Advanced Social and Political

Research Institute, University of Latvia Hildegard Müller (Germany)

Chairwoman, BDEW Bundesverband der Energie- und Wasserwirtschaft

Wolfgang Münchau (Germany) President, Eurointelligence ASBL

Kalypso Nicolaïdis

(Greece/France)
Professor of International Relations,
University of Oxford

Daithi O'Ceallaigh (Ireland) Director-General, Institute of International and European Affairs

Christine Ockrent (Belgium)

Andrzej Olechowski (Poland) Former Foreign Minister

Dick Oosting (The Netherlands) CEO, European Council on Foreign Relations; former Europe Director, Amnesty Internationa

Mabel van Oranje (The Netherlands) CEO, The Elders

Marcelino Oreja Aguirre (Spain) Member of the Board, Fomento de Construcciones y Contratas; former EU

Cem Özdemir (Germany) Leader, Bündnis90/Die Grünen (Green Party)

Ana Palacio (Spain)Former Foreign Minister; former Senior
President and General Counsel of the
World Bank Group

Simon Panek (Czech Republic) Chairman, People in Need Foundation

Chris Patten (United Kingdom) Chancellor of Oxford University and cochair of the International Crisis Group; former EU Commissioner

Diana Pinto (France) Historian and author

Jean Pisani-Ferry (France) Director, Bruegel; Professor, Université Paris-Dauphine

Ruprecht Polenz (Germany) Member of Parliament; Chairman of the Bundestag Foreign Affairs Committee

Lydie Polfer (Luxembourg) Member of Parliament; former Foreign

Charles Powell (Spain/United Kingdom)
Deputy Director, Real Instituto Elcano

Andrew Puddephatt (United

Kingdom)Director, Global Partners & Associated

Vesna Pusić (Croatia)

Robert Reibestein (The Netherlands)

Director, McKinsey & Company

George Robertson (United Kingdom)
Former Secretary General of NATO

Albert Rohan (Austria) Former Secretary General for Foreign **Affairs**

Adam D. Rotfeld (Poland) Former Minister of Foreign Affairs; Co-Chairman of Polish-Russian Group on Difficult Matters, Commissioner of Euro-Atlantic Security Initiative

Norbert Röttgen (Germany) Minister for the Environment,

Conservation and Nuclear Safety Olivier Roy (France)

Professor, European University Institute,

Daniel Sachs (Sweden) CEO, Proventus

Pasquale Salzano (Italy) Vice President, International Institutional Affairs, ENI

Stefano Sannino (Italy)Director General for Enlargement,

European Commission Marietje Schaake

(The Netherlands) Member of the European Parliament

Pierre Schori (Sweden) Chair of Olof Palme Memorial Fund; former Director General, FRIDE; former SRSG to Cote d'Ivoire

Wolfgang Schüssel (Austria) Member of Parliament; former Chancellor

Karel Schwarzenberg (Czech Republic) Foreign Miní

Giuseppe Scognamiglio (Italy) Executive Vice President, Head of Public Affairs, UniCredit Spa

Narcís Serra (Spain) Chair of CIDOB Foundation; former Vice President of the Spanish Government

Radosław Sikorski (Poland) Foreign Minister

Aleksander Smolar (Poland) Chairman of the Board, Stefan Batory Foundation

Javier Solana (Spain) Former EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy & Secretary-General of the Council of the EU; former Secretary General of NATO

George Soros (Hungary/USA)Founder and Chairman, Open Society **Foundations**

Teresa de Sousa (Portugal)

Goran Stefanovski (Macedonia) Playwright and Academic

Rory Stewart (United Kingdom) Member of Parliament

Alexander Stubb (Finland)
Minister for Foreign Trade and
European Affairs; former Foreign

Michael Stürmer (Germany)

Chief Correspondent, Die Wel

Ion Sturza (Romania) President, GreenLight Invest; former Prime Minister of the Republic of

Paweł Świeboda (Poland) President, Demos EUROPA - Centre for European Strategy

Vessela Tcherneva (Bulgaria) Spokesperson and advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Teija Tiilikainen (Finland) Director, Finnish Institute for International Relations

Loukas Tsoukalis (Greece) Professor, University of Athens and President, ELIAMEP

Erkki Tuomioja (Finland) Foreign Minister

Daniel Valtchev, (Bulgaria) Former Deputy PM and Minister of

Vaira Vike-Freiberga (Latvia) Former President

Antonio Vitorino (Portugal) Lawyer; former EU Commissione

Andre Wilkens (Germany)Director Mercator Centre Berlin and Director Strategy, Mercator Haus

