

The Institutional Limits of the European Union in Humanitarian Intervention:
The Case of Darfur

Submitted by

Dana Marie Parke

International Relations
African Studies
French Language and Literature

To

The Honors College
Oakland University

In partial fulfillment of the
requirement to graduate from
The Honors College

Mentor: Dr. Paul Kubicek, Professor of Political Science
Department of Political Science
Oakland University

10/15/13

I. Introduction

The institution of the European Union, which is a congregate of 28 member states, arose out of the desire to preserve peace and prevent any further recurrence of conflict after the continent's devastating experience with two World Wars. However, since its origination as the European Steel and Coal Community in 1951¹ and under its current title since 1992, the European Union (EU) has fallen far short of its proclaimed ambitions—at least in terms of humanitarian intervention beyond its borders. For an institution founded on the ideals of protecting human rights, promoting peace and security,² Europe's “Never Again” attitude adopted after the Holocaust rang hollow when the EU failed to take action to halt the Balkan tragedy in the 1990s. Yet the European Union claimed to have learned its lessons and strengthened its values of protecting human rights. In a 2000 address by Nicole Fontaine, President of the European Parliament,³ she proclaimed:

Keeping alive the memory of the process that led to the Holocaust is our second duty, second only to the commitment to see justice done....to ensure that it never happens again. Those who forget their history are doomed to relive it....The European Union is not only an economic arena—it is first and foremost a community of values....Once irreparable damage has been done, it is too late to take action, and when we finally resolve to intervene, as in Bosnia or Kosovo, the price paid is much higher than if a resolute approach had been adopted from the outset.⁴

Bosnia demonstrated the necessity of military force to prevent future conflicts. Consequently, the European Union created the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). With this new capability, strong rhetoric promoting human rights (and later the “Responsibility to Protect”) and the “lessons from Bosnia” fresh in mind, one would have expected the more established European Union to intervene in the catastrophic violence that broke out in Darfur in 2003 and continues to this day. This, however, was not the case: the EU only offered monetary and technical assistance that fell far short of a much-needed military intervention. Critics were quick to recognize this failure as “too little,

¹ The six Founders of the European Union were Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

² “The founding principles of the Union.” *europa.eu*. From the European Constitution, Article 1-3 Paragraph 4.

³ The European Parliament is a body of the European Union, comprised of 785 directly-elected Members of Parliament.

⁴ Address by Nicole Fontaine, President of the European Parliament to the Knesset. 21 February 2000.

too late,”⁵ demonstrating that, indeed, the lessons of Bosnia had not been learned.⁶

Why did the European Union fail to live up to its principles of protecting human rights?

Certainly the 1997 speech by the Prime Minister of Portugal, H.E. Antonio Guterres, reflected the need for a strengthened Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) to protect these fundamental human rights, particularly in Africa:

Let us put into practice a more credible and efficient Common Foreign and Security Policy. The Treaty that was signed in Amsterdam two weeks ago gives us some tools to develop CFSP. But new provisions, even enshrined in a legal text, will mean nothing if we do not move forward advancing common political priorities. Co-operation for enhancement of Human Rights has been at the core of European policies. But let us not also forget solidarity with the poorest regions in the world. In a time when fragile democracies try to take root in Africa, the European Union should maintain its commitment regarding economic assistance and enlarge its action on stabilising democracy and conflict prevention....The European Union should increase its political opening to the world. Obstacles remain. We need a single voice if we are to be respected.⁷

Yet when the Darfur conflict broke out, this rhetoric of commitment appeared forgotten in terms of concrete action by the EU. What could explain this inaction? Perhaps Darfur was geographically too far away; perhaps the international norm of “responsibility to protect” was not strong enough; perhaps the Europeans believed the Africans could solve their own problems; perhaps the European Union continued to be too inexperienced and did not have the power capabilities. While these explanations are plausible, and certainly played some role at various stages of the conflict, this paper argues that a different variable caused the inaction: namely, the institution of the European Union itself. As the above speech demonstrates, not only did the EU require a strengthened CFSP but, further, Mr. Guterres called for co-operation and unity amongst the European Union, the need for a “single voice”—recognizing the internal discord. Coordination amongst the 15 member states in 2003 was difficult,

⁵ Human Rights Watch. “Too Little Too Late: Sudanese and International Response.” 2004.

⁶ For an article that highlights the “lessons learned” of Bosnia in the context of Darfur see: Kubicek, Paul and Dana Parke. “European Union and Humanitarian Intervention: Bosnia, Darfur, and Beyond.” *EU External Affairs Review* 1 (2011): 60-70.

⁷ Speech delivered by the Prime Minister of Portugal, H.E. Mr. Antonio Guterres, at the opening ceremony of the 48th academic year of the College of Europe. Bruges. 16 October 1997.

given differing member-state interests and levels of political will, bureaucratic red tape, and the lack of a clear leader to help resolve the conflict.

Does the European Union's inaction in Darfur demonstrate the **limits** of this multinational institution? If the EU is unable to decisively act on its principles in times of genocidal acts, what might that say for the future of this—and similar—institutions? Lessons learned have clearly become lessons forgotten: one can only hope that the European Union will be able to recall those lessons for the sake of the prevention of future conflicts and its internal unity.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section two provides context for the European Union's failed history with humanitarian intervention in the case of Bosnia. Section three conducts a thorough analysis of the case of Darfur with especial attention to the actions and rhetoric of the European Union. Section four presents this paper's argument that the institutional make-up of the European Union contributed to its inaction in Darfur. Section five tests the argument in a three-part analysis: first, using text from European Parliament debates; second, investigating several member states foreign aid, military personnel and rhetoric on Darfur; and third, examining European Council Conclusions on Darfur. Section six concludes with a discussion of what lessons should have been learned from Darfur and how the European Union might proceed as an institution.

II. Precursor to Darfur: The EU in the Balkans

The European Union was formed under its present title in 1992 under the Maastricht Treaty. Recognized as a prominent international actor, its credibility was put to the test when its “soft power” tactics failed to halt the mass killings and war crimes in Croatia and Bosnia. The extent of this tragedy was only realized and acted on after the July 1995 massacre of the town of Srebrenica, Bosnia, in which 8,000 unarmed Muslim men were targeted by Bosnian Serbs, separated from their families, and then executed. While the signs had been evident to the world regarding the Serbs' intentions, and

despite the presence of Dutch UN peacekeepers (from a founding country of the European Union, no less), Europe failed to stop the massacre. The crisis in Bosnia only ended after the United States, through the intercession of NATO, took the lead and utilized “hard power” air strikes against Serbia, forcing a peace settlement.

Certainly the European Union was not the only international actor who had failed the tens of thousands of civilians who had been killed throughout the conflict; however, the EU's inaction remains important for several reasons. **First**, individual member-states were not unified: the main actors France, Britain and Germany had been particularly divided on the crisis, thus offering competing policies. **Second**, there was a lack of political will to take assertive action or policy risks.⁸ The combination of these two difficulties allowed individual member states to excuse inaction due to the institution of the European Union. **Finally**, the conflict in the Balkans demonstrated that not only was the European Union's hailed “soft power” approaches (diplomacy, humanitarian assistance, etc.) unable to resolve conflicts of this magnitude, but also that compared to the United States and NATO, the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) lacked the physical capabilities to halt atrocities.

Given the harsh criticism for the EU's inaction right on its doorsteps, the European Union nonetheless claimed “lessons learned” from its experience with Bosnia. Rhetorically, the EU strengthened its commitment to human rights. A speech by H.E. Wim Kok, Prime Minister of the Netherlands, was one of many that reflected this renewed focus:

Creating a democratic Europe means first and foremost that we must incorporate the principle of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Union Treaty. How can we transform the Union from a cooperative framework that is purely economic into a more political union unless it is based on the principles that are most fundamental to our society?⁹

Physically, the EU backed up such rhetoric by creating a “hard power” tool in 1999: the Common

⁸ Gow, James. *Triumph of the Lack of Will: International Diplomacy and the Yugoslav War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

⁹ Opening Address by the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Netherlands, H.E. Wim Kok, to mark the start of the College of Europe's 47th academic year. Bruges. 3 October 1996.

Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), a 60,000 person military force to be used largely for peacekeeping purposes. Specifically, this entailed:

By the year 2003, cooperating together voluntarily, [Member States] will be able to deploy rapidly and then sustain forces capable of the full range of Petersberg tasks as set out in the Amsterdam Treaty, including the most demanding, in operations up to corps level (up to 15 brigades or 50,000-60,000 persons). These forces should be militarily self-sustaining with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support services and additionally, as appropriate, air and naval elements. Member States should be able to deploy in full at this level within 60 days, and within this to provide smaller rapid response elements.¹⁰

Europe embraced this new strengthened capability. Javier Solana, High Representative of the CFSP, stated: “The Union has to be prepared to use military assets and resources....[to be] in support of the values for which the European Union is respected world-wide.”¹¹ Two months later, the European Council Conclusion on the European Security and Defence Policy officially laid out:

The aim of the efforts made since the Cologne, Helsinki, and Feira European Councils is to give the European Union the means of playing its role fully on the international stage and of assuming its responsibilities in the face of crises by adding to the range of instruments already at its disposal an autonomous capacity to take decisions and action in the security and defence field. In response to crises, the Union's particular characteristic is its capacity to mobilise a vast range of both civilian and military means and instruments, thus giving it an overall crisis-management and conflict-prevention capability.¹²

Equipped with this new resource, and the accompanying political rhetoric endorsing the use of military force, the European Union seemed ready to live up to its proclaimed ideals and prove itself capable of resolving any conflict the 21st century might bring.

