Political and Social Sciences Department

Simulating Europe

A Role Play Simulation of the EU Council of Ministers

MARTIN DAHL
and
GIAMPIERO GIACOMELLO

SPS No. 2000/1

EUI WORKING PAPERS

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

EUI Working Paper **SPS** No. 2000/1

Simulating Europe

A Role Play Simulation of the EU Council of Ministers

MARTIN DAHL
and
GIAMPIERO GIACOMELLO

BADIA FIESOLANA, SAN DOMENICO (FI)

Printed in Italy in June 2000
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I – 50016 San Domenico (FI)
Italy

SIMULATING EUROPE:

A Role Play Simulation Of the EU Council of Ministers

Martin Dahl, and Giampiero Giacomello
Department of Political and Social Sciences[1]
European University Institute

Abstract

This paper is based on a successfully implemented "role-play simulation" of the CFSP that authors designed and then carried out in the Spring of 1999. The aims of this exercise were to evaluate the working of the CFSP and further to develop simulation techniques in a European (academic) atmosphere. The authors conclude that the simulation represented a viable means of better understanding the working and limitations of the CFSP. Moreover, the authors suggest that simulations such as this should become an integral part of the full array of analytical tools when teaching and researching International Relations.

[1] We benefited from the comments to a previous version of this paper from the participants of the Working Group on International Relations, European University Institute 17 Nov 1999. We also thank Benita Blessing for her tremendous work on the editing phase of the paper, Craig Robertson for participating in the Control Group, and the two anonymous reviewers for their comments. We welcome any further comments: dahl@datacomm.iue.it or giacomel@datacomm.iue.it.

Introduction

"Basically social scientists simulate to investigate and learn about the behavior of individual and group processes" (Dawson, 1962:5). Gilber and Trotzsch have observed that "building a model is a well-recognized way of understanding the world: something we do all the time" (1999:2), and simulations are particular types of models. Simulations may be used for at least four very useful purposes: (1) design; (2) the development of a body of knowledge; (3) training; and (4) teaching (Dawson, 1962). This paper discusses how to construct a worthwhile simulation environment, specifically for the purpose of teaching theories of International Relations.

This paper is based on a successfully implemented "role-play simulation" that we designed and then carried out in the Spring 1999. Our participants consisted of a large group of graduate students from the European University Institute in Florence (EUI). The formal environment of the simulation was a post-Amsterdam Treaty Council of Ministers meeting, the General Affairs Council (GAC). Playing roles of foreign ministers, political advisors, the Commission, and legal advisors to the Council Secretariat, these participants were confronted with a precisely targeted scenario of political events. The joint venture of the formal and informal environment constituted the first human-based simulation of the functioning of the European Council of Ministers in foreign affairs as it stands after the Amsterdam Treaty came into force (1 May 1999).

A crucial motivation for this study is that European academics seemingly lag behind their American counterparts as regards the use of simulations as teaching procedure.[1] In the U.S., simulations are standard pedagogical tools even at the secondary school level. Since simulation techniques had not been used at the EUI before, we agreed that organizing a simulation there in was an appropriate venue to begin bridge this transatlantic gap. Moreover, offering the researchers the possibility to test and evaluate

[2] There are some exceptions though. For instance, at the 1999 ISA meeting one of the panels (Stimulating Simulation) was dedicated to the use (or non-use) of simulation techniques in Europe as teaching aid.

this technique as participants would further strengthen the competing edge of the EUI graduates by teaching them a new perspective on the EU Council of Ministers as well as providing them with a new teaching methodology.

The methods we have adopted in our analysis are deductive. We moved from the results of the simulation—the actual outcome, the questionnaires handed out to participants, their reactions—as effects to generate some hypotheses. We have focused on two primary areas of research:

- to which extent the use of role-playing is a successful learning/teaching technique, and
- to which extent we were able to generate insights or emphasize features about the workings of the Common Foreign and Security Policy that were not straightforward from other educational learning tools.

We considered both questions relevant enough to be debated based on this one simulation experience. However, by repeating the simulations in the future, we plan to accumulate further evidence on these questions. Future simulations would also enable us to cast light on a third research area, namely the impact of culture and gender on the outcome of the simulation.[3]

As regards the evaluation of role-playing as a teaching/learning tool, the results of our simulation reflect several similar contributions in the literature. Rather unambiguously, these widely recognize the usefulness of this type of simulation in taught courses and seminars (Guetzkow, 1962; Hermann, 1969). Our principal inference in this area of research was, instead, to confirm the usefulness of role-play simulations as a teaching/learning tool - not only in an undergraduate or in a graduate studies environment - but also within postgraduate studies. A further emphasis was to

[3] The results of the simulation currently under construction will be particularly interesting with regard to gender, for the number of female participants in the second run is likely to be greater than in the first run. Admittedly, these factors are subjects for endless studies. A definitive answer is hard to identify as while most scholars agree that these factors do influence the outcomes in the foreign policy making process as well as during negotiations, attempts to "measure" them are mostly unconvincing. Thus, we want to acknowledge their importance without, however, being able to include them in our current generalizations about the CFSP.

investigate the impact of the multinational environment of the EUI on the simulation. With participants stemming from 14 different nations we wondered if these backgrounds strengthen or weaken the effectiveness of role-playing as a teaching/learning tool compared to role-plays with less diversity of nationalities present.

The other research aim was to see whether the simulation would generate or emphasise insights about the workings of the CFSP that were not obvious from the use of other educational tools. The task was to evaluate the differences between the simulated and the real world GAC in order to provide a rough outline of some of the factors underlying these differences. This outline would at least consist of two dimensions. First, differences might be based on what may be termed "noise" from the simulation. Noise may, for instance, derive from the lack of authenticity and subjectivity of the events portrayed in the scenario[4] or from the scarcity of participants with sufficient knowledge on particularly informal rules and procedures of CFSP decision-making. Second, differences could be due to deficiencies in the workings of the rules of CFSP after the Amsterdam Treaty. The workings of the post Amsterdam CFSP at the time of the simulation only comprised various qualified guesses (Lykke Friis 1998, Cameron 1998, Hill 1999[5]), so that an investigation into this new situation could prove enlightening.

Our task was not to provide a prudent "test" of the practicality of the current CFSP machinery under the Amsterdam Treaty. Consider, for instance, that scholars have had substantial problems just describing the CFSP in a consistent manner (Holland 1994, Jørgensen 1993, Ginsberg 1999). The closest we may come to "testing" is to categorize it, according to Lijphart (1971) as a "theory-confirming case study".[6] Given the large body of literature on the CFSP, it might seem that we have merely confirmed existing

[4] This point may be debated endlessly. What we really were interested in was to create critical conditions to verify whether the instruments available to the EU foreign ministers would allow them to take effective decisions that may lead to "results" in foreign policy. The term "results" is intentionally undetermined because the assessment of the desirability of given outcomes is left to the evaluation of actual governments. In this respect, the content of the scenario is of secondary importance.

[5] Hill's address at the EUI simulation 1999: "CFSP after Amsterdam"

[6] As endnote, George (1979) compares Lijphart's "theory-confirming/infirming case" to Eckstein (1975) "crucial case". We are not sure, however, that, with regards to the CFSP, Eckstein's crucial case definition can be applied to the example presented in this paper.

theories about its working. As Lijphart has warned, "...the demonstration that one more case fits does not strengthen it a great deal" (1971:692).

Instead, the idea was to use simulation techniques as means to provide a different perspective to the workings of the CFSP. The investigation of the viability of the CSFP under the Amsterdam Treaty has not reached a final stage and it is still being discussed among EU foreign policy scholars. The theory is therefore in need of adding new dimensions of findings, and, one could not exclude that simulation techniques might be one of the tools that could provide at questions and incentives for such findings. Than the simulation did not appear completely detached from reality was clear early in the simulation.

Many *echoes* were heard during the simulation that were consistent with the *sounds* (or the multiplicity of voices) of the real CFSP decision-making. For instance, the first five hours of the simulation fits neatly into Zielonka's notion of "*Euro-Paralysis*" (1998b), "Europe's inability to act in international politics". That our simulation provides a similar result may appear to provide little originality to the field of research, since knowledgeable scholars have already estimated that result (Zielonka 1998, Cameron 1997, Bourlanges 1997, Rummel & Wiedemann 1998). However, what we value is the fact that *we came to a similar conclusion through a different tool of analysis, namely role-playing simulation*. Besides confirming European foreign policy analysis, the simulation – we will argue – furthermore indicated some new areas where one may explore further whether the Amsterdam Treaty may improve or decrease the likelihood of stronger European foreign policy. For instance, the new rules of abstention were used during the simulation, paving the path for a Common Position of the CFSP in the final seconds of the negotiations.

