



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

MASTER THESIS IN
EUROPEAN STUDIES

Expected interests, or just interesting expectations?

*- How the EU's bodies promote and prioritize policies in the
EaP and ASEAN*

Author: Martina Hammarström
Supervisor: Ann-Kristin Jonasson
2013-05-24

Abstract

This thesis takes its starting point in that policy promotion previously has been discussed mainly as values or norms, and argues that policies are also constructed of interests. As such, this thesis examines the behaviour of the EU's bodies when promoting and prioritizing policies in the Eastern Partnership (EaP) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). It asks and answers the question of which policies that the bodies promote and prioritize, and whether the same policies are equally important in each of the regions. Two hypotheses are set up for the expected behaviour of each institution – the European Parliament (EP), the Council of the European Union and the European Commission. They build on the theoretical framework of institutionalism and role theory, and are tested through a basic data analysis (BDA). The model provides an analytical framework of characteristics and codes by which the content of documents provided by each of the three institutions, i.e. action plans and declarations are coded. Hence, this thesis use a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methodology, through which both the content of the text as well as the frequency of codes becomes evident. The conclusion is that there is a clear difference between promoting and prioritizing policies, as well as in how the EU's bodies choose to behave in different regions. The concluding remark is that the bodies of the EU can be argued to behave on both self-interests as well as on basis of urgency.

Word count: 19 584

Contents

- 1. INTRODUCTION5**
 - 1.1 DISCUSSING AND DEFINING THE RESEARCH GAP7
 - 1.2 AIM AND RESEARCH QUESTION8
 - 1.4 DISPOSITION9
- 2. POLICY PROMOTION, AND THE EU AS A POLICY PROMOTER10**
 - 2.1 POLICY PROMOTION10
 - 2.2 THE EU AS A POLICY PROMOTER11
- 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK11**
 - 3.1 INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONALISM.....11
 - 3.2 ROLE THEORY12
 - 3.2.1 *The European Parliament*14
 - 3.2.2 *The Council of the European Union*.....15
 - 3.2.3 *The European Commission*.....15
 - 3.3 SUMMARY16
- 4. DEFINING THE CASES.....16**
 - 4.1 ASEAN16
 - 4.2. THE EAP17
- 5. HYPOTHESES AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK.....18**
- 6. METHODOLOGY19**
 - 6.1 CASE SELECTION19
 - 6.2 STUDY DESIGN20
 - 6.3 TEXT ANALYSIS AND MATERIALS21
 - 6.4 BASIC DATA ANALYSIS (BDA).....21
 - 6.4.1 CODES AND CHARACTERISTICS.....22
 - 6.5 EXTERNAL VALIDITY, RELIABILITY AND ETHICS24
- 7. RESULTS.....24**
 - 7.1 THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT24
 - 7.1.1 *The EP and ASEAN*24
 - 7.1.2 *The EP and the EaP*.....26
 - 7.2 THE COUNCIL29
 - 7.2.1 *The Council and ASEAN*.....29
 - 7.2.2 *The Council and the EaP*.....31
 - 7.3 THE COMMISSION.....34
 - 7.3.1 *The Commission and ASEAN*34
 - 7.3.2 *The Commission and the EaP*.....37
 - 7.4 SUMMARY OF RESULTS40
- 8. ANALYSIS.....40**
 - 8.1 THE EP.....40
 - 8.2 THE COUNCIL42
 - 8.3 THE COMMISSION.....44
- 9. CONCLUSIONS.....46**
 - 9.1 FURTHER RESEARCH.....48
- 10. REFERENCES49**

Abbreviations

AFTA	ASEAN Free Trade Area
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BDA	Basic Data Analysis
DG	Directorate General
EaP	Eastern Partnership
EEC	European Economic Community
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
EU	European Union
EP	European Parliament
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade
FTA	Free Trade Area
GAERC	General Affairs and External Relations Council
MS	Member State
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
TEU	Treaty of the European Union

1. Introduction

The Treaty of the European Union (TEU) establish the European Union (EU) as a world actor, promoting values not only within its own borders but also beyond them:

“In its relations with the wider world, the Union shall uphold and promote its values and interests and contribute to the protection of its citizens. It shall contribute to peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair trade, eradication of poverty and protection of human rights, in particular the rights of the child, as well as to the strict observance and the development of international law, including respect of the principles of the United Nations Charter.”¹

This shows a strong intention by the EU to promote what is commonly recognised as “good” policies, but in fact should be considered the EU’s own model.² But as such, the quote also raise questions: Are all policies equally important to promote in all regions of the world, and are they promoted and prioritized as strongly by all bodies of the EU, or do these bodies prioritize differently?

Scholars have previously raised the problem of lack of consistency among the EU’s bodies when it comes to policy promotion. Also, it is noted that much effort has been put into mapping the internal relationship between institutions and their interests, while less focus has been put on such external relations.³ Scholars have mainly been interested in how policies are established and promoted by institutions in the member states (MS) of the EU⁴, what the effects of policy promotion are in external regions⁵, or whether or not the EU can be considered a normative power⁶. Hence values and norms are often in focus, but it has over time become harder to distinguish between the concepts of norms, values and interests.⁷ In this thesis the three elements come together to create a given model⁸ and will not use ‘policy promotion’ as something that only consists of values and norms, but very much of interests. It is assumed that EU’s policy promotion is not only a matter of promoting “good” policies to external regions, but also a matter of EU’s interests. I argue that in the field of policy promotion, the EU’s bodies’ interest bases have not been evaluated thoroughly enough previously.

¹ Treaty of the European Union, (2012/C 326/01), Article 3(5)

² Gilardi Fabrizio (2008) *“Delegation in the Regulatory State – Independent Regulatory Agencies in Western Europe”*, Cheltenham; Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, p.80

³ Carbone Maurizio (2008) *“Mission Impossible: the European Union and Policy Coherence for Development”*

⁴ Reiche Danyel, Bechberger Mischa (2004) *“Policy Differences in the promotion of renewable energies in the EU member states”*

⁵ Aggestam Lisbeth (2008) *“Ethical power Europe?”*

⁶ Manners Ian (2008) *“The normative ethics of the European Union”*

⁷ Meunier Sophie, Nicolaidis Kalypso (2006) *“The European Union as a conflicted trade power”*, p.912

⁸ Gilardi (2008) p.80

This thesis is based on the assumption that the different main bodies of the EU – the European Parliament (EP), the Council of the European Union (hereinafter the Council) and the European Commission (hereinafter the Commission) - are assigned different tasks to protect and represent, and that this behaviour can be traced in the field of policy promotion. That is, if the assigned task of an institution is known it is also possible to predict its behaviour. According to role theory it is possible to do this, given that the context in which the institution operates is known. Hence, it is assumed that institutions have specific functions in a system, and that functions are tied to certain behaviour. In other words, behaviour of institutions can be predicted since certain behaviour is expected.⁹ Why institutions actually behave in certain ways can be explained through theories of institutionalism, which also may be used in order to explain why institutions take on different roles depending on the situation it is faced with.¹⁰ This thesis uses the theory mainly for the latter reason.

The study takes its starting point in that even though institutions belong to the same constellation, e.g. all bodies of the EU belongs to the EU, they have different interest bases and different formal tasks to fulfil and are therefore expected to perform their work according to these roles. The question is whether this applies on the matter of EU's external relations, and therefore the aim of this study is to explore the theoretical approach in the context of the EU's bodies' policy promotion and prioritization in the regions of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Eastern Partnership (EaP) countries. The basic assumptions made are that the EP is the representative of the European citizens,¹¹ the Council work for the national interests,¹² and that the Commission is the voice of the EU as a whole.¹³ Further it is assumed that they are expected to promote and prioritize policies in line with these different assigned interests and levels of concern.¹⁴ Thereby, this thesis sheds light on the EU's bodies in regard to their behaviour, and most importantly it analyzes the relation between expected and actual behaviour by comparing what the theoretical framework suggests with what the text in the studied documents expresses. Hence, it is a case of institutional behaviour that on the basis of role theory and institutionalism suggests institutions can behave differently towards different actors, and that this behaviour can be predicted.

⁹ Biddle, Bruce J. (2001) "Role Theory", p.2415

¹⁰ Hall, Peter A. "Historical Institutionalism in Rationalist and Sociological Perspective" in Mahoney, James; Thelen; Kathleen (2010) "Explaining Institutional Change – Ambiguity, Agency, and Power", New York; Cambridge University Press, p.204

¹¹ Bomberg Elizabeth, Peterson John, Stubb Alexander (2008) "The European Union: How Does it Work?", New York; Oxford University Press Inc., p.58

¹² Ibid. p.50

¹³ Bomberg, Peterson, Stubb (2008) p.46

¹⁴ Aggestam Lisbeth (2006) "Role theory and European foreign policy: a framework of analysis" in Elgström O., Smith M. (2006) "The European Union's Roles in International Politics – Concepts and analysis" (pp.11-29) Oxon; Routledge, p.20

1.1 Discussing and Defining the Research gap

The EU's policy promotion in external regions has in previous studies mainly been discussed as export of norms or values. This means for example that promoting democracy in fact is not only the promotion of a governmental system, but also promotion of certain values.¹⁵ Hence, that policies are built on several components, as explained more thoroughly in section 2.1.¹⁶ As such, policy promotion has so far been a concept of norms and values, and therefore it has been widely discussed whether the EU as a policy promoter is to be considered a normative power or not. Manners is the most prominent scholar in this field, critically discussing the EU's role on the international arena.¹⁷ His type of research however puts more focus on the EU as an actor as a whole, and the underlying meaning the EU's policy promotion and how that is received in external regions, rather than on the role of institutions when he argues that "*the EU is a normative power in world politics*" and hence that the EU promotes norms.¹⁸ The critique to Manners is that the promoted norms in fact are to be considered more as interests.¹⁹ The EU is not a state actor²⁰, but constructed by 27 MS and their individual interests, ultimately makes the bodies of the EU interest based. Meunier and Nicolaidis have also noted that the definition of values, interests and norms has been blurred over time, in accordance with the EU's increased activity in international matters.²¹ Therefore I argue that policy promotion also holds interests, not only norms and values. I argue that with the growing role on the international arena there are also growing expectations regarding to how the EU behaves, and that certain behaviour actually can be expected on the base of the bodies' roles.

Second, earlier research often focuses on the affects of policy promotion in targeted regions. Aggestam has conducted such a study on the subject of what the EU 'is' and what it actually 'does', in which she discusses that the EU's policy promotion has been more or less effective depending on the targeted region.²² This is indeed closely connected to this study, but with the important difference that this thesis will not measure or evaluate the actual effects of the policy promotion. Also in the field of policy promotion, studies tend to be conducted mostly among the MS of the EU, and come to the conclusion that promotion is not constant in all cases. For example, Reiche and Bechberger brings up that EU's policy promotion of sustainable development and renewable energies has varied across the EU's MS.²³ Their study shows that the policy promotion in the MS has relied on factors such as geographical

¹⁵ McFaul Michael (2004) "Democracy Promotion as a World Value", p.152

¹⁶ Powel Brieg Tomos (2009) "A clash of norms: normative power and EU democracy promotion in Tunisia", p.196

¹⁷ Manners (2008)

¹⁸ Ibid. p.46

¹⁹ Jorgensen Knud Erik (2006) "A multilateralist role for the EU?", in Elgström O., Smith M. (2006) "*The European Union's Roles in International Politics – Concepts and analysis*" (pp.30-46) Oxon; Routledge, p.37

²⁰ Ibid. p.36

²¹ Meunier, Nicolaidis (2006) p.912

²² Aggestam Lisbeth (2008)

²³ Reiche, Bechberger (2004)

location, culture, technical knowledge and international obligations.²⁴ This gives an indication that the institutions might not be coherent towards external actors and regions either, and that the action by the EU's bodies might rely on the preconditions in a region, hence if the region can offer anything of interest.

The distinction between 'promotion' and 'prioritization' is also lacking throughout previous research, which seems to highlight the promotion of policies rather than how they are prioritized. EU's policy promotion is widely discussed both regarding individual policies such as discussed by McFaul above²⁵, and more generally as noted through Manners' research²⁶. Policy prioritization occur more within policies, as for example how the EU prioritize different aspects of the enlargement policy.²⁷ I argue that policy promotion and prioritization should be studied beyond these borders. It is important to separate the two concepts promotion and prioritization. To promote something is defined as trying "*to make it happen, increase or become more popular*"²⁸, while someone's priorities are defined as "*tasks or things they consider to be the most important.*"²⁹ Hence, promoting a policy does not necessarily mean that one is prioritizing the same. This is the reason for the two-folded research question for the study, pinpointing both the EU's bodies' policy promotion, as well as their priorities.

Hence, there is no absolute lack of studies on the EU's bodies' promotion of policies. However none of this research actually highlights the EU's bodies' policy promotion behaviour in external regions, and most certainly not their prioritizations. This is where this thesis takes its starting point. As briefly noted earlier, the most prominent feature throughout previous research is that it tends to focus on deeper analysis of EU's promoted and prioritized policies individually, and therefore miss out on the greater notion of policy promotion. This study will not be analysing policies as such, but only if they are promotion and prioritized. It thereby contributes to the knowledge about how the institutions of the EU act in regions beyond its borders, while asking the question if the theoretically expected behaviour also is the actual behaviour of the EU's bodies in regards to external relations.

