



**DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR EXTERNAL POLICIES
POLICY DEPARTMENT**



**ESTABLISHING THE
KNOWLEDGE BASE OF A
SMART POWER:
A BLUE PRINT FOR AN EU
INSTITUTE FOR PEACE**

AFET



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR EXTERNAL POLICIES OF THE UNION

DIRECTORATE B

POLICY DEPARTMENT

STANDARD BRIEFING

**ESTABLISHING THE KNOWLEDGE BASE
OF A SMART POWER: A BLUE PRINT
FOR AN EU INSTITUTE FOR PEACE**

Abstract

The purpose of this report is to present a view on whether there is an added value in establishing an “EU Institute for Peace”, and, if so, to make a suggestion on how it can be organized. The background is the fact that as the Lisbon Treaty has now come into force the Union should be capable to carry out the role of a global actor in the pursuit of peace as set up by the Treaty. The world as it looks today with the challenges and threats described in the European Security Strategy has given the Union a vast and complex task in its ambitions to create security and work for peace also on a global level. The challenge for the Union at this stage is to acquire the capabilities needed in analysis, knowledge and training based on a common strategic vision to pursue this. Suggestions for an EU Institute for Peace have been made by former Finnish President, Martti Ahtisaari, and Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Carl Bildt, referring to the need to fulfill EU’s goals in a better way. It seems clear already at this stage that the EU is in need of strengthened capabilities and the purpose of this standard briefing is to suggest a structure for this in the form of an EU institute for peace.

This study was requested by the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs

AUTHOR:

Gunilla HEROLF, Senior Researcher, SIPRI

Standard briefing carried out within the framework agreement between TEPSA and the European Parliament.

Ref.: EP/EXPO/B/AFET/FWC/2009-01/Lot6/06

EDITOR RESPONSIBLE:

Gerrard QUILLE
Policy Advisor - Security and Defence
Directorate-General for External Policies of the Union
Policy Department
WIB 06 M 081
rue Wiertz 60
B-1047 Brussels

LINGUISTIC VERSIONS

Original: EN

ABOUT THE PUBLISHER

Manuscript completed on 13 April 2010.

© European Parliament, 2010

Printed in Belgium

The study is available on the Internet at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/studies.do?language=EN>

If you are unable to download the information you require, please request a paper copy by e-mail: xp-poldep@europarl.europa.eu

DISCLAIMER

Any opinions expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament.

Reproduction and translation, except for commercial purposes, are authorised, provided the source is acknowledged and provided the publisher is given prior notice and supplied with a copy of the publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1 INTRODUCTION	3
2 PEACE AS A SUBJECT OF STUDY	3
3 THE PURPOSE OF AN EU INSTITUTE FOR PEACE	4
4 PRESENT MEANS	5
5 POSSIBLE MODELS FOR INSTITUTES FOR PEACE	6
6 DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL SOLUTIONS FOR AN INSTITUTE FOR PEACE	7
6.1 STATUS QUO MODEL	8
6.2 EU INSTITUTE BUILT ON EXISTING BODIES	8
6.3 NEW INSTITUTE	8
7 TRAINING AND SUPERVISION	9
8 CONCLUSION	10
ORGANIZATION CHART: EU INSTITUTE FOR PEACE	11
BIBLIOGRAPHY	13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The question to be answered by this report is whether an “EU Institute for Peace” would give an added value to the Union. This question can be answered by yes. The issue of which particular tasks and which institutional form these capabilities should have is at the core of this report. At the centre are the tasks of advice, analysis, research and a variety of training tasks. The suggestion given in this report is that in terms of institutional organization, in order to follow the principles of legitimacy, possibilities for increased cohesion and efficiency, the best solution is to build up a new institute to serve as an EU Institute for Peace. The training tasks will also be connected to this institute in addition to remaining a responsibility of Member States. (see also chart on page 11).