In designing the scenario and the role-playing, we had to balance numerous factors: CFSP shortcomings and rules of procedures, realism and viability of the scenario, need to reward players, etc. For the scenario's theoretical background, we actually used Zielonka's "Europe's inability to act in international politics" concept as a starting

point. Our goal in preparing the scenario was to generate a crisis that might bear direct, significant consequences for European countries if the EU Council of Foreign Ministries could not formulate viable solution within the given time frame. If our simulated Council failed to agree upon a common stance because it got slowed down by procedural difficulties or national jealousies, one could correctly deduce that, under the same or similar circumstances, that would also be the case for the "real" Council. In fact, there is no need for a full intersection of simulation and reality; that is, a simulated crisis need not actually affirm that the CFSP may or may not be serving EU's interests well. Some critical structural similarities—like how the real procedures work, and securing widespread agreement to act under time pressure—are enough to shed some light about what can happen in the real world, should a serious crisis take place.[7]

All in all, a failure in decision-making in the simulated Council was our expected result, based on the existing literature. However, our judgment about the success of the simulation was not only based on achieving such a result. For us it was also important to attain a high level of realism in our Council, so that participants would feel satisfied and put considerable energy in their role-playing. Making their lives impossible just to fulfill our theoretical assumption has never been a criterion to judge the quality and success of our simulation.

The paper is divided into three sections. The first section browses through the simulation literature, assessing the heuristic value of various simulation objectives. The second section defines and discusses "role-playing" as a simulation technique. The third section debates the choice of the CFSP as a simulation environment. The fourth section develops the behavior one would expect from the participants given a formal environment as the CFSP after the Amsterdam Treaty. The fifth section presents and discusses some of the results of the simulation.

[7] One may just need to look at the EU role during the Yugoslav war. The EU consistently failed to achieve its goals.

The trade-off between realism and abstraction of simulations

Simulation techniques became established tools of research and training for the social sciences in the 1950s in the United States.[8] Simulation operations have hence constantly grown, becoming more sophisticated and acquiring increasing respect as scientific instruments for the social sciences. Currently, it is possible to distinguish three main types of simulations: (1) human-to-human (all human); (2) human-to-machine (or computer-assisted); and (3) machine-to-machine (all-computer) simulations.[9] The decision to use one type of simulation or another rests on a crucial trade-off between the realism of the representation and the degree of abstraction that is necessary to generate problem-solving result or judicious generalizations. That is, the simulation designers should determine *a priori* which feature suits better their goal. A simple graphical illustration can look like fig.1:

Realism *Degree of Abstraction*

Case Study	Role Playing	Gaming Simulation	Computer Simulation

Fig.1[10]

The costs and specific goals of these operations may vary considerably. Two activities, namely teaching/training and experimenting, are probably the most common.

Although, "experimenting with a simulated system, instead of the real system [such as, for instance, the global polity] to study problems that would be impractical or altogether impossible to study in real life" (Dawson, 1962:13), simulations as experiments have produced mixed results. Too many explanatory and intervening variables in many social investigations are so tightly correlated that it may be difficult, if not outright impossible, for the researcher to single out precisely those factors that he/she wants to study. Large-

[8] The earliest attempts at designing political games were made at the RAND Corporation around 1954 (Dawson, 1962). Later, Northwestern University and M.I.T. emerged as forerunners in the application of this technique in the classroom. The use of simulations, or rather war-games, in developing military operations dates back to the second half of the 19th century. Discussing this specific type of simulations, however, is beyond the scope of our paper.

[9] A similar typology can be also found in Guetzkow (1968:24) and Natalicchi (1994:76).

[10] Adapted from Duke and Burkhalter, reproduced in Taylor (1989:271). See also Allen (1987:4 and 147).

N repetitions and quantitative techniques may help, but causal inference from "experimental" simulations should still be carefully evaluated.[11]

If scholars in the field more readily accept the heuristic value of simulation exercises, the use of this method to confirm/infirm hypotheses is definitively regarded in a more skeptical manner. In this respect, simulations like this one at the EUI can also be employed to generate hypotheses that would then need to be tested later through additional qualitative (e.g. case studies) and quantitative methods.

The case of using simulations as effective teaching/training aids is by far the less controversial, as it has been widely acknowledged in the academic world (Guetzkow, 1962, Alger, 1963, and Hermann, 1969). All-human or computer-assisted exercises are mostly used as teaching/training tools. In the latter case, individually or commercially developed software is amply available for the teacher for classroom assignments. From stockmarkets to urban development to national economies, software applications can perform as multipliers for students' learning of complex systems and processes. More recently, interactive web pages allow Internet users to test their abilities in competition with one another without even needing to be in the same physical space at the same time.[12] But even less expensive and "technologically" advanced simulations, i.e. those relaying [relying] only on human actors, can be extremely valuable as teaching/training devices.

The Role of "Role Play"

Old wisdom suggests that if we want to understand somebody else [else's] viewpoint, we should "walk a few miles in his/her shoes". That is, acting as another person and seeing a problem from his/her perspective would foster comprehension and greater

[11] All-computer simulations have been mostly employed in this specification. See for instance Allen (1987), particularly pp.323/350, and, more recently Gilbert and Troitzsch (1999).

[12] For instance it is now possible to test one's own ability as a member of a NATO-like international alliance (http://www. clevermoves.net).

willingness to negotiate. In short, this is the essence of role-playing[13], which is one of the many activities that are included in the more general term of *simulations*.

Role-playing simulations have been praised by instructors not only in political science or sociology, but, perhaps, even more so in business and law schools (Alger, 1963).[14] Actually, according to Cengarle (1989), simulation techniques have been amply utilized and they may constitute the principal and most efficient methodology available to train negotiators in any fields. Role-playing is based on a scenario, outlining the conditions under which the participants will operate, and a set of rules that can vary according to the designers' intentions and goals but always have the overall purpose of creating the most convincing make-believe situation.

The crises can replicate historical events (such as the 1962 Cuban missiles crisis, the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon or Russia's financial crisis of 1998/99) or devise hypothetical circumstances in a more or less distant future.[15] In the EUI Council of Ministers simulation the emphasis was on the latter. This method offers the designers—who often also act as a so-called "Control Group"[16] during the simulation—greater flexibility in the scope as well as in the actual management of the exercise. As result of fictitious conditions, the crisis can be more precisely tailored on the objectives that the designers want to achieve with the simulation. It should be noted, however that, as Natalicchi (1994:77) correctly points out, the Control Group is also one of the most notable limits of this type of simulation.

---

[13] While all role-plays are simulations, as it can be deduced by our introduction, not all simulations are role-plays (see Crookall, 1989 for instance). Henceforth we will use the two terms interchangeably, none the less we always mean "all-human role-plays".

[14] For instance, The EUI Moot Court Team description of their experience in Luxembourg (in the EUI Review issue of summer 1999, pp.41/44) is just a most recent example in this tradition. See also Grandori (1986).

[15] Evans and Newnham define a scenario as "an imagined, hypothetical state future state of affairs" (1998:486). We use the term here also to characterize the historical conditions from which to develop the unfolding of the simulation.

[16] Generally speaking, the Control Group covers all the contingencies over which role-players have no influence, such as, for instance, the weather, other countries not represented, international institutions or terrorist groups. The Control Group also acts as umpire among the participants and is responsible for managing the exercise. Perhaps most importantly, the Control Group has to uphold the overall level of credibility of the scenario during the crisis. Allen defines the Control Group as "...everything...that is not on [your] side" (1987:14). We put it slightly differently, telling the participants tha the Control Group was everything not actually present in that room.

Without the historical example as reference, participants can also enjoy greater freedom of action. More important, they can "make mistakes" without the grave consequences that wrong choices often have in the real world (Crookall 1989). Without proper checking, however, this freedom of blundering by participants can seriously undermine the whole simulation. Role-players may want to implement decisions that would patently be impossible to make in the real world. Or they may try to accomplish solutions to the crisis that would objectively exceed the resources and capabilities that the countries or institutions they represent would have in reality. It is indeed one of the most important tasks of the designers and of the Control Group to prevent this deterioration.