1.2 Aim and Research Question

This study is based on the theoretical assumption that all institutions are assigned different tasks, and therefore have different preferences. Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to explore this theory in the context of the EU. It will fill the research gap of what policy areas different

²⁴ Reiche, Bechberger (2004) p.843ff

²⁵ McFaul (2004)

²⁶ Manners (2008)

²⁷ Sjursen Helene (2002) "Why Expand?: The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU's Enlargement Policy"

²⁸ Collins Cobuild Student's Dictionary (1994) p.443

²⁹ Ibid. p.440

bodies of the EU – the EP, the Council and the Commission – promote and prioritize. In order to do this it will examine the bodies’ promotion and prioritization of policies in two different sets of countries, analyzing whether the expected outcome is the same as the actual. It is examined if the institutions individually are promoting and prioritizing differently or in accordance to the theoretical framework of roles and institutionalism. The research question is therefore stated as follow;

- What policies are promoted and prioritized by the main bodies of the EU, are all policies equally important to promote in all regions of the world, and are they promoted as strongly by all bodies of the EU, or do these bodies prioritize differently?

1.4 Disposition

The first following section (2) holds a description of the context in which the EU operates as a policy promoter, as well as a brief discussion of ‘policy promotion’ as a concept. The following part (3) holds the theoretical framework of role theory and institutionalism that the study is based on. Thereafter (4) the selected cases – the EaP and ASEAN - and the background for the EU’s cooperation with the two regions is explained and defined. The expectations of institutions are laid out and the characteristics and basics of institutions behaviour are explained. On the basis of this framework, the next section (5) holds the six hypotheses that are tested. The methodology section (6) contains detailed information on the study design and analytical framework, explaining the choices of conducting a qualitative text analysis through a basic data analysis (BDA). The chapter of results (7) holds the findings in the documents studied and are separated for each institution individually, while the analysis section (8) connects the finding to the theoretical framework. The conclusions (9) are summarized in the final part of this thesis, where suggestions on further research also are given.

2. Policy promotion, and the EU as a policy promoter

2.1 Policy promotion

The term ‘policy promotion’ is commonly used in research but is not defined and elaborated as often. Aiming at describing the EU’s policy promotion, it will here be explained how it should be understood further on in this thesis. As Gilardi described it; “*International policy promotion refers to cases where a given model is advocated by influential actors, and is ceremonially adopted to show that the appropriate policies have been put in place.*”³⁰ This describes the export of policies that are framed and developed by a powerful actor or organization, and put into force as such by the receiving actors. In this thesis it is the first part of Gilardi’s definition that becomes interesting, namely policies as given models constructed by actors. As such, the EU is promoting policies, i.e. their models, of how certain areas of concern are supposed to be. Then the receiving regions implement them under the supervision of the EU.

A policy can be considered a value, norm or interest, which is discussed above by Jorgensen, MacFaul and Manners. As brought up previously however, I argue that the true definition of a policy is that it is based on a combination of all three of these, but can ultimately be described as interests. I use the term ‘policy’ as something that consists of a number of components. For example, ‘democracy’ is a policy built on components such as the freedom of speech, free and fair elections, and the freedom of religion. Another example is that ‘human rights’ consists of the components of gender equality and the health of human beings. As such this thesis will trace the bodies’ promoted policies, by paying attention to the components of each policy. The policies chosen for this study are explained in detail in section 6.4.1.

Important to note is that not all promoted policies are “good” policies. I will not argue for whether the EU’s policies highlighted in this thesis are good or not, but settle with the fact that the EU aims to promote what one generally may consider as “good”. As stated in the introducing quote, that is for example policies on peace, security, human rights and sustainable development.³¹

³⁰ Gilardi (2008) p.80

³¹ Treaty of the European Union, (2012/C 326/01), Article 3(5)

2.2 The EU as a policy promoter

The EU has over time become a powerful actor in international politics, now being involved in partnership agreements in regions all over the world.³² From the founding of an economic cooperation, the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1958 to being transformed into a political Union later on in 1993³³, the role of the EU can be seen as ever growing. Its role as a policy promoter is discussed from different perspectives, as already noted above. Although EU is a supranational institution, it is run by its bodies³⁴ – e.g. the EP, the Council, and the Commission – consisting of politicians from the 27 MS that work on different interest bases. The bodies generally work as a team, but explicitly they do not work on promoting the same type of policies due to the different interest bases.³⁵ Being aware of these preconditions, I argue that certain expectations can be connected to each of the single bodies.

Every single one of the EU's partnership agreements comes with an action plan of what the cooperation includes and what it means, for all parties involved. Final action plans are combinations of each body's preparatory work, but each body also frame own plans. This indicates that the bodies also have different preferences of what policies to promote and prioritize. Also, the context of the partnership can possibly affect the behaviour, since preconditions have been concluded as an important factor in the policy promotion process previously.³⁶ That is, the preconditions in a region can explain how the bodies promote and prioritize policies. On the other hand, this could make it even easier and clearer to expect certain action from certain institutions.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Institutions and Institutionalism

In order to discuss how the EU's bodies act and behave, a more general description of institutions is in place. Institutions “*are comprised of regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life.*”³⁷ Building on these main elements means that institutions both are a necessity for society, as well as constituted by the same. Due to these characteristics they possess a lot of power to change behaviour of others. This includes supporting, guiding

³² Nugent Neil (2006) ”The Government and Politics of the European Union, Palgrave MacMillan,; Hampshire, p.485

³³ European Union, “*How the EU works*” <http://europa.eu/about-eu/> 2013-04-16

³⁴ Malone Linda (2008) “*International Law 2007*”, New York; Aspen Publishers, p.22

³⁵ ECG, the Association of European Vehicle logistics, “*European Institutions*”
<http://www.eurocartrans.org/Activities/EUAffairs/EuropeanInstitutions.aspx>
2013-04-16

³⁶ Reiche, Bechberger (2004) p.843ff

³⁷ Scott Richard W. (2008) “*Institutions and Organizations – Ideas and Interests*”, Thousand Oaks; Sage Publications, Inc., p.48

and empowering others to take certain action, as well as prohibit the same by providing stability in society.³⁸ Here, the EU is the actor taking action in form of promoting policies for change in ASEAN and the EaP. Further, institutions exist on different levels of society – domestic, national and supranational – to provide information, rules and services. This can be carried out through both formal and informal constellations in society.³⁹ In this study, the EU is defined as a formal supranational institution consisting of a number of bodies – i.e. the EP, the Council and the Commission.

Institutionalism is a theory that can explain the importance of institutions in regards to European integration⁴⁰, and hence may help provide an explanation for the behaviour of the EU's bodies. In the political sphere, it is important to note that it exist institutions with competing interests, i.e. that politics is an environment “*that generate independent interests and advantages and whose rules and procedures exert important effects on whatever business is being transacted.*”⁴¹ This means that the bodies of the EU have different interest bases, and that these interests can be different depending on the targeted region. This is in line with Hall's acknowledgement that it is important to be aware of “*when institutions should be seen as determinants of behaviour and when as objects of strategic action themselves*”⁴², meaning that institutions can change others but also be changed by others. This translates to that the three bodies of the EU in focus here have different approaches towards different receiving actors just because those actors are in need of different things, not just that the EU's bodies promote their interests for own gain. Hence why they can act differently towards different actors, in different situations.

3.2 Role Theory

Here, role theory sets the base for how the EU's bodies are expected to act in relation to different regions and policy areas. This theoretical approach evolves from sociological research and explains behavioural patterns of humans, and assumes that persons behave in certain ways depending on the social construction they are situated in. As put by Biddle: “*role theory concerns the tendency for human behaviours to form characteristic patterns that may be predicted if one knows the social context in which those behaviours appear.*”⁴³ In close connection to this, March and Olsen have defined a notion of such behaviour as ‘the logic of appropriateness’. It means that policy making is based on and driven by exemplary behaviour by institutions,⁴⁴ and to act in line with this is “*to proceed according to the institutionalized*

³⁸ Scott (2008) p.49f

³⁹ Furusten Staffan (2007) “*Den institutionella omvärlden*”, Malmö; Liber AB, p.46

⁴⁰ CIVITAS, Hatton Lucy (07/2011) “*Theories of European Integration*”

⁴¹ Scott Richard W. (2008) p.32

⁴² Hall (2010) p.204

⁴³ Biddle (2001) p.2415

⁴⁴ March James G., Olsen Johan P., “*The logic of appropriateness*” in Moran Michael, Rein Martin, Goodin Robert E. (2006) “*The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*”, New York; Oxford University Press Inc., p.689

practices of a collectivity, based on mutual, and often tactic understandings of what is (...) right, and good.”⁴⁵ Whether the bodies’ behaviour in the two regions is good or bad will however, as noted previously, not be evaluated. But March and Olsen points at what is stated in the introduction, that the EU aims at promoting what is commonly referred to as “good”.

There are multiple ways in which one can define ‘roles’, mainly as tied functions or as behaviours.⁴⁶ Actors aim to fulfil the imbedded rules of a role, mainly because the rules are seen as legitimate. When a role is put in a social context, institutions follow this ruled or expected path, but can also choose to act according to what is appropriate for them in a certain situation.⁴⁷ This means that institutions distribute resources in order to follow rules, as well as to adjust to the particular setting it is faced with.⁴⁸ Even though most often used in sociological research, the concept of roles can be widened and applied on all sorts of groups. As such, focus is on the EU’s bodies and their roles in ASEAN and the EaP in regard to this theory, as looking at behaviour in the context of imputed roles is one of the most general ways of studying role-taking.⁴⁹ ‘Roles’ are in this thesis defined as a mix of functions and behaviour, meaning that one assumes that the institutions are tied to a specific function in the EU’s political system, and that this function comes with a specific behaviour.

Expectations can be set in relation to what a certain role implies an institution to actually do, and pressure to carry out this action can come from both inside or outside the institution.⁵⁰ Applied on the EU this translates to that the EP, the Council and the Commission are injunctive to different and certain tasks individually, with pressure from both outside and inside the body to behave as expected when performing these tasks. Peters points specifically in this direction, explaining that both individual actors as well as institutions can adjust itself to the particular situation it is face with in order to benefit. It can for example be an incentive for the EU a to adjust the tactics of policy promotion when it is cooperating with possible future members of the EU.⁵¹

Even though roles come with certain expectations, taking on a role should not be seen as a mechanical process but is as discussed earlier, constructed through the social context in which it exists. In the process of defining a role, institutions therefore have the chance to shape and elaborate with its own role, at the same time as it is guided by surrounding expectations of

⁴⁵ March, Olsen (2006) p.690

⁴⁶ Biddle (2001) p.2416

⁴⁷ March, Olsen (2006) p.689

⁴⁸ Ibid. p.694

⁴⁹ Biddle Bruce J., Thomas Edwin J. (1979) “*Role Theory: Concepts and Research*”, New York; Robert E Krieger Publishing Company Inc., p.151

⁵⁰ Harnisch Sebastian, Frank Cornelia, Maull Hanns W. (2011) “*Role Theory in International Relations – Approaches and analyses*”, Oxon; Routledge, p.8

⁵¹ Peters B. Guy (2005) “*Institutional Theory in Political Science – The ‘New Institutionalism’*”, Hampshire; Ashford Colour Press Ltd, p.53

how to act and what to achieve.⁵² For the case of the EU, it should be noted that its bodies are working under different sorts of pressure. Agendas and agreements on what should be done are set under force of interests such as economic and social conditions as well as public opinion. The EP generally pressures the Commission to launch new incentives in response to citizens and the public opinion, while the Council is more driven by ideological means, and the Commission is driven mostly by obligations in treaties and legislation.⁵³ The fact that the bodies have different levels of society to represent should however not change the expectations of their work, but rather just strengthen that certain behaviour actually can be expected.

3.2.1 The European Parliament

The EP is the one body of the EU that is directly elected. Hence it is the voice and representation of the peoples of the EU.⁵⁴ The power of this institution is however widely discussed, since it cannot initiate legislation, and have very limited control over the EU's agenda in general.⁵⁵ On the basis of being chosen by the peoples of the MS, and therefore having close connections to these peoples, the EP is expected to prioritize policies especially concerning humanitarian issues, i.e. human rights and democracy. That is, that it promotes these policies in external regions as well as within the EU. This argument is strengthened by the EP's own formulation of its function and purpose; "*Human rights are among the main priorities of the European Parliament. Parliament is a key actor in the fight for democracy, freedom of speech, fair elections and the rights of the oppressed.*"⁵⁶

Though the power of the EP has strengthened over time, most of its influence still lies in the supervision role it always had over the Commission and the Council. This includes to question and examine decisions and proposals, as well as to raise debate on the same.⁵⁷ Also, there are some areas of decision-making where the EP has to be consulted and give its approval. This regards for example the accession of new MS, and decisions that affects the rights of residence for citizens of the EU.⁵⁸ Once again, the EP's task to protect the peoples within the EU comes through.

⁵² Jorgensen (2006) p.5

⁵³ MacCormick John (2011) "European Union Politics", London; Palgrave Macmillian, p.312f

⁵⁴ European Parliament, "European Parliament" <http://europa.eu/about-eu/institutions-bodies/european-parliament/> 2013-05-20

⁵⁵ Bomberg, Peterson, Stubb (2008) p.58

⁵⁶ European Parliament, About Parliament, "*Human rights and democracy*" <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/0039c6d1f9/Human-rights.html> 2013-03-11

⁵⁷ Bomberg, Peterson, Stubb (2008) p.59

⁵⁸ El-Agraa, Ali M. (2011) "*The European Union – Economics and Policies*", Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, p.46

3.2.2 The Council of the European Union

The Council consists of ministers from all policy areas of the EU, from each of the 27 MS, and works as the member governments do.⁵⁹ They meet in different groups in regards to the topic that is discussed, which make the Council a very complex and multi-levelled institution. For example, in matters of external relations the foreign ministers are brought together in the General Affairs and External Relations Council (GAERC). The Council adopts EU legislation in co-decision with the EP, but it differs from the EP in the sense that it represents the citizens in other matters than that of the EP, and represents interests of national governments.⁶⁰ It should however be noted that the governments are elected bodies as well, by the people of each MS. The task of the Council though implies that it is interested in promoting some policies more heavily than the other two institutions in this study – good governance and trade, i.e. to cooperate with countries that the EU can have a beneficial trade relation with. Hence also implying that the Council's behaviour towards the EaP and ASEAN might not be the same.

