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Abstract

One of the mayor security problems nowadays is international terrorism and it has become a threat to the European people as well. The number of the attacks is increasing. European citizens are traveling to Middle East to join foreign terrorist groups and online propaganda is being more and more popular. The main goal that terrorists have is to get worldwide attention and harm as many people as possible. To answer the research questions of this study: *What are the measures that the EU has taken to fight terrorism? And To what extend can EU’s counter-terrorism approaches be explained by hard-soft power theory?* a qualitative one case study method has been used. The results of this study show that EU has taken many significant measures in the fight against terrorism, such as implementation of common strategies and regulations but also in giving mandate to Europol that is now the leader partner in the European counter-terrorism approach. There have been many improvements in the last years, but there are still gaps that need to be filled, especially in the collaboration between the Member States. The study has also concluded that EU is mostly using Soft Power as a tool for the international politics.
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1. Introduction

"The recent terrorist attacks in Europe are a stark reminder of the need for all of us to work together more closely, and build on trust. Trust is the basis of effective cooperation. Fighting terrorism will remain at the top of our common political priorities for the time to come, not just in Europe but globally. For the safety of our citizens, and for the cohesion of our societies, we need to step up our information exchange and our cross-border cooperation at all levels." - Dimitris Avramopoulos, EU Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs and Citizenship

One of the security problems today is global terrorism and it has become a very pertinent topic in Europe. EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report (TE-SAT), summarizing the year 2016, have shown that a total of 142 failed and completed attacks were noted in the eight European Union (EU) member states. 76 of them have taken place in the United Kingdom. In France, it was 23, and in Italy 17. The other involved member states are Spain, Greece, Germany, Belgium and Sweden. 142 died in these attacks and over 350 were injured in the EU last year. It is important to mention, that not all attacks were connected to jihadism. However, statistics show that most of the terrorist attacks that resulted in deaths or had an aggressive nature, have a jihadist background. In about 40 percent of these attacks, explosives were used by men, women and also teenagers. One out of four arrested were women, which is a 15 percent increase from 2015. The European Counter Terrorism Centre at Europol has been involved in 127 investigations of terrorism during last year, which is a clear indicator that the jihadist terrorist activity in Europe is growing rapidly (TE-SAT, 2017).

In 2016, 1002 people were arrested for being related in some capacity to the terrorist attempts. Most of them were jihadists, and that trend has continued and increased more than double since 2014. The report has also shown that one-third of all arrested people were 25 years old or younger. Another aspect that the TE-SAT highlights is the online propaganda. It has decreased comparing the data from 2015, due to the wining situation of the Global Coalition against Daesh and the shrinking of IS territory in the Middle East. At the same time, al-Qaeda is attempting to get back their influence and is taking over the online propaganda. Jihadist groups have a good understanding of social networks and have launched several campaigns to recruit new followers and spread their radical ideas. Europol’s Internet Referral Unit (IRU), together with EU has enforcement and private sector is working daily on restricting this activity (TE-SAT, 2017).
Statistics show that terrorism threat in the EU has been increasing drastically during the last years. The number of Europeans traveling as foreign terrorist fighters to the conflict areas in Syria and other places in Middle East, the internet propaganda and online recruitment are only a few examples of the challenges that the EU is facing today. Attacks by jihadist terrorists comes both from networked groups and lone individuals. Usually, the main idea is to harm as many people as possible and get worldwide media attention. That is why terrorists tend to choose big cities as their targets, such as Brussels, Berlin or London. These attacks can be both well planned out and spontaneous. Jihadist terrorists have demonstrated their ability to act quickly and plan very complex attacks (TE-SAT, 2017).