Despite all the great care in the scenario design and skillful management of the Control Group, unlike all-computer and computer-assisted simulations, role-plays are highly susceptible to the attitudes of human participants toward the make-believe contingency of the simulation (Allen, 1987 especially pp.256/265 and Grandori, 1986:10/14). Indeed, motivating a group of educated adults to play their roles as resolute actors—which is an "accepted" condition for grown-ups—without slipping into the self-conviction of "playing games"—which is not appropriate for adults—represent the psychological crux that makes a role-play simulation successful.

The Choice of Simulation environment: The Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union (CFSP)

Looking at empirical facts, one may hardly find a less confidence building pedagogical exercise than simulating the joint EU decision-making of the CFSP. The CFSP was implemented by the Treaty on European Union November 1, 1993 as the successor to European Political Cooperation (EPC) of 1970. Since then, and particularly in the 1990s, the CFSP has been chastened for its lack of ability to provide solutions to major international conflicts in the European sphere. For example, the CFSP has been portrayed as "*non-existent*" (Rummel & Wiedemann 1998), "*paradoxical*" (Zielonka et

al 1998), not holding its promises (Bourlanges 1997), suffering from a "*capability-expectations gap*" (Hill 1993, 1998a), "*unsatisfactory*" (Wessels, 1996, 42), "*regrettably inadequate*" (Cameron 1997), or "*paralyzed*" (Zielonka 1998b).[17]

However unconvincing the merits of the CFSP are, there are many other good reasons for choosing the CFSP for a role-play simulation. Let us discuss three main motives for choosing the CFSP for simulation purposes. First, the objectives of the CFSP are broadly formulated "common sense" aims. Hereby the aims are somewhat controversial in content while being at least of some concern to any potential participant of the simulation. Take for instance the objectives of the CFSP as stated in the Treaty of Amsterdam (1999). These include: 1) to safeguard common values, fundamental interests, 2) to strengthen the security of the Union and its Member States in all ways, 3) to promote international cooperation, and 4) to develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law and respect human rights and fundamental freedoms.[18] For the simulation, this commonality between the individual participant and the objectives of the CFSP are instrumental for a more successful perception of the formal environment of the participant. This is in accordance with Crookall (1989:163) who has observed that "the efficacy of a role-play depends on the degree of correspondence between the individual and the role he/she is asked to undertake.[19] Brody confirms this point (1963:206) outlining RAND basic assumption for employing this technique for research: "*the better the experts, the more thoroughly they become involved in the role and the closer the approximation of reality*".[20] Hence, the closer the individual is to the actual personality he/she has to play, the easy the identification with that role. For instance, it would be easier for junior foreign servants to play the roles of ambassadors than it would be for elementary school teachers.

---

[17] Summaries of the development of CFSP necessarily pay considerable attention to the failure of the CFSP to avoid the "tragedy in Yugoslavia". This was a conflict that the Presidency of the CFSP, Luxembourg's foreign minister Jacques Poos on several occasions - notably June 29 1991 - had voiced expectations to be "Europe's Hour". Europe's hour included by all accounts determinacy to solve the conflict on its own and possibly by military means. These were expectations that even today, nine years after the outbreak of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, are labeled by some commentators as "*laughable if they were not so pathetic*" (1999). Thomas L. Friedman, in International Herald Tribune, 19 August 1999

[18] Treaty of Amsterdam, Title V, Article J.1 (1)

[19] ibid

Obviously, simulations for teaching purposes do not dispose of junior foreign servants to play the roles of the game (although some of the EUI participants probably aspire to such positions). More important is to be aware that not all political themes are well suited for simulations. Simulations of an informal body of EU trade ministers preparing a common stance in the WTO negotiations, for instance, appear to be dealing with a more exclusive theme than a similar body dealing with human rights violations. First, technical trade details would have to be studied intensively before the simulation could begin. Second, a non-expert participant may have more difficulties associating herself with the problems of, for example, five different trade lobbies than human rights groups concerned with problems in five different areas. In the EUI simulation, several—although not all—participants had relevant research interests on the history or politics of the EU and the Council of Ministers, or on negotiation techniques, international law, etc. With such merits, the importance of choosing an area is not as crucial as it would be, for instance, for simulations including people with less education, such as undergraduates. However, since the degree of abstraction already is rather high by the simulation as such, our suggestion is to choose as politicized and commonly discussed areas as possible before moving on to higher levels of abstraction.

Second, the CFSP as an institution still has only a limited number of instruments at its disposal. It should be mentioned that "institution" is intended to describe organizational capabilities (i.e. assemblies of personnel, material, and informational resources that can be used for collective action) and the formal and informal rules governing their employment.[21] The CFSP basically has five institutional instruments available confronted with a foreign policy crisis. It may either, 1) take no action; 2) issue a statement; 3) decide on a Common Position; 4) engage in a Joint Action or 5) formulate a common strategy. The few but very explicit institutional options available limit the strategies available for the participants in the simulation. This may be considered as an advantageous property, since participants otherwise may spend too much time striving to familiarize with the institutional rules of the "game", biasing the simulation away

[20] Emphasis in the original

from its real-purpose, that is: experiencing how these institutional rules actually work. In the following section, the five institutional options of decision-makers mentioned above will briefly be discussed. As it may be seen, the rather clear institutional surface somewhat fades when looking carefully at the contents of the different instruments of the CFSP. This is probably a rather familiar problem of simulations, but its implication mostly work against the possibility of using simulations for predictive purposes, rather than working against using the CFSP in simulations for educative purposes.

Third, European foreign analysis, i.e. the analysis of Union (EU) foreign policy, is a rapidly expanding field of study in International Relations. Union (EU) foreign policy is defined as the formulation and action execution of diplomatic and foreign policy actions of the EC and the EPC, now the CFSP (Ginsberg, 430,3). One of its essential questions is why the common foreign and security policy has been so slow in developing compared to other areas of European integration, e.g. monetary policy. Importantly, CFSP seems in many respects to have failed despite significant "socialization" among elites in the foreign policy sphere (Larsen 1996, Joergensen 1995, Tonra, 1997). Moreover, the CFSP has failed even given what seems to be a constant intensification of the prospects of "*spill-over*" from Community areas of European integration to the foreign policy area (Schmitter 1969, 1996, Lindberg & Scheingold 1970, Moravcsik 1993). On the other side, European foreign policy analysis also includes puzzles: such as why the CFSP even after several grave setbacks like those in the former Yugoslavia, has still gradually intensified its degree of foreign policy cooperation. Indeed, the development of the European Security and Defense Identity/Policy seem to illustrate that one can no longer speak about the CFSP as a failure only, at least not in terms of its own development. The recent developments of the CFSP's defense and security arm as agreed to at the Helsinki Summit December 1999 may be "pathetic" as Friedman suggests above. However, by letting the participants experience the workings of the GAC themselves, the idea was to enable them to evaluate future CFSP events with deeper background and knowledge than any reading of articles or papers on the subject

[21] Scharpf, 1989; North, 1990

could give. In sum, the motivation for choosing the CSFP as simulation environment was its relevance, manageability, and its intellectually stimulating challenge.

The Workings of the CFSP

As regards the manageability, it is true that there are relatively few strategies of action available for CFSP decision-makers and, thus, participants in a CFSP simulation. As mentioned, the four formal institutional strategies comprise, 1) taking no action, 2) issuing statements, 3) Common Positions, and 4) Joint Actions.[22] Crucial for any assessment of how the participants were able to adapt to the CFSP environment is to assess – theoretically - how the CFSP works. This would also be a necessary condition for any conclusions to be drawn as regards the new institutional rules of the Amsterdam Treaty based on the simulation. Below we, therefore, present a theoretical assessment of the workings of the five formal instruments at the CFSP's disposal. It is based on a range of sources, notably, academic literature on the CFSP, interviews in the Council Secretariat and with Member State representation, besides official documents of the CFSP, in particular, the European Foreign Policy Bulletin.

Statements

Unsurprisingly, statements are the most frequently used instrument of the CFSP. Statements are often official communiqués to a third country. A specific style of language defines the degree of harshness or content in the CFSP statements. For instance, expressions might include *condemning, regretting, urging, sincerely regretting, expressing worry, welcoming, noticing, hoping, expressing concern or expressing grave concern* of the developments in a third country. These expressions

[22] A fifth option is *Common Strategies but this is only available to heads of state*. The last instrument at the Union's disposal is Common Strategies. The purpose of Common Strategies was to fill out those functions that originally had been intended for Joint Actions (Crowe 1999 interview). Indeed, common strategies share the property of Joint Actions of setting *out the objectives, duration and the means to be made available by the Union and the Member States* (Amsterdam Treaty, Title V, J.2 (2)). However, common strategies more explicitly are declared *"to be implemented by the Union in areas where the Member States have important interests in common"* (Amsterdam Treaty, Article V, J.3 (2)). Vitally, only the European Council decides common strategies, however, on recommendation of the Council of Ministers. This marks a difference vis-a-vis Joint Actions that could be decided under TEU based on general guidelines of the European Council. After the Amsterdam Treaty, the European Council still shall set out general guidelines and principles of the CFSP; in particular; this feature is relevant in areas with defence implications to which common strategies are not formally extended by the Amsterdam Treaty.

may then be used with respect to a given human rights violation, the process to return to civilian democratic rule, earlier commitments of the third country, etc. Statements are rather "cheap"; mobilizing only slightly more resources than *no actions*. Having few other effects, statements send a rhetorical signal to Member States' domestic constituency that "action" has been taken.