3.2.3 The European Commission

The Commission consists of one, or maximum two Commissioners from each of the MS.⁶¹ There is a set of important tasks that this body is injunctive to and can do. Among these are to initiate policies, guard the Treaties, and lead negotiations on international trade. This makes it very powerful, and it does not really have a counterpart to compare with on national level, but it represents and protects the interest of the EU itself.⁶² As mentioned the Commission has the power to propose new policies, although they have to be adopted by the College before put into action, the College only is a higher body of the Commission.⁶³ Again, the Commission is a very powerful actor, since it can actually decide what policies there are to handle and work with in the first place.

In order not only to consider national interests but to be the voice of the EU as a whole, yet another set of promoted and prioritized policies is suggested. It is expected that policies and values that make the EU an exporter of “good” values are promoted, e.g. policies on sustainable development, democracy and economic development. However, to be the voice of the EU should mean that all policies are promoted to some extent, but maybe not equally, i.e. that some policies are prioritized over others. Again, this implies a variation of prioritization in the two studied regions.

⁵⁹ Wallace Helen, Wallace William, Pollack Mark A. (2005) *“Policy-Making in the European Union”*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, p.60

⁶⁰ Bomberg, Peterson, Stubb (2008) p.50f

⁶¹ European Parliament (2013) Fact sheet, *“The European Commission”*, p.1

⁶² Bomberg, Peterson, Stubb (2008) p.46

⁶³ Ibid. p.46

3.3 Summary

The three bodies in focus are expected to promote and prioritize different policies. The EP is the representative of the EU's citizens, promoting policies on human rights. The Council represents the national interests, in which policies as good governance and trade are in focus. Finally, the Commission is the voice of the EU as a whole, and is thereby expected to put forward policies on topics that make the EU a forerunner in the world, e.g. sustainable development. The following table provides a summary:

Table 1. Expected policy promotion and prioritization by the EU's bodies.

Institution	Level of concern	Expected policies of concern	Expected promotion and priority of policies
EP	People/Citizens	Human rights Democracy	Same in all cases and regions, at all times.
Council	Countries/MS	Trade Good governance	Depending on the targeted region.
Commission	EU	Sustainable development Economic development Trade Democracy	Promotion of all policies at all times, but difference in priority depending on the targeted region.

4. Defining the cases

The cases chosen for this study are the EaP and ASEAN, based on that different behaviour can be expected from the bodies in these two regions. As discussed about institutions, different behaviour can be expected from one body in different cases. Here, this is expected since the countries included in the EaP are close neighbours to the EU, and possible future MS of the EU. ASEAN on the other hand, does not include such countries but may be interesting to the EU for other reasons, e.g. trade agreements. This is the most important argument for the case selection, and also why it is possible that a difference of interest and policy promotion as well as of prioritization might occur in this study – European integration of Eastern European countries on one side, and an interesting trading partner on the other.

4.1 ASEAN

ASEAN is a cooperation of countries founded by the Foreign Ministers of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand in 1967.⁶⁴ It has grown over the years and today it consist of five additional countries – Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam.⁶⁵ The aims of ASEAN are stated in seven points, and can overall be concluded to enhanced economic growth and deepen relations in the social and culture fields. The purpose is to promote Southeast Asia in the world while maintaining good relations with

⁶⁴ ASEAN, "History" <http://www.asean.org/asean/about-asean/history> 2013-02-27

⁶⁵ ASEAN, "ASEAN Member States" <http://www.asean.org/asean/asean-member-states> 2013-02-27

external actors, as well as continuing to develop the internal relations.⁶⁶ ASEAN is established through the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia Indonesia of 24 February 1976, in which article 2 of the first chapter states the main principles of the foundation, among them: “*Mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all nations*”.⁶⁷

The EU and ASEAN now have close to 40 years of relations to look back on, as the two became official partners in 1972 through the EEC. The specific objectives for the EU’s relationship with ASEAN are the following:

- “*to promote peace, regional stability and security through bilateral and multinational channels;*
- *to strengthen trade and investment relations;*
- *to support the development of the less prosperous countries;*
- *to promote human rights, democratic principles and good governance;*
- *to cooperate in combating transnational crime and terrorism;*
- *to bring together peoples and cultures.*”⁶⁸

4.2. The EaP

In 2009, the EU confirmed a new cooperation with Eastern European countries – the EaP - to be the Eastern dimension of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and to build even closer relations to the countries who are not yet members of the EU.⁶⁹ The EaP involves Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. The EU’s aim is to deepen the free trade agreements, but also to integrate these countries in the EU economy:⁷⁰ “*the EU’s interest – of all its Member States alike – are tightly bound up with developments in the countries on its eastern border.*”⁷¹ Through the EU’s joint declaration on the EaP, the involved countries agreed “*the establishment of the Eastern Partnership will advance the cause of democracy, strengthen stability and prosperity, bringing lasting and palpable benefits to citizens of all participating countries.*”⁷²

As mentioned, the EaP is a relatively new partnership between the EU and six Eastern European countries. The objectives for this region cover all of the countries, however they are

⁶⁶ ASEAN, “*Overview*” <http://www.asean.org/asean/about-asean/overview> 2013-02-27

⁶⁷ Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia Indonesia of 24 February 1976, Article 2a

⁶⁸ European Parliament, Nuttin Xavier (2011) Fact sheet, “*The association of South East Asian Nations*”, p.1

⁶⁹ European Union, Development and Cooperation (2012) “*EU cooperation for a successful Eastern partnership*”, p.2

⁷⁰ European Union External Action (EEAS), “*Eastern Partnership*” http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/index_en.htm 2013-03-04

⁷¹ Ferrero-Waldner Benita, Commissioner for External relations and European Neighbourhood Policy (2009) “*Eastern Partnership – An ambitious project for 21st century European foreign policy*”, p.1

⁷² Council of the European Union, Press release 8435/09 (Presse 78), “*Joint Declaration of the Prague Eastern Partnership Summit*”, Prague, 7 May 2009, p.11

mostly laid out for three of them – South Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia) - and are the following:

- “to stimulate the countries of the region to carry out political and economic reforms,
- support intra-regional cooperation,
- develop the countries’ relation with the EU and contribute to the settlement of conflicts and facilitate implementation of such settlement.”⁷³

5. Hypotheses and Analytical framework

The theoretical framework suggests specific areas of interest for each of the three bodies, and also that their behaviour could vary depending on the targeted region. This means that the bodies may behave different in the EaP and ASEAN, and hence different hypotheses for each region are set up. In line with the theoretical framework, six hypothesisises will be tested in order to answer the research question. They are stated as follow:

H1: The European Parliament promotes and prioritizes human rights and democracy in the case of ASEAN.

H2: The European Parliament promotes and prioritizes human rights and democracy in the case of the EaP.

H3: The Council promotes policies on trade and good governance, but prioritizes policies on trade in the case of ASEAN.

H4: The Council promotes policies on trade and good governance, but prioritizes policies on good governance in the case of the EaP.

H5: The Commission promotes policies on sustainable development, economic development, democracy and trade, but prioritizes policies on trade and economic development in the case of ASEAN.

H6: The Commission promotes policies on sustainable development, economic development, democracy and trade, but prioritizes policies on sustainable development and democracy in the case of the EaP.

The EP has an identical set of hypotheses for both cases, based on theory and its background that emphasize the citizens’ well-being in all cases, not depending on the targeted region. The Council is expected to prioritize trade in ASEAN, and good governance in the EaP, since the good governance is assumed to be more in line with the EU’s interest for new MS. Finally, as protector of the EU’s common good the Commission is expected to promote several policies

⁷³ European Parliament, Sourander Dag (2013) “*The South Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia)*“, p.1

in both regions, but for the same reasons as for the Council’s priorities, the Commission’s prioritized policies are different in the two regions.

The theoretical framework along with the hypotheses in this section generates the following two tables:

Table 2. Expectation of promoted and prioritized policies by the EU’s bodies in ASEAN.

Institution	Level of concern	Expectation of promoted policies	Expectation of prioritized policies
EP	People/Citizens	Human rights Democracy	Human rights Democracy
Council	Countries/MS	Trade Good governance	Trade
Commission	EU	Sustainable development Economic development Trade Democracy	Economic development Trade

Table 2.1. Expectation of promoted and prioritized policies by the EU’s bodies in the EaP.

Institution	Level of concern	Expectation of promoted policies	Expectation of prioritized policies
EP	People/Citizens	Human rights Democracy	Human rights Democracy
Council	Countries/MS	Trade Good governance	Good governance
Commission	EU	Sustainable development Economic development Trade Democracy	Sustainable development Democracy

6. Methodology

6.1 Case selection

The theoretical framework is tested through analysis of the EU’s bodies’ expressed will of action in two regions. Again, theory suggests that institutions can prioritize different interests depending on what they want to achieve, and it also noted that role-taking is often studied in the context of a given role.⁷⁴ Hence, two regions where the role of the institutions is clearly laid out, and promotion and prioritization therefore can be studied are selected as cases for this study. Theory have also specifically highlighted that the bodies may prioritize policies differently or in accordance with their own interests in countries that are possible future MS

⁷⁴ Biddle (1979) p.151

of the EU, and those who are not.⁷⁵ Therefore, different behaviour is expected, as previously discussed in section 4.

The timeframe for this thesis is based on the time for which the two regions have been partners with the EU. The EU-ASEAN partnership was launched in 1972, however the EaP was launched first in 2009. In order to collect information on the same years, the timeframe for the study is therefore limited from 2007 to 2013. The starting year is based on being before the EaP was established in order to be able to study preparatory work leading to the strategic plan for the region, but also being the starting point for the EU's joint actions plans regarding the targeted regions in this study. Studying the same time period for both regions provides a more credible and reliable result, and also makes them comparable.

The fact that the two partnerships has been going on for a different amount of years could impact the result in such a way that the bodies' policy promotion and prioritization has changed over the years, meaning that one cannot simply rely on the basic assumptions that has been made for this thesis. However, these possible variations of results have been considered having such little impact that the study should not suffer. That is, drawing on the theoretical framework, the expectations on each institution are still relevant and not depending on when they are tested.

6.2 Study Design

The case here is defined as regions in partnership with the EU, and the phenomenon in focus is policy promotion and prioritization in regions outside the EU. This makes the units of analysis as the cases of ASEAN and EaP. In order to explore the expected behaviour of EU's bodies this study is a comparative multiple case study carried out with a deductive and qualitative approach, with features of quantitative character. It does not build new theories but is testing existing theories - role theory and institutionalism. The theories are the base on which the cases are explored and analysed, for one to be able to conclude anything about the roles of EU's bodies in partnership regions. As such, it is clear that this type of study provides a connection between theory and social research.⁷⁶

The study design helps making a general example of how the EU is working with policy promotion in partnership regions, but also to deepen the analysis to specific cases. The choice of a qualitative approach also goes in line with this argument and the aim of the study. The features of a quantitative approach are shown in the choice of using a BDA as analytical tool. This methodology brings attention to the frequency and prioritization of policies.⁷⁷ Therefore,

⁷⁵ Peters (2005) p.53

⁷⁶ Bryman Alan (2006) "*Social research methods*", Oxford; Oxford University Press, p.9

⁷⁷ Hardy Melissa, Bryman Alan (2009) "*The Handbook of Data Analysis*", London; SAGE Publications Ltd., p.8

this study cannot simply be labelled as qualitative, but has elements of quantitative methodology. Mixed method strengthens the study because it enforces arguments and highlights issues from more perspectives than one.⁷⁸

6.3 Text analysis and Materials

The starting point for this thesis is taken in previous theoretical research in the field of institutionalism and the roles of political institutions. For the background and the possibility to map expectations of the institutions, previous research articles and fact sheets by other authors are used. For the analysis, focus is on documents written and published by the EU's institutions. These documents are first and foremost joint action plans for the two specific regions, but also the institutions' preparatory work that preceded these plans. The preparatory work documents will help specify the individual statement of each body within the EU, while the action plan gives the final version of what policies the EU actually will focus on in the two sets of countries.

6.4 Basic Data Analysis (BDA)

The texts are analysed through a BDA. This means that the analytical framework is based on the theoretical framework and previous research provided above. This type of method is based on the content of texts and relies on the frequency of coded data, i.e. how often or how many times a particular characteristic appears in the text. In order to decide what categories to choose for coding, one may for example derive features that are appearing in the relevant documents.⁷⁹ Here, the set of characteristics are policies that the EU promotes to external regions. The content of the documents will be coded with letters A through R. For example: if the EP writes something on the topic of human rights this will be coded as 'A', as shown in the charts provided in section 6.4.1. The section also provides tables with codes and characteristics for the two cases. This type of coding and analytical framework makes it possible to see if the bodies are promoting the expected policies, and also what policies they prioritize.

The second part of answering the research question concerns the bodies' prioritization of policies. Since the theoretical framework not only suggests that policies occur more or less often in various cases, but also that they can be prioritized differently depending on the case, this is paid attention to in the analysis. It is noted how much focus a certain policy gets in the documents, where in the text it is mentioned and of course whether policies are mentioned at all. For example, a policy will be considered prioritized if it is mentioned early in a document, and if great amount of text is written on it. If several of the same code is found in beginning

⁷⁸ Bryman (2006) p.9

⁷⁹ Hardy, Bryman (2009) p.8

of documents, this of course strengthens that it is actually prioritized and not only mentioned. This highlights that even though policies may be promoted, they may not be prioritized. In the analysis, it is therefore also discussed whether a policy is more or less prioritized. The final version of the chart marks the prioritized policies with an ‘X’. The results are presented in the order in which they appear in the documents, which makes it possible to see if they are of such priority that they occur first in documents.