Due to the increased migration from Middle East and North Africa to European Union Frontex, the EU external border agency, has taken important measures to control the borders and people’s flow. Some of the EU’s countries, as Italy and Greece, requested additional forces to help them patrol the coast (Frontex, 2011). Security of European Union is a complex and advanced issue and many measures have been taken to guarantee the safety of its citizens and counter terrorism threats. An example of this is the adoption of the European Security Strategy (ESS) that was established in 2003 and has been updated every few years. At the same time, it has been seen that the number of the attacks had increased dramatically these last few years. Moreover, Kaunert et al (2012) argues that there have not been enough measures taken by the EU policy-makers to protect the ‘Homeland’. The focus was on the border controls but not on the other fields of counter terrorism approaches. People are therefore calling for an effective and united response from the member states and the EU (Kaunert et al. 2012:1-3).

The migration flow to Europe is expected to continue and it has been proved that IS has been using it to send people that can recruit others or even commit acts of terrorism. That happened for example in 2015 in Paris attacks. However, individuals involved in the jihadist related terror actions are not only refugees that have arrived in these last years but also people that are born in the EU countries but have been feeling “outside the system” for a long time (TE-SAT, 2017).

The idea of terrorism has changed to a large degree during the last decades. Historically it was clear that terrorists used violence and guns as a way of negotiation to achieve their goal. Today there is no negotiation. The terrorist groups act directly and use the media to get the whole world’s attention. The placement of bombs in public areas became also very popular among the terrorists (June, 2011;3). Globalization and modernization are two factors for the ongoing revolution of terrorism. Terrorism is used in that context as a way of protest and the hatred for the west countries’ values and ideas, especially by the conservative and extremist religious
groups. At the same time, these two factors made it possible for the terrorists to spread their message to the whole population (ibid, 10-11).

The EU’s history on cooperation against terrorism goes back to 1979, when the first police group, with focus only on terrorism was established in the European Union. It started with IRA in Britain and Ireland and the Baader Meinhof gang in Germany. The increasing cross-border organised crime in the 1980s forced the EU states to find new methods for combating the attacks. The first formal policy for cooperation has been established in 1991, in the Maastricht treaty. The situation changed in the 2001, when AL-Qaeda attacked the US. The EU saw the danger and directed more resources to the fight against terrorism. First, the EU-wide arrest warrant was created, together with a list of terrorist groups (Keohane, 2005).

A common description of terrorism has been established as well by the EU Commission Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA in 2008. It states that a terrorist attack is a violence act that may seriously damage a state or intergovernmental organization and aims to seriously intimidate a population or population group, compel a government or an intergovernmental organization to do or abstain from doing any act and/or destabilize or destroy the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures (EU Commission, 2018). But there is still no worldwide accepted definition of terrorism although the EU and US are both using the guidelines written by the UN, as a point of reference. The UN’s attempts to establish a global definition of terrorism has been stopped by the Member States and their different opinions about this issue. There are two concerns in establishing a definition. The first is about using armed forces against civilians by states. Any definition should state clearly that it is acceptable for states to interfere but not all states have agreed on that. The other issue is people’s right to resistant in case of war, but it should not justify killing other civilians (UN, 2017).

1.1 Research purpose and research question

The purpose of this thesis is to explore the responses of the European Union and its policies to the increasing problem of terrorism in European countries in the recent years. By focusing on the European Commission’s measures and improvements of the already existing documents and treaties, the researcher will analyse what the EU has done to approach terrorism as a growing security challenge. Two research questions have been chosen to analyse and deal with the subject:
1) What are the measures that the EU has taken to fight terrorism?
2) To what extent can EU’s counter-terrorism approaches be explained by hard-soft power theory?

1.2 Structure of the thesis

Chapter one, which is the introduction, shortly describes the background of this study, formulates the research problem, together with the purpose and research questions of this thesis. Chapter two describes the theoretical framework, which is the hard-soft power theory, that will be used to explain the different mechanisms the EU has been using for dealing with terrorism. It includes definitions and descriptions of two concepts that give background understating for the analysis; security and terrorism. Chapter three explains the chosen research design, its strengths and weaknesses, material selection and the delimitations of this study. Chapter four presents the analysis of the study, that compromises five sections. The first focuses on the European anti-terrorism approaches before 9/11 attacks, the second describes the current counterterrorism policies in the European Union, from 2003 until 2017, the third part describes the last efforts made by the EU, the fourth part is about Europeans’ attitudes towards security and the last part analyses the measures by using Hard & Soft power theory. Chapter five is concluding the results, summarizes the study and its main findings.