Common Positions

Informally, Common Positions were defined as (general) guidelines for the Member States (Krenzler 1997, 139) (towards a specific issue or region) that should be upheld. In the Amsterdam Treaty, Common Positions have been specified to "*define the approach of the Union to a particular matter of a geographical or thematic nature*" (Title V, Article J.5 (7)). In reality, Common Positions are legal documents in two parts. The first part expresses the Union's position in language resembling that of statements. The second part often contains a specification of those mostly restrictive measures that the Union has introduced towards solving the problem. These restrictive measures, for instance, may include embargoes, visa restrictions and suspensions of development aid. Indeed, it would not be unbefitting to characterize Common Positions as the Union's foreign policy "stick" from 1993-1999. Moreover, contrary to the image of the Union as paralyzed in the 1990s, Common Positions have been implemented relatively often and to an increasing degree. In 1993 and 1994 respectively 1 and 8 Common Positions were issued, whereas in 1998 and 1999 as many as 24 Common Positions were issued each year. In total, over 100 Common Positions have been issued since the TEU.[23] The CFSP is thus nowadays more than a forum issuing only rhetorical statements as its predecessor the EPC on the other hand was (Schneider *et al* 1997).

Joint Actions

Joint Actions are by Krenzler defined as actions "that according to the treaties are very concrete and visible towards a given international problem and where greater political

[23] These are not, however, all original Common Positions. About half of these are extensions.

authority is given to the CFSP (1997).[24] The actual wording of the TEU says that "it shall lay down the specific scope, the Union's general and specific objectives in carrying out such action, if necessary its duration, and the means, procedures and conditions for its implementation" (TEU, Title V, Article J.3 (1)). Contrary to Common Positions, Joint Actions often offer "the carrot" – the more constructive foreign policy action.[25]

Joint Actions generally are considered a tool indicating more European foreign policy cooperation than Common Positions do.[26] Yet, in the Union's foreign policy towards the former Yugoslavia 1991-1995, it was relatively easy for the Union to agree on measures of support of the developments through joint actions, once events had been stabilized by among others UN and NATO military intervention. Conversely, the Union had huge difficulties in agreeing on more restrictive measures through common positions in the initial phase of the conflict.[27] Indeed, Joint Actions have since its initiation by the TEU almost been issued as frequently as Common Positions.

---

supplements, or suspensions of earlier Common Positions

[24] Krenzler (1997, 139) from Bulletin of the EC 6-1992 point I.31: "Report to the European Council in Lisbon on the likely development of the CFSP... "

[25] The "carrot" nature of Joint Actions that was the informal rule from 1993 to the Amsterdam Treaty is explicitly incorporated in the Amsterdam Treaty. Here, Joint Actions "shall address specific situations where operational action by the Union is deemed to be required". Joint actions are still to "lay down their objectives, scope, the means to be made available to the Union, if necessary their duration, and the conditions for their implementation (Treaty of Amsterdam, Title V, Article J.4 (1). This may be operationalized as "sending a special envoy" as the Union has done to Mostar, the African Great Lakes Region, the Middle East Peace Process and Kosovo. Joint Actions have also included sending EU short time supervisors to support the holding of elections as it did in Bosnia Herzegovina. They have included the establishment of "European electoral unit" of observers as they did in the elections for the Palestinian Council. Moreover, Joint Actions have involved the assistance for establishment of various policing activities to support the democratic process or counteract terrorism. For instance, the support for the Palestinian Police Force in 1995 and the WEU policing element of the Union's administration of the city of Mostar 1996. Joint Actions have moreover decided to initiate the European Assistance Program to support the Palestinian Authority, and the investigations regarding the deployment and later actual deployment of international policing operation in Albania. Exceptionally only, Joint Actions have included both restrictive and constructive measures. In these cases, the target of the actions have been broadly defined, e.g. all "exporters of dual use goods" or all countries allowing "antipersonnel landmines".

[26] One should not forget that the "Council should define those matters of the Joint Action on which decision were to be taken by qualified majority" (TEU, Title V, Article J.3 (2)). However, this clause was only used once before Amsterdam.

[27] Winn (1997) mentions that it was only used once, which was in the case of the joint actions concerning anti-personnel landmines; however, qualified majority voting was not even in this case finally used as mode of decision-making.

Decision-making rules

A final note regards the new decision-making rules of the CFSP after the Amsterdam Treaty. In many respects the Member States are kept in a tighter rein after the Amsterdam Treaty than they were in TEU, even though unanimity ruling remains. Noteworthy is the rule of qualified abstention whereby Member States may abstain from a decision that it disagrees with instead of voting against it and thus blocking the other Member States from implementing the decision. Abstaining Member States must, however, follow the decision taken unless it qualifies its abstention—in which case it shall "*not be obliged to apply the decision, but shall still accept the decision*" (Treaty of Amsterdam, Title V, J.13).

The Scenario[28]

In designing the scenario for the simulation, we tried to present the participants with a chain of events that reflected grave violations of the objectives of the CFSP. This would imply that some of the actions available above would seem inevitable. Furthermore, we tried to provide a complexity that would be able to highlight some of the conflicts of interests, norms and principles that belong to the ordinary agenda of the CFSP. The events were distributed to the participants through e-mail over a period of two weeks until the day of the simulation. Those "collapsed-time" events corresponded to "real-time" happenings of over half a year.

Other researchers—most of them working on the Balkans—at the EUI considerably criticized scenario design before and after the simulation. We presented our reasons,[29] and contended that if a scenario for a role-playing is *not* criticized by the so called "area experts",[30] then the designers should seriously worry that something important is wrong.

---

[28] The description of the scenario is taken from EUI Review, Summer 1999, Page 45-48

[29] To briefly sum them up, 1) we tried to stress the fact that also the Mediterranean could be an area of crisis, not only the Balkans, 2) we linked the political manifesto of the new Egyptian (but it could also be Moroccan or Algerian Fundamentalist governments) government with the need to protect Muslims everywhere, including the Balkans, so as other "Bosnias" will not happen again, 3) the details of the scenario were expanded by a Portuguese Army Intelligence officer with considerable experience of the Balkans, serving in the headquarters of the Portuguese-Spanish-Italian multinational division based in Florence.

[30] Area experts seem to think that all International Relations scholars who do not work given area as their

We did try to consult other scholars to have a wide range of opinions about the scenario itself. Nonetheless, we have realized that assessing the realism of scenarios is a most subjective activity of role-playing and simulations in general.

The scenario was set in the Summer of 1999, and involved two main areas: the Middle East and the Balkans. The emphasis was primarily Egypt. The scenario began with the election of a religious fundamentalist party in Egypt. The elections were deemed free and fair by international observers, including the EU. Upon election, the new Egyptian government immediately declared that it would continue the work to maintain Egypt's international status as a democratic and free country. Shortly after the election victory, however, there were reports of religious intimidation of minorities in the country. These regarded in particular harassment of the minority of Coptic Christians. On defence issues, Egypt and Syria further signed a wide-ranging defense alliance embarrassing Israel, and the Egyptian regime banned all political parties. Moreover, senior officials of the Iraqi program of weapons of mass destruction were seen in Cairo by sources.

In addition to the developments in Egypt, the situation also changed in the Balkans. It was claimed that materials associated with the development of weapons of mass destruction were being landed at a port in Albania and stored in the north of the country. It was also reported that in a training camp for the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) recruits were receiving training in techniques for chemical and biological warfare. There was suggestion that arms were shipped to the area from Egypt, and that Egyptians were involved in the training of personnel. In the meantime, reconnaissance photographs from southern Egypt showed the construction of what looked like nuclear missile silos. The Egyptian regime issued the Cairo Declaration, which called on the Serb leadership to desist from the use of force in the province and to enter negotiations with Kosovar leaders on the provinces future. The final clause of the declaration noted that, should Belgrade fail to accede to these demands, Egypt supported the right of ethnic Albanians to use all means deemed necessary in their fight towards independence. In the days

---

main topic of research should be "forbidden" from writing about them. While we agree that generic IR scholars have lesser grasp about specific areas, such an argument would simply forbid them from writing about the whole world!

immediately before the simulation, the Serb authorities arrested a group of Egyptians in Kosovo – one of whom was identified as an expert in the use of weapons of mass destruction. Finally, there some evidence was uncovered that the Egyptian regime had used chemical weapons against its Christian population.