1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to present a view on whether there is an added value in establishing an “EU Institute for Peace”, and, if so, to make a suggestion on how it can be organized. The background is the fact that as the Lisbon Treaty has now come into force the Union should be capable to carry out the role of a global actor in the pursuit of peace as set up by the Treaty. The world as it looks today with the challenges and threats described in the European Security Strategy has given the Union a vast and complex task in its ambitions to create security and work for peace also on a global level. The challenge for the Union at this stage is to acquire the capabilities needed in analysis, knowledge and training based on a common strategic vision to pursue this. Suggestions for an EU Institute for Peace have been made by former Finnish President, Martti Ahtisaari, and Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Carl Bildt, referring to the need to fulfill EU’s goals in a better way. It seems clear already at this stage that the EU is in need of strengthened capabilities and the purpose of this standard briefing is to suggest a structure for this in the form of an EU institute for peace.

In order to fulfill the aims of this report, first the concept of peace studies as well as the purposes for an institute for peace will be outlined. Thereafter the present means for research on peace will be mentioned as well as the possible models for a new institute for peace. Finally, a proposal for how new capabilities may be added to the EU will be submitted, followed by the conclusion. While the expression “Institute for Peace” will be used in the report, this does not foreclose the later analysis on which institutional form the added capabilities deemed necessary should have. An assumption made here is that an institute must be based on a formula giving it a maximum of legitimacy within the EU in the way in which it is set up and works. Only in this way can its work result in the further goals of common vision and cohesion.

A second assumption is that the way the work is organized, as well as the organizational structure of added capabilities, should have a maximum of efficiency. For this reason the structure of an institute for peace may be of an innovative character, including the use of other organizations in order to get the most out of the funds available.

A third assumption is that the creation of an institute should be pursued without duplication, not only within the institute but also within Europe. The EU should make sure that work already carried out within Europe in research and analysis is made available to the Union, thus in all ways striving for the goal that rather than being repeated, ongoing work should be used and built upon.

2 PEACE AS A SUBJECT OF STUDY

While peace may be defined as the absence of war, the EU has pursued a policy and carried out active policies for which the ambition has been higher. Prevention of violence, crisis management within ongoing crises as well as post-conflict work have for a number of years been a central part of its work. In addition, the creation of stable and democratic societies has been a substantial part of its external policies not only within the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) but also within other policies of the Union, such as the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP).

In the academic field, peace research has dealt with this whole area as well, including early recognition of causes of conflicts, analysis on how violence can be prevented, the roots of terrorism, reasons for conflict such as nationalism, environment deterioration, poverty and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. Certain fields deal with the collection of data on wars, conflicts, armaments etc as a basis for further analysis. In contrast to research in the field of security, peace research is not of a national

character but usually relates to why conflicts as such occur and how they can be prevented. In some cases research concerns regional studies, however with a focus on the particular conflicts of the region.¹

3 THE PURPOSE OF AN EU INSTITUTE FOR PEACE

An institute for peace should serve to make the EU a better global actor in the pursuit of peace by increasing its capability for fast and relevant action to this aim. This means understanding the situation, knowing what to do and doing it quickly when necessary and in a way to achieve sustainable peace.

A suggestion was made in a debate in the European Parliament by the former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari, as he claimed that the EU should create an Institute for Peace in order to be more active in peace mediation and to boost its expertise in this field.²

Carl Bildt has also referred to this need. A task for an EU Institute for Peace, as he sees it, might be to salvage the good and bad experiences of past missions and build on them for new ones, doing this in close contact with academics as well as practitioners. Bildt has also referred to the US Institute of Peace (USIP) as an institute from which ideas can be picked, mentioning informal diplomacy as one of the tasks.³

Two different kinds of deficiencies may be identified as hurdles for the EU to play the desired role as a global actor.

1. The first of them is the lack of a **common strategic vision**. The EU Security Strategy of 2003 and its revision in 2008 were very good steps towards this end, demonstrating that the EU member states are now in agreement on what are the threats facing the EU and that these can only be met jointly. However, in spite of its name, the ESS is not a strategy and therefore it does not give the guidance that would be helpful for the Union in terms of priorities and focus. This deficit reflects the fact that the EU members are not in total agreement on which threats/challenges and regions are the most important ones as well as if and how they should be addressed by the EU.