However, when violence broke out in 2003 in the Sudanese region of Darfur, resulting in hundreds of thousands killed and millions more made refugees, the European Union did not implement its “lessons learned” and did not promote a military solution. Instead, the EU went back to its old habits

¹⁰ Helsinki European Council. Annex IV of the Presidency Conclusions. 10 and 11 December 1999.

¹¹ Solana, Javier. “Reflection on a Year in Office.” Speech given at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm. 27 October 2000.

¹² Presidency Conclusions. “Presidency Report on the European Security and Defence Policy.” Nice European Council Meeting. 7-9 December 2000.

of favoring “soft power” tools of diplomacy and humanitarian assistance, with little tangible results. Darfur became a bleeding wound, causing skepticism in the institution of the European Union. *What happened to the lessons learned from Bosnia? Why did the European Union fail to intervene militarily, given the extent of the violence?* The rest of this paper seeks to answer these questions.

III. The Case in Darfur

Darfur is a region in northwest Sudan, a country that, since obtaining independence from Great Britain in 1956, has experienced many violent conflicts and civil wars. The Darfur conflict is rooted in competition for land and water resources, and the Sudanese government's manipulation of local tensions to gain political advantage. In 2003, violence escalated and, using methods seen previously in the genocides in Bosnia and Rwanda, the Arab Sudanese government employed *janjaweed* militias to target non-Arab civilians. Protected by the government's impunity, the *janjaweed* forces committed mass atrocities in which hundreds of thousands of people were killed and millions more were displaced from their homes in refugee camps. An African Union-led Mission in Sudan (AMIS) was created in 2004 and sent into Darfur expressly to manage the situation. Yet with a staff of 7,000 troops, AMIS was very under-staffed and under-equipped, incapable of policing a region covering the size of France. Pillaging and burning of villages, mass rape, and the prevention of access to humanitarian assistance became the systematic weapons of this war.¹³

The international community reacted to this violence with strong rhetoric. On September 9, 2004, a year after the atrocities began, United States Secretary of State Colin Powell was the first who

¹³ For books written on the conflict, see, for example: Cheadle, Don and John Prendergast. *Not on Our Watch: The Mission to End Genocide in Darfur and Beyond*. New York: Hyperion, 2007; Prunier, Gerard. *Darfur: A 21st Century Genocide*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008; Crockett, Richard. *Sudan: Darfur and the Failure of an African State*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

officially invoked the term “genocide” to describe the situation in Darfur.¹⁴ One week later, the European Parliament adopted a resolution terming the situation in Darfur “tantamount to genocide.”¹⁵ The United Nations sent a Commission of Inquiry to Darfur in 2005, yet its findings did not label the violence as a genocide. Most of the EU member states had taken the position that it was up to the UN to decide whether or not Darfur was a genocide and, once the UN Commission of Inquiry had decided it was not a case of genocide, this became the official stance of European governments.¹⁶ Sidestepping the term “genocide” effectively removed the international community of their obligation to end genocide under the 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide,¹⁷ as well as the newly created Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine.

The Responsibility to Protect doctrine has particular importance to this case as it was adopted by United Nations members in 2005 during the height of the Darfur crisis. Specifically, this document lays out that:

The international community has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to help protect populations threatened by these crimes [genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing]. When a State manifestly fails in its protection responsibilities, and peaceful means are inadequate, the international community must take stronger measures, including the collective use of force authorized by the Security Council under Chapter VII.”¹⁸

Traditional notions of respecting a state's sovereignty thus become null and void when that state fails to protect its citizens; in that case, it becomes permissible—and indeed, a moral obligation—for the international community to take strong action, including military force.

The European Union and its member states immediately jumped on board to advocate for this ideal. The European Consensus for Development, signed in 2005, makes a direct reference to R2P¹⁹

¹⁴ Testimony before U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. 9 September 2004.

¹⁵ “EP-Sudan Crimes 'Tantamount to Genocide'.” *European Union @ United Nations*. 16 September 2004.

¹⁶ Smith, Karen. *Genocide and the Europeans*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2010. p. 224

¹⁷ “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.” *United Nations*. 1948.

¹⁸ *World Summit Outcome Document*. Paragraph 138-139. 2005.

¹⁹ European Consensus for Development. 2005. Article 6 Paragraph 36 reads: “The EU also strongly supports the

and frequent European Parliament Resolutions have cited this doctrine in regards to Darfur.²⁰ Certainly, Responsibility to Protect became an international norm and was widely accepted by the European Union. Given this strong rhetoric concerning the use of “genocide” and the power of the Responsibility to Protect norm, one would expect that the European Union—as a principal global actor, one sensitive to the importance of international norms and human rights—would rise to the occasion in resolving the conflict. Instead, Darfur became a bleeding wound, a crisis that has lingered for years with no forceful international action to end the violence. As Rory Keane and Asbjorn Wee conclude, the EU's response to Darfur has proved that the R2P principle is not yet a reality in practice.²¹

Why did this happen? Certainly the answer lies in the gap between rhetoric and action. The fact that the Europeans called the violence “tantamount to genocide” implied that they recognized a responsibility to take action. And arguably, given their not-so-distant history in the Balkans, they were cognizant of the need for military intervention to resolve conflicts of this magnitude.

Statements by Javier Solana, High Representative for the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy, reflect this recognition of military importance in conflict management. On the eve of the Darfur crisis in 2002, he conceded that “On occasion military intervention would be needed for the EU to act as a promoter for fundamental human rights and democracy.”²² At the height of the conflict in 2005, while addressing the United Nations, he did not renege on his prior conviction: “If there is a 'lesson learned' from interventions in crisis areas such as Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan/Darfur, the Congo and many others, *it is the need to enhance our effectiveness through better co-ordination of civil*

responsibility to protect. We cannot stand by, as genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing or other gross violations of international humanitarian law and human rights are committed.”

²⁰ See the European Parliament debates and resolutions of 6 April 2006, 27 September 2006, and 14 February 2007.

²¹ Keane, Rory and Asbjorn Wee. “The European Union.” In *The International Politics of Mass Atrocities: The Case of Darfur*. David Black and Paul Williams, eds. London: Routledge, 2010.

²² Solana, Javier. *Europe's Place in the World*. Address to the Danish Institute of International Affairs. Copenhagen 23 May 2002.

and military crisis management instruments [my emphasis].”²³

And yet despite all the rhetoric underlining the necessity of military intervention, it did not occur. The European Union continued to stick to its guns of “soft power” in managing Darfur, and like the rest of the international community, deferred to the African Union-led Mission in Sudan (AMIS) to manage the situation on the ground. Sven Koopmans, the Political Advisor to the Special Representative to Sudan, recounted that in 2003-4 the European Union's role was limited to humanitarian assistance and development aid. “Back then, the European Union was more in the hands of member-states. Therefore, it's hard to say that the 'EU' thought or did this, as actions were in the hands of member-states.” He speculated that “Maybe, member-states would have taken more action if the conflict was in Europe.”²⁴ His comments reflect the institutional weakness of the European Union, which offer an explanation for some inaction.

The European Union did employ several tools at their disposal, offering much-needed logistical and financial support. Most importantly, in April 2004, the EU had created the Africa Peace Facility, meant to support African-led, -operated and -staffed Peace Keeping Operations on the continent. Once Darfur became a key conflict zone, the Facility became the mechanism through which the European Union channeled financial support to AMIS, the African Union-led Mission in Sudan. This facility has consequently been termed the “financial muscle' to back up [the AU's] political resolve.”²⁵ Dietmar Krissler, a member of the European External Action Service, commented: “Darfur was not at our doorstep. More so, Africans said 'Help us to help ourselves; give us your support and instruments.' With the Africa Peace Facility, the European Union gave 300-400 million Euros: this was concrete support to 'help themselves'.”²⁶ As he points out, the EU played an important function; however, without the threat

²³ “Address by EUHR Solana on Civil-Military Co-ordination.” *European Union @ United Nations*. 17 October 2005.

²⁴ Phone Interview conducted by Paul Kubicek. 24 May 2012.

²⁵ Cameron, Fraser. “An Introduction to European Foreign Policy.” London: Routledge, 2007.