Carlos Alonso Zaldívar (Spain) Ambassador to Brazil

Stelios Zavvos (Greece) CEO, Zeus Capital Managers Ltd

Samuel Žbogar (Slovenia) EU Representative to Kosovo; former Foreign Minister

/52

ALSO AVAILABLE FROM FCFR

New World Order: The Balance of Soft Power and the Rise of **Herbivorous Powers**

Ivan Krastev and Mark Leonard, October 2007 (ECFR/01)

A Power Audit of EU-Russia **Relations**

Mark Leonard and Nicu Popescu, November 2007 (ECFR/02)

Poland's second return to Europe? Paweł Swieboda, December 2007 (ECFR/03)

Afghanistan: Europe's

forgotten war Daniel Korski, January 2008 (ECFR/04)

Meeting Medvedev: The Politics of the Putin Succession

Andrew Wilson, February 2008 (ECFR/05)

Re-energising Europe's Security and Defence Policy

Nick Witney, July 2008 (ECFR/06)

Can the EU win the Peace in

Georgia? Nicu Popescu, Mark Leonard and Andrew Wilson, August 2008 (ECFR/07)

A Global Force for Human **Rights? An Audit of European** Power at the UN

Richard Gowan and Franziska Brantner, September 2008 (ECFR/08)

Beyond Dependence: How to deal with Russian Gas

Pierre Noel, November 2008 (ECFR/09)

Re-wiring the US-EU relationship Daniel Korski, Ulrike Guerot and Mark Leonard, December 2008 (ECFR/10)

Shaping Europe's Afghan Surge Daniel Korski, March 2009

A Power Audit of EU-China Relations

John Fox and Francois Godement, April 2009 (ECFR/12)

Beyond the "War on Terror": Towards a New Transatlantic Framework for Counterterrorism Anthony Dworkin, May 2009 (ECFR/13)

The Limits of Enlargement-lite: **European and Russian Power in** the Troubled Neighbourhood

Nicu Popescu and Andrew Wilson, June 2009 (ECFR/14)

The EU and human rights at the UN: 2009 annual review

Richard Gowan and Franziska Brantner, September 2009 (ECFR/15)

What does Russia think?

edited by Ivan Krastev, Mark Leonard and Andrew Wilson, September 2009 (ECFR/16)

Supporting Moldova's Democratic Transition Nicu Popescu, October 2009

(ECFR/17)

Can the EU rebuild failing states? A review of Europe's Civilian Capacities Daniel Korski and Richard Gowan,

October 2009 (ECFR/18)

Towards a Post-American Europe: A Power Audit of EU-US Relations

Jeremy Shapiro and Nick Witney, October 2009 (ECFR/19)

Dealing with Yanukovych's Ukraine

Andrew Wilson, March 2010 (ECFR/20)

Beyond Wait-and-See: The Way Forward for **EU Balkan Policy**

Heather Grabbe, Gerald Knaus and Daniel Korski, May 2010 (ECFR/21)

A Global China Policy

François Godement, June 2010 (ECFR/22)

Towards an EU Human Rights Strategy for a Post-Western World

Susi Dennison and Anthony Dworkin, September 2010 (ECFR/23)

The EU and Human Rights at the UN: 2010 Review

Richard Gowan and Franziska Brantner, September 2010 (ECFR/24)

The Spectre of a Multipolar

Europe Ivan Krastev & Mark Leonard with Dimitar Bechev, Jana Kobzova & Andrew Wilson, October 2010 (ECFR/25)

Beyond Maastricht: a New Deal for the Eurozone Thomas Klau and François

Godement, December 2010 (FCFR/26)

The EU and Belarus after the Election

Balázs Jarábik, Jana Kobzova and Andrew Wilson, January 2011 (ECFR/27)

After the Revolution: Europe and the Transition in Tunisia Susi Dennison, Anthony Dworkin, Nicu Popescu and Nick Witney, March 2011 (ECFR/28)

European Foreign Policy Scorecard 2010

March 2011 (ECFR/29)

The New German Question: How Europe can get the Germany it needs

Ulrike Guérot and Mark Leonard, April 2011 (ECFR/30)

Turning Presence into Power: Lessons from the Eastern Neighbourhood

Nicu Popescu and Andrew Wilson, May 2011 (ECFR/31)

Egypt's Hybrid Revolution: a Bolder EU Approach Anthony Dworkin, Daniel Korski and Nick Witney, May 2011 (ECFR/32)

A Chance to Reform: How the EU can support Democratic Evolution in Morocco

Susi Dennison, Nicu Popescu and José Ignacio Torreblanca, May 2011 (ECFR/33)

China's Janus-faced Response to the Arab Revolutions

Jonas Parello-Plesner and Raffaello Pantucci, June 2011 (ECFR/34)

What does Turkey think?Edited by Dimitar Bechev, June 2011 (ECFR/35)

What does Germany think about Europe?