6.4.1 Codes and Characteristics

The analytical framework for each region is provided in the two charters below, which holds the same set of codes and characteristics. The characteristics are extracted from the theoretical framework, and are stated here along with an explanation for how they will be interpreted:

- *Human rights*: All areas regarding the wellbeing of citizens are included. This includes matters concerning the public health. Socio-economic development, and social stability is also coded as human rights.
- *Democracy*: This characteristic is separated from the human rights characteristic. In regard to democracy, texts on concepts such as ‘democracy promotion’ are valuable to the study. This includes freedom of politics, free elections and press.
- *Sustainable development*: Here, all text that highlights environmental issues, such as mitigation of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and energy is included. To simplify, it concerns the wellbeing of the planet and all the work conducted for that purpose.
- *Economic development*: This is a wide framework, in which trade can be included. However, in this study the two are separated. Texts are coded as ‘economic development’ at any time that they emphasize issues as economic growth, for example industry and work opportunities. Promoting anti-corruption is a further example of economic development.
- *Trade*: All texts concerning trade are included in this policy, which means that no attention is paid to what kind of trade that is referred to.
- *Good governance*: Text is coded in regards to this policy whenever it is about well-managing policies or action, and governance reforms for the better.

The two tables below show how the documents are coded.

Table 3. Characteristics and codes for the EU’s bodies’ promoted policies in ASEAN.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Institution						
EP	A	B	C	D	E	F
Council	G	H	I	J	K	L
Commission	M	N	O	P	Q	R

Table 3.1 Characteristics and codes for the EU's bodies' promoted policies in the EaP.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Institution						
EP	A	B	C	D	E	F
Council	G	H	I	J	K	L
Commission	M	N	O	P	Q	R

The analysis is based on the findings provided by the charts. That is, characteristics and cases are discussed individually, but are also compared with each other. The distinction between just mentioned or actually promoted characteristics has been crucial. The result provides examples for both, but only text that indicates promotion is coded. An example here is if the bodies write about “the implementation” or “deepening” of a characteristic. If no indication of such effort is evident, characteristics are only considered as mentioned and are not be coded. Further, only after texts have been coded it has been possible to determine whether each hypothesis individually is corroborated or rejected. The decision is made on the base of the following: if texts from the studied documents are coded in accordance with the expected policies, the hypothesis is corroborated. If majority of the codes does not match the expectations on the other hand, the hypothesis is rejected. This goes also for the second part of the question, which concerns prioritization. Important to note is though that this means that all hypotheses can be partly corroborated or rejected, since they are two-folded.

A policy is recognized as promoted if it is mentioned at all, however the frequency of which the policies has been promoted opens up for discussion and analysis of why they are more or less promoted. This should not be confused with prioritizing a policy however. A policy with a total score of more codes than another policy is more promoted, but maybe not of higher priority. The task of determine if a policy is to be considered as prioritized is however more ambiguous to measure. It should be noted that a policy can be considered as prioritized if it is mentioned repeatedly throughout a document, even though it might not be mentioned first in every document. However, this thesis considers first and foremost the placement as well as the amount of text provided for each policy. Over all, the results and assessment for corroboration or rejection of the hypotheses is based on the methodological choices, hence how a BDA function. The codes has been compared to the hypotheses stated earlier, and thereafter discussed according to the theoretical framework in order to conclude whether the outcome of this study is in line with what previous research has found.

6.5 External validity, reliability and ethics

This study is not conducted through interviews, which immediately helps to reduce problems of ethics that might occur by the use of such material.⁸⁰ To do a proper analysis of the material that this study is based on means to keep an objective distance to the material. That is to consider who wrote it, the context in which it was written, and for what purpose it has been conducted. These aspects fall under the category of being intersubjective, which is also important in order for the study to be externally valid.⁸¹ If the findings and results of this study would be replicated later on, it means a high degree of external reliability.⁸² The result may however vary if other characteristics, or policies, are put to the test. With the issues of credibility and validity in mind, this of course also raises the question of whether the chosen cases for this study are representative for the field of research that this thesis aims to contribute to. Findings in one case does not always have to be true for other cases of the same type, but it is also important to highlight the opposite – that they just as well might be true in all cases.⁸³ The material has been double checked and recoded, in order to prevent that something has been missed out. Again, the possibility of reproduction strengthens the reliability of the study.⁸⁴

7. Results

7.1 The European Parliament

7.1.1 The EP and ASEAN

According to the EP, there are several issues that the EU has to deal with in regard to ASEAN. First, “*the EP continuously emphasizes the need to restore the democratic process (...) and to release all political prisoners*”⁸⁵ (B,A), and that the EP have worked on “*political reforms notably involving the abolition of the death penalty and the end to religious persecution*.”⁸⁶ (A) In 2008, the Parliament also “*adopted a resolution on Trade and to political and economic relations with ASEAN that supports an ambitious trade agreement that would greatly benefit both sides*”.⁸⁷ (E) When the EP gives its points on the Commissions’ draft of the Asia strategy for 2007-2013, it marks that the Commission has taken on a too big task in supporting a “*possible ASEAN-EU Free Trade Agreement*

⁸⁰ Marshall Cathrine, Rossman Gretchen M. (2011) “*Designing Qualitative Research*”, London; SAGE Publications, Inc. p.154

⁸¹ Ibid. p.251

⁸² Bryman (2006) p.376

⁸³ Ibid. p.55

⁸⁴ Bryman (2006) p.376

⁸⁵ European Parliament, Nuttin Xavier (2011) Fact sheet, “*The association of South East Asian Nations*”, p.4

⁸⁶ Ibid. p.4

⁸⁷ European Parliament, Nuttin (2011) p.4

negotiations and implementation".⁸⁸ This also goes for other points that the Commission has proposed. Therefore, the EP calls on the Commission to withdraw the programme for Asia.⁸⁹

After the Strategy Plan was established, the EP divided the evaluations of the cooperation in separate documents even though they contain traces of all policies anyway. In a report from 2008 on the topic of trade and economic development in ASEAN, the EP acknowledge that one must be aware of that "*the ASEAN countries have different economic profiles*", but that the cooperation between the EU and ASEAN "*could produce substantial economic advantages for both parties*".⁹⁰ The EP stress the importance of "*strengthening regional economic integration*"⁹¹ (D) in ASEAN, but is at the same time eager to make sure that this is done in a proper way, meaning that the EU-ASEAN cooperation will "*ensure transparency and effective rules for public procurement, competition and investment [and] simplified bureaucratic procedures*".⁹² (F) On the track of developing the economic conditions the EP also wants the Commission to be careful and respectful of the countries rights to regulate their own activity since they can "*play a key role in preserving cultural diversity*". (A) Trade and economics further also concerns wellbeing of the citizens in the region, which the EP highlights by stressing "*the importance of compliance with hygiene and health rules in the fishing industry*"⁹³ (A), as well as wanting "*the Union and ASEAN to enhance cooperation in combating human trafficking [and] sex-tourism*".⁹⁴ (A)

Continuing on the track of trade and economics the EP also address the importance of recognizing "*the prevention of and recovery following natural disasters*" (C) as well as "*the development of transport infrastructure for energy products*".⁹⁵ (C) Hence, the EP "*consider an ambitious sustainable development chapter to be an essential part of any agreement and emphasises that the enforcement of those agreed standards is essential*"⁹⁶ (C) in the case of ASEAN. Also, the solving of this sort of problems could "*improve labour standards*".⁹⁷ (A) Following this, the EP suggests "*that a mechanism be established whereby recognised workers' and employers' organisations should be able to submit requests for action (...) in order to maintain pressure against violations of workers' rights*".⁹⁸ (A)

⁸⁸ European Parliament, (P6_TA(2007)0280), Multiannual Indicative Programme for Asia, "*European Parliament resolution of 21 June 2007 on the draft Commission decision establishing a regional Strategy Document 2007-2013 and a Multiannual Indicative Programme for Asia*", p.2

⁸⁹ Ibid. p.2f

⁹⁰ European Parliament, Committee on International Trade (A6-0151/2008) "*Report on trade and economic relations with the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)*", p.4

⁹¹ Ibid. p.5

⁹² European Parliament, Committee on International Trade (A6-0151/2008) p.5

⁹³ Ibid. p.6

⁹⁴ European Parliament, Committee on International Trade (A6-0151/2008) p.6

⁹⁵ Ibid. p.6f

⁹⁶ European Parliament, Committee on International Trade (A6-0151/2008) p.7

⁹⁷ Ibid. p.8

⁹⁸ European Parliament, Committee on International Trade (A6-0151/2008) p.8

Finally, the EP again notes that developing the economic cooperation between the EU and ASEAN will be the key to solving many other issues: *“to step up economic and trade relations between the Union and ASEAN will help to consolidate overall relations between the two regions and encourage further progress regarding political cooperation and security, the advancement of democracy and human rights, further progress in the field of energy/climate change and the environment, in the socio-cultural field and in the area of cooperation and development”*.⁹⁹ (D,E,B,A,C,A) And as a final point of the document, the EP *“recalls that human rights and democracy are core EU values and demands that they form an integral part of the negotiations with ASEAN”*.¹⁰⁰ (A,B)

In a separate document the Directorate-General (DG) for external policies have evaluated the work for human rights, and stated the EP:s role in regard to this in ASEAN.¹⁰¹ First, the parliamentarians of the EP have been *“highlighting the call for democracy”* (B) in this region of the world.¹⁰² Second, various committees are working on different issues that the EP has in focus: *“human rights issues [and] protection and promotion of the rights of migrant workers in the ASEAN; and action against illicit drugs”*.¹⁰³ (A) On the track of this, questions of family conditions and equality between man and women are also raised - *“increasing opportunities for women as family income earners”*.¹⁰⁴ (A) And finally, an overall goal not only for the EU-ASEAN cooperation, but for many regions that the EP work with – an *“integrated water resource management for sustainable development”*.¹⁰⁵ (C)

Table 4. The EP’s promoted and prioritized policies in ASEAN.

Policy area \ Institution	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Promotion	A (12)	B (4)	C (5)	D (2)	E (2)	F (1)
Prioritization	X					

7.1.2 The EP and the EaP

In the EaP, especially the South Caucasus, the EP supports the policies that the EU has taken on towards the region but also *“calls for greater EU activity to encourage development of the three countries towards open, stable and democratic countries enjoying peace, stability and prosperity.”* (B) It is expressed that the EU as a whole should consider developing a strategy

⁹⁹ European Parliament, Committee on International Trade (A6-0151/2008) p.9

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. p.9

¹⁰¹ European Parliament, Directorate-General for external policies (2012) *“Development of the ASEAN human rights mechanism”*

¹⁰² European Parliament, Directorate-General for external policies (2012) p.16

¹⁰³ Ibid. p.16

¹⁰⁴ European Parliament, Directorate-General for external policies (2012) p.16

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. p.16

to be able to integrate European policy into these countries. Considering the conflicts that are ongoing in the area, namely the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, the EP is working for the parties to “*recognise the rights of those who fled their homes*” (A).¹⁰⁶ In the EP’s resolution on the need for an EU strategy for the South Caucasus¹⁰⁷, it is highlighted “*that democratisation, good governance, political pluralism, the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms*” (B,F,A) are highly valued for EU’s future cooperation with in this region.¹⁰⁸

In the EP:s review of the ENP, it is clear that the it wants to continue to push the deepening of fundamental freedoms and policies in the EaP. The EP stress the platforms on which the cooperation is build should continue to develop; “*democracy, good governance and stability; economic integration and convergence with EU policies; environment, climate change and energy security; and contacts between people*”.¹⁰⁹ (B,F,C) Then it emphasize the importance of building the partnership on a stable base, meaning that the strengthening of the citizens’ situation is crucial for the continued functioning of the EaP: “*The EU should promote and significantly strengthen a bottom-up approach, increasing its economic support to civil societies and promoting freedom of the press and freedom of assembly in order to sustain the democratisation processes, which are a precondition for long-term stabilisation*”.¹¹⁰ (B) By this, the EP also notes that the role of the whole of the EU first and foremost is to respect and help support the reforms that the EaP countries are going through, and also that the preconditions may not be the same for all of these countries. The EP calls for both the Commission and the Council to recognise the individual potential and goals for each country. In connection to this, it also calls for the recognition of fundamental values; “*democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, independence of the judiciary, combating corruption [and] upholding media freedoms*”.¹¹¹ (B,A,D)

The EP continues throughout the document to stress the importance of the functioning of the society, to make the EU-EaP cooperation function properly. This includes “*combating corruption, in particular in the judiciary and the police (...) stepping up people-to-people programmes [and to keep an] active dialogue with civil society*”.¹¹² (D,F) It emphasize that the fundamental freedoms of the citizens are among the most important preconditions for these countries if they are ever going to continue towards a EU membership. Hence, as long as problems that “*regards freedom of expression, especially in the media, and freedom of association and assembly, and that the space available to civil society actors*” (A) stays

¹⁰⁶ European Parliament, Sourander Dag (2013) p.4

¹⁰⁷ European Parliament, P7_TA(2010)0193 ”*The need for an EU strategy for the South Caucasus*”, European Parliament resolution of 20 May 2010 on the need for an EU strategy for the South Caucasus, 2009(2216(INI)

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. Article 18

¹⁰⁹ European Parliament, P7_TA(2010)0193, p.2

¹¹⁰ Ibid. p.3

¹¹¹ European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153, p.4

¹¹² Ibid. p.5

unresolved everything else will be troublesome as well.¹¹³ Therefore, the EP calls for the Commission to lead the way for these countries “to support them with a view to strengthening local democracy and local governance”.¹¹⁴ (B,F) As a part of this development, “the importance of trade unions and social dialogue” (E) are stressed features.¹¹⁵ The EP notes “closer economic integration can be a powerful agent for social and political change.”¹¹⁶ (D)