2 Theoretical framework
This chapter will provide a suitable and needed theoretical framework for the analysis that includes a description of security and terrorism terms, hard and soft power, and the differences between them. It also includes examples of previous research about terrorism in Europe.

Terrorism and security are the two main terms that will be used in the analysis. They are the ground for the analysis of the European Union’s documents, policies and institutions established in the last years, in order to fight the new challenge of terrorism in Europe. The global definition of security and terrorism have been changing recently, because of the new threats and dimensions. That is why there is a need of explaining these changes in order to be able to apply the above-mentioned terms in the analysis.

Hard and Soft power has been chosen as the theoretical indicators for the analysis of the work of the EU against terrorism.

2.1 Security

Security has been one of the main subjects of studies in the field of international relations. Its significance in world’s politics has been growing during the last fifty years and shaped the view of the post- Cold War period. Security is a very widely used term, that involves issues such as war, peace, power, and arms but there has been a shift from national security to international security lately. During the Cold War period the security was focused on states, policies and agendas in terms of war and peace, but it has now begun to include the cooperation of different states and global policies. Other types of security, for example environmental security, economic security or terrorism are now more important than only the military dimension. International organizations, such as North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and United Nations (UN) has started to use a broader and multi-sectoral definition of security (Sheehan, 2005:1-4). Moving towards a broader explanation of security and leaving the old state-centric perception behind is crucial to apply a global security cooperation. It is about sub state and interstate levels of security that matters considering the realities of worlds politics today. What is a security and insecurity for people is a very broad and complex phenomenon (ibid, 62-63).

A short definition of security, provided by Heywood (2011), is to be safe from any kind of harm and threats. It can be divided into national, international, global and human security. But security is a much broader aspect than that. In terms of politics, the most popular aspect is the national security, where all states are in possible threat and need to be able to protect
themselves. Therefore, focus of national security is military power. However, that leads to the security dilemma, a phenomenon that makes countries compete. Building a strong defence by one state can provoke aggressive responses from other states (Heywood, 2011:19).

Baldwin (1997) talks about the description of security and the lack of concretes and explanations of the included terms. He means that security studies have not been very popular before, which is why it didn’t get the attention that is needed to provide a global definition and idea of what security is. The shift from cold war and military force to a broader aspect is also included in his work, where he talks about the multidimensionality of security. The importance of values is a complicated issue in defining security. Baldwin states that all included actors, such as countries, individuals or organizations have different values and that is why it has been difficult to provide a single definition of security that will consist of all these values. Also, the definition of possible threats is not briefly explained. There can be various types of threats, depending on the security form and the values that matter. It can be anything from other states, groups of people, economic and environmental threats, etc.

There are also other ideas of what security entails. Liberals focus more on collective security, giving more importance to international aspects of security. It is also important to mention that the security aspect in global politics has been changing in the last decades. Zones of peace, security regimes and security communities have been implemented and developed to avoid conflicts, spread democracy and secure people’s lives. At the same time, the growing terrorism threat has brought new security challenges. They come from non-state actors and are worldwide connected. Human security has also been included and made the idea of security deeper and more complete. The end of cold war, where focus was only on the interstate relations, gave more space to human security and the individuals. Another type of security, which is relatively new is the environmental security. It affects people in many countries and is a global threat. Diseases and refugee crises are other types of threats to security (Heywood, 2011: 19-20).

According to Heywood (2011) international security are the conditions and measures that secure the safety of states, and to prevent aggression and disorder. The terrorist attack of September 11 has changed the view of international security. Globalization has also affected the view of security. Fragile national borders, technology and mobility made it possible for the terrorists to carry out an attack on such a big scale. Further, the threat was not from another state anymore, but from a global network with religious and ideology motives. It was meant to scare the west world and has started a new era of security and war on terror (ibid, 20-21).
This research will focus on international security and the new dimensions of security, global policies and cross-country cooperation.