²⁶ Personal Interview conducted by Dana Parke. Brussels, Belgium. 19 October 2012.

of a big stick, monetary contributions can do little to stop the physical act of killing, and tend to hide the lack of political will of Western powers. Indeed, as underlined by Tuoko Piiparinen, a scholar on Darfur:

Humanitarian aid thus has frequently served as a camouflage under which to hide the unwillingness of Western powers to use military force to halt atrocities. Similarly, the provision of logistical, technical, and training support by ANTO and the EU may be used as a facade, a rhetorical tool, by which Western countries portray themselves as “doing their bit” in alleviating African suffering, when in reality the AU urgently needs not only Western hardware, but also professional soldiers from the world's most sophisticated armies, especially in challenging theaters like Sudan.²⁷

From the beginning it was clear that the African-Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) was “set up to fail.”²⁸ While initially AMIS had been the best solution, as the only group the Sudanese government would allow into the country, one who best understood the regional issues, AMIS was severely underfunded and under-equipped to manage the conflict.²⁹ While the European Union helped supply necessary technical and logistical support, it is clear that the European Union relied too heavily on the convenient adage, “African solutions for African problems.”³⁰ Depending on this ill-equipped regional organization was insufficient to manage the magnitude of atrocities occurring in Darfur. As the years dragged on it is remarkable that the European Union did not do more to engage its CSDP military force to augment that of the African Union. Without such use of “stronger measures” or “the collective use of force” the European Union's rhetorical adherence to the Responsibility to Protect doctrine rings hollow.

Thus the gap between official rhetoric and physical action is highlighted. A disconnect occurs between the moral obligation to intervene and the failure to do so; this disconnect must consequently occur inside the institutional mechanism of the European Union. Commissioner Louis Michel offers

²⁷ Piiparinen, Tuoko. “The Lessons of Darfur for the Future of Humanitarian Intervention.” *Global Governance* 13 (2007): 365-390. p. 376

²⁸ Henshaw, Amber. “Africa's troubled Darfur mission.” *BBC News*. 15 November 2007.

²⁹ Lynch, Colum. “African Union force low on money, supplies and morale.” *The Washington Post*, 13 May 2007. p A17.

³⁰ Riesche, Simon. “Bosnia, Darfur and the 'Actorness' of Regional Organizations: Assessing the Performance of EU and AU Regional(ized) Peace Operations.” In *Multilateral Security and ESDP Operations*. Attina, Fulvio and Daniela Irrera, eds. London: Ashgate, 2010.

one such explanation: “As [with] each EU's policy on a conflict issue, there were internal divisions between member states. Throughout the tragedy, many EU member states have acted either bilaterally or along with others on the issue of Darfur, in particular, the UK, Italy, the Netherlands and France. The EU sees this as complementary to its own work.”³¹ These comments highlight the difficulty of coordinating multiple member states. The fact that some member-states felt the need to act independently of the European Union signifies an institutional problem. The next section lays out my theory that institutional coordination is the reason the European Union did not intervene militarily in Darfur.

IV. Theory

The institution of the European Union provokes an interesting debate within international relations theory.³² International relations theory is largely divided between the realist camp and its challenger, liberalism.³³ The existence of international institutions represents one area of contention between the two theories. Mearsheimer explains: “Realists maintain that institutions are basically a reflection of the distribution of power in the world. They are based on the self-interested calculations of the great powers, and they have no independent effect on state behavior.”³⁴ He later claims, “[Liberal] Institutionalists directly challenge this view of institutions, arguing instead that institutions can alter state preferences and therefore change state behavior. Institutions can discourage states from calculating self-interest on the basis of how every move affects their relative power positions.”³⁵

³¹ Interview via e-mail conducted by Dana Parke. 3 October 2012.

³² Risse-Kappen, Thomas. “Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union.” *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34 no. 1 (1996): 53-80.

³³ For further reading on the basic assumptions held by liberals and realists in international relations theory see: Walt, Stephen. “International Relations: One World, Many Theories.” *Foreign Policy* 110 (1998): 29-46.; Doyle, Michael. *Ways of War and Peace*. New York: Norton, 1997.; and Baldwin, David, ed. *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

³⁴ Mearsheimer, John. “The False Promise of International Institutions.” *International Security* 19, no. 3 (1994): 5-49, p.7.

³⁵ Ibid.

The existence of the European Union then is a star child of liberal international relations theory, a prime example of how states can join together in an international organization to act authoritatively on issues of global importance. Liberals also emphasize the power of international norms and ideas in affecting international politics.³⁶ Certainly the European Union, while originally founded solely for economic unity, has grown to encompass many global norms, key among them an emphasis on human rights and the prevention of atrocities including genocide. Indeed, according to liberals, the European Union is a key domain for collaboration on such principles and norms, and is one of the most effective institutions at implementing policies to uphold these ideas.³⁷

Given these liberal normative assumptions upon which the founding of the European Union was based, *why then, faced with genocide in Darfur, did the European Union fail to intervene in any substantial way?* Much of the evidence points to the fact that the European Union *should have* intervened: it was a stronger, more established organization and had the ability to deploy its CSDP; it had learned its moral lessons from Bosnia; and international norms against human rights abuses, including the Responsibility to Protect, had been consolidated into EU documents.³⁸ Yet in 2003 when the Darfur crisis came to light, despite much-needed military action on the ground, the European Union did not deploy its forces.

A main explanation offered was that Darfur was geographically too far away, and many EU officials relied on the phrase “African solutions to African problems”³⁹ to justify offering technical

³⁶ Norms and ideas have played an especial role in EU membership: the norms of the EU institution have become internalized in the domestic environments of member states. See: Sandholtz, Wayne. “Membership Matters: Limits of the Functional Theory of International Institutions.” *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34 (1996): 404-429.

³⁷ This is true especially for liberal intergovernmentalism theorists. See, for example: Moravcsik, Andrew and Frank Schimmelfennig. “Liberal Intergovernmentalism.” In *European Integration Theory*. Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

³⁸ The EU lays out its commitment to human rights in its Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000). The preamble states “the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law.”

Further, Article 6 Paragraph 36 of the European Consensus for Development (2005) reads: “The EU also strongly supports the responsibility to protect.”

³⁹ Riesecke, Simon. “Bosnia, Darfur and the 'Actress' of Regional Organizations: Assessing the Performance of EU and

assistance and aid to the African Union Mission in Sudan rather than their own military forces. However, this explanation became a convenient excuse for inaction on the part of the West and shows the European Union's emphasis on being a global power to be insincere. Particularly when one considers that in 2003 the European Union had sent 1800 troops to the Democratic Republic of Congo in the CSDP's first non-European mission,⁴⁰ the geographic location argument falls through and the EU's inaction in Darfur shows itself to be hypocritical. Further, individual member states have engaged in military interventions in the region. In May 2000, Britain deployed over 1,000 troops to Sierra Leone under Operation Palliser. This exercise demonstrated Britain's self-interest: in neo-colonial fashion, Britain solidified its presence on the global playing field as well as protected its national interests.⁴¹ Another major EU power, France, has also been heavily involved in the region, largely for neo-colonial interests: several thousand troops under Operation Unicorn have been stationed in Cote d'Ivoire since 2002.⁴²

These facts highlight the realist explanation of states' self-interest. In comparison, Darfur was just not politically important enough to warrant military intervention. Initially, the conflict in Darfur was mired in the decades of conflict in Sudan. Then, due to Sudan's major petroleum exports and the regime's close relationship with China, the international community did not wish to jeopardize their own interests by calling for harsh sanctions on the perpetrator: the Sudanese government.⁴³

Yet perhaps realism does not fully explain the situation—for the European Union did in fact address Darfur with strong rhetoric and the conflict was often the subject of debate in the European Parliament. Further, the EU offered substantial foreign aid and technical support to the region. Darfur

AU Regional(ized) Peace Operations.” In *Multilateral Security and ESDP Operations*. Attina, Fulvio and Daniela Irrera, eds. London: Ashgate, 2010.

⁴⁰ Feinstein, Lee. “Darfur and Beyond: What Is Needed to Prevent Mass Atrocities.” *Council on Foreign Relations 22* (2007):1-53. p. 32

⁴¹ Tran, Mark. “New Imperialism in Sierra Leone.” *The Guardian*. 14 May 2002.

⁴² Diop, Boubacar Boris. “Ivory Coast: Colonial Adventure.” *Le Monde Diplomatique*. 10 April 2005.

⁴³ Metzler, John. “Darfur tragedy obscured by mitigating factors: Oil, Sudan-China ties.” *World Tribune*. 2 August 2013.

was not ignored; however, it is clear that the European Union could have done much more.

This stark gap between the EU's strong rhetoric and weak action reflects that there must be some internal mechanism within the European Union itself that is responsible for its failure to act in the face of such moral imperative. I argue that it is the institutional workings of the European Union itself which tend towards inaction in such matters of global importance. There are several reasons that explain why this is the case: **multiple member states focused on self-interest, bureaucratic difficulties, and a tendency of inaction.**

Firstly, the inherent characteristic of multinational institutions is that there are many members and many institutional bodies in power, resulting in a bureaucratic coordination problem.⁴⁴ Within the European Union, not only are there 28 member states,⁴⁵ but also many bodies (the European Parliament, the European Commission and the European Council, to name a few) within which institution-wide policies must be adhered to. James Dobbins points out, “The division between the European Council, which decides upon defence and security matters, and the European Commission, which sets and implements development policy, often leads to a disjointed EU response to the call of nation building.”⁴⁶

Apart from the main Constitution of the European Union, there are thousands of pages of

⁴⁴ For an article addressing the EU's problems of coordination, legitimacy and control see: Shapiro, Martin. “The Problems of Independent Agencies in the United States and the European Union.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 4, no. 2 (1997): 276-277.