On the day of the simulation, the first news that was distributed to the participants were that the Israeli air force had launched a series of attacks against the suspect sites in Egypt causing the death of nine people – including some women and children. The US accepted the right of the Israelis to act in defense of their security. Over lunch, the news came that Egypt has closed the Suez Canal to all traffic from states supportive of Israel, including the EU. Other events during the afternoon were the news of a failed coup d'état in Egypt and the expulsion of two senior British diplomats. Due to the crises, the world price of oil rose by 12% and the EURO came to its lowest yet since its introduction in January 1999. Moreover, one of the factory units bombed by the Israelis, and thought to be part of Egypt's chemical program, was reportedly built by a German company. With the escalation of events, an emergency meeting of the UN Security Council became necessary and called for. In the preparations for this meeting, US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright confirmed in a secret document to the German presidency that she expected EU foreign ministers to agree on a common line (internally and with the US) before the meeting of the Security Council.

Results I: Simulation as tool of learning/teaching

Time compression and granularity[12]

Two elements are worth mentioning in discussing the creation of a proper design for the participants to simulate the workings of the CFSP: time compression and granularity, i.e. the level of details of the simulation. As regards the former, we decided to use as little time compression as possible. Before the simulation, events of half a year were as noted taking place within 14 days. Yet, on the day of the simulation the events and the ministers' meeting took place almost in real-time. This diverges from similar exercises

[11] Telephone interview General Affairs Council Secretariat February 1999

in military tactical training facilities where the time-compression of an operation often is extensive both before and during the simulation exercise. Emphasis in our simulation was thus on experiencing the dynamics of decision-making under crisis conditions, rather than teaching doctrines of strategic action. The responses from the questionnaires indicated that most participants found it possible to cope with the degree of time-compression chosen, in particular, because there was practically no time-compression the day of the simulation. What was a problem in terms of learning/teaching was, instead, the granularity of events.

The level of detail is always controversial and hard to solve problem in designing simulations. As Guetzkow (1968:21) has noted, "in developing simulations for the study of international relations, with what granularity should one work?" With the participants representing Member States and what may be termed "national interests" in EU negotiations, we had prepared the participants for the scenario in the following way. First, the participants had been asked to do some background readings—so that they would have at least a basic knowledge of where their represented countries stood. Second, we had provided them with additional information (that we researched) about what issue-areas their countries would consider of priority in bargaining with other EU members. It has been noted that in simulation exercises, "benefits seem to vary directly with the amount of background information one brings to the game" (Brody 1963:205). Since, the willingness of our participants to do extra reading and their time constraints fluctuated noticeably, we would expect rather ambiguous results among the participants. Indeed, the reactions of the participants during and after the simulation indicated that the granularity had been very high. This contradicted our first impression that it had been rather low on the day of the simulation with about eight new hand-outs of news reports. However, even eight news reports were perceived as an immense amount of information to cope with by the participants. The added value of simulations as regards teaching and learning, thus, seems to be of a different order than trying to teach relatively exact knowledge. What the simulation brings is the context, the pressure and the stress of

[12] Granularity is the level of details that are required for simulations by designers.

foreign policy decision-making something that probably no textbook or course in International Relations may be able to provide.

Choice of National Interests

It was of vital importance for us to observe how the participants made distinctions between three types of "interests" implicitly defined in the Amsterdam Treaty. These may be termed as, 1) vital national policy interests that are observed when Member States veto a decision, 2) diverging interests that would justify a qualified abstention, or 3) diverging interests that would just justify abstention, but without being qualified. To some extent the emergence of situations in a simulation representing all three types of "interests" would be too optimistic to expect. However, the intention was that besides the vital national policy interest (the veto situation), within the complex scenario came ample possibility that at least one of the "abstention" national interest situations would evolve.

Indeed, the question regarding the "choice of national interests" of the participants seems one of the most crucial of our simulation. The rich variety of cultures and traditions embodied in the multinational society of EUI researchers was a tremendous temptation to test the different national attitudes in a framework such as that of a simulation exercise. In fact, participants themselves expressed concern about whether or not they should play "their own countries" or choose a different one, possibly indicating an assumption that such decision would affect the simulation considerably. Simulation scenarios can rely on unspecified, non-denominational state-like entities and actors—if the emphasis is placed, for instance, on understanding the mechanisms of negotiations and decision-making—or on the representatives of real world national governments and international institutions.[35] Role-players are usually confronted with a crisis whose solution requires, to different extents, communication and bargaining skills,

[35] Two well-known examples are the Inter-Nation Simulation (INS), developed by H. Guetzkow et al. at Northwestern University in 1957/58 (Guetzkow, 1962), and the more recent National United Nations Model (http://wwwnunm.org).

appreciation of "their" represented country national interests, and some plain common sense to help maintain the exercise under credible conditions.

The results of the simulation emphasize the need for more work that tries to understand more precisely how decision-makers perception of national interests is formed. During the simulation, it seemed that the participants to some extent based their perception of interests on a combination of 1) personal beliefs, 2) a rough perception of how the country that one represented had acted before, and 3) a rough perception of the alliances that normally would be formed in European Union affairs. In other words, it was rather unlikely that the participants would be able to distinguish consistently from one case to the other between the national interests that the Amsterdam Treaty delineates for the Member States. Our conviction is that the main reason for this derives from the lack of structures and actors that we were able to simulate in a satisfactory way in our scenario. Yet, the similarities between the real world CFSP and the simulation were – as will be discussed – many. We, therefore, must not speculate that Member State representatives themselves have immense problems defining their "national interest" in more than an ad hoc fashion.

Information level

Another important question for learning and teaching is the absorption of the information given to the participants. In principle, all participants should welcome adequate and more complete information. However, a fair assumption is that, under crisis conditions, an overwhelming amount of information could presumably lead to (almost) paralysis in the decision-making process. Even if one allows for a more generous allocation of political advisers/analysts in the real EU Council of Foreign Ministers than we had available, the capability of information absorption by important decision-makers quickly may be depleted. This was exactly what happened during the simulation. At a certain point in time, participants were almost incapable of processing more information and using it effectively.

Results II: Lessons to be aware of about the CFSP after Amsterdam

From the section on strategic choices of the CFSP, the expected action of the participants would be initially to enter a period of chaotic negotiations. Here, the participants would be paralyzed except for possibly being able to issue statements of a condemning nature. Later, the history of the CFSP suggested two paths of action. If the situation did not stabilize by external influence and action, the CFSP would hardly arrive at any further action. On the other hand, if intervention of more potent international organizations was likely, the expectation was that the participants would be able to initiate Joint Actions, i.e. actions of a more cooperative or constructive nature. Such a pattern would fit the Union's reactions towards the former Yugoslavia. Common Positions would be another likely option despite the relatively high degree of complicity of the scenario.

Indeed, the simulation confirmed the potency of issuing statements in CFSP negotiations. However, for nearly five hours, the participants discussed the exact wordings of the following statement proposed by the Austrian former Presidency on request of the German Presidency:

> *The Council of the European Union is recalling its enduring commitment to promote peace in the Middle East. It reaffirms its willingness to serve as mediator acting in good faith towards each party involved. The Union recalls the costly peace that has been reached between Israel and Egypt in 1978. It remembers the Camp David Agreement, the personal achievements and the precious legacy of statesmen Begin and Sadat, expresses deep concern about the unilateral attach launched by Israel on Egypt. The Union calls upon Israel to use mechanisms of consultation prior to the use of force. The Union requests Egypt to refrain from any retaliatory action. It urges all parties involved in the conflict to revert to diplomatic means of communication and to promote de-escalation. The Union offers its services as a trustworthy and experienced mediator to all parties involved in the conflict Assures its belief in the peaceful coexistence of different religions in the Middle East.*[16]

The main discourse regarded the sentence, "the Union expresses deep concern about the unilateral military attack launched by Israel on Egypt". Here, France was against using the wording "deep", while Britain in the beginning was reluctant to accept any statement of condemning nature at all— calling the Israeli attack an act of self-defense. Since the rest of the Member States were eager to condemn the Israeli attack in very strong terms,

[16] Joint Declaration, Proposal I/1999/Israel, sponsored by the Federal Republic of Austria as represented by foreign minister Wolfgang Schuessel.

the predicted paralysis followed.