In spite of this shortfall, an impressive amount of work has been done. Much of it, however, would have been done quicker and more efficiently if this common vision had existed. Many steps forward have been taken by the EU earlier in this regard, such as the establishment of the concept of military-civilian cooperation, which turned out to be a very successful approach to meeting conflicts. The Lisbon Treaty has introduced some means for improvement, such as the European External Action Service (EEAS). Still, more has to be done towards this important goal. Good research, is the argument here, may contribute to advanced knowledge that will ultimately lead to a greater commonality of views. This is a highly difficult task and no illusions should be harboured about achieving a totally common strategic vision. It is, however, also of utmost importance to continue to take steps in this direction, and therefore it should be given a high priority to make progress.

¹ Peter Wallensteen, Björn Hettne, Nationalencyklopedin

² Elitsa Vucheva, "EU could do more for peace, Ahtisaari says", euobserver.com, 2 April 2009.

³ "Strengthening the ESDP – The EU's Approach to International Security", Tal av Carl Bildt vid ESS i Helsingfors, [Speech by Carl Bildt at ESS in Helsinki], Regeringskansliet [Government Offices], Helsinki 19 September 2008, <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/7417/a/112759>; "Speech by Mr Carl Bildt, Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the conference 'ESDP @10 – What Lessons for the Future'", Brussels, 28 July 2009, Regeringskansliet [Government Offices], <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7417/a/131181>.

As will be developed up later, the way in which an institute for peace is organized is an essential factor when seeking to increase the European vocation in an area in which member states may have many and different vested interests, different cultures etc.

2. The second factor concerns the tasks of the institute. A number of areas have been identified as in need of added capabilities. Among them are advice, analysis, research, informal negotiation and training for a range of tasks such as mediation. The efficiency with which EU missions of various kinds are carried out, coordination among the participating countries and the final evaluation, feedback and a continual institutional learning process are important but also sensitive areas in which an institute for peace may play an important role. Some of the above functions exist but can be improved, whereas others need to be found or to be brought into the EU.

Here again, the organisation of added capabilities is a key factor. The connection between the EU level and those of the member states when carrying out all these tasks are of utmost importance. Constant communication between the two as well as between member states in order to spread knowledge is of great importance.

4 PRESENT MEANS

The present means for analysis of peace and security issues are of various kinds. They exist within the EU, in agencies connected to it, in member states and in research institutes of various characters.

With the establishment of the EEAS the aim is that the coherence of the EU foreign policy machinery will increase. While HR Ashton will not put forward her ideas on the EEAS until April, an indication of the character of the EEAS was set out in the report by the Swedish Presidency that was accepted at the meeting 29-30 October 2009. Called a *sui generis* unit, the EEAS including both Council and Commission bodies and functions, as well as personnel composed from both and from member states, will go some way in the right direction. As indicated in the report the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD), the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC), and the Military Staff (EUMS) as well as the Situation Centre (SitCen) should be part of the EEAS. The EU Special Representatives and their tasks should likewise be included in the EEAS. The geographical desks proposed should eliminate the duplication existing today.⁴ Still, however, there are some question marks surrounding the organization. Enlargement, trade and development are to remain in the Commission, but so may also some other areas.

The EUISS, connected to the Council calls itself a *think tank* and an *agency of the EU*. Its role is to find a common security culture for the EU, to help develop and project the CFSP and to enrich Europe's strategic debate. EUISS carries out research in an area closely related to peace but is not dealing with the particular tasks of peace and stability creation sought for at this stage. Research and analysis are also carried out within the Commission in its Forward Studies Unit and in the European Parliament's Policy Department.

A long range of institutes, some called peace research institutes, other institutes addressing peace-related subjects among others, deal with analysis and research related to peace. Their range of activities may vary considerably. Academic research is one of them, but there are also other tasks such as giving advice and/or education. Many of them have been founded by governments but a range of varieties in affiliation and degree of independence exists. Other organizational characteristics may vary as well.