For specifics on the institutional problems associated with conflict, see: Cameron, Fraser. “The European Union and Conflict Prevention.” United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. 2004.

He states, for example:

“There are sometimes differences between the 25 EU member states on the use of instruments to deal with potential conflicts, and some may also have specific interests in a region. There are also the oft-cited rivalries between those responsible for Community instruments and those for CFSP/ESDP. It is thus not always easy to secure a common vision of the desired outcome of a crisis.” p. 18

⁴⁵ Currently there are 28 member states, with Croatia's addition in July 2013. At the start of the Darfur crisis in 2003 the EU comprised of 15 countries. During the Darfur conflict, the European Union expanded twice: in 2004, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia were added to the EU. In 2007, Bulgaria and Romania were declared members.

⁴⁶ Dobbins, James. “Europe's Role in Nation Building.” *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy* 50, no. 3 (2008): 83-110. p. 108.

documents that regulate the internal workings of the European Union. One of the principles laid out in these documents is an emphasis on democracy, the power of the majority, in implementing policy. Yet in practice, this power of majority needed to pass policies actually excuses inaction. One critic points out:

In 1993 the European Union consolidated its disparate foreign policy arms into a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), pledging to finally “speak with one voice” for a united Europe. But “speaking” appears all this body is capable of. Under the Maastricht Treaty, CFSP actions require the unanimity of all E.U. Member states, an uber-majority that all but eliminates the possibility of collective armed intervention. By defect or design, this allows member states to voice their concerns—and then excuse their inaction as bowing to the judgment of the whole.⁴⁷

This is an institutional flaw written into the founding documents of the EU.⁴⁸ On paper this rule demonstrates adherence to the norms of majority-rule politics, but in practice, particularly in the case of Darfur, it permits inaction. This then provides one explanation of the stark gap between rhetoric and policy of the European Union.

Another causal explanation is obvious: certainly with so many individuals and groups represented within the European Union, the options available when confronting any situation are innumerable. Robert Putnam's formative article on Two-Level Games demonstrates the intricacies of decision-making between the domestic and international spheres.⁴⁹ Applying this logic to the European Union, in which two dozen member states must acquiesce to their domestic constituents and

⁴⁷ Bock, Christian and Leland Miller. “Darfur: Where Is Europe?” *The Washington Post*. 9 December 2004. Page A33.

⁴⁸ The text of the Maastricht Treaty on the Declaration on voting in the field of the Common Foreign and Security Policy reads: “The Conference agrees that, with regard to Council decisions requiring unanimity, Member States will, to the extent possible, avoid preventing a unanimous decision where a qualified majority exists in favour of that decision.” The following Declaration on practical arrangements in the field of the Common Foreign and Security Policy reads: “The Conference agrees that the division of work between the Political Committee and the Committee of Permanent Representatives will be examined at a later stage, as will the practical arrangements for merging the Political Cooperation Secretariat with the General Secretariat of the Council and for cooperation between the latter and the Commission.”

⁴⁹ Putnam, Robert. “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games.” *International Organization* 42 (1988): 427-460. He specifically argues, “The politics of many international negotiations can usefully be construed as a two-level game. At the national level, domestic groups pursue their interests by pressuring the government to adopt favorable policies, and politicians seek power by constructing coalitions among those groups. At the international level, national governments seek to maximize their own ability to satisfy domestic pressures, while minimizing the adverse consequences of foreign developments.”

international spectators, demonstrates the complexity of making institution-wide decisions.

In the contexts of large institutions, the individual member state's radical positions must be watered down to pass agreement of the majority. Thus resulting policies tend to conform to the status quo, making change difficult. Further, the European Union largely accredits equality to each member state. Yet, without a key advocate to push policies through to fruition, the ranging interests of member states become difficult to unify. This was seen once before in the case of Bosnia, as James Dow pointed out that poor cohesion, bad judgment and the absence of political will to use military force resulted in the European Union's failure of inaction.⁵⁰ Years later with Darfur these themes played out again, reflecting an institutional flaw to resolving conflict.

Large institutions thus tend to adopt a least common denominator approach in managing conflict situations that arise, meaning adopting policies that involve little or no-risk and is agreeable to all. In the case of Bosnia and Darfur, this meant sending humanitarian aid as opposed to military intervention. There was no risk involved by sending financial support over deploying troops, and perhaps more importantly, public outrage against the atrocities in Darfur was never a central campaign issue to motivate further action. This type of low-risk approach is common in large institutions such as the European Union, where there are many interests to consider and, short of domestic calls for action, little interrupts the institutions' inertia.

Finally, after a careful analysis of the theory of liberal institutionalism, Mearsheimer concludes: “that institutions have minimal influence on state behavior, and thus hold little promise for promoting stability in the post-Cold War world.”⁵¹ He argues this in the context of realism, in which states always focus on self-interest and relative gains, making institutions ineffectual. Certainly this has been the case for Darfur, where the European Union proved itself as a scapegoat for inaction on the parts of some

⁵⁰ Gow, James. *Triumph of the Lack of Will: International Diplomacy and the Yugoslav War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

⁵¹ Mearsheimer, John. “The False Promise of International Institutions.” *International Security* 19, no. 3 (1994): 5-49, p.7.

member states. Noting the fact that many of its member-states sent substantial aid to Darfur, independent from the institution of the European Union, what does this say about the internal effectiveness of this multinational organization?

These institutional characteristics demonstrate that the European Union, due to many differing **self-interests of member states, bureaucratic red tape, and a tendency of inaction** in multinational organizations, is unable to act effectively in cases of genocide and similar atrocities. The next section will test my argument using a three-part method.

V. Testing the Argument

While the above sections described the crisis in Darfur and the overall European Union (in)actions, in order to test the argument that the EU failed to intervene successfully because of institutional discord among its members, it is necessary to analyze the internal mechanisms and members of the European Union. I start by examining the texts of the European Parliament's first debate on the situation in Darfur. The European Parliament is composed of 785 directly elected members and is the largest multinational legislative parliament in the world. As Commissioner Louis Michel proclaimed, "The European Parliament played the strongest role of the EU institutions calling for action in Darfur on repeated occasions."⁵² While the Members of European Parliament do not represent the national interests of member states, this debate vividly demonstrates that people in the European Union were aware of Darfur and highlights the specific issues surrounding Darfur that were discussed; ultimately providing an initial examination of the intricacies of agreement within a multinational body.

Next, I provide a closer examination of member states as exemplars. I begin by charting their

⁵² Interview via e-mail conducted by Dana Parke. 3 October 2012.

aid contributions to Darfur in light of their military capabilities. Then I provide an analysis of major speeches and rhetoric on Darfur by key heads of states, to signal their attitudes and ideas towards the Darfur crisis. How did member states regard the situation? What plans of actions did they advocate for? This examination highlights some of the differing policy positions that contributed to the internal discord found within the European Union.

Finally, I examine the texts of European Council Conclusions on Sudan and Darfur. The European Council is the main body of the European Union, composed of the heads of state of EU member countries. This is the arena where major decisions are made, which consequently reflect the national interests of member states. By examining these final documents in light of the rhetoric previously examined by individual heads of states, we can see how the internal discord resolves itself into a single document. Let us now turn to an in-depth analysis of the first main European Parliament debates focused on the situation in Darfur.

European Parliament Debate on the Humanitarian Situation in Sudan: 14 September 2004

The debate of 14 September 2004, in Brussels, occurred in the context of the findings of an EU delegation to Sudan and Chad. Almost all speakers commented on the harrowing facts that over one million people had been displaced and 50,000 had been killed. Notably, how the Members of Parliament articulated their position and the actions that should be taken provides an illuminating initial description for my argument.

Speakers did not fail to criticize the lack of immediate response to Darfur from the European Union and the international community. Emma Bonino from Italy began her statement: “We are reacting to a crisis that was sparked off and exploded in March 2003. We are in September

2004 and this delayed reaction is not due to the fact that we did not know.”⁵³ Ana Maria Gomes from Portugal similarly criticizes the international community's inaction: “[Khartoum] is a government that realises that there is no political will, when permanent members of the Security Council use words like genocide to describe what is happening in Darfur and do not act immediately with adequate resources to stop it with anything more than words.” Philip Claeys of Belgium disapproved of the debate's opening statements: “So far, the Council and the Commission have been extremely reserved, not to mention lukewarm, in their reactions to the events in Sudan.” Margrietus van den Berg, from the Netherlands, ended his statement in this way: “The question that many are left with is: will these remain just words, and does the Sudanese Government meanwhile have little to fear, or are we prepared to actually see this matter through via the Security Council?”