Statements are often considered "cheap" as earlier described. However, the fierce "wording" debate among participants in the simulation above may suggest that even statements have a rather high cost among diplomats. The question is of course whether the diplomats from countries outside the EU that are targeted in the various statements share this perception of statements as a costly measure. If the common understanding of diplomatic statements in third countries is different from that in the EU, statements necessarily are rather worthless in terms of the events they are supposed to address.

As regards Common Positions and Joint Actions, it was interesting to see the similarity in the choice of these two instruments between the participants and the real Council of Ministers. In other words, the participants clearly felt more comfortable issuing Common Positions than Joint Actions. This feature may stem from the fact that the participant representing the German Presidency was closely familiar with the CFSP decision-making. Another striking characteristic was the apparent confusion in the finally agreed upon Common Position (See appendix A) about the proper content of a Common Position. Should a Common Position express general guidelines or should it define concrete measures to be implemented? Experts on the CFSP would know that even the Council of Ministers have had immense difficulties in making such a distinction.

There were several differences between the outcome of the simulation and the expected CFSP decision-making. Notably, a situation of abstention emerged during the simulation. It was a "last minute" abstention without qualification. The abstention suggests that the new instruments of the Amsterdam Treaty indeed were comprehensible for negotiators. In fact, the simulation anticipated the first real CFSP abstention of Greece 10 May 1999 to the petroleum sanctions imposed on Serbia. One should note, however, that Sweden's abstention in the simulation was a matter of procedure and method rather than of content, since the content was already negotiated down to a level on or even below the lowest common denominator level. Before the abstention, a fierce

fight over which measures to include had taken place without even touching upon the decision-making rules allowing for qualified abstentions. In other words, the decision had already been negotiated as though unanimity ruling prevailed in all aspects except for some technical matters.

In this respect, it may be recalled that an important informal rule of the Council is not "to isolate any member states"[37]. Unfortunately, exactly this informal rule combined with the Article J.13 of the Amsterdam Treaty's clause that decision shall be taken by the Council acting unanimously has the unpleasant reverse property of producing only decisions according to the "lowest common nominator". Now, the simulation seems to point to an important deficiency in the decision-making rules of Amsterdam; that is, that decisions still are negotiated as though unanimity ruling prevails. This is no wonder since unanimity ruling according to the Treaties always can be introduced in any kind of decision even though it might give individual Member States a "bad reputation" in the long run. However, it is questionable how "bad" a reputation a Member State that frequently abstains, qualified abstains or "veto" decisions actually gets, when the informal rule "is not to isolate any Member State". In sum, since the negotiations are based consensus, abstention rules may have the opposite effect of weakening a decision that is already at its lowest common denominator outcome.

Learning from European foreign policy failures/successes

A theme that constantly emerges in literature on European foreign policy is how decision-makers are able to change their perception about the EPC/CFSP in the light of various failures or successes and thus redirect developments. In Nuttall's "trial and error" learning process, decision-makers of the CFSP learn by experiencing the (in) effectiveness of designated instruments. Subsequently, they create more effective informal procedures (some times unfortunately also more ineffective) (1997). Another learning process is the notion of the vicious and virtuous circle of European foreign policy by Regelsberger *et al* (1997). The idea behind the vicious circle is that ineffective and inefficient institutions made European foreign policy decision-makers run into

failures. This, in turn, lowered the belief in the effectiveness of the CFSP—"credibility" is the word used by CFSP scholars and participants to the simulation alike. Consequently, the willingness to use the CFSP was lowered and—in a development not surprising for students of bureaucracies—even less effective institutions evolved. Unavoidably, more failures arose. In contrast, the virtuous circle is the future ideal described by the converse mechanics. Member States realize the ineffective institutional structures, improve them and experience success followed by success. Finally, Hill's "Capability-Expectations Gap" implicitly assumes a learning process based on the updating of expectations (1993). Hill's expectations are those ambitions and demands of the Union's international behavior that derive from both inside and outside the Union. The capabilities, on the other hand, are the instruments and resources of the Union, including the cohesiveness of action. Nevertheless, these externally and internally created expectations somehow lead the decision-makers of the CFSP into the belief that they are capable of solving (or, alternatively, they should solve) various foreign policy problems without actually being able to do it. This forms the capability-expectations gap. The gap may be lowered through a learning process. Primarily the internal beliefs about the effectiveness of the CFSP are here lowered, experiencing the limitations of the CFSP.

To cast some light on how our "decision-makers" would react to the development of their own negotiations, we therefore gave the participants questionnaires before and after the simulation (Appendix B). We asked the participants were before and after the simulation asked to indicate what extent they considered the CFSP to be an adequate forum for dealing with problems of the kind they had been presented to (question 2). They were also to report whether or not they felt that the word "confidence" described their view on the ability of the CFSP to reach a solution to the situation that developed (question 3). Both questions could be answered by the options: 1) extremely adequate/well, 2) very adequate/well, 3) adequate/well, 4) somewhat adequate/well or 5) not adequate/well at all. The distribution of answers are shown in Table 1 below.

[17] Telephone interview General Affairs Council Secretariat February 1999

Table 1 Learning about the CFSP from experience during the simulation

Time	Before the SIM	After the SIM	Before the SIM	After the SIM
	To which extent is CFSP the adequate forum of dealing with problems of the kind you have been presented to?	*To which extent is CFSP the adequate forum of dealing with problems of the kind you have been presented to?*	*How well do you feel that the word "confidence" describes your view on the ability of the CFSP to reach a solution to the situation developed?*	*How well do you feel that the word "confidence" describes your view on the ability of the CFSP to reach a solution to the situation developed?*
Extremely adequate/well	-	-	1	1
Very adequate/ well	3	-	-	-
Adequate/well	4	2	5	1
Somewhat adequate/well	8	12	6	7
Not adequate/ well	2	5	5	8
Total	17	19	17	17

See the full questionnaire with results in Appendix B. The different totals are due to incomplete answers from the participants to one or more questions.

As may be seen from Table I, there is a clear shift in opinion among the participants to the two questions. For the credibility of the CFSP, the change is to the worse. In other words, participants generally had less confidence and belief in the CFSP after having experienced its workings than before. One may note that this result was unrelated to the participants' sense of confidence and general satisfaction with the organization and learning from the simulation as such. The questionnaires handed out to participants showed an overwhelming satisfaction with the degree of experience the simulation had given each participant. Another reason for the change in confidence may be that some of the events of the scenario were not known to the participants when they answered the questionnaire before the simulation. Here, future questionnaires would necessarily need to control for this possibility. Yet, it seems unlikely that it was the eight new events of the scenario given to the participants during the day of the simulation that should have provided the change in confidence, only. More probable is that the participants experienced first hand that there were severe difficulties in the institutional rules of the CFSP - if not frustration - when the negotiations started. Repeated simulations of this kind may probably also cast some light on how exactly decision-makers learn – if they learn – in European foreign policy.

Future Research

Here we would like to highlight a possible domain for research that has seriously been overlooked in the past literature on simulations. Old and more recent writing on simulations have mostly concentrated on factors such as the robustness of forecasting based on multiple runs of simulations (Deutsch, 1972) or the rationality of actors (Riker and Zavoina, 1972). Political scientists have undertaken few investigations on the impact of cultural differences in negotiations. Mushakoji has beheld that "...cultural factors may play a certain role in many...negotiations.... I am not pretending that culture is the most significant factor determining negotiation behavior: rather I am merely bothered by the lack of attention addressed to this factor" (1972:110).[38]

Indeed, it seems awkward to introduce cultural variables (notoriously a "squishy" problem to measure) in a field dominated by rationality and formalization such as simulation techniques. Yet, role-playing and foreign policy analysis cannot disregard such an important element. In fact, Coplin has pointed out that simulating "...demands the construction of analytic boundaries between the system being simulated and the environment of that system" (1968:2), thus, quite logically, using role-playing in foreign policy analysis must include the representation of "cultures".

Given the scracity of scholarly articles on this topic and the research interests of many professors and researchers at the Institute, we think that the EUI could well placed to give original contributions in this area. And this simulation exercise could as well be a fair starting point.