For a successful EU-EaP cooperation the EP also calls for a better and more effective framework for the mobility of citizens, i.e. visa liberalisation.¹¹⁷ But even if the EP repeatedly throughout the document calls for this sort of cooperation, it is also stressed that it is “necessary to step up energy cooperation, energy efficiency and the promotion of renewable energy” (C) as a part of deepening the partnership.¹¹⁸ However reaching the final part of the document, the EP again stress the wellbeing of the citizens over all.¹¹⁹ On this issue, the EP “expresses concern at the fact that forcibly displaced persons (both refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs)) are still being denied their rights” (A), and strongly encourage the EU’s MS to continue their work on this point.¹²⁰ The EP finish off by stating its own role in the process of developing not only the EaP but all partnership regions: “fostering political debate and in enhancing freedom an democracy in the neighbouring partner countries”.¹²¹ (B)

Table 4.1 The EP’s promoted and prioritized policies in the EaP.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Institution						
EP promotion	A (5)	B (7)	C (2)	D (3)	E (1)	F (4)
EP prioritization	X	X				

¹¹³ European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153, p.6

¹¹⁴ Ibid. p.6

¹¹⁵ European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153, p.6

¹¹⁶ Ibid. p.7

¹¹⁷ European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153, p.7

¹¹⁸ Ibid. p.8

¹¹⁹ European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153p.9

¹²⁰ Ibid. p.10

¹²¹ European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153, p.11

7.2 The Council

7.2.1 The Council and ASEAN

In the declaration on EU-ASEAN Enhanced Partnership from 2007, the Council highlight the continuous promotion of “*sustainable peace, security and prosperity*.”¹²² It is satisfied with the way the partnership has developed since the establishment in 1976, noting that the cooperation now goes beyond the previously mentioned policies and also means promotion of “*economic and trade, social and cultural and development cooperation*”.¹²³ (J,K) For strengthening the EU-ASEAN relations the Council will promote “*universal values of justice, democracy, human rights, good governance, anti-corruption, the rule of law [and] social equality*.”¹²⁴ (H,G,L,J,G) Here, the “*protection of human rights*” (G) is emphasized as an important step in deepening the cooperation from an international perspective.¹²⁵

Three more specific areas of cooperation are brought up in the declaration, of which the first is on politics and security. Here the Council focus on building a better world on the basis of the “*political, human, social and economic dimension*” (G,J) especially highlighting the protection of human beings.¹²⁶ The second area of concern is in regard to economics, where both economic development and trade are important for the EU in ASEAN – by strengthening the “*frameworks regarding regional and international trade and economy*” (K,J) - in order to “*ensure equitable benefits from globalisation and economic liberalisation*”.¹²⁷ (J) Also, the Council wants to “*create a conducive environment for more trade, investment and other economic activities between the EU and ASEAN*.”¹²⁸ (K,J)

The third following part of the Council’s declaration holds an extensive text regarding the cooperation on issues of energy security and the environment. It highlights that one through the EU-ASEAN partnership will “*promote energy security [and] sustainable energy (...) building in renewable energies and energy efficiency so as to ensure energy security and energy for sustainable development*.”¹²⁹ (I) In the field of these kind of issues, the most prominent and clear declaration in the text comes next: “*Strengthen cooperation between the EU and ASEAN in the field of climate change, in particular reducing greenhouse gas emissions*.”¹³⁰ (I) Fourth, the Council declare the importance of promoting and cooperating on socio-cultural issues, which concerns aspects that the citizens in the EU-ASEAN cooperation

¹²² Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), “*Nuremberg Declaration on an EU-ASEAN Enhanced Partnership*”, Nuremberg 15 March 2007, p.1

¹²³ Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), p.1

¹²⁴ Ibid. p.2

¹²⁵ Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), p.2

¹²⁶ Ibid. p.3

¹²⁷ Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), p.4

¹²⁸ Ibid. p.4

¹²⁹ Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), p.5

¹³⁰ Ibid. p.5

are involved in. The promotion regard “*efforts in nurturing human, cultural and natural resources for sustainable development [and to] promote people-to-people contacts.*”¹³¹ (I,G)

Following the Nuremberg Declaration for the 2007-2012 cooperation between the EU and ASEAN, the Council met in 2010 to resolve on the importance of an enhanced cooperation between the two parties.¹³² The Ministers “*reaffirmed their shared desire to promote political stability and security, economic progress, justice, democracy, human rights, good governance, the rule of law and social equality, peace, and sustainable development*” (J,H,G,L,G,I), to thereby emphasize the importance of the EU’s continued support in the region.¹³³ They are positive towards ASEAN’s economic progress and that the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) has been fully implemented. On this track, the EU will also help improving the infrastructure in order to ease the communications.¹³⁴ Further, “*the Ministers agreed to strengthen mutual cooperation promoting and protecting human rights*”.¹³⁵ (G) The Council is especially targeting Myanmar in this regard, where the it wants to “*make the forthcoming elections a credible, transparent, democratic and inclusive process*”¹³⁶, (H) but calls for more “*effective global governance*” (L) over all in ASEAN.¹³⁷ More support in this area would be beneficial for both parties according to the document, in which “*the Ministers agreed that by promoting trade, investment and financial links between ASEAN and the EU, growth and prosperity would be enhanced in both regions*”, with the Free Trade Areas (FTA) in mind.¹³⁸ (K,J) Finishing this section of the document, the Council give their support for “*promoting Inter-religious and Intercultural Dialogue, Understanding and Cooperation for Peace*”.¹³⁹ (G)

The next section concern peace, security and stability, but also the environment where the Ministers call for “*banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.*”¹⁴⁰ (I) This introduces the next section in which ASEAN countries are encouraged to fight terrorism and “*enhance human security*”.¹⁴¹ Here, the Council emphasize the importance of a functioning and stable EU-ASEAN cooperation, since ASEAN is an important actor on the growing international arena – “*The Ministers resolved to contribute to reform the global economic and financial architecture in order to safeguard the*

¹³¹ Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), p.6

¹³² Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), “*18th ASEAN-EU Ministerial Meeting Co-Chair’s Statement*”

¹³³ Ibid. p.2

¹³⁴ Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), p.3

¹³⁵ Ibid. p.3

¹³⁶ Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), p.4

¹³⁷ Ibid. p.4

¹³⁸ Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), p.4

¹³⁹ Ibid. p.5

¹⁴⁰ Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), p.6

¹⁴¹ Ibid. p.7

global economy from future crises, and to promote regional and global economic growth and recovery. They also welcomed the representation and the governance reforms.”¹⁴² (J,L) The document continue by declaring that the Council is satisfied that ASEAN have taken action in combating climate change, but they still “acknowledge the need for closer co-operation on environmental conservation, sustainable development and natural resource management”.¹⁴³ (I) The Council therefore “encouraged ASEAN to make active contributions to the global efforts to address climate change”.¹⁴⁴ (I)

On the issues of global concern, the Council note the importance of maintaining peace and humanitarian conditions,¹⁴⁵ but further “the Ministers also underlined the importance of strengthened region to region cooperation in the trade area”.¹⁴⁶ (K) On the note of energy “and renewable energy resources, the Ministers encouraged greater efforts to create a favourable investment climate”.¹⁴⁷ (I,J) Also on the topic of the environment, the Council wants to see improvement in the development of “disaster preparedness, prevention and mitigation, especially in light of the Climate Change challenges in the ASEAN region.”¹⁴⁸ (I) Finally, the Council support “ASEAN Member States to prevent and respond to health risks emerging at the interface between animals, humans and environment.”¹⁴⁹ (G)

Table 4.2 The Council’s promoted and prioritized policies in ASEAN.

Policy area Institution	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Council promotion	G (10)	H (3)	I (9)	J (9)	K (5)	L (4)
Council prioritization	X			X		

7.2.2 The Council and the EaP

In 2010, the Council published “Conclusions on Eastern Partnership”, through which it recognise and adopt a number of points concerning the EaP cooperation.¹⁵⁰ The document, “confirms the strategic importance for the European Union of promoting stability, good

¹⁴² Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), p.7

¹⁴³ Ibid. p.8

¹⁴⁴ Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), 9

¹⁴⁵ Ibid. p.9

¹⁴⁶ Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), p.11

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. p.12

¹⁴⁸ Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), p.14

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. p.14

¹⁵⁰ Council of the European Union, 3041st Foreign Affairs Council meeting, ”Conclusions on Eastern Partnership”, Luxembourg 25 October 2010

governance, and economic development in its Eastern neighbourhood.”¹⁵¹ (L,J) The conclusions are introduced by expressing the Council’s intentions to deepen its cooperation with the EaP countries through a “*meaningful political framework*” through which they can “*converge towards the European Union*”.¹⁵² However it is highlighted that the cooperation is build on “*mutual interests and commitments, as well as on shared ownership and responsibility.*”¹⁵³

The Council emphasize that the partnership calls for engagement from both the EaP countries and the EU, and brings forward that the EU will assist in the enhanced work with principles “*including democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights and good governance.*”¹⁵⁴ (H,G,L) Further, the Council continuously point in the direction of promoting “*democracy and human rights [and] people-to-people contacts as a means to promote mutual understanding, as well as business.*”¹⁵⁵ (H,G,J) In regard to business and economics though, it raise the concern for unresolved conflicts in the EaP countries, which could make it difficult for the EU to help the “*economic and political development of the partner countries.*”¹⁵⁶ (J) However, the EU will keep an open dialogue for “*the exchange of experience and best practices*” (L) in order to make the cooperation work.¹⁵⁷

Through the joint declaration of the EaP it is stated that the partnership is based on a mutual recognition of values and principles, which are first and foremost “*liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rue of law.*”¹⁵⁸ (H,G) The role of the EU is particularly highlighted - to support the EaP countries in their aspiration to “*seek an even closer relationship with the EU.*”¹⁵⁹ As a step in this process the possibilities of deepening the trade agreements will be evaluated, since it is noted that “*there is more trade and economic interaction between the EU and its Eastern European partners than ever before.*”¹⁶⁰ (K,J) As such these policies are continuously pushed, and depending on whether the EU’s economic reforms are put in force or not, it can affect the EU-EaP relationship. Effective and engaged countries in the EaP “*will benefit more from their relationship with the European Union, including (...) gradual economic integration in the EU Internal Market and increased EU support.*”¹⁶¹ (J) Before more specifically laying out the objectives for the cooperation, the

¹⁵¹ Ibid. p.1

¹⁵² Council of the European Union, 3041st Foreign Affairs Council meeting, p.1

¹⁵³ Ibid. p.1

¹⁵⁴ Council of the European Union, 3041st Foreign Affairs Council meeting, p.2

¹⁵⁵ Ibid. p.2

¹⁵⁶ Council of the European Union, 3041st Foreign Affairs Council meeting, p.4

¹⁵⁷ Ibid. p.4

¹⁵⁸ Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), “*Joint declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit*”, Warsaw 29-30 September 2011, p.1

¹⁵⁹ Ibid. p.1

¹⁶⁰ Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.2

¹⁶¹ Ibid. p.2

EaP declaration is summarized with the statement that the members “*must be significantly strengthened and commit to stepping up implementation, with the objective of building a common area of democracy, (...) and increased interactions and exchanges.*”¹⁶² (H)

The first proper section of the declaration is on bilateral issues, regarding the political environment and the socio-economic conditions. Again it is emphasized that the deepening of these reforms must continue in the future, and therefore that “*the creation of an economic area between the EU and partner countries*” (J) is important to strive for, as a part of the already existing FTA.¹⁶³ The Council further describes that it is an important task for the EaP to “*enhance mobility of citizens in a secure and well-managed environment*” (G,L) and that it is especially crucial to improve the conditions for “*travellers [and] students, researchers and businesspeople.*”¹⁶⁴ (G) This somewhat goes hand in hand with the following section, in which the Council wish for a more extensive interaction of partner countries in the EU. Here, the participants of the Summit agree to cooperate on energy issues to a greater extent. All members of the Council, alongside with the members of the EaP, “*will promote an inclusive and open policy on energy security*”, which includes “*cooperation on stable and secure energy supply and transit [and] nuclear safety.*”¹⁶⁵ (I) A green and “*environmentally sustainable*”¹⁶⁶ environment (I) is put high up on the list of objectives, where the members of the EaP need “*to take urgent action to address climate change and combat environmental degradation.*”¹⁶⁷ (I) In extension to this, communication concerning “*the democratization of societies*” (H) is briefly mentioned, as the section ends to highlight “*education, research, youth and culture.*”¹⁶⁸ (G)

Through the framework for multilateral cooperation, the Council “*will help advance partner countries’ legislative and regulatory approximation to the EU aquis*”¹⁶⁹, i.e. to “*promote the development of civil society’s role in support of democracy, sustainable socio-economic development [and] good governance.*”¹⁷⁰ (H,G,L) In order to implement these policies in the EaP, the Council recognise that everything comes down to the financial framework, and in order “*to promote economic development*” (J) the EU have risk capital and guarantee schemes available as an instrument to realize the plans.¹⁷¹ The Council’s summary of the declaration highlights the grandness of the EU’s presence in the EaP countries as a key actor “*in conflict*

¹⁶² Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.2

¹⁶³ Ibid. p.3

¹⁶⁴ Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.4

¹⁶⁵ Ibid. p.5

¹⁶⁶ Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.6

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. p.6

¹⁶⁸ Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.6

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. p.6

¹⁷⁰ Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.7

¹⁷¹ Ibid. p.7

resolution and confidence building efforts.”¹⁷² Policy development in the EaP is especially aimed towards Belarus, where the Council express the urge to take action “*towards respect by the Belarusian authorities for democracy, the rule of law and human rights.*”¹⁷³ (H,G)

Table 4.3 The Council’s promoted and prioritized policies in the EaP.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Institution						
Council promotion	G (8)	H (7)	I (3)	J (7)	K (1)	L (5)
Council prioritization	X	X		X		