The question of genocide thus became prominent in the debate. Jana Hybaskova, of the Czech Republic, who had visited Darfur, discussed the ethnic context: “We have seen that there are no Arabs in the camps. Ninety percent of those to whom we have spoken do not have Arabic as their mother tongue. In Arabic they are called 'Suda', the black population.” She sets up the context under which genocide can be discussed. Glenys Kinnock stated openly: “I would like to say at the very outset that everything I saw in Darfur confirmed the view that what we are seeing there is a genocide.”

However, other Members of Parliament, such as Fiona Hall from Great Britain, pleaded that “in our discussions we do not get too bogged down on issues such as whether this is or is not genocide in Darfur. Let us concentrate on the actions that this Parliament can take to support the African Union ceasefire monitors and the peace negotiations.” While this is a progressive view, seeking action over rhetoric, it also is significant that by not using the word genocide, this speaker limits the European Union's responsibility to take action.

⁵³ Emma Bonino and the quotations from all the speakers in this section originated from: “Humanitarian Situation in Sudan.” *European Parliament Debate*. Brussels. 14 September 2004.

A main result of the debate was the decision that the African Union should be the main actor in resolving the crisis on the ground. Many references were made to the need for an **“African solution for an African problem.”** Indeed, European Councilman Bernard Bot had opened the debate mentioning, “We welcome the active role of the African Union in the Sudan crisis. As much as is possible and realistic, the ownership of the solution to the Darfur crisis should rest with Africa itself.” And Danish Commissioner Poul Nielson echoed his predecessor, noting that “the African Union has to be in the driving seat” in resolving the conflict.

Yet Glenys Kinnock critiqued the Commission and Council's opening statements on this matter: “To both the Commission and the Council I would say that in Al Fasha the African Union expressed no enthusiasm for an increased protection force....They called for more monitors and for an international policing and human rights monitoring force. They said they were not able to deal with the current challenges they faced, never mind having to deal with a substantially increased force.” She recognized that the African Union was ill equipped to handle such a large operation, and consequently critiqued the European Union's deference to the AU to resolve the crisis.

This internal criticism played out in other fashions. For example, the Dane Poul Nielson of the Commission pointedly remarked that the Commission had been active in giving humanitarian aid, some 105 million euros.

This amount corresponds to some 37% of what the EU as a whole has contributed. Normally, the Commission's share of support in these humanitarian crises is about 20% of what Member States give in total. I would add here that we see quite a spread when we compare what different Member States have contributed. I mention this because I find the qualitative value of what the EU as a whole is doing in a given situation is related not only to what the Commission is doing or the total amount of what we do, but also to the genuine character of commitment across Europe as a whole in support of our activity.

His critique was telling: clearly Member States had viewed the situation in Darfur with differing levels of importance. This signifies that to individual member states the situation in Darfur had differing levels of importance based on their own national self-interest and agendas. This hints that member

states were deferring to the European Commission to solve the crisis without individual commitment.

Another major theme of the debate was that “the only possible solution is a political one; it cannot be by military means” (Louisa Morgantini, Italy). Common solutions and actions suggested included an arms embargo, supporting the ceasefire monitors and peace negotiations, sanctions against the Sudanese government, an oil boycott, and increased humanitarian aid assistance.

Yet the few mentions of actual military intervention are striking. Helene Goudin of Sweden argued:

Intervention in Sudan must be based on a UN mandate, affording the greatest possible international support. The UN should act in cooperation with the African Union.....Military intervention by the EU would be in danger of making it more difficult to conduct a successful UN intervention. The plans for an EU intervention in the Sudan conflict also give the impression of being a springboard for the creation of an EU army able to act without a UN mandate. The EU Constitution makes it possible for the EU to intervene in conflicts without UN support. This would be in danger of weakening international law.

She wished to act according to international law and defers to the United Nations for military intervention. Claudio Fava from Italy staunchly opposed a military solution: “Of course, we must at all costs avoid creating the preconditions for a military intervention, even though it would be justified on humanitarian grounds. Mr. President, we are all aware that the history of recent years, from Bosnia to Iraq, has been that of the arbitrary and often counterproductive use of force to resolve crises. That is an option to be avoided, most of all because we would risk turning this region into a never-ending war zone.”

Finally, the last perception on military intervention came from Charles Tannock, of Great Britain:

Understandably, no one in the EU wants direct military intervention, but only supports the continued presence of African Union troops as monitors and possibly as peacekeepers. The UN and EU sanctions may be very difficult to enforce in such a vast country as Sudan, especially with the recent large investments in the oil sector by China and India, which would be negatively affected. ... However, with the lessons of Iraq in mind, no western power, to my mind, will contemplate military intervention. I call upon the African Union to show the world what it can do.

This response finally reflected the notion that military intervention might have been the best solution, because political measures such as sanctions would be difficult to enforce; however, he recognized that the West does not want the responsibility of military intervention and would continue to defer to the African Union following its policy of a no-risk approach.

The final outcome of this debate was a resolution that “calls for a political solution rather than a military one as the only way to end the conflict” and “asks the UN and the African Union to coordinate their plans.” This resolution is important in that it called international attention to the crisis in Darfur, yet it minimized the role that the European Union would play. Certainly those speakers who had offered more radical ideas and criticisms had been disregarded in favor of the silent majority.

An Examination of Member-States

One important topic highlighted in the above debate was Mr. Poul Nielson's criticism of member-states' aid contributions. Below, Table 1 provides these aid figures, reflecting the Official Development Assistance sent to Sudan from 2003-2008 by the main European Union members in comparison to the European Union Institutions. Certainly, the combined EU Institutions represent the largest aid donor as it is a multinational effort. However, several trends are worth pointing out, especially in comparison with the member states' military personnel capabilities⁵⁴ (See Table 2).

⁵⁴ I use the number of military personnel as a proxy for a country's military power. Certainly many other factors go into a complete calculation (total military expenditure, military resources including planes and tanks, etc); however, I use the number of military personnel because Darfur was largely in need of more manpower to monitor the situation on the ground.

Table 1: Total Net Official Development Assistance to Sudan in Current Prices USD millions⁵⁵

Country	2003	2004	2005*	2006	2007	2008
EU Institutions	247.05	68.92	212.80	299.41	254.68	277.84
United Kingdom	33.02	116.57	196.46	215.55	206.17	199.16
Netherlands	20.99	97.61	154.77	96.08	202.51	157.58
Sweden	12.65	26.50	45.49	47.53	68.11	64.98
Germany	15.50	48.32	44.89	50.72	36.93	47.30
Denmark	1.31	3.44	23.75	33.66	43.39	37.80
France	3.95	11.63	18.17	14.71	13.80	11.20
Italy	8.90	16.88	16.79	12.50	19.93	35.10
Ireland	5.15	11.45	13.17	19.27	25.65	24.15
Finland	3.41	9.59	11.73	12.87	16.96	8.66
Spain	0.31	7.87	9.72	13.26	28.36	37.68
Belgium	0.20	1.11	3.09	2.27	7.74	2.70
Luxembourg	0.54	2.62	2.58	3.43	3.49	3.45
Greece	0.37	0.95	1.11	0.96	2.80	2.98
Austria	0.46	2.18	.89	1.12	1.32	0.75
Portugal	..	0.32	0.17	1.66	0.28	1.02

Table 2: Member States' Military Personnel (in thousands) in 2004⁵⁶

Country	2004	Country	2004
Germany	284	Belgium	38
France	256	Austria	37
United Kingdom	209	Finland	27
Italy	195	Sweden	27
Greece	170	Denmark	22
Spain	149	Ireland	10
Netherlands	53	Luxembourg	1
Portugal	44		

⁵⁵ Table is constructed showing the descending order of the aid amounts by country in year 2005. Source: OECD.StatExtracts. *Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development*. 10 September 2013.

⁵⁶ Singer, J. David. "National Material Capabilities. Version 4.0." *Correlates of War Dataset*. 2010.

Immediately Great Britain was the largest individual aid donor to Sudan. This can be largely attributed to its history with Sudan: Great Britain had governed Sudan with indirect rule from 1899 until its independence in 1956. Colonial ties have a strong influence on aid flows.⁵⁷ Secondly, this large sum reflects Great Britain's prominent global position (which is also reflected by its large military).

The Netherlands contributed the second highest amount (Sweden and Denmark are fourth and fifth). This discrepancy can largely be attributed to a regional difference: Scandinavia tends to focus much more on human rights and consequently, humanitarian aid becomes a method of promoting and protecting these rights. However, one can also contend that aid is largely a “band-aid solution”⁵⁸: a soft-power mechanism that in times of humanitarian disasters is unable to completely resolve the conflict (and often hides lack of political will). To Scandinavia's credit, they do not have large military capacity, and thus aid functions as a main mechanism to exert influence on the situation.⁵⁹

Germany was the third largest aid donor to Sudan, which reflects its prominence as a major European power. In this case, it can be argued that Germany was not sending aid as a “band-aid” to cover up the crisis, because it had the largest military personnel available for when the crisis called for such action. It is also of note that Germany's vested interests in Sudan included the building of a Sudan-East Railroad extension.⁶⁰

France's trend in these two tables represents an interesting case because, compared to its military capability and its relative global position (permanent member on the U.N. Security Council), it sent relatively little aid to Sudan (\$18.7 million in 2005 compared to Great Britain's \$196.5 million).