Conclusion

The scholarly community's attitude towards simulation techniques has gone through many phases. The period of great expectations about simulations as a forecasting tool for foreign policy analysis (Hermann, 1969) has been followed by a period of more skeptical disposition. Currently, as mentioned, simulations and role-playing continue to

be part of the curricula of many universities and colleges, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world.

In this paper we have addressed two principal goals, namely to make future European scholars more familiar with simulations as teaching instruments (our heuristic end) and to use the EU foreign ministers role-playing as a supplementary technique to confirm the thesis of others scholars on the functioning of the CFSP (our ontological end). We have approached the second task via deductive method, and we have found evidence that supports the explanatory hypotheses that other scholars have elaborated. Thus, as we mentioned earlier, our original contribution were not the findings themselves but rather the proxy method we used to confirm those hypotheses. When two different research methods confirm the same findings, the likelihood that those findings correctly capture the explanatory causes greatly increases. The simulation also illuminated some intriguing features of the CFSP decision-making after the Amsterdam Treaty that is worth taking a closer look at in future empirical work on the CFSP. In this respect, one may actually benefit from looking at simulations as a helpful tool in European foreign policy analysis. Obviously, there is nothing that suggests that role-playing simulations should be back in fashion as forecasting tools. However, under careful scrutiny, they represent a worthwhile complement for hypotheses testing at hand for social scientists—at least in some fields such as (European) foreign policy analysis.

[18] Mushakoji is indeed the only example of this kind that we have encountered in our literature review.

References

Allen D and M. Smith, 1990, "Western European Presence in the Contemporary International Arena", Review of International Studies 16(3), pp.19/38

Allen, T. B., 1987, War Games New York, NY: McGraw-Hill

Bourlanges, Jean-Louis, 1996-1997, "Les Européens Malades de la PESC" [Europeans sick of the Common Foreign and Security Policy], Politique Internationale, Winter, No. 74, pp. 207/228

Brody R.A., 1963, "Varieties of Simulation in International Relations" in Guetzkow H. et al (eds) Simulation in International Relations: Developments for Research and Teaching, Englewood Cliffs, NJ Prentice-Hall, Inc. pp. 190/223

Carlsnaes, W. and S. Smith (eds), 1994, European Foreign Policy: The EC and Changing Perspectives in Europe, London; Sage, ECPR

Cengarle, M., 1989, "L'uso delle Tecniche di Simulazione nella Formazione dei Negoziatori" in Cecchini A. and F. Indovina (eds) Simulazione, Milano, Italy: Franco Angeli Libri, pp. 220/231

Crawford, Beverly, 1997, "An Empty Nest? Reconciling European Security Institutions in the Bosnian Crisis"; unpublished manuscript for forthcoming book

Crawford, Young, 1996; "The Impossible Necessity of Nigeria: A Struggle for Nationhood", Foreign Affairs, Vol. 75, No. 6, Nov/Dec

Crookall, D., 1989, "Concetti Fondamentali dei Giochi di Simulazione" in Cecchini A. and F. Indovina (eds) Simulazione, Milano, Italy: Franco Angeli Libri, pp.155/170

Dawson, R.E., 1962, "Simulation in the Social Sciences" in Guetzkow, H. (ed) Simulation in the Social Science Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, Inc., pp.1/15

Deutsch, K., 1972, "The Contribution of Experiments within the Framework of Political Theory" in Laponce, J.A. and P. Smoker (eds) Experimentation and Simulation in Political Science Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press

Eckstein, H., 1975, "Case Studies and Theory in Political Science" in F. Greenstein and N. Polsby (eds) Handbook of Political Science. Strategies of Enquiry Menlo Park, CA et al Addison-Wesley Publishing Company vol.7, pp.79/137

Emerson, 1998, "Cosmos, Chaos and Backbone for a Wider European Order", CEPS Working Document, No. 130

Evans, G. and J. Newnham, 1998, Dictionary of International Relations, London, England, Penguin Books

Fink-Hooijer, Florika, 1994, "The Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union"; 5 EJIL, pp.173/198

Fraser, Cameron, 1995, "Keynote Article: The European Union and the Forth Enlargement", Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 33; August 1995, pp.17/34

George, A. L., 1979, "Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison" in P. Lauren (ed.) Diplomacy. New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy, New York: Free Press, pp.43/68

Gilbert, N. and K. G. Troitzsch, 1999, Simulation for the Social Scientist, Buckingham, U.K., Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press

Gordon, Philip H., 1997/98, "Europe's Uncommon Foreign Policy", International Security, Vol. 22, No. 3, Winter 1997/98, pp.74-100

Grandori, A., 1986, Simulazioni di Organizzazione, Milano, Italy: Franco Angeli Libri

Guetzkow, H., 1968,"Simulation in the Study of International Relations" in Coplin, W.D. (ed) Simulation in the Study of Politics, Chicago: Markam Publishing Company, pp.9/30

Hill, Christopher and Wallace, William, 1996, "Introduction: Actors and Actions", in Hill, C. (ed.), The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy, London: Routledge

Hill, Christopher, 1987, "The Study of International Relations in the UK", Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 16, No. 2 Summer 1987

Hill, Christopher, 1988, "The Historical Background. Past and Present in British Foreign Policy", in Michael Smith, Steve Smith and Brian White (eds.), British Foreign Policy: Tradition, Change & Transformation, London: Unwin Hyman

Hill, Christopher, 1993, "The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role", Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 31, No. 3, September, pp.305/328

Hill, Christopher, 1998a, "Convergence, Divergence and Dialectics: National Foreign Policies and the CFSP", Chapter III in Zielonka, 1998a

Hill, Christopher; 1998b; "Closing the Capability-Expectations Gap?"; In H. Sjursen and J. Peterson (eds), A Common Foreign Policy For Europe?, pp. 18-38; London/New York; Routledge

Holland, Martin, 1993, European Community Integration, London: Pinter Publishers

Holland, Martin, 1994, "Plus ça change...? The European Union 'Joint Action' and South Africa", CEPS Paper 57; May

Holland, Martin, 1995, European Union Foreign Policy. From EPC to CFSP Joint actions and South Africa, Basingstoke: MacMillan

Holland, Martin, 1996, "European Foreign Policy Transition in Theory and Practice", International Relations, col. XIII, no. 3, December

Holland, Martin; 1995b; "Bridging the Capability-Expectations Gap: A Case Study of the CFSP Joint Action on South Africa; Journal of Common Market Studies 33(4), pp. 555/572

Joergensen, Knud Erik, 1998, "The European Union's Performance in World Politics: How Should We Measure Success?", Chapter VI in Zielonka 1998a

Katzenstein, P.J., (ed), 1996, Culture of National Security. Norms and Identity in World Politics, New York: Columbia University Press

Kavanagh, John J., 1997, "Attempting to Run Before Learning to Walk: Problems of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy, Boston College International and Comparative Law Review, Vol. XX, Summer, No. 2

Larsen, H., 1997, Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe, London, Routledge

Lijphart, A., 1971, "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Methods" American Political Science Review Vol.65 September, pp.682/693

Lijphart, Arend, 1975, "The Comparable-Cases Strategy in Comparative Research", Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 8 No. 2, July 1975:pp.158-177

Monar, Joerg and Werner Ungerer (eds), 1994, The Maastricht Treaty on European Union: Legal Complexity and Political Dynamics, College of Europe, Bruges, European Interuniversity Press

Mushakoji, K., 1972, "The Strategies of Negotiations: an American Japanese Comparison" in Laponce, J. A. and P. Smoker (eds) Experimentation and Simulation in Political Science ,Toronto and Buffalo University of Toronto Press, pp.109/130

Natalicchi, G., 1994, Modelli Simulativi nelle Scienze Sociali, Milano, Italy Franco Angeli

Noergaard, Ole; Pedersen, Thomas and Nikolaj Petersen, 1993, The European Community in World Politics, London: Pinters Publishers

North D.C. 1990, Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Nuttall, 1994, "Keynote Article: The EC and Yugoslavia - Deus ex Machina or Machina sine Deo", Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 32, No. S, pp.11/26

Nuttall, 1997, Chapter II in Regelsberger, Elfriede, Philippe de Schoutheete de Tervarent, Wolfgang Wessels (eds.), Foreign Policy of the EU: from EPC to CFSP and Beyond, Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner

Petersen, Thomas, 1993 in Noergaard, Ole; Pedersen, Thomas and Nikolaj Petersen: The European Community in World Politics, London: Pinters Publishers,

Regelsberger and Wessels, 1996, "The CFSP Institutions and Procedures: A Third Way for the Second Pillar", European Foreign Affairs Review, 1, 29/54

Regelsberger, Elfriede, Philippe de Schoutheete de Tervarent and Wolfgang Wessels, Foreign Policy of the European Union. From EPC to CFSP and Beyond, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1997

Riker, W. and W. Zavoina, 1972, "Rational Behaviour in Politics: Evidence from 3-person Games" in Laponce J.A. and P. Smoker (eds) Experimentation and Simulation in Political Science, Toronto and Buffalo University of Toronto Press

Risse-Kappen, Thomas, 1995, "Cooperation Among Democracies: The European Influence on US Foreign Policy", Princeton, NJ: Princeton U.P.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas, 1996, "Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union", Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 34, No. 1, March

Risse-Kappen, Thomas,1995, Bringing Transnational Actors Back in: Non-state actors, domestic structures and International Institutions, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge U.P.