⁴ *Presidency report to the European Council on the European External Action Service*, Council of the European Union, 14930/09, Brussels 23 October 2009, p.3.

They may be international or national, have different levels of closeness to authorities in general, and differences in sources of income. Some think-tanks are based in Brussels, the geographic position giving them a closer connection (even though informal) to the EU.

National means of analysis furthermore are found in the ministries and agencies of Member States.

Education and training are mainly pursued on the national level but connected to other Member States' facilities in a number of ways. The European Security and Defence College (ESDC) serves as a joint organization for the national training units being educated for military crisis management tasks. On the civilian side the European Group on Training (EGT) is financed as a Commission project. Again national organizations are engaged for these tasks; however, such training does not take place in all Member States. Those existing are all of varying type. They may in addition to training have such tasks as national recruitment and supervision of missions dispatched and they may be internationally involved. Examples are Zentrum für Internationale Friedenseinsätze (ZIF) in Germany and Folke Bernadotte Academy (FBA) in Sweden.⁵

Together these bodies form an impressive array of work done and knowledge gathered. Today, however, much remains in taking advantage in a comprehensive way of all that has been accomplished.

5 POSSIBLE MODELS FOR INSTITUTES FOR PEACE

While Europe hosts a very large number of peace research institutes their focus, as mentioned above, is not primarily on the European Union and its goals in the prevention of conflicts, crisis management and stabilization. They deal with the EU only as part of their research agenda, most often centring on conflicts. A survey of them does not give any European institute as a useful pattern on which an EU Institute of Peace can be modeled.⁶ However, the impressive number and research makes connection with European peace research institutes seem valuable for an EU institute, which in order to be useful should be closely associated with the tasks and goals of the European Union.

The **US Institute for Peace (USIP)** is sometimes mentioned as a useful model for an EU Institute of Peace and is mentioned by both by Mr Ahtisaari and Mr Bildt. The USIP has three goals: (1) Prevent and resolve violent international conflicts, (2) promote post-conflict stability and development, and, (3) increase conflict management capacity, tools and intellectual capital worldwide. Its activities include the following: (a) operating-on-the-ground in zones of conflict, (b) performing cutting edge research, (c) identifying best practices and developing innovative peacebuilding tools, (d) training on conflict management, (e) educating high school and college students (f) supporting policy-makers by providing analyses.⁷

The structure of this organization reflects the fact that the USIP is established in one particular country, from which it receives all its income and from which it receives tasks. It is a government-funded agency that answers to a Senate-confirmed board of directors. This organizational model is considered as an advantage since as an institute the USIP may take risks and form relationships that the State Department cannot. At the same time USIP is careful not to complicate things for the State Department

⁵ Training for Civilian Crisis Management, A European Common Approach to Basic and Specialised Training of Field Mission Personnel, Folke Bernadotte Academy, 2009.

⁶ The European Peace Directory of the Quaker Council for European Affairs includes 54 research institutes of various kinds. See www.quaker.org/qcea/peacedirectory/topic/education.htm.

⁷ <http://www.usip.org/about> us.

and therefore does not pursue any activities in another country without permission from the State Department.⁸

Another organization, which has also been mentioned in this context, is the International Crisis Group (ICG). The primary task is to be a source of analysis and to give advice to governments and intergovernmental bodies such as the UN, the EU and the World Bank on the prevention and resolution of deadly conflict. Well known for its field-based work, the ICG has a high reputation for solid and non-partisan analysis and is thereby an influential advisor.

The reason why these two in particular have been mentioned in the context of a European Institute for Peace is hardly that their structures as a whole can be overtaken by the EUIP, but rather as stated by Carl Bildt for “picking ideas”. The USIP in addition, is clearly more of a vehicle for US activities than is the EU Institute for Peace to the EU. According to instructions the latter “may include developing an intellectual focus for supporting the development of the Union in External Relations and carrying out independent lessons learned for all EU institutions”.⁹ The interest in these two institutes is instead most likely generated by the fact that both, albeit in different ways have produced very good results and as regards the USIP included functions perceived as lacking within the EU.