2.2 Terrorism

The EU has come up with three criteria to construct a common ground for the terrorism concept. These are to indicate serious fear of a group of people or the whole population, to force public agencies or intergovernmental organizations to take or not take certain actions, and to destroy basic political, economic and social structures. There is also a division of old and new terrorism. Previously, terrorism was about national and regional conflicts, but nowadays it has a broader and more international perspective (Europas publikationsbyrå, 2007).

The view of terrorism has changed a lot during the last decade. Historically, terrorists used guns to negotiate, today it is becoming normal to shoot people directly and put bombs in crowded places to get everybody’s attention. Kidnapping is also a very common form of terrorism in today’s world. The word, terror, means ‘unforgiving and uncontrollable fear’. But there are many different definitions and explanations of terrorism, terrorists and their acts (June 2011:3-4). The tactics that terrorists use have also been shifting from kidnapping officials and politics, hijacking the planes, bombings in the buildings, and using vehicles to kill people on streets (ibid, 5).

There is still no worldwide accepted definition of terrorism, but the UN, EU and the League of Arab States define it as an act of violence with political background and aimed to affect society and civilians. It is used by left and right-wing extremists, religious and nationalist groups, but also by single organizations and individuals. There are three types of terrorism; state terrorism, national terrorism and international terrorism (Europas publikationsbyrå, 2007).

State terrorism refers to a violent act ordered by or with aim to attack a selected state. It is, for the most part, about liquidating inconvenient people. States that have been known for attempting terrorism on political opponents or other actors that live abroad, for example Iran, Pakistan and Syria. Also, the United States has been accused of state terrorism because of violence abroad to eliminate people that have attacked or were involved in terrorism acts on the US territory (ibid).

National terrorism has roots in political or social misconduct. In this case, violence is exercised by individuals or organized groups and aimed to the state or any kind of person or organization
related to the government. There are many countries that have suffered national terrorism, often as a part of a larger revolution against the regime or politics. Irish IRA and Basque ETA are the biggest and famous national terrorist groups in Europe. However, nowadays their violence activity is quasi non-existent (Schmid, 2011). International terrorism is exercised by groups or individuals that aim their attacks outside of the country’s borders. The targets can be diplomats, embassies, tourists, hotels, public transportation, etc. Among countries accused of supporting or using terrorism are Pakistan, Sudan and Iran. The purpose is usually to get as much attention as possible. The IS is, at this moment, the biggest terror group that operates internationally (ibid, 2011).

There are several types of attacks carried out by terrorists. The most common one is bomb attacks. With the existing sources of information at people’s disposal, such as the internet, it is relatively easy to make a bomb which can be hidden in a public place and cause a great disaster. Moreover, it can also be carried out as a suicide attack, where a person hides a bomb under his or her clothes and explodes it. The second most common way of attacks is murder, followed by hijacking an airplane and kidnapping. The World Trade Centre attack from 2001 changed the view of terrorism. It was the first one with, so many killed people, worldwide attention and political consequences. Al-Qaida was responsible for that (ibid, 2017).

Even though there is no concrete and worldwide accepted definition of terrorism, all of them include the same aspect; aim, fear, violence against civilians, planned and systematic actions (Savasta, 2011:37). US Department of Defence describes terrorism as ‘the unlawful use of, or threatened use of, force or violence against civilians or property to coerce or intimidate governments or societies, often to achieve political, religious, or ideological objectives’ (U.S State Department, 2006).

There are various causes of terrorism. One of them is poverty. Many researchers mean that if the money was properly spent on a country’s population the terrorist would not gain so much power and popularity. Tony Blair, former British prime minister, suggested that another cause of terrorism is the lack of democracy, especially in countries in the Middle East. Corruption and extremist ideologies are other examples of possible causes of terrorism (Savasta, 2011:38).