Rummel, Reinhardt & Joerg Wiedemann, 1998, "Identifying Institutional Paradoxes of the CFSP"; Chapter IV in Zielonka, Jan (ed.) 1998a

Rummel, Reinhardt, 1994, "West European Cooperation in Foreign and Security Policy", Annals, The American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, AAPSS, 531, January 1994, pp.112/123

Scharpf, Fritz W., 1989, "Decision rules, Decision Styles and Policy Choices"; Journal of Theoretical Politics 1 (2): pp.149-179

Schmitter, Philippe, 1969, "Three Neo-Functional Hypotheses About International Integration", Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 23 (1), pp.161/166

Schmitter, Philippe, C., 1996, "Imaging the Future Euro-Polity with the Help of New Concepts", Chapter 6, in Marks *et al*, 1996

Schneider, G. and Seybold, C.(1997): Twelve tongues, one voice: An evaluation of European Political Cooperation": European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 31. No. 3, April 1997, pp. 367/396

Smith, C. J.: "Conflict in the Balkans and the Possibility of a European Union Common Foreign and Security Policy"; International Relations; vol XIII; No. 2; August, 1996

Smith, K. 1996, European Foreign Policy towards Eastern Europe, 1985-1995, Ph.D. Dissertation, London School of Economics

Smith, K., "The Instruments of European Union Foreign Policy"; Chapter V in Zielonka, Jan; 1998a

Snyder, R. C., 1968, "Some Perspectives on the Use of Experimental Techniques in the Study of International Relations" in Guetzkow H. *et al* (eds) Simulation in International Relations: Developments for Research and Training, Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. pp.1/23

Taylor, J. L., 1989, "La simulazione nella didattica territoriale, nuove prospettive" in Cecchini A. and F Indovina (eds), Simulazione, Milano, Italy: Franco Angeli Libri pp.270/294

Tonra, B, 1997, "The Impact of Political Cooperation" in Joergensen (ed) 1997

Wallace, William, 1997, "On the Move – Destination Unknown", The World Today, April, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp.99/102

White, Brian, 1999, "The European Challenge to Foreign Policy Analysis", European Journal of International Relations, 5(1), pp.37/66

Winn, Neil, 1997, "The Proof of the Pudding is in the Eating: The European Union 'joint action' as an effective foreign policy instrument?", International Relations, Vol. XIII, no. 6, Dec, 1997, pp.19/32

Zielonka, Jan (ed.), 1998a, Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy, The Hague; Boston : Kluwer

Zielonka, Jan, 1998b, Explaining Euro-Paralysis: Why Europe is Unable to Act in International Politics, London: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Questionnaire given to the participants of the 1999, European Council of Ministers GAC meeting held at the Badia, European University Institute, 25 February, 1999

Tick your choice of answer.

1. If actions are to be taken to solve the problems reflected in the scenario of the simulation, which actor would you then prefer should play the major role in solving the conflict? Pick only one of the following!

- your own country
- European Union
- US
- WEU
- NATO
- Russia
- G7
- OSCE
- European Commission
- the Presidency of the Council of Ministers
- the High Representative
- the Contact Group Other,
- Others, please indicate who/which _____

2. Would you from the outset, please, indicate to which extent you consider the CFSP as the adequate forum to deal with problems of the kind you have been presented to until now? Please, pick only one of the following options!

- extremely adequate
- very adequate
- adequate
- somewhat adequate,
- not adequate at all

3. How well do you feel that the word "confidence" describes your view on the ability of the CFSP to reach a solution to the situation as developed up until now? Please, pick one of the following options.

- extremely well
- very well
- well
- somewhat well
- not well at all

4. If you were supposed to indicate one of the following actions as the most probable action that you believe the meeting will result in what would that (independent CFSP) action be? Please, pick one of the following options:

- no action at all, i.e. no issuing of statement and no use of either military or economic force
- only diplomatic action such as statements
- only economic and diplomatic actions
- only military and diplomatic actions
- a combined military, economic and diplomatic action

Please indicate which Member State you represent (in the simulation):

Please indicate whether the above is the member state where you hold citizenship?

Please indicate you sex? Male Female

Thanks a lot!

EUI WORKING PAPERS

EUI Working Papers are published and distributed by the
European University Institute, Florence

Copies can be obtained free of charge
– depending on the availability of stocks – from:

The Publications Officer
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy

Please use order form overleaf

Publications of the European University Institute

To The Publications Officer
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI) - Italy
Fax: +39-055-4685 636
e-mail: publish@datacomm.iue.it
http://www.iue.it

From Name .....

Address .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

❑ Please send me a complete list of EUI Working Papers
❑ Please send me a complete list of EUI book publications
❑ Please send me the EUI brochure Academic Year 2000/2001

Please send me the following EUI Working Paper(s):

Dept, n°, author .....
Title: .....
Dept, n°, author .....
Title: .....
Dept, n°, author .....
Title: .....
Dept, n°, author .....
Title: .....

Date .....

Signature .....

Working Papers in Political and Social Sciences

Published since 1998

SPS No. 98/1
Stefano BARTOLINI
Exit Options, Boundary Building, Political Structuring. Sketches of a Theory of Large-Scale Territorial and Membership 'Retrenchment/ Differentiation' Versus 'Expansion/ Integration' (With Reference to the European Union)

SPS No. 98/2
Arpád Szakolczai
Identity Formation Mechanisms: A Conceptual and Genealogical Analysis

SPS No. 98/3
Knut MITTENDORFER
Founding Moments of Western Moral Experience - Christian Spiritual Discernment Between Hebrew Law and Modern Emotivism

SPS No. 98/4
J. Magnus RYNER
Neoliberal Globalization and the Crisis of Swedish Social Democracy

SPS No. 98/5
Neil FLIGSTEIN
Is Globalization the Cause of the Crises of Welfare States?

SPS No. 98/6
Petr LOM
Scepticism, Eclecticism and the Enlightenment: An Enquiry into the Political Philosophy of Denis Diderot

SPS No. 98/7
Petr LOM
Scepticism, Liberalism and Illiberalism: An Enquiry into the Implications of Doubt

* * *

SPS No. 99/1
Petr LOM
Alexis de Tocqueville: The Psychologist of Equality

SPS No. 99/2
Miguel E. VATTER
The Machiavellian Legacy: Origin and Outcomes of the Conflict Between Politics and Morality in Modernity

SPS No. 99/3
Christian JOPPKE
The Domestic Legal Sources of Immigrant Rights: The United States, Germany, and the European Union

SPS No. 99/4
Arpád SZAKOLCZAI/László FÜSTÖS
Assessing the Legacy of Communism: Continuities and Discontinuities in the East-Central European Transitions III

SPS No. 99/5
John K. GLENN III
The Impact of Collective Actors upon Democratization

SPS 99/6
Seraphim SEFERIADES
Low Union Density Amidst a Conflictive Contentious Repertoire: Flexible Labour Markets, Unemployment, and Trade Union Decline in Contemporary Greece

SPS 99/7
John K. GLENN
International Actors and Democratization: US Assistance to New Political Parties in the Czech Republic and Slovakia

SPS 99/8
William K. ROCHE
The End of New Industrial Relations?

* out of print

SPS 99/9
Philippe C. SCHMITTER/
Imco BROUWER
Conceptualizing, Researching and
Evaluating Democracy Promotion and
Protection

SPS 99/10
Daniel VERDIER
Financial Capital Mobility and the Origins
of Stock Markets

SPS 99/11
Giovanni CAPOCCIA
Challenge, Prevention and Response:
Game-Theoretical Perspectives on
Breakdown and Survival of Democracy

* * *

SPS 2000/1 - Martin DAHL/
Giampiero GIACOMELLO
Simulating Europe: A Role Play
Simulation of the EU Council of Ministers

* out of print