7.3 The Commission

7.3.1 The Commission and ASEAN

The Commission’s document on the strategy for the EU-ASEAN cooperation¹⁷⁴ states that the Commission’s work in ASEAN is based on the basic objectives for EU’s cooperation with Asia over all. The program for 2007-2013 is summarized in three major points, of which the first concludes to keep working for supporting ASEAN. Second, policy cooperation will target policies regarding “*environment, energy and climate change, through sustainable consumption (...), governance and trade (...) higher education and support to research institutes [and] cross-border cooperation in animal and human health.*”¹⁷⁵ (O,O,R,Q,M,M) Third, a number of cross-cutting issues are promoted: “*human rights and democracy, gender equality, good governance, the rights of the child and indigenous peoples’ rights, environmental sustainability and combating HIV/AIDS*” (M,N,M,R,M,O,M), for which the policy programmes will be adjusted to fit the targeted area.¹⁷⁶

The strategy document states the objectives and aims for the Asia: “(1) *contribute to peace and security in the region and globally, through a broadening of EU engagement with Asia;* (2) *strengthen mutual trade and investment flows with the region;* (3) *promote the development of the less prosperous of Asia, addressing the root causes of poverty;* (4) *contribute to the protection of human rights, the spread of democracy, good governance and the rule of law;* (5) *build global partnership and alliances with Asian countries to help address both the challenges and the opportunities offered by globalisation and to strengthen joint efforts on global environmental and security issues;* and (6) *help to strengthen the*

¹⁷² Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.8

¹⁷³ Ibid. p.9

¹⁷⁴ European Commission (2007) ”Regional Programming for Asia, Strategy Document 2007-2013”

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. p.3

¹⁷⁶ European Commission (2007) p.3

awareness of Europe in Asia and vice versa.”¹⁷⁷ (Q,P,M,M,N,R,O) The following sections specifically analyse what the need in the individual regions is. In this political sphere, the Commission notify the need for support of governance character in ASEAN since divergence on democracy matters still remain in the region. Hence, democracy problems, poor labour standards and lack of respect for human rights are noted.¹⁷⁸

The EU and ASEAN have intensified their economic cooperation, as the Asian market has expanded to the EU over time. On environmental issues is the progress thus not as positive. Much is to be done since the negative trend is likely to cause huge problems in the future.¹⁷⁹ Almost all policy areas are explicitly included in the Commission’s action plan for Asia, and ASEAN is encouraged to continue the integration these policies. First and foremost noted however, before it is noted that it is important *“to support the emphasis on human rights”*(M) it is stated that the *“ASEAN’s integration will accelerate growth and economic dynamism to the benefit of itself and its trading partners alike.”*¹⁸⁰ In connection to this economic aspect, it is emphasized that the trade relations will lead to beneficial results on issues of sustainable development and socio-economics as well: *“trade negotiations achieve the over arching goal of sustainable development, including socio-economic (...) assessments.”*¹⁸¹ How the policy promotion and cooperation as a whole will function is found in the last in the strategy document: *“(I) Environment, Energy and Climate Change; II) Higher Education and Support to Research Institutes; III) Cross-border Cooperation in Animal and Human Health”*.¹⁸² (O,M,M)

The follow up document for the 2007-2013 action plan, is the multi-annual programme for Asia for the time period 2011-2013.¹⁸³ It was adopted in 2007, just as the strategy plan for the whole of 2007-2013, in order to specify what action to take for individual regions.¹⁸⁴ The Commission recognise that the regions in focus have developed in many areas since the action plan was launched, but also that there is still much left to do. First, it is summarized what the aim of the action plan is: *“eradicating poverty by supporting broad-based sustainable economic growth, promoting an environment and conditions conducive to trade and integration within the region, enhancing governance, [and] increasing political and social stability.”*¹⁸⁵ (M,P,O,Q,R,M) The EU’s funding will specifically target three different regions, and ASEAN is one of them. Second it is explained how the main issue areas will be

¹⁷⁷ European Commission (2007) p.4

¹⁷⁸ Ibid. p.5

¹⁷⁹ European Commission (2007) p.6f

¹⁸⁰ Ibid. p.11

¹⁸¹ European Commission (2007) p.12

¹⁸² Ibid. p.13f

¹⁸³ European Commission (2010) MTR Document, Regional Strategy for Asia 2007-2013, *“Multi-Annual Programme for Asia (MIP) 2011-2013”*

¹⁸⁴ European Commission (2010) MTR Document, p.3

¹⁸⁵ Ibid. p.3

dealt with. On the topic of environmental issues the Commission highlight three activities: to “*promote green growth (...) by financing projects that encourage sustainable consumption and production, (...) Cooperation on Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT), (...) to facilitate investment relevant to climate change.*”¹⁸⁶ (O,R,Q,O) Further, “*higher education will be promoted through partnerships between European and Asian higher education institutions*” (M), and also: “*The Commission will support a cross-sectoral approach to improve the capacity at national and regional level to prevent, detect and respond to sanitary risks*”.¹⁸⁷ (M) Third and last, the Commission will support is the uprooted people, which includes that “*assistance will be given to refugees, internally displaced persons, returnees, former soldiers and other combatants.*”¹⁸⁸ (M)

The indicative programme recognise that the EU’s relations with Asia are going in the right direction considering that the Commission wants an increased relationship that is “*going beyond traditional cooperation, to encompass economic integration and political cooperation.*”¹⁸⁹ (P) It is emphasize that the integration process has been positive, which should help strengthen the relation between the two parties. Continuing on this track, the Commission announces that “*aid for trade will also be addressed in the ASEAN framework*”.¹⁹⁰ (Q) Here, the EU is striving for the accomplishment of a FTA, but is still in the process of negotiating with the countries that might be interested in such a trade agreement.¹⁹¹ Also stressed is that the FTA would “*promote a better business climate*”.¹⁹² (P)

Highlighting the support that the EU plans for ASEAN, the Commission states that “*climate change is a key priority for the EU, which has taken the lead in this area (...), and the EU looks forward to exploring with developing countries how appropriate support can contribute to their efforts to undertake ambitious nationally appropriate mitigation actions.*”¹⁹³ (O) The EU is eager to actively cover all of the themes on the policy agenda in ASEAN, but that a lot of the effort depends on ASEAN and its willingness to accept support.¹⁹⁴ On this note, the Commission emphasize the EU’s role as well as the difficult task of developing the partnership both on international and individual level: “*The EU also continues to foster a comprehensive approach to the management of migration flows, aiming at striking a balance between security and the basic rights of individuals, and to develop partnerships*”.¹⁹⁵ (M) The fostering will be “*based on Europe’s democratic values: respect for human rights,*

¹⁸⁶ European Commission (2010) MTR Document, p.3

¹⁸⁷ Ibid. p.3

¹⁸⁸ European Commission (2010) MTR Document, p.3

¹⁸⁹ Ibid. p.4

¹⁹⁰ European Commission (2010) MTR Document, p.5

¹⁹¹ Ibid. p.6

¹⁹² European Commission (2010) MTR Document, p.7

¹⁹³ Ibid. p.6

¹⁹⁴ European Commission (2010) MTR Document, p.7

¹⁹⁵ Ibid. p.7

democracy, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law, good governance, gender equality, solidarity, social justice and effective multilateral action".¹⁹⁶ (M,N,M,R,M,M) Finishing up the strategy for 2011-2013, the Commission states that it is important to note that each country in these regions are in charge of their own development.¹⁹⁷ In ASEAN, the regional strategy has been satisfactory implemented, however it is concluded that ASEAN's weak point is that regional strategies lack implementation at national level.¹⁹⁸

Table 4.4. The Commission's promoted and prioritized policies in ASEAN.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Institution						
Commission	M (21)	N (3)	O (10)	P (4)	Q (4)	R (6)
Commission	X		X			

7.3.2 The Commission and the EaP

In the Commission staff document, a communication from the Council and the EP¹⁹⁹, the Commission clearly mark the policy areas in focus for the EaP. First, the platforms on which the cooperation should be based are explained and it starts off by highlighting "*democracy and human rights (...), justice, freedom and security [and] security and stability*".²⁰⁰ (N,M) Here, the Commission suggests the EU's full assistance in order to stabilize the EaP countries. The next platform has more economic influences. It contains "*trade and regulatory approximation (...), socio-economic development (...), environment and climate change [and] general issues*".²⁰¹ (Q,M,P) Hence it concerns everything from deepening the trade agreements to increase the knowledge of sustainable development. For the third theme the Commission puts energy security forward, which means "*enhancing framework conditions and solidarity (...), support for infrastructure development, interconnection and diversification of supply [and] harmonisation of energy policies*".²⁰² (P) This means strengthening the EU-EaP cooperation on points such as trade agreements, but first and foremost on issues of security. The fourth and last platform concerns peoples and includes "*culture (...), education and research [and] information society and media*".²⁰³ (M) Here, the Commission aims to increase the quality of education, as well as the conditions under which the peoples of the EaP live their lives.

¹⁹⁶ European Commission (2010) MTR Document, p.7

¹⁹⁷ Ibid. p.7

¹⁹⁸ European Commission (2010) MTR Document, p.9

¹⁹⁹ European Commission, SEC(2008) 2974/3, "Commission staff working document accompanying the communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – Eastern Partnership"

²⁰⁰ Ibid. p.2

²⁰¹ European Commission, SEC(2008) 2974/3, p.4f

²⁰² Ibid. p.6f

²⁰³ European Commission, SEC(2008) 2974/3, p.8

Next following section of the document holds the main incentives that the Commission emphasize for the EaP. Some of the key policy areas already mentioned are again found here. Solving the issue of non-EU borders is essential since it this would help “*tackling customs fraud, trafficking and illegal migration, and thus for progress in key policy areas such as trade*”.²⁰⁴ (M,Q) On the topic of trade the Commission also acknowledge the importance of developing small and medium enterprises (SME) in countries involved in the partnership, “*for the potential of generating growth and employment*.”²⁰⁵ (P) Continuing on the market track, the electricity market is evaluated and the Commission stress that “*an integrated and interconnected regional electricity market in and with EaP countries will bring greater energy security for the partners and the EU [and] there are also great opportunities for enhancing the use of indigenous renewable energy sources*.”²⁰⁶ (O) In the field of the wellbeing of the peoples and coping with disasters that can cause for example “*health risks (epidemic, pandemic [and] maritime pollution*”,²⁰⁷ (M,O) climate change and protection of the civil society are important issues to deal with.

Finally the Commission describe its incentives for cooperating with the EaP: “*the EaP will build on the declared will of partner countries to pursue alignment with the European Union and/or their aspiration for European integration, rather than on the regional aspect*.”²⁰⁸ Here, the EaP draw on cooperation “*in the fields of trade, transport and energy*”.²⁰⁹ (Q,P) The Commission cannot underline enough that this cooperation is an important but yet expensive investment for the future. However it is also beneficial for both the EU and other international parties; “*progress in implementing the governance and reform agenda will make partner countries more attractive for foreign investors*”.²¹⁰ (R)

In the final communication from the Commission to the Council and the EP, the Commission highlights the need to establish the EaP, emphasizing that this region do not fit in the current framework of the ENP and needs to be approached differently.²¹¹ The ENP is announced as a successful EU project, but “*the EaP should go further*”.²¹² Through the EaP, the EU aim is to export as well as give full support for political policies and values of importance for both the EU and the partnership countries.²¹³ The key policies for the EaP are stated as follow: “*the rule of law, good governance, respect for human rights, respect for and protection of*

²⁰⁴ European Commission, SEC(2008) 2974/3, p.9

²⁰⁵ Ibid. p.9

²⁰⁶ European Commission, SEC(2008) 2974/3, p.9

²⁰⁷ Ibid. p.10

²⁰⁸ European Commission, SEC(2008) 2974/3, p.11

²⁰⁹ Ibid. p.11

²¹⁰ European Commission, SEC(2008) 2974/3, p.12

²¹¹ European Commission, COM(2008) 823 final, ”*Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – Eastern Partnership*”, p.2

²¹² Ibid. p.3

²¹³ European Commission, COM(2008) 823 final, p.2

minorities, and the principles of the market economy and sustainable development.” (R,M,P,O) However, the extent to which the EU will give its support the EaP is depending on the level of ambition in those countries.²¹⁴

The platforms structure the Commission’s main themes for the EaP multilateral framework. The first one is ”Democracy, good governance and stability” and highlights the importance of “stable democratic institutions and effective state structures at the service of their citizens” (N).²¹⁵ Key words such as ‘stability’ and ‘sovereignty’ are important features of this category for mutual benefits for both parties. The theme of “Economic integration and convergence with EU policies”, focus mainly on that the EaP will include mutual benefits of economic character – “intra-regional trade and economic integration” (Q,P). Policies are here promoted in regards to many levels of society and several business sectors, both socially and economically.²¹⁶ The Commission seeks to be “improving the business climate in the partner countries” (P) and will “also focus on enhancing employment, decent work, social cohesion and equal opportunities” (P,M).²¹⁷ Finally, the section mentions sustainable development, as “environment policy and climate change” (O) is recognized as a policy area where EU and the EaP countries must cooperate in order to make a difference. Also, the EaP make an important actor in spreading these values to eastern regions.²¹⁸

Table 4.5. The Commission’s promoted and prioritized policies in the EaP.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Institution						
Commission	M (7)	N (2)	O (4)	P (8)	Q (4)	R (2)
Commission	X			X		

²¹⁴ European Commission, COM(2008) 823 final, p.3

²¹⁵ Ibid. p.11

²¹⁶ European Commission, COM(2008) 823 final, p.11f

²¹⁷ Ibid. p.12

²¹⁸ European Commission, COM(2008) 823 final, p.12

7.4 Summary of Results

The results of the coded documents are sorted in the two tables below. Important to note us that the frequency of codes found within the brackets are not comparable with each other between the cases. The numbers only indicate which policy that is more or less promoted within each case.