6 DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL SOLUTIONS FOR AN INSTITUTE FOR PEACE

As stated above, the establishment of an institute for peace, regardless of its institutional form, should be guided by certain principles: an organizational setup assuring *legitimacy*, institutional procedures serving increased *cohesion* among institutions and Member States, ultimately to lead in the direction of a common strategic vision, search for *efficiency* including *avoidance of duplication* of work and, finally, *transparency*.

Another point to consider in the layout of tasks is the need for some *focusing and limitation* considering that the possibilities are endless. *Compatibility of tasks* is another guiding principle, in the sense that the pursuit of one should not impair the pursuit of others. The decision here has been to include the following tasks: advice, analysis, research, informal negotiation and training for a range of tasks such as mediation.

The goals of an institute for peace should be connected to the goals of the European Union, serving its aim to create peace and security within the EU, in the neighbourhood and on a global level. This means that an institute for peace should serve the institutions of the EU but also, in order to contribute to the goals of cohesion and transparency, produce results open to the general public. In order to contribute to the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty, the EEAS, with its wide and demanding tasks, should be seen as the most important institutional client.

Several kinds of models for an institute for peace can be envisaged, which are in different ways including or connected to the existing units of knowledge/analysis and to the member states. To consider here is also the fact that different forms of tasks will require different forms of attachment to other bodies and to the member states.

⁸ *National Journal*, 26 April 2008.

⁹ EP/EXPO/SEDE/FWC72009-01/Lot6/06: Establishing the knowledge base of a smart power: a blue print for pan EU Institute for Peace. Description of the Standard Briefing

The first model is the status quo alternative, the continuation of work of the existing bodies of research, analysis and training, including the work done by member states. The second one is the merger of existing bodies of analysis within the European Union. The third model, finally, is the establishment of a European Institute for Peace, which is built up without attachment to any existing unit.

6.1 Status Quo Model

The status quo means a continuation of the rich variety of analysis, research, training etc which exists today within the EU, connected to it or outside the Union. One possibility would be to try to establish better links between the various units of knowledge and activities. While convenient and inexpensive (at least in the short run) and also a way to preserve the work now being done within each of these bodies, it would, however, serve the institutional division within the EU and thereby be in contradiction to what the Lisbon Treaty seeks to achieve, including the creation of the EEAS as a unit not “owned” by any of the institutions.

For the reason stated above, this is not seen as a viable option for the necessary work of fulfilling the EU’s new and demanding goals. Nor does it fulfill any of the guiding principles of legitimacy, institutional procedures leading to cohesion or that of efficiency and lack of duplication.

6.2 EU Institute Built on Existing Bodies

The model of building on the existing EU bodies of analysis, research and training (the EUISS, the Forward Studies Unit of the Commission, the European Parliament’s policy departments and the ESDC) is intuitively advantageous since it can be perceived as an inexpensive way to create a new institute. With the exception of the EUISS the other bodies are, for example, already in Brussels. This development of present structures may also be seen as a parallel to the way in which the EEAS has been created. This solution also has the advantage that ongoing work is salvaged.

This model would, however, also have several disadvantages. In practice this merger would be difficult and cohesion within the new entity would be hard to achieve. Old work habits may prevail and lead to partition, and possibly also to duplication of work. There is in addition also likelihood that the EUISS, through its sheer size, would dominate the new institute. Finally, with such tendencies, even if limited the credibility for this institute as a united EU institute may be limited.

The conclusion is that this model, even though it is seen as an improvement of the first one, would not be a satisfactory option either.