Edited by Ulrike Guérot and Jacqueline Hénard, June 2011 (FCFR/36)

The Scramble for Europe

François Godement and Jonas Parello-Plesner with Alice Richard, July 2011 (ECFR/37)

Palestinian Statehood at the UN: Why Europeans Should Vote "Yes"

Daniel Levy and Nick Witney, September 2011 (ECFR/38)

The EU and Human Rights at the UN: 2011 Review Richard Gowan and Franziska

Brantner, September 2011 (ECFR/39)

How to Stop the Demilitarisation of Europe Nick Witney, November 2011 (ECFR/40)

Europe and the Arab Revolutions: A New Vision for Democracy and Human Rights Susi Dennison and Anthony Dworkin, November 2011

Spain after the Elections: the "Germany of the South"?

(ECFR/41)

José Ignacio Torreblanca and Mark Leonard, November 2011 (ECFR/42)

Four Scenarios for the **Reinvention of Europe** Mark Leonard, November 2011

(ECFR/43)

Dealing with a Post-Bric Russia Ben Judah, Jana Kobzova and

Nicu Popescu, November 2011 (ECFR/44)

Rescuing the euro: what is

China's price?'
François Godement, November 2011 (ECFR/45)

A "Reset" with Algeria: the Russia to the EU's South

Hakim Darbouche and Susi Dennison, December 2011 (ECFR/46)

Ukraine after the Tymoshenko verdict

Andrew Wilson, December 2011 (ECFR/47)

European Foreign Policy Scorecard 2012 February 2012 (ECFR/48)

The Long Shadow of Ordoliberalism: Germany's Approach to the Euro Crisis Sėbastian Dullien and Ulrike Guérot, February 2012 (ECFR/49)

The End of the Putin Consensus Ben Judah And Andrew Wilson, March 2012 (ECFR/50)

Syria: Towards a Political Solution

Julien Barnes-Dacey, March 2012 (ECFR/51)

ABOUT ECFR

The **European Council on Foreign Relations** (ECFR) is the first pan-European think-tank. Launched in October 2007, its objective is to conduct research and promote informed debate across Europe on the development of coherent, effective and values-based European foreign policy.

ECFR has developed a strategy with three distinctive elements that define its activities:

- •A pan-European Council. ECFR has brought together a distinguished Council of over one hundred Members politicians, decision makers, thinkers and business people from the EU's member states and candidate countries which meets once a year as a full body. Through geographical and thematic task forces, members provide ECFR staff with advice and feedback on policy ideas and help with ECFR's activities within their own countries. The Council is chaired by Martti Ahtisaari, Joschka Fischer and Mabel van Oranje.
- A physical presence in the main EU member states.
 ECFR, uniquely among European think-tanks, has offices in Berlin, London, Madrid, Paris, Rome, Sofia and Warsaw.
 In the future ECFR plans to open an office in Brussels. Our offices are platforms for research, debate, advocacy and communications.
- A distinctive research and policy development process. ECFR has brought together a team of distinguished researchers and practitioners from all over Europe to advance its objectives through innovative projects with a pan-European focus. ECFR's activities include primary research, publication of policy reports, private meetings and public debates, 'friends of ECFR' gatherings in EU capitals and outreach to strategic media outlets.

ECFR is backed by the Soros Foundations Network, the Spanish foundation FRIDE (La Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior), the Bulgarian Communitas Foundation, the Italian UniCredit group, the Stiftung Mercator and Steven Heinz. ECFR works in partnership with other organisations but does not make grants to individuals or institutions.

www.ecfr.eu

The European Council on Foreign Relations does not take collective positions. This paper, like all publications of the European Council on Foreign Relations, represents only the views of its authors.

Copyright of this publication is held by the European Council on Foreign Relations. You may not copy, reproduce, republish or circulate in any way the content from this publication except for your own personal and non-commercial use. Any other use requires the prior written permission of the European Council on Foreign Relations

© ECFR March 2012.

ISBN: 978-1-906538-52-1

Published by the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR), 35 Old Queen Street, London, SW1H 9JA. United Kingdom

london@ecfr.eu