Table 5. Frequency of characteristics for the EU's bodies' promoted policies in ASEAN.

Policy area Institution	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
EP	A (12)	B (4)	C (5)	D (2)	E (2)	F (1)
Council	G (10)	H (3)	I (9)	J (9)	K (5)	L (4)
Commission	M (21)	N (3)	O (10)	P (4)	Q (4)	R (6)

Table 5.1 Frequency of characteristics for the EU's bodies' promoted policies in the EaP.

Policy area Institution	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
EP	A (5)	B (7)	C (2)	D (3)	E (1)	F (4)
Council	G (8)	H (7)	I (3)	J (7)	K (1)	L (5)
Commission	M (7)	N (2)	O (4)	P (8)	Q (4)	R (2)

8. Analysis

8.1 The EP

In the case of the EP relation to ASEAN, human rights (A) is found to be both the most frequent as well as the highest prioritized policy. Democracy (B) is not as frequent as expected, and is not even the second most promoted policy, but comes in at third place behind sustainable development (C). Sustainable development is also prioritized higher than democracy in this case. Hence, the hypothesis (H1) cannot be completely corroborated nor completely rejected since it is shown that the EP promotes policies of both human rights and democracy, but only that policies of human rights are prioritized in the case of ASEAN.

All policies in the chart are promoted to some extent although as mentioned human rights is both most promoted and highest prioritized. As for the less promoted economic development (D) the EP notes that the cooperation “*could produce substantial economic advantages for both parties*”.²¹⁹ And to further clarify that the cooperation based on both parties' conditions

²¹⁹ European Parliament, Committee on International Trade (A&-0151/2008) p.4

the EP states that it is build on “*mutual interests and commitments, as well as on shared ownership and responsibility.*”²²⁰ The EP’s behaviour in ASEAN therefore seem to follow the theoretical path that March and Olsen have discussed, which means that an institution can chose to adjust its behaviour to a certain situation, and hence act as needed or appropriate in that particular setting.²²¹ Even though sustainable development was not one of the expected prioritized policies, it is possible that the EP have reasons to make this priority on basis of the regions’ preconditions, as Reiche and Bechberger discussed as a reason for divergent behaviour.²²² But it is also possible that the EP has been “forced” by the Council and the Commission to take certain action in ASEAN, meaning that the EP’s agenda has been adjusted by the two other bodies, since the EP has very limited power over the agenda setting in the EU.²²³

The concern of human rights certainly shines through though, for example when the EP “*continuously emphasizes the need to restore the democratic process (...) and to release all political prisoners*”²²⁴ and “*increasing opportunities for women as family income earners*”.²²⁵ But it is also clear that there is more to the EP-ASEAN relation than this, since the EP “*adopted a resolution on Trade and to political and economic relations with ASEAN that supports an ambitious trade agreement that would greatly benefit both sides*”.²²⁶ Again, the EP seems torn between its own interests and priorities, and the EU’s interest as a whole unit.

The EP’s relation to the EaP looks slightly different from the one with ASEAN. Democracy (B) is here the most frequently promoted policy, as well as prioritized the highest. Thereafter, human rights (A) and good governance (F) follow, in which good governance is not as frequent as human rights, but at many times prioritized before it instead. The hypothesis (H2) for this case therefore corroborates, since policies of human rights and democracy are both promoted as well as prioritized by the EP in the EaP.

Again, all policies are promoted to a certain extent, but it is the two expected policies of priority that actually turns out to be prioritized. The case of the EP’s behaviour in the EaP may therefore be explained by what Peters have pointed out earlier, namely that institutions can change depending on the situation and that this can be grounded on for example the possibility of the EU’s future MS.²²⁷ The importance of the cooperation cannot be mistaken when the EP emphasize that “*The Eastern Partnership (EaP) is a meaningful political*

²²⁰ Council of the European Union, 3041st Foreign Affairs Council meeting, p.1

²²¹ March, Olsen (2006) p.689f

²²² Reiche, Bechberger (2004) p.843ff

²²³ Bomberg, Peterson, Stubb (2008) p.58

²²⁴ European Parliament, Nuttin (2011) p.4

²²⁵ European Parliament, Directorate-General for external policies (2012) p.16

²²⁶ European Parliament, Nuttin (2011) p.4

²²⁷ Peters (2005) p.53

framework for deepening relations with and among partner countries”.²²⁸ All EaP countries must be considered as possible MS of the EU, and therefore it might be easier to expect the promoted outcome of the EP’s behaviour here than in the case of ASEAN, i.e. that it is known how the EP and the EU want their already existing MS to behave and that one therefore can expect the bodies to promote the same on future MS. This is evident for example through the EP’s statement that it aims at *“fostering political debate and in enhancing freedom an democracy in the neighbouring partner countries”*.²²⁹ As mentioned, the outcome in this study shows that good governance also is both promoted and has semi-high priority. This may be because good governance could be considered a precondition for the other prioritized policies – human rights and democracy – which would mean that some, or all policies are more or less dependent on each other.

Table 6. The EP’s prioritized policies.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Region						
ASEAN	X					
EaP	X	X				

8.2 The Council

The Council’s relation to ASEAN shows that human rights (G) was the most frequently promoted policy, while economic development (J) was almost as frequent. However, economic development was more prioritized throughout the documents than human rights was, judging on the amount of text written as well as on where in the documents the text was placed. Sustainable development (I) also showed to be a very frequent policy, however it was only existent in the end of documents, not making it a prioritized policy. The hypothesis (H3) for this case is therefore partly rejected and partly corroborated.

As expected, the Council promotes both good governance (L) and trade (K) in ASEAN, but neither of them are prioritized. It is therefore rejected that the Council prioritize trade in the case of ASEAN. Its behaviour is therefore the same as the EP’s to start with, namely that human rights is the most frequent policy, however economic development takes over the field of priority here. The promotion of human rights comes through as *“the Ministers agreed to strengthen mutual cooperation promoting and protecting human rights”*,²³⁰ while the economic aspects shows early when the Council wants to improve the *“frameworks regarding regional and international trade and economy.”*²³¹ None of these two policies were expected

²²⁸ European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153 p.2

²²⁹ European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153, p.11

²³⁰ Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), p.3

²³¹ Ibid. p.4

as policies of priority, but this might again show that institutions can change their preferences as well as their behaviour depending on the targeted region. Also, since the Council is working on the base of the national governments' interests this can simply indicate that this is the area of interest for the EU's MS in ASEAN - "*greater interaction of the private sector [and] create a conducive environment for more trade, investment and other economic activities between the EU and ASEAN.*"²³² Based on MacCormick's statement that the Council is driven by ideological means²³³, the outcome here does not mean that the theoretical framework points at false prioritizations or promotion of policies, but simply that human rights and economic development is in the Council's interest. Again, as for the EP, these two policies might be what lay the base for the one policy that was expected to be prioritized – trade.

In the case of EaP, the Council promotes policies on human rights (G) the most frequent, as well as prioritizing it the highest. Economic development (J) is almost as frequently promoted as human rights, but have a higher degree of priority than human rights on the other hand. It is more commonly mentioned in beginning of texts and is more extensively written on, for example it is early noted that the EaP will "*ensure equitable benefits from globalisation and economic liberalisation*".²³⁴ Democracy is the third most promoted policy, but is however highly prioritized by the Council in the EaP. The same situation for this hypothesis (H4) as for the previous on the Council-ASEAN therefore occurs, that the hypothesis can be partly rejected and partly corroborated.

The Council promotes policies on trade (K) and good governance (L) in the case of EaP, but they are not prioritized. It is therefore rejected that the Council prioritize good governance in the case of EaP. Human rights is again on top of promoted policies and is prioritized here, but so is economic development. This means that the Council's interest is similar in both cases of this study. However, in the case of the Council and the EaP, there are also indications of that democracy is an important issue to deal with. Again one can reflect on the EU's general interest of the EaP countries as future MS of the EU, and that democracy is not only a desirable but necessary feature in these countries. This is shown when the Council states that the EaP is a "*meaningful political framework*" through which the countries can "*converge towards the European Union*".²³⁵ Hence the Council's behaviour is in accordance with what is stated through Harnisch et al. in the theoretical framework on that institutions are pressured from both inside and outside, and that its behaviour is regulated not only by its own interest

²³² Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), p.4

²³³ MacCormick (2011) p.312f

²³⁴ Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), p.4

²³⁵ Council of the European Union, 3041st Foreign Affairs Council meeting, p.1

but also by the EaP countries’ desire to fit the EU’s model one day,²³⁶ According to the Council, one would like to help the EaP countries and support them in their desire to “*seek an even closer relationship with the EU.*”²³⁷ It is clear that the Council and the EU as a whole would benefit greatly from the EaP countries involvement in the EU one day if integration is made properly. It is not explained in such terms, but as that the EaP countries who make the effort to adjust “*will benefit more from their relationship with the European Union, including (...) gradual economic integration in the EU Internal Market and increased EU support.*”²³⁸ Again, the theoretical aspect of EU’s own gain and possible future MS becomes evident.

Table 6.1 The Council’s prioritized policies.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Region						
ASEAN	X			X		
EaP	X	X		X		

8.3 The Commission

In the case of the Commission-ASEAN it is found that human rights (M) is by far the most promoted, as well as the highest prioritized policy. The amount of text, in combination with where in the document that the texts are found make it dominant over the other promoted policies. Sustainable development (O) is the second most promoted policy, and is also shown to be one of the Commission’s most prioritized policies in combination with human rights. Good governance (R) is also a policy area that the Commission is promoting strongly in ASEAN, however it is not as prioritized as sustainable development. The hypothesis (H5) on the Commission’s behaviour in ASEAN is therefore partly corroborated and partly rejected.

It is found that the Commission in fact promote all the six policies in focus for this study, but there are no evidence in the analysed documents that trade (Q) nor economic development (P) are prioritized policies in ASEAN. As for the other two institutions in the case of ASEAN, human rights is shown to be the most promoted as well as highest prioritized - “*to support the emphasis on human rights*”²³⁹ The promotion and prioritization of sustainable development also showed to meet the expectations set up in the hypothesis. The reason for why this particular expectation was found to corroborate may be that the Commission work according to legislation and treaties²⁴⁰, in which many there are plans for a global sustainable

²³⁶ Harnisch Sebastian, Frank Cornelia, Maull Hanns W. (2011) “*Role Theory in International Relations – Approaches and analyses*”, Oxon; Routledge, p.8
²³⁷ Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.1
²³⁸ Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), p.2
²³⁹ European Commission (2007) p.11
²⁴⁰ MacCormick (2011) p.312f

development. However, it also indicates that the Commission's work and behaviour actually can be predicted and hence confirms Biddle's theory of how institutions' behaviour is shaped i.e. that the environment they flourish in form their characteristic pattern of behaviour.²⁴¹ Concerning the wide promotion of human rights, this may be in line with what has already been mentioned for the other two bodies as well, that human rights as well as good governance lay the base for the other policies and that these issue must be dealt with before one can put focus on other interests. It is after all highlighted that "*ASEAN's integration will accelerate growth and economic dynamism to the benefit of itself and its trading partners alike,*"²⁴² i.e. the EU.

As for the Commission's behaviour in the EaP, human rights (M) is again among the top promoted policies. This time however, it is just beaten by economic development (P), which is the Commission's most promoted policy in the EaP. Even not most promoted, human rights seem to be the policy with the highest priority, while economic development share its space of priority with trade (Q), which is not as promoted as the latter two policies. This makes the result of the hypothesis (H6) twofaced once again, as it is rejected that the Commission prioritize sustainable development (O) and democracy (N) in the case of EaP. It can though be corroborated that all policies that Commission was expected to promote in the EaP in fact are promoted.

The Commission's behaviour in the EaP is shown to be one of the few cases in this study where human rights is not the most frequently promoted policy. Although economic development and trade seem most important as such, human rights have higher priority. Also, sustainable development got very little attention compared to what the expectation was set to beforehand, although frequently promoted it is not prioritized as expected. Most worthy to mention in this case is that democracy got promoted with such low frequency, since the EaP was the region in which one expected to see indications of European integration, even from the Commission's side. Although declared that "*the EaP will build on the declared will of partner countries to pursue alignment with the European Union and/or their aspiration for European integration, rather than on the regional aspect*"²⁴³, this seem to be in regard to trade and economic development first and foremost since the Commission wants to be involved in "*improving the business climate in the partner countries*"²⁴⁴ As the body should look after the common good for the EU as a whole, this behaviour is two folded. One can either see it as the Commission's reasons for prioritizing trade and economic aspects is a way of supporting the EaP countries in their recovery from poor conditions, or one can see it as a

²⁴¹ Biddle (2001)p.2415

²⁴² European Commission (2007) p.11

²⁴³ Ibid. p.11

²⁴⁴ European Commission, COM(2008) 823 final, p.12

way of creating something of a dependency on the EU, i.e. step by step integrating the countries in the EU in which case the Commission is prioritizing these policies for the sake of own gain. This would again be in order with Peters theory that institutions can change and adjust themselves depending on the situation they are faced with, and maybe especially when they are dealing and cooperating with future MS.²⁴⁵

Table 6.2 The Commission’s prioritized policies.

Policy area	Human rights	Democracy	Sustainable development	Economic development	Trade	Good governance
Region						
ASEAN	X		X			
EaP	X			X		

9. Conclusions

Turning to answers the research question - What policies are promoted and prioritized by the main bodies of the EU, are all policies equally important to promote in all regions of the world, and are they promoted as strongly by all bodies of the EU, or do these bodies prioritize differently? – it is first established that all bodies if the EU promote all policies of focus in this thesis to some extent, but that there are differences in terms of which policies that are prioritized. Hence, the answer to the next part of the question is ‘no’, all policies do not seem to be equally as important to promote in all regions, at least not in the studied cases of ASEAN and the EaP. Further, also the next answer is ‘no, the bodies of the EU do not promote all policies as strongly, and ‘yes’ they do prioritize differently.