Globalization and modernization have also been changing the face of terrorism in the last years. Social media, access to internet and technology has been providing terrorists with new ways of funding, spreading their propaganda and searching for members. Something that was supposed to help fight terrorism has also been a huge advantage for themselves (Ibid, 10-11). Samuel
Huntington talks about the problems with a globalized world in his book, *The clash of civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1997), where he explained the problems with a united world that may lead to conflicts and increased terrorism activities.

‘Counterterrorism efforts should recognize that terrorism is carried out by small groups striking swiftly and violently. A hard lesson learned is that a like reply to terrorism is more effective than large military forces. The back bone of counterterrorism is the development of an efficient and reliable intelligence apparatus that can rapidly gather, analyse, and disseminate terrorist intelligence to responsible mobile teams who can respond to the terrorist effort with their own strike of swift and violent force.’ (ibid, 34).

As mentioned before, terrorists have a huge advantage of media. They tend to create terror and fear among people. Therefore, using media to send images, videos and messages have become very popular. It is also helpful for recruiting new members and sending money to finance their activities all over the world (ibid, 40-41).

There are several international conventions against terrorism, for example the UN Diplomatic Convention from 1973, the European Conventions on Combating Terrorism from 1977, and the Council of Europe Convention on Prevention of Terrorism from 2005. In total, there are 13 different UN conventions against terrorism. In the United States, after the World Trade Centre Attack, the Department for Homeland Security was created. The global cooperation has also been strengthened and developed, for example between UN and EU. In Europe, Europol is one of the responsible organs for fighting terrorism. Special military forces, new laws and organizations have also been applied in many countries in the world to enhance security (Schmid, 2011).

But as for now, nobody has come with a clear and concrete solution for defeating terrorism. Technology is one vital tool, with internet, telecommunications and information sending. At the same time, they can also help terrorists achieve their goals. The internet, for example, has many weak spots, such as passwords and updates. Those can be hacked and used against the governments and organizations (Savasta, 2011:41).

Education, financial assistance and new job placements could resolve the problem of terrorism if the only causes were poverty and unemployment. But countries that went to war with terrorism have not been able to handle it properly. There are evidences that show lack of investment and control in Iraq, after the war there, and in many other places where for example
the US has been fighting in the recent years. At the same time, every conflict in the world brings new terrorist threats with different goals, approaches and main targets. (ibid: 41-42).

2.3 Hard Power vs Soft Power

Power is a complex phenomenon, but in general it is the ability to affect the possible outcomes of an event or decision making. In international relations and global politics, this means the ability of a state to create their own agenda and gain benefits without the influence of other countries. Power is also seen as a relationship, where a state can manage to influence other behaviours for their own good. There are different divisions of power. Actual/potential power, relational/structural power and hard/soft power, which is the focus in this paper (Heywood, 2011:210).

The changing nature of power has been a recent subject of the debate about international relations. There are new mechanisms of power, such as a shift from military power, where security and survival were crucial, to economic power, that uses the resources to gain influences (Heywood, 2011:213-214). The second shift is the decline of hard power and a growth of the use of soft power. Hard power is based on military but also economic power. By contrast, soft power, a co-optive power with focus on ‘attraction rather than coercion’ (Nye, 2004). Hard power operates through force, economic sanctions and bribes. Soft power uses culture, ideals and foreign policies. The key explanation for the shift from hard to soft power is the increase of interdependence and connectedness between people and states. Cross-border flows of information, people traveling, and global organizations make it possible for everybody to have an opinion about different countries and their agenda. This trend is also explained by the higher levels of literacy and education in the world, and by the spread of democratic values including soft power mechanisms, such as the image of political leaders and parties. In these circumstances the use of hard power is more difficult to manage and could lead to unhappy population and loss of voters. One example for a negative outcome of the use of hard power is the ‘war on terror’, that Bush administration started in 2003. It created a wave of anti-American feelings in the Muslim world. Obama, on the other hand, has put more effort to use the soft power mechanisms as well, and it has led to increase support for his international agenda. Norway and Canada are examples of countries that focus only on the soft power, thus, in most of the cases, states tend to use both types of power (Heywood, 2011:213-216).
Hard Power involves the use of military forces and economic influences to control or affect behaviour of other states or political actors. Therefore, states with greater capacity will generally have more influence than those with less resources. Joseph Nye describes this phenomenon as “the ability to use the carrots and sticks of economic and military might to make others follow your will.” The strongest countries will always use their power on weaker actors by offering or cutting the benefits. Economic sanctions, coercive diplomacy, military interventions and trade restrictions are some of the methods that a state can use (Nye, 2004).