6.3 New Institute

Building a new institute has several advantages in terms of some of the guiding principles. Maybe the most important ones are those of legitimacy and the potential for cohesion. It is far easier to see a new institute created as a community effort as a legitimate one, compared to restructuring of those once established within other institutions. While the set-up costs of the institute will be higher than for the other models, it can be assumed that efficiency should be higher as well. The continued description of this model therefore assumes this one as the one to be established.

This model of a new institute stands for the establishment of a body that has a certain distance from the EU. The distance should be wide enough to make it possible for the researchers of the institute to work independently. This means that the institute should be free to engage in research on any country of its choice (as well as those suggested by the EU) and no instructions should be made as to the content of its publications.

The institute needs to take into consideration the whole spectrum within which the EU is engaged. Realistically, however, it needs to make priorities among the very large number of areas and tasks possible. While no important area can be neglected, the institute must make a choice between what should be done by its own researchers. In other areas, where high-quality work is done by other institutes, the EUIP should take advantage of this work rather than duplicate it. The institute should therefore be in touch with the European research establishments in order to take advantage of their relevant research connecting it to its own. There may also be an exchange of personnel between EUIP and other institutes.

Apart from the public role associated with the research function, the EUIP would also have a close and non-public association with the EU. The institute may take on tasks such as informal negotiations which are of a high-risk character and highly likely to fail. These are the kind of tasks that the EU itself or Member States find hard to pursue due to the publicity that would be a consequence of a failure. In this function the EUIP comes close to the task of the USIP which performs mediation among parties in conflict, "operating on- the- ground in zones of conflict". Such tasks may create some misunderstandings – there should be a clear and visible border-line between what the EU does and what can be done by an institute for peace, in order not to complicate the political situation for the EU.

The role of adviser to the EU is important as well. Being of confidential nature, it could be done in several ways, including informal procedures with oral presentations and discussions or in written form with confidential reports may be sent only to the EU. Another possibility is that research report open to all may add a confidential/advisory part that is available only to the EU.

7 TRAINING AND SUPERVISION

The previous sections as regards the three possible models have concentrated on the tasks of research, advice and informal negotiation. While (according to the suggestion) partly public and partly closed, these tasks also have certain similarities. Training is different and while it is suggested to be connected to a European Institute for Peace, it is also suggested here to have a special character.

The European Security and Defence College (ESDC) and the European Group on Training (EGT) are bodies of different character, both, however, with a strong link to the Member States. As for the ESDC it may develop into a more independent structure than today, even though the link with Member States is bound to remain strong. In that case the ESDC may also include the EGT. Regardless of how the development goes, the new form of unit(s) needs to be in some way connected to the EUIP in order for the work of EUIP to benefit training.

The proposal here is to retain the Member State-based training as the main principle, however, with some changes. There are several reasons for keeping training as a Member State task. First of all, as mentioned above, not all states today have any training of their civilian personnel. This is not acceptable – persons arriving at a trouble-spot representing the EU must be well educated and trained for their particular tasks, preferably in their own language. In addition they must know the political situation that they will meet and the task ahead of them, including the rules and laws which apply. A task for the EU in this regard would be to write a list of requirements and to supervise Member States. Each country sending personnel to EU missions would need to comply with the requirements on this list.

The role of the EU should, however, extend beyond listing and supervising requirements. Training of higher level personnel should preferably be done on EU level. The reason for this is that these persons need to meet each other in an EU context to learn from each other, thus creating best practices for

others to follow. They furthermore need training on a higher level than what their own country may be able to offer and the EU needs to check that their knowledge is on a sufficient level. Furthermore, this training will in the best case create a positive learning process: countries bring their own experiences and knowledge to the EU level and receive other knowledge back, while at the same time the country representatives learn from each other. It is natural that some countries are more experienced than others and this would give a good possibility to share this knowledge.

One important part of this EU-level based training is the factor of lessons learnt. The task could well be handled by the EU itself if it had not been for this particular aspect of it. Identifying and analysing mistakes made is a very sensitive task that is better dealt with in a non-official forum. For this reason the proposal is that a division of the EUIP would deal with it rather than the EU itself.