⁵⁷ Alesina, Alberto & David Dollar. “Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?” *Journal of Economic Growth* 5 (2000): 33-63.

⁵⁸ Moyo, Dambisa. *Dead Aid: Why Aid is Not Working and How There is Another Way for Africa*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009.

⁵⁹ Denmark is the only EU member that has opted out of the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy on military matters. “Financing of CSDP military operations: ATHENA.” *Council of the European Union*.

⁶⁰ “The Train to Independence.” *GermanForeignPolicy.com*. 30 October 2009.

France had reasons to be interested in Darfur in addition to the humanitarian imperative: Darfur borders two of France's main allies in the region, Chad and the Central African Republic. With more than a thousand troops stationed in Chad, France was especially interested in regional stability. Further, the French oil company Total held major concessions in southern Sudan's oil fields.⁶¹ Thus, in 2007 when France took major control in the EUFOR operation in Sudan,⁶² it is clear that France favored a more “hard power” approach, explaining its limited aid. Oddly, the host country of the European Union, Belgium, gave a far lesser amount of aid to Darfur, in comparison with the above countries.

With these trends in mind, this section continues by providing a brief snapshot of the rhetoric of several EU Member States to illustrate their varying viewpoints on the situation in Darfur.

Exemplar: Great Britain

Tony Blair was Britain's Prime Minister throughout the debut of the Darfur conflict. Consequently, he had spoken out many times on the situation and his rhetoric proves an interesting examination. Well before the Darfur conflict occurred, Blair gave one of his more famous speeches in April 1999, “The Blair Doctrine,” where he spoke out about Kosovo and the principle of intervention. “No one in the West who has seen what is happening in Kosovo can doubt that NATO's military action is justified,”⁶³ he said. More importantly he focused on the changing globalized world system:

But the principle of non-interference must be qualified in important respects. Acts of genocide can never be a purely internal matter. When oppression produces massive flows of refugees which unsettle neighbouring countries then they can properly be described as “threats to international peace and security.”⁶⁴

His speech lays out five rules to deciding whether and when to intervene: Are we sure of our case?

⁶¹ Prendergast, John and Colin Thomas-Jense. “An Axis of Peace for Darfur: The United States, France, and China.” *EnoughProject.org*. 11 June 2007.

⁶² Charbonneau, Bruno. “France.” In *The International Politics of Mass Atrocities: The Case of Darfur*. David Black and Paul Williams, eds. London: Routledge, 2010.

⁶³ Blair, Tony. “The Blair Doctrine.” *PBS News Hour*. Chicago. 22 April 1999.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

Have we exhausted all diplomatic options? Are there military operations we can sensibly and prudently undertake? Are we prepared for the long term? Do we have national interests involved?

This speech precludes the Darfur conflict and the norm of Responsibility to Protect, yet lays out the precedent for military intervention in response to humanitarian crises. He touched on this theme again in 2004 when justifying military action in Iraq:

The global threat to our security was clear. So was our duty: to act to eliminate it....The essence of a community is common rights and responsibilities. We have obligations in relation to each other. If we are threatened, we have a right to act. And we do not accept in a community that others have a right to oppress and brutalise their people. We value the freedom and dignity of the human race and each individual in it.⁶⁵

This rhetoric is an important precursor to the Darfur conflict and sets up Britain's position on intervention. Once the Darfur conflict became the focus of international attention, Tony Blair did not fail to speak harshly on the violence. In September 2006, Blair was especially vocal: "The situation is completely unacceptable...But the immediate and desperate need is for better security."⁶⁶ Blair emphasized Britain's specific involvement in Darfur:

Britain is determined that this time the world will face up to its responsibility. We have been heavily involved from the start in trying to find a way towards a solution of this crisis. We have strongly supported peace negotiations. We took the lead in delivering UN Resolutions to impose sanctions and authorise a UN force for Darfur. We were the first country to announce its financial support for the African Union mission. We have contributed nearly 200 million pounds in humanitarian assistance to the region in the past two years. But I accept, given the human crisis in Darfur, that we have to do more, and urgently.⁶⁷

His call to action emphasized the need to support UN Security Council Resolution 1706, which would create a deployment of a UN Peacekeeping mission to replace the African Union mission.

Around this time Blair took an interesting step, writing a letter to each member of the European Union regarding the crisis in Darfur His main theme called for unity among members: "We should

⁶⁵ Blair, Tony. "Tony Blair Speech." Sedgefield. Speech. 5 March 2004.

⁶⁶ "Blair says situation in Darfur 'completely unacceptable.'" *Sudan Tribunal*. 16 September 2006.

⁶⁷ "Tony Blair: If Darfur is not to be another Rwanda we must act, and now, to avert catastrophe." *The Independent*. 17 September 2006.

work to create the broadest possible coalition to speak with one united voice on this issue.”⁶⁸ He targeted the European Union as the mode through which action should be performed: “The EU should play a central role in mobilising world opinion on this issue.”⁶⁹ Yet he clearly understood that his own country, being one of the larger powers and on the UN Security Council, would be at the forefront of this coalition.

In March 2007 Blair pushed for a controversial initiative: “We need to consider a no-fly zone to prevent the use of Sudanese air power against refugees and displaced people” along with a new sanctions package.⁷⁰ In May 2007 in a video message addressed to his public, Tony Blair stated: “It's a very very serious situation indeed...I hope and I'm sure that the British people will respond generously as they always do, and this will be obviously in addition to the money that the UK government has been putting into the situation in order to try to alleviate the humanitarian suffering.”⁷¹

Exemplar: France

Former French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac similarly played an important role early in the Darfur crisis, with strong pronouncements on the situation. In September 2006 he stated that he would make a “solemn appeal” to the Sudanese President during the UN General Assembly meeting, believing that a new catastrophe in Darfur “could destabilize all the countries in the region.”⁷² Here his focus on regional stability demonstrated his determination to protect France's national interests.

In February 2007 at the 24th Africa-France summit Chirac was firm: “I am calling on the belligerents and the government of Sudan....to accept the deployment of a peace force, to halt the attacks, to respect the civilian population and humanitarian workers, to accept the impasse and the

⁶⁸ “Blair's Darfur letter in full.” *BBC News*. 17 September 2006.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ Borger, Julian. “Blair wants no-fly zone enforced over Darfur.” *The Guardian*. 27 March 2007.

⁷¹ “PM urges action in Darfur and Chad.” *Youtube.com*. 24 May 2007.

⁷² “Chirac urges Sudan to accept peacekeepers.” *Sudan Tribune*. 18 September 2006.

horror of this policy and to choose reconciliation.”⁷³

One month later, a major speech used compelling rhetoric on Darfur and calls for action to prevent further humanitarian crises. “We cannot forget the lessons of the genocides and crimes against humanity of the 20th century that haunt our consciences.”⁷⁴ Chirac invoked international norms:

It is France's honor and duty to get involved whenever universal values are threatened, whenever the intolerable occurs....In 2004, France mobilized its military forces to ensure that the refugees would receive aid and protection. It mobilized the European Union. It took action to ensure that the Security Council would sanction those who violate human rights.⁷⁵

In a nationalistic tone, he underscores the European Union by indicating that France was the main mobilizer in Darfur. He also favors that “Everything must be done to ensure that the UN and the African Union force can be deployed in Darfur.”⁷⁶

Starting in 2007 France began to present a much stronger military stance on Darfur. Two months after Nicolas Sarkozy took over the Presidency, he actively called for the international community to send peacekeeping troops to Darfur quickly, bluntly stating “Silence is killing” in Darfur.⁷⁷ Thus, later that year when an EU logistical operation in Sudan, EUFOR, was authorized by the UN, France became the leading actor, supplying 57% of the personnel. What was perhaps the only EU operation with a military mission in Darfur became a national mission led by France, reflecting the rest of the European Union's lack of political will. As Bruno Charbonneau concludes, “The French government's involvement in the Chad/Darfur crisis seems to highlight the weakness of the 'responsibility to protect' norm for without the convergence of interests [of France] with the humanitarian crisis, it seems unlikely that we would have witnessed such an operation.”⁷⁸

⁷³ “Chirac Urges Sudan to Accept Darfur Force.” *Agence France-Presse*. 15 February 2007.

⁷⁴ “Message from President Jacques Chirac on Darfur.” Paris: Maison de la Mutualité. 20 March 2007.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ “Get troops to Darfur soon, Sarkozy says.” *The New York Times*. 25 June 2007.

⁷⁸ Charbonneau, Bruno. “France.” In *The International Politics of Mass Atrocities: The Case of Darfur*. David Black and Paul Williams, eds. London: Routledge, 2010.