A state is a great power due to its capacity, size and resources. Population, territory, natural resources, military strength and economic potential are included in the measurement of states. States with high level on all these sectors are usually those that tend to use hard power. An example of use of such power is the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union in 1979. Another example of hard power is when the United States and allied forces invaded Iraq in 2003. These are typical examples of use of military forces but there are other types of achieving goals and benefits. Trade embargos are a type of economic power that has been imposed on several states in the 20th century, for example Cuba and Iraq (ibid, 2004).

Soft Power represents a more gentle and subtle form of power. It has been defined by Nye as ‘a persuasive approach to international political relations, involving the use of a nation’s cultural, historical and diplomatic influence’. It is about fulfilling the goals and plans without using force, focusing on indirectly convincing other actors to act in the same way and share a vision. It is very common to use soft power by international organizations to express their preferences. Soft power involves the use of three main resources. A nation’s culture, its political values and foreign policies. In the concept of hard power, the main themes are the use of power and military interventions, meanwhile in soft power it is co-opting and indirectly convincing, by using diplomacy. There are several surveys that rank states that tend to use Soft Power as a tool in their political agenda. One of them is the Monocle Soft Power Survey. The countries that have been places in top five are the US, Germany, United Kingdom, Japan and Canada (Nye, 2004).

The concepts of Hard and Soft power are complex and require a deeper analysis in order to apply them to the material and given subject. Hard power is clear to understand because it is something people can see in the news. The use of army or economic sanctions are easy to notice and are a good topic for the media. Realists use this aspect to determine international politics.
At the same time there has never been a society that has been using hard power only. It is usually a combination of both hard and soft power; the amount is chosen depending on the countries' interests and goals. Soft power has been more difficult to explain because we can’t see the effects of it directly (Cooper, 2004).

On the global level, if a hard power is used successfully, the next step should be to overgo to soft power to maintain order and good political climate. Soft power has a crucial role in international relations and achieving peace worldwide. The core of soft power is legitimacy. It is about obeying the orders by using legal measures. It is possible to use military force, but it is not very common and most of the countries do not apply it. Soft power means basically authority without force. There are many different sources of legitimacy. The first one is about sustaining international order. It includes a country’s resources as public goods, because if a country wants to use soft power you need to offer something in exchange or get others attention. It may also be necessary to provide military forces as a form of protection. That is why hard and soft power are related in many ways. An important part of legitimacy is also a good public image. Everything that appears in media can affect the political outcomes. Participation is also crucial for legitimacy. The UN is now the biggest example of it, by being active and involved in international legal framework but also by following human rights and democratic rules (Cooper, 2004).

According to Nye (2006), seduction is more effective than coercion when it comes to soft power and there are values that are very seductive, such as democracy and human rights. Hard Power, on the other hand, uses the coercion with military forces. It is difficult to use hard power in countries that are under terrorist threats and have an ongoing conflict. But it has also been seen that soft power is more popular, even against the terrorists. It can help to reduce their network of supporters, cut the funding, but also to find allies willing to fight them and start a cooperation. USA stopped using the soft power drastically in 2003, when they went to war in Iraq, together with many European countries. People’s support for the country’s political agenda declined fast and their international image lost its attractiveness. The same happened, earlier in 1960s when USA started a war in Vietnam (Nye, 2006:26-27).