Education in civilian tasks can focus on several different tasks and skills. Mediation is at the centre of Martti Ahtisaari's proposal, whereas Bildt mentions informal diplomacy and negotiations. A third is training for tasks such as i.e. European Union Monitoring Missions (EUMM) or as election observers. These different kinds of tasks have some common and some different aspects. One of the common ones is the lessons learnt aspect, as mentioned above and underlined by both Bildt and Ahtisaari. Without including this element we may continue without enjoying much progress in these tasks.


8 CONCLUSION

The EU is an organization which needs leadership and at the same time cohesion. Satisfying both these needs is the difficult combination of tasks that in spite of its difficulty is continually demanded from the organization. In the context of this report, the view is that all member states must, although in various ways, be involved in the execution of new tasks suggested here. If this does not happen, the competences within these states will be lost for the EU. The passive states themselves will lose by not learning and the distance between them and the organization will grow with a consequent growth of distrust. At the same time we need the leadership and the efficiency that can only be achieved by the impact of the organization itself and above all we should seek to promote the constant interaction between the two levels within all institutional forms we design.

Clearly the EU needs added research and analytic capabilities in its pursuit of peace and stability within Europe, in the European neighbourhood and globally. In addition a number of support activities are necessary which may best be done by this institute rather than by the EU. Finally, training needs to be structured in a better way than at present. In this report three different models have been suggested and resulted in the choice of the idea of setting up a new EU Institute for Peace rather than building on previous units.

Finally, the potential role for the European Parliament. The European Parliament is the guardian of the link between the European people and the EU. Any strengthening of the EU needs to be built on a basis of popular support giving legitimacy and of a nature furthering cohesion. To see that the EU preserves this link in developing the new structures and capabilities would be a valuable task for the whole endeavour. In addition, and maybe with some added funding, the EP may add a very valuable educational function to the new European Institute for Peace. This should above all be a means for students to acquaint themselves better with the Union and may be organizationally handled by a department at the new institute.

ORGANIZATION CHART: EU INSTITUTE FOR PEACE



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bildt, Carl, "Strengthening the ESDP – The EU's Approach to International Security", Tal av Carl Bildt vid ESS I Helsingfors, [Speech by Carl Bildt at ESS in Helsinki], Regeringskansliet [Government Offices], Helsinki 19 September 2008, <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/7417/a/112759>;

Bildt, Carl, "Speech by Mr Carl Bildt, Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the conference 'ESDP @10 – What Lessons for the Future'", Brussels, 28 July 2009, Regeringskansliet [Government Offices], <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/7417/a/131181>.

Council of the European Union, *Presidency report to the European Council, External Action Service*, Council of the European Union, 14930/09, Brussels 23 October 2009.

Hettne, Björn and Wallensteen, Peter, Entry on Peace and Conflict Research, *Nationalencyklopedin* [Swedish National Encyclopedia]

Korski, Daniel and Herrberg, Antje, *Building a European Institute of Peace. A Discussion Note*, European Council on Foreign Relations.

National Journal, 26 April 2008.

Quaker Council for European Affairs, The European Peace Directory www.quaker.org/qcea/peacedirectory/topic/education.htm.

Training for Civilian Crisis Management, A European Common Approach to Basic and Specialised Training of Field Mission Personnel, Folke Bernadotte Academy, 2009.

Vucheva, Elitsa, "EU could do more for peace, Ahtisaari says", *euobserver.com*, 2 April 2009

The Yellow Starts pro-EU, pro-Europe Blog, The European Union as a peace broker..., <http://blog.yellow-starts.com/2009/04/european-union-peace-broker.html>.

United States Institute for Peace, <http://www.usip.org/about-us>

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR EXTERNAL POLICIES

POLICY DEPARTMENT

Role

Policy departments are research units that provide specialised advice to committees, inter-parliamentary delegations and other parliamentary bodies.

Policy Areas

Foreign Affairs
Human Rights
Security and Defence
Development
International Trade

Documents

Visit the European Parliament website: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/studies>