Exemplar: Great Britain & France Joint Letter

Gordon Brown succeeded Tony Blair as Prime Minister in June 2007. Brown made a quick union with newly-elected French Prime Minister, Nicolas Sarkozy, publishing a co-authored letter on Darfur in August. Their letter called strongly for more action: “There is still a gap between the efforts pursued by the international community, and the dramatic situation that remains on the ground.”⁷⁹

They promoted a hard power solution:

The important UN Resolution 1769 is not the end, but just the starting point, of the international efforts that we must mount [in order] to stop the killing and to bring peace to this troubled region. The troop deployment is only one stage in the process of bringing peace, and we cannot wait a moment longer for intense international action to secure a ceasefire.⁸⁰

They also highlighted upcoming international meetings, an AU/UN meeting in September 2007 and France's chairing of a Security Council meeting, where they will use their political power to “rally world leaders to deliver on commitments in Darfur.”⁸¹ They concluded: “It is the combination of a ceasefire, a peacekeeping force, economic reconstruction, and the threat of sanctions that can bring a political solution to the region—and we will spare no efforts in making this happen.”⁸² Certainly the Brown-Sarkozy joint statement demonstrates the determination that Britain and France have in using military and political solutions to resolve Darfur, albeit three years into the conflict.

Exemplar: The Netherlands

After Great Britain, the Netherlands showed itself to be a remarkable aid donor to Sudan. The Netherlands proclaimed itself to be firmly invested in promoting human rights. In its candidacy for the UN Human Rights Council, the Netherlands declared: “Being one of the founding members of the UN, the Netherlands is firmly committed to the world-wide promotion and protection of human rights. For

⁷⁹ Brown, Gordon and Nicolas Sarkozy. “We are pushing and pushing to save the Darfuris.” *UK Times*. 30 August 2007.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

decades, human rights have been a cornerstone of Dutch policy in foreign affairs and development cooperation. Our obligation to the international promotion of human rights is even enshrined in our national constitution.”⁸³ The Netherlands sincerely promotes human rights and consequently rose to the occasion in offering aid to Sudan during the Darfur crisis. During European Parliamentary debates, the Dutch speakers were among the most vocal on the need for action to halt the humanitarian crisis in Darfur; thus their interests were truly motivated by the sanctity of human rights. However, without internal agreement in the EU on decisive measures including military action, the Netherlands settled for sending vast amounts of foreign aid.

Several official speeches reflected this notion that the Netherlands was committed to peace and human rights. Dutch Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende signed the Constitution for Europe in 2004 reminding his peers that “In the course of our history, we Europeans have given the world astounding ideas...But we have also brought brutal violence, and crushing oppression. After the dark years of the Second World War we realised that we could only build up a life of freedom, peace and prosperity if we worked together. We linked hands and set off on this road.”⁸⁴ He recognized that Europe had had a dark past, yet placed emphasis on the hope that is possible when member states join together. One year later Prime Minister Balkenende again spoke out, affirming: “Values like freedom, solidarity, respect for human rights and respect for the Earth are not 'possessions'. They are not shiny medals we can pin on our chests to impress others. Values are a call to action. Values create obligations.”⁸⁵ He said this in 2005 and, while he was addressing a different subject, his sentiment also refers to the conflict in Darfur: *if Europe respects peace and human rights as it says it does, then action must be taken to halt the genocide in Darfur.*

⁸³ “The Netherlands' voluntary pledges and commitments on human rights.” *Human Rights Council*. 2006.

⁸⁴ “Address given by the President of the European Council, Dr Jan Peter Balkenende at the signing ceremony for the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe.” *Council of the European Union*. Rome. 29 October 2004.

⁸⁵ “Speech by Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende in honour of the fifth anniversary of the Earth Charter.” Amsterdam. 9 November 2005.

Exemplar: Germany

On June 6, 2004 German Chancellor Gerhard Schroder gave a speech commemorating the 60th anniversary of D-Day. Considering this was during the first year of the Darfur conflict, his point of view is interesting. He stated:

Our democratic goals are freedom, justice and a worthy life for all—in freedom, without religious hatred, without national arrogance or political indoctrination.....Because we Germans know that, we are not pacifists. But we are also not prepared to turn lightly to military means. *Where a military intervention was and is needed, Germany will not shirk from its responsibility for peace and human rights [my emphasis].....*We want a united, peaceful Europe that takes its responsibility for peace and justice on its own continent and in the world seriously. That is our hope.⁸⁶

This is significant because while he recognizes that a military option cannot be taken lightly, there are times it is necessary: to protect human rights. In light of the gravity of the conflict in Darfur, his words signified that he would strongly consider a military intervention to resolve Darfur.

Exemplar: Ireland

Speeches by Ireland's Prime Minister Bertie Ahern throughout the Darfur conflict reveal several interesting points. In March 2004 he discussed the changing context of international security: “If these challenges are to be met, Europe must play its part and we must do this to the full, using all of the instruments available to us and guided by principles which have served the wider world well....

Divisions in the international community in the past year have highlighted the need to develop a more effective multilateral international system.”⁸⁷ He discussed Ireland's role in the European Union: “As Presidency, Ireland is facilitating the dynamic to enhance the role of the EU has a force for peace.”⁸⁸

He commented on the EU's resources:

When it comes to conflict prevention, the European Union is playing to its strengths. It has at

⁸⁶ “Text of Gerhard Schroder's Historic Speech.” *Agence Presse*. 6 June 2004.

⁸⁷ “Speech by Bertie Ahern, then Taoiseach, at the University of Ulster, Magee.” 4 March 2004.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

its disposal a wide range of capacities, which sets it apart from any other organisation. As well as developing capabilities for military and civilian crisis management, the resources available to the Union also encompass development co-operation assistance and trade policy, as well as diplomatic and political measures. Bringing greater coherence and effectiveness to our collective EU external action means harnessing these instruments.⁸⁹

He concluded this speech with emphasis on Ireland's particular stance:

The European Security and Defence Policy is fully consistent with Ireland's neutrality policy. Our policy has always expressed itself in support for conflict prevention and crisis management. The European Security and Defence Policy now allows us to play our true role in building peace in the world, hand in hand with our EU partners.⁹⁰

Thus, despite Ireland's neutrality policy, Ahern embraced both military and political options in preventing conflicts. A few months later in October, he pledged his support for United Nations efforts in Darfur. His spokesperson said: "They [Bertie Ahern and Kofi Annan] covered a wide number of international issues including developments in Darfur, Sudan. The Taoiseach (prime minister) expressed his support for full intervention."⁹¹ Certainly Ireland was very proactive in recommending a solution for Darfur.

Exemplar: Sweden

Sweden played an interesting role during Darfur, as it was the host for the Stockholm International Forum in 2004, from which "The Stockholm Declaration on Genocide Prevention" resulted. In July of that year, the Swedish Prime Minister Goran Perrson wrote a letter to United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan. In this letter he raised many important points. "We must all shoulder our responsibility to protect groups identified as potential victims of genocide, mass murder or ethnic cleansing."⁹² This mention of the Responsibility to Protect, a year before it was officially signed into international doctrine at the UN, demonstrated his commitment towards the protection of

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ "Ireland backs efforts in Darfur." *Sudan Tribune*. 16 October 2004.

⁹² "Göran Persson writes letter to Kofi Annan on the Situation in Darfur." *MyNewsDesk.com*. 19 July 2004.

human rights. He continued:

It is crucial that the Security Council takes its responsibility towards the situation in Darfur. The international community must continue to give high priority to influencing the Government of Sudan to take the necessary measures, as well as to provide assistance to those in need in Darfur. It is encouraging that the African Union is taking such great responsibility towards peace and security on the African continent by sending an observer mission to the area. As you know, Sweden, together with a number of other EU member states, is participating in that mission.⁹³

Here, he defers to the UN Security Council and the African Union in resolving the crisis; yet he emphasizes the political role that Sweden was playing. Finally, Perrson commented on the issue of impunity: “We stand ready to co-operate with all relevant parts of the United Nations to ensure that Darfur will not become a place where impunity prevails.”⁹⁴ Given that this letter was written in July of 2004 (earlier even than the first European Parliament debate devoted to Darfur), the mention of not only responsibility to protect but also the importance placed on the United Nations route and impunity, suggested Sweden's decisive and progressive stance on the situation.

Exemplar: Belgium

Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt did not play a large role in Darfur. In a 2002 speech at NATO he explained an interesting cooperation with Russia, focusing on how “this new relationship will reinforce the political and military means at our disposal to defend and promote democracy, peace and stability on the continent and in the world. This Council and this Cooperation with Russia opens new perspectives in crisis management.”⁹⁵ Yet, five years later when discussing Darfur, his earlier focus on military was de-emphasized. While he proclaimed that “Horrible crimes have been committed

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ “Intervention by Guy Verhofstadt, Prime Minister of Belgium at the Meeting of the NATO-Russia Council.” *NATO*. 28 May 2002.

during these last few years in Darfur”,⁹⁶ he also believed that “Military force alone cannot make peace.”⁹⁷ While this is certainly a true statement, he disentangled himself from military commitment by focusing on the soft power options.

Council of the European Union Conclusions

The European Council is a main body of the European Union, composed of the heads of states of each member state. It is this body in which decisions are made and state interests are reflected. Thus, in light of the previous section which examined several heads of states' views, this section will examine the texts of several European Council Conclusions on Darfur.