The most important resources of soft power are culture, domestic values and policies and the tactics of foreign politics. All three are important, together with attitudes and the good image of a country. ‘Soft power is about mobilizing cooperation from others without threats or
payments. Since it depends on the currency of attraction rather than force or payoffs, soft power depends in part on how we frame our own objectives. Policies based on broadly inclusive and far-sighted definitions of the national interest are easier to make attractive to others than policies that take a narrow and myopic perspective’ (ibid, 27).

International policies are more attractive to other states and actors when they share the same values. Cultural attractiveness means that a country is more likely to follow any agenda if their culture is similar or even if the other country’s culture is more popular and interesting for the people (ibid, 28).

2.4 Previous research

Peter R. Neumann (2007) analyses in his paper various conditions that have affected the development of jihadist groups in Europe, such as the presence of foreign Islamic activists and the freedom to operate online. The author mentions also the impact of the Iraq War on Europe and the implications for policies in the EU. Neumann mentions three dynamics for the increased Islamic activity in Europe. The first one involves the migration crisis of the last 20 years, that has brought to European countries many extremists among the refugees. It made it possible for them to establish new bases and recruit more people for the terrorist organizations, both in Europe and in the Middle East. It started with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Osama Bin Laden and Ayman al Zawahiri were the first two leaders of global jihad. Globalisation helped them to travel, exchange information and use funding, not only on national level but also on the international area (Neumann, 2007).

The second dynamic that Neumann mentions is related to the first one, but focuses more on the type of people that are being recruited by the jihadist groups. In a study conducted in Netherlands, its domestic intelligence services classified three categories. The first group are new immigrants, that were born in Middle East or North Africa and came to Europe as for example student, and have not been involved in Islamic groups before. The second group includes second or third generation foreigners. They are often European citizens and speak the language of the country where they live. Many of them are not satisfied with the life or work conditions and are frustrated over the social gaps in their environments. The last group is still small, but has been growing lately. It is people that converted to Islam recently, mostly because
of some personal problems and tensions in their lives. These people are usually an easy target for the recruitment leaders, because of their low self-confidence or anger (Neumann, 2007).

The third dynamic, according to Neumann (2007), is the big network of people in Europe, that are somehow connected. They may share the same values, experience or fears. It is possible for them to communicate or meet because of the open borders and the internet. States' possibility to monitor and control their activities is still very limited, but has been improving the last years (Neumann, 2007).

The author talks also about the Iraq War, and whether it had an impact on the increased terrorism in Europe or not. He argues that it has led to radicalisation of many Muslims in European countries, and gave space for new organizations and recruiters. There are many researchers that don’t support his thesis, such as a French scholar Olivier Roy. He states that Al Qaeda has developed, and would have done it anyways, without any important connection to the West world, and that the young generation of Islamic extremists in Europe has no relevance in this subject. Neumann, on the other hand, means that even if one does not agree with him it is obvious that the connection between the Iraq War and European jihadists is very complex and involves several aspects (Neumann, 2007).

Neumann (2007) makes a list of improvements for European countries. Integration is one of them. He means that states should focus more on including European Muslims into their communities and that will aggravate the recruitment for the jihadist groups. He mentions also the cross-border cooperation and legal aspects.

Karns and Mingst (2010) describes some of the international measures that have been taken after 9/11 attacks in New York but also the conventions that have been written way before that. The UN General Assembly and the International Civil Aviation have been working on global counterterrorism legal actions. The first convention related to terrorism has been established in 1969, the Convention on Offences and Certain Acts Committed on Board Aircraft. Later conventions started to include the new ways of terrorism and the weapons that have been used in the attacks, for example bombings, taking hostage and financing of terrorists.