On the basis of institutionalism and role theory this thesis have examined the EU’s bodies’ – the EP, the Council and the Commission – policy promotion and prioritization in the EaP and ASEAN. It shows that the theoretical framework of institutionalism is useful for explaining institutions’ behaviour in specific cases. On this note it is also shown that the bodies of the EU in many regards adjust themselves to specific settings and do whatever is needed in order to build and restore certain policy areas. However, the findings also indicate that policy promotion and prioritization also is based on the bodies’ own interests in the regions. Role theory set the base on which the expectations and predicted behaviour of each body was set, and proved to be both useful and misleading since it became evident that the bodies adjust their work to a greater extent than expected.

Five of the total six hypotheses could not be rejected nor corroborated because of the variations in promotion and prioritization. The hypothesis on the EP’s behaviour in the case

²⁴⁵ Peters (2005) p.53

of the EaP corroborated completely. However, thereby this thesis have confirmed the yet diffuse difference between promoting and prioritizing a policy, meaning that promoting a policy does not necessarily mean that one is prioritizing the same. It also confirms that the political sphere that the EU operates in creates certain behaviour depending on the current situation. This study makes it clear that the EP, the Council and the Commission have diverged from the expectations and hence the stereotypic behaviour in some cases, in order to meet their own interests instead. They clearly show an interest in integrating the EaP countries in the EU in the future, and therefore adjust their behaviour – promotion and prioritization of policies – thereafter. In this sense the same goes for the case of ASEAN, namely that the EU and its bodies through their documents shown a desire of enhancing the bounds with the region. The main finding is that human rights was both strongly promoted as well as highly prioritized by all bodies in both regions, and that economic development was one of the main priorities in the EaP, when in fact the expectation was that economic development would be of higher priority in ASEAN.

The two charts below summarize the conclusions in each of the two cases individually.

Table 7. Conclusions of promoted and prioritized policies by the EU’s bodies in ASEAN.

Features Institution	Level of concern	Expectation of promoted policies	Expectation of prioritized policies	Actually promoted policies	Actually prioritized policies
EP	People/Citizens	Human rights Democracy	Human rights Democracy	All studied policies	Human rights
Council	Countries/MS	Trade Good governance	Trade	All studied policies	Human rights Economic development
Commission	EU	Sustainable development Economic Development Trade Democracy	Economic development Trade	All studied policies	Human rights Sustainable development

Table 7.1 Conclusion of promoted and prioritized policies by the EU's bodies in the EaP.

Features Institution	Level of concern	Expectation of promoted policies	Expectation of prioritized policies	Actually promoted policies	Actually prioritized policies
EP	People/Citizens	Human rights Democracy	Human rights Democracy	All studied policies	Human rights Democracy
Council	Countries/MS	Trade Good governance	Good governance	All studied policies	Human rights Democracy Economic development
Commission	EU	Sustainable development Economic development Trade Democracy	Sustainable development Democracy	All studied policies	Human rights Economic development

9.1 Further research

This thesis has tested the theoretical frameworks of institutionalism and role theory to examine the behaviour of the EU's bodies. As mentioned about the selection of cases and when discussing the same, it is not certain that the same results would occur if the same theoretical framework would be applied on the EU's behaviour in other regions of the world. For further research it is therefore suggested that this is tested.

10. References

Literature

Aggestam Lisbeth (2008) "Ethical power Europe?", *International Affairs*, 84(1): 1-11

Aggestam Lisbeth (2006) "Role theory and European foreign policy: a framework of analysis" in Elgström O., Smith M. (2006) "The European Union's Roles in International Politics – Concepts and analysis" (pp.11-29) Oxon; Routledge

Biddle, Bruce J. (2001) "Role Theory", *Encyclopedia of Sociology*, 2: 2415-2420

Biddle Bruce J., Thomas Edwin J. (1979) "Role Theory: Concepts and Research", New York; Robert E Krieger Publishing Company Inc.

Bomberg Elizabeth, Peterson John, Stubb Alexander (2008) "The European Union: How Does it Work?", New York; Oxford University Press Inc.

Bryman Alan (2006) "Social research methods", Oxford; Oxford University Press

Carbone Maurizio (2008) "Mission Impossible: the European Union and Policy Coherence for Development", *Journal of European Integration*, 30(3): 323-342

Collins Cobuild Student's Dictionary (1994) London; Harper Collins Publishers

El-Agraa, Ali M. (2011) "The European Union – Economics and Policies", Cambridge; Cambridge University Press

Furusten Staffan (2007) "Den institutionella omvärlden", Malmö; Liber AB

Gilardi Fabrizio (2008) "Delegation in the Regulatory State – Independent Regulatory Agencies in Western Europe", Cheltenham; Edward Elgar Publishing Limited

Hall, Peter A. "Historical Institutionalism in Rationalist and Sociological Perspective" in Mahoney, James; Thelen; Kathleen (2010) "Explaining Institutional Change – Ambiguity, Agency, and Power", New York; Cambridge University Press

Hardy Melissa, Bryman Alan (2009) "The Handbook of Data Analysis", London; SAGE Publications Ltd.

Harnisch Sebastian, Frank Cornelia, Maull Hanns W. (2011) "Role Theory in International Relations – Approaches and analyses", Oxon; Routledge

Jorgensen Knud Erik (2006) "A multilateralist role for the EU?", in Elgström O., Smith M. (2006) "The European Union's Role in International Politics – Concepts and analysis" (pp.30-46) Oxon; Routledge

MacCormick John (2011) "European Union Politics", London; Palgrave Macmillian

Malone Linda (2008) "International Law 2007", New York; Aspen Publishers

Manners Ian (2008) "The normative ethics of the European Union", *International Affairs*, 84(1): 46-60

March James G., Olsen Johan P., "The logic of appropriateness" in Moran Michael, Rein Martin, Goodin Robert E. (2006) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, New York; Oxford University Press Inc.

Marshall Cathrine, Rossman Gretchen M. (2011) *Designing Qualitative Research*, London; SAGE Publications, Inc.

McFaul Michael (2004) "Democracy Promotion as a World Value", *The Washington Quarterly*, 28(1): 147-163

Meunier Sophie, Nicolaidis Kalypso (2006) "The European Union as a conflicted trade power", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(6): 906-925

Nugent Neil (2006) *The Government and Politics of the European Union*, Palgrave MacMillan.; Hampshire

Peters B. Guy (2005) *Institutional Theory in Political Science – The 'New Institutionalism'*, Hampshire; Ashford Colour Press Ltd

Powel Brieg Tomos (2009) "A clash of norms: normative power and EU democracy promotion in Tunisia", *Democratization*, (16)1: 193-214

Reiche Danyel, Bechberger Mischa (2004) "Policy Differences in the promotion of renewable energies in the EU member states", *Energy Policy*, (32)7: 843-849

Scott Richard W. (2008) *Institutions and Organizations – Ideas and Interests*, Thousand Oaks; Sage Publications, Inc.

Sjursen Helene (2002) "Why Expand?: The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU's Enlargement Policy", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, (40)3: 491-513

Wallace Helen, Wallace William, Pollack Mark A. (2005) *Policy-Making in the European Union*, Oxford; Oxford University Press

Official Documents

CIVITAS, Hatton Lucy (07/2011) "Theories of European Integration"
<http://www.civitas.org.uk/eufacts/download/OS.16%20Theories.pdf>

Council of the European Union, 3041st Foreign Affairs Council meeting, "Conclusions on Eastern Partnership", Luxembourg 25 October 2010
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/117327.pdf

Council of the European Union, Press release 14983/11 (Presse 341), "Joint declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit", Warsaw 29-30 September 2011
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/eastern_partnership/documents/warsaw_summit_declaration_en.pdf

Council of the European Union, Press release 8435/09 (Presse 78), “*Joint Declaration of the Prague Eastern Partnership Summit*”, Prague, 7 May 2009

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/eastern_partnership/documents/prague_summit_declaration_en.pdf

Council of the European Union, Press release 7588/07 (Presse 54), “*Nuremberg Declaration on an EU-ASEAN Enhanced Partnership*”, Nuremberg 15 March 2007

<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/070315-EU-Asean.pdf>

Council of the European Union, Press release 10440/10 (Presse 148), “*18th ASEAN-EU Ministerial Meeting Co-Chair’s Statement*”, Madrid 26 May 2010

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/er/114712.pdf

European Commission (2007) “*Regional Programming for Asia, Strategy Document 2007-2013*”

http://eeas.europa.eu/asia/rsp/07_13_en.pdf

European Commission (2010) MTR Document, Regional Strategy for Asia 2007-2013, “*Multi-Annual Programme for Asia (MIP) 2011-2013*”

http://eeas.europa.eu/asia/rsp/07_13_mtr_annex_en.pdf

European Commission, SEC(2008) 2974/3, “*Commission staff working document accompanying the communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – Eastern Partnership*”

http://ec.europa.eu/culture/documents/staff_working_document_en.pdf

European Commission, COM(2008) 823 final, “*Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – Eastern Partnership*”

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0823:FIN:EN:PDF>

European Parliament, “*European Parliament*”

<http://europa.eu/about-eu/institutions-bodies/european-parliament/> 2013-05-20

European Parliament, (P6_TA(2007)0280), Multiannual Indicative Programme for Asia, “*European Parliament resolution of 21 June 2007 on the draft Commission decision establishing a regional Strategy Document 2007-2013 and a Multiannual Indicative Programme for Asia*”

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P6-TA-2007-0280&format=XML&language=EN>

European Parliament (2013) Fact sheet, “*The European Commission*”

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.3.8.pdf

European Parliament, Nuttin Xavier (2011) Fact sheet, “*The association of South East Asian Nations*”

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/0044c3dd41/EU-fact-sheets.html?tab=theme6> 2013-03-05

European Parliament, Sourander Dag (2013) “*The South Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia)*”

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_6.4.3.pdf 2013-03-05

European Parliament, Committee on International Trade (A6-0151/2008) “*Report on trade and economic relations with the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)*”

European Parliament, Directorate-General for external policies (2012) “*Development of the ASEAN human rights mechanism*”

<http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/development-of-the-asean-human-rights-mechanism-pbBB3112953/?CatalogCategoryID=m3UKABstAj4AAAEjh4cY4e5K>

European Parliament, P7_TA-PROV(2011)0153 “*Review of the European Neighbourhood Policy - Eastern Dimension, ”European Parliament resolution of 7 April 2011 on the review of the European Neighbourhood Policy – Eastern Dimension*”

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2011-0153&language=EN>

European Union, Development and Cooperation (2012) “*EU cooperation for a successful Eastern partnership*”

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/eastern_partnership/documents/eastern_partnership_flyer_final_en.pdf

Ferrero-Waldner Benita, Commissioner for External relations and European Neighbourhood Policy (2009) “*Eastern Partnership – An ambitious project for 21st century European foreign policy*”

http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/docs/eastern_partnership_article_bfw_en.pdf

Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia Indonesia of 24 February 1976

<http://www.asean.org/news/item/treaty-of-amity-and-cooperation-in-southeast-asia-indonesia-24-february-1976-3>

Treaty of the European Union, (2012/C 326/01)

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:326:FULL:EN:PDF>

European Parliament, P7_TA(2010)0193 “*The need for an EU strategy for the South Caucasus*”, European Parliament resolution of 20 May 2010 on the need for an EU strategy for the South Caucasus, 2009(2216(INI))

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+TA+P7-TA-2010-0193+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN>

Electronic resources

ASEAN, “*History*”

<http://www.asean.org/asean/about-asean/history> 2013-02-27

ASEAN, “*ASEAN Member States*”

<http://www.asean.org/asean/asean-member-states> 2013-02-27

ASEAN, “*Overview*”

<http://www.asean.org/asean/about-asean/overview> 2013-02-27

ECG, the Association of European Vehicle logistics, “*European Institutions*”

<http://www.eurocartrans.org/Activities/EUAffairs/EuropeanInstitutions.aspx> 2013-04-16

European Union, “*How the EU works*”

<http://europa.eu/about-eu/> 2013-04-16

European Union External Action (EEAS), “*Eastern Partnership*”

http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/index_en.htm 2013-03-04

European Parliament, About Parliament, “*Human rights and democracy*”

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/0039c6d1f9/Human-rights.html> 2013-03-11

List of tables

1. Expected policy promotion and prioritization by the EU’s bodies, p.16
2. Expectation of promoted and prioritized policies by the EU’s bodies in ASEAN, p.19
 - 2.1 Expectation of promoted and prioritized policies by the EU’s bodies in the EaP, p.19
3. Characteristics and codes for the EU’s bodies’ promoted policies in ASEAN, p.22
 - 3.1 Characteristics and codes for the EU’s bodies’ promoted policies in the EaP, p.23
4. The EP’s promoted and prioritized policies in ASEAN, p.26
 - 4.1 The EP’s promoted and prioritized policies in the EaP, p.28
 - 4.2 The Council’s promoted and prioritized policies in ASEAN, p.31
 - 4.3 The Council’s promoted and prioritized policies in the EaP, p.34
 - 4.4. The Commission’s promoted and prioritized policies in ASEAN, p.37
 - 4.5. The Commission’s promoted and prioritized policies in the EaP, p.39
5. Frequency of characteristics for the EU’s bodies’ promoted policies in ASEAN, p.40
 - 5.1 Frequency of characteristics for the EU’s bodies’ promoted policies in the EaP, p.40
6. The EP’s prioritized policies, p.42
 - 6.1 The Council’s prioritized policies, p.44
 - 6.2 The Commission’s prioritized policies, p.46
7. Conclusion of promoted and prioritized policies by the EU’s bodies in ASEAN, p.47
 - 7.1 Conclusion of promoted and prioritized policies by the EU’s bodies in the EaP, p.48