In one of the first European Council Conclusions on Darfur, in June 2004, the emphasis on resolving the conflict—with a political solution—was placed on the African Union. “The Council commends the African Union for assuming a leading role in this monitoring mission, and pledges continued support to it, in political terms but also in the form of human resources, as well as technical, logistic and financial assistance, including from the Africa Peace Facility.”⁹⁸

One month later, the Council focused on humanitarian aid and raising the issue at the UN: “The Council called upon Member States and other actors of the international community to substantially increase their support to the humanitarian relief effort underway. The Council announces its resolve to release additional funding for humanitarian resources in Darfur as soon as possible....The Council welcomed the efforts to address this issue at the UN Security Council.”⁹⁹ This conclusion laid out specific demands for the Sudanese Government, including “implementation of the N'djamena and Addis Ababa Agreements”; “unhindered, immediate and safe humanitarian access”; “immediate and

⁹⁶ Paquet, Philippe. “Guy Verhofstadt dénonce l'impunité.” *La Libre*. 27 September 2007. [Translated by author].

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ “Council conclusions on Sudan/Darfur.” *Council of the European Union*. Brussels. 15 June 2004.

⁹⁹ “Council conclusions on Darfur/Sudan.” *Council of the European Union*. Brussels. 14 July 2004.

unconditional disarmament and neutralisation of the Janjaweed militias”; and “cooperation with the UN on the protection of human rights.”¹⁰⁰ However, the EU's threat behind these demands is rather weak: “If these demands for the improvement of conditions on the ground and of the protection of civilians from being exposed to death, atrocities and starvation, are not met within the near future, the EU will consider taking further measures.”¹⁰¹

In September 2004, coinciding with a major European Parliament debate on Darfur, the Council maintained its stance on the African Union: “In close co-ordination with the UN, the Arab League, the US, and other important international actors, the EU stands ready to further support the AU mission.”¹⁰²

One year later, the European Council decided on a stronger stance, including a form of military assistance. “This decision follows an official invitation addressed to the EU by the African Union (AU) for the EU and its Member States to support the efforts of the AU and the reinforcement of AMIS.”¹⁰³

Consequentially, the EU adopted measures including:

- (a) military assistance: provision of equipment and assets; provision of planning and technical assistance to all AMIS II levels of command; provision of additional military observers; training of African troops and observers; strategic and tactical air transport; aerial observation; (b) assistance to the police component of AMIS II: support to the police chain of command; support for the training of AMIS II CIVPOL personnel; support to the development of a police unit within the Secretariat of the AU; (c) appointment of an EUSR for Sudan.¹⁰⁴

While this is a demonstration of a more “hard power” stance on Darfur; the majority of this support is only financial and logistical, which reflects that the EU is taking a least common denominator approach.

In June of 2006 the new development was the planning of a transition from the under-equipped

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² “Council Conclusions on Darfur.” *Council of the European Union*. Brussels. 14 September 2004.

¹⁰³ “Draft Initial Public Master Messages on possible EU civilian/military supporting action to the African Union Mission in the Darfur region of Sudan (AMIS II).” *Council of the European Union*. Brussels. 16 June 2005.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

African Union mission to one operated by the UN. The EU Council expressed its support:

The EU reaffirms its support for the transition from AMIS to a UN peace-keeping mission as the only viable option for providing sustained stability and security in Darfur in the long term. The EU underlines its readiness to support, as appropriate, the planning of the transition. The EU will continue, in the meantime, to provide, within means and capabilities, a wide range of material, expertise, planning, airlift, financial and political support to AMIS until its current mandate expires.¹⁰⁵

The European Council reiterated its position on this mission statement: “The Council underlined that a UN operation is the only viable and realistic option in Darfur in the long term.”¹⁰⁶

Yet the Sudanese government opposed this UN operation and the AMIS mission languished. “The Council acknowledges the need to urgently address the funding needs of AMIS. It urges other international partners to contribute to the success of the mission and appeals to them to fulfill already made pledges and to provide additional contributions.”¹⁰⁷ While certainly this aid is important, the Council reverted back to soft power initiatives and spoke little of hard sanctions that could have convinced the Sudanese government to comply.

Several months later the Council was optimistic:

The Council welcomes the renewed momentum of the efforts to resolve the Darfur conflict through a negotiated political settlement and the deployment of the AU-UN Hybrid Operation. It is essential that the joint AU/UN initiative to revitalise the political track and the strengthening of peacekeeping in Darfur be backed up by strong and coherent international support. The EU equally stands ready to play its full role in providing assistance for the reconstruction and development of Darfur once a peace agreement is effective, promoting a progressive transition from humanitarian aid to development cooperation.¹⁰⁸

Yet certainly, this optimism that the conflict would be resolved quickly by the AU-UN mission, and that the European Union could focus on post-conflict reconstruction was naïve, for the Darfur crisis still continues to the present day.

¹⁰⁵ “EU civilian/military supporting action to the African Union Mission in the Darfur region of Sudan (AMIS II)-updated master messages.” *Council of the European Union*. Brussels. 7 July 2006.

¹⁰⁶ “Council Conclusions on Sudan/Darfur.” *Council of the European Union*. Brussels. 18 July 2006.

¹⁰⁷ “Council Conclusions on Sudan/Darfur.” *Council of the European Union*. Brussels. 5 March 2007.

¹⁰⁸ “Council Conclusions on Sudan/Darfur.” *Council of the European Union*. Brussels. 25 July 2007.

These European Council Conclusions have demonstrated that many of the differing ideas promoted by individual heads of states have become watered down in the final document, revealing a gap between the rhetoric spoken and the action taken in Darfur.

VI. Conclusion and Implications

The European Union has prominently touted itself as an actor for peace, security and human rights. Equipped with its new CSDP force and its “lessons learned” from Bosnia to match, one would have expected the European Union to be a major global actor when the crisis in Darfur arose.

However, the case of Darfur reflects that there is a serious gap between the EU's rhetoric and action.

Why did this happen? This paper argues that it is *due to the institutional mechanism of the European Union itself*. The EU is made up of many member states, each with differing national interests and preferences on how to handle conflicts. There is no key actor in charge of leading the rest, as each member is accorded voting equality. Consequently, making an institution-wide decision that appeases each member is a complex matter. More radical positions must be watered down to meet the approval of the majority. Thus, resulting policies tend to conform to the status quo.

The case of Darfur certainly illustrates these institutional difficulties. Despite strong post-Bosnia rhetoric that “never again” will Europe stand by during a crisis of such magnitude, the conflict in Darfur became a bleeding wound as strong international action was largely non-existent. The European Union explicitly had claimed “lessons learned” from Bosnia (specifically, the need for military intervention) and created a military tool, the Common Security and Defence Policy, to back up its rhetoric. Yet when Darfur broke out, the European Union remained largely inert and reverted back to its status quo “soft power” policies: sending foreign aid and logistical support. The lessons of Darfur now echo the lessons that should have been learned Bosnia: *in times of genocide, the need for quick, decisive military action is paramount.*

While this paper argues that the cause of inaction on the part of the European Union is due to institutional flaws, inherent in this argument is that the EU member states have not lived up to their proclaimed rhetoric. Despite the leaders' compelling words, of whom many seemed amenable to military options, and even despite the new Blair-Sarkozy approach, European Union military intervention did not take place in Darfur. Certainly it appears that the United Kingdom and France, and perhaps Germany and others, were ready and willing to engage in military methods. As the larger players in the European Union, this evidence should lend towards the occurrence of a more hard power course of action. Thus, the obvious failure of engagement in this regard is perplexing. This paper traces the institutional hangups that prevented concrete EU action; however, it is also evident by the lack of action that member-state leaders' rhetoric was, in fact, hollow and hypocritical. If the major powers in the European Union had genuinely been advocates of a hard power resolution to Darfur, some form of military intervention would have occurred. Thus, the forceful rhetoric by the Heads of State of the European Union merely represents a bandwagon desire to condemn the atrocities in Darfur in order to maintain international legitimacy, and consequently, speaks poorly of the European Union's true resolve in intervening in humanitarian conflicts.

Overall, these findings have a variety of important implications for future research. Certainly this argument begs an in-depth examination of European Union actions and inactions in other recent case studies involving humanitarian intervention, to see if these lessons have yet been learned. However, the evidence from this paper reflects a pessimistic outlook on the ability of the EU to learn its lessons for the near future.

This paper also questions the commitment of the international community to the norm of Responsibility to Protect. Clearly this norm was not able to spur action in Darfur. If institutions are unable to properly act on this norm, then the efficiency and practicality of international institutions in

the face of human rights abuses is called into question. Particularly, the legitimacy of the European Union as a force for global peace begs inquiry, given its stark gap between rhetoric and action. *If the lessons of Bosnia have already been forgotten, who is to say that the EU will relearn its lessons from Darfur?*

Finally, this paper reveals important institutional flaws for members of the European Union to consider when faced with future humanitarian crises. Without major changes to its internal institutions and policy regarding bureaucratic coordination and intragroup unity, it is very unlikely that the European Union will intervene successfully in future humanitarian crises. If the European Union is incapable of such change, perhaps it will do best to leave humanitarian intervention to other institutions and individual states, and revert to its original politically safe founding goal of economic cooperation.