EU has been working on its own strategies to fight terrorism. A ‘twinning program’ have been implemented to share counterterrorism knowledge between member states and cooperate on border controls and administrative procedures. Focus has also been on cutting of the financing opportunities for terrorists and Europol became the main European actor in the fight against terrorism (Karns & Mingst, 2010).
Another interesting point of view is presented by Anna Triandafyllidou (2015). She is doing a distinction between the problems of integration of the Muslim population in Europe and jihadist terrorism. There have been many incidents involving terrorist attacks in Europe recently, and many people have died or have been injured. Many European citizens have joined IS forces in the Middle East. In 2014 there were around two thousand fighters from Western countries in the IS army, but this number have been growing.

Triandafyllidou (2015) argues that even though there are some important differences and integration challenges for the Muslim population in European countries, they should not be used as an excuse and explanation for the radicalisation. She means that radicalisation does not concern all young migrants with some adaptation difficulties and that there are other features that are not included here. Secondly, connecting political and global issues with real life and personal problems of the society, such as discrimination or respect, does not provide any concretes for the understanding of the growing terrorism threat in Europe.

Emerson names three types of radicalisation in Europe, that has emerged after 9/11. The first type has a political-religious background. The terrorists base then believes and plans on Islamic texts from the Koran and their own translations of it. The second type is only religious, and has nothing to do with politics. It is inspired by theology and Islamic trends. It involves more personal methods, such as killing inside the families and violence against women. The third type is related to socio-economic problems of second-generation migrants. They seek salvation and understanding in Islam and radical groups. They can also show interest in connecting themselves with the people from the two other types of radicalisation. It has been demonstrated that some of the terrorists involved in the attacks in the 9/11, but also those in Germany, UK and other European countries, were highly educated migrants, mostly second-generation, that have been recruited by the Islamic fighters. Triandafyllidou summarises the terrorist threat in three forms; as a cultural clash and invasion, as a geopolitical invasion and a growing terrorist network in the society (Triandafyllidou, 2015).
3 Methodological framework

This chapter will provide a description of the methodology of this paper. This research is going to be conducted as a qualitative one case study. It has been chosen as the most suitable to analyse what the EU has been doing in the fight against terrorism.

3.1 Research Design

Research design is a set of methods that are going to be used to conduct the study. In this case, a descriptive qualitative case study is going to be done. The strongest advantage of using the qualitative study method is that it makes it possible to include the meaning of the whole text and aspect (Esaiasson, 2012:237).

The qualitative studies lay focus on text and its details. Personal reflections, political institutions, issues and events are examples of subjects for the use of a qualitative method. Researchers may choose to focus on one case or few cases. It is a common method of studies to find and analyses a deeper understanding of the research subject and to see the whole picture. An analysis with open questions leaves room for a broader aspect and context and gives the researcher the opportunity to include all important variables and issues. It is also important to remain neutral as a researcher, and to not draw any subjective conclusions. Qualitative studies are very common and often used in the field of international relations (Marsh & Stoker, 2010). This method seeks to find a deeper and broader understanding of the analysed subject (Esaiasson, et.al. 2007:237).

3.1.1 Case Study

The case study method helps the researcher to get a full understanding of the subject by including all valuable parts of the issue. Case study method can be used in the analysis of individuals, people, collective phenomenon or institutions (Eckstein, 2000:119). In this study the EU will be analysed as a one case study. According to Eckstein (2000:124) a case is a ‘a phenomenon for which we report and interpret only a single measure on any pertinent variable’. There can be different types of case studies, depending on the number of cases, included details, the size of the case and the context of the research (Gomm, 2000:4).
With the case study method, it is convenient to do it over a longer period in order to be able to deeply understand and explain the subject. The study can involve both quantitative and qualitative data. In this study, only a qualitative research is going to be conducted (Goodrick, 2014). There are several types of researches where case study method can be applied, such as with ‘how’ questions, or when a deep understanding of the issue is needed (ibid, 2014). The case selection and research problem will determine the results (Landman, 2003:238). This paper focuses on EU documents, laws and institutions that have been established as measures to fight terrorism on the European territory. These will be analysed with the concepts of hard and soft power. An advantage of using a one case study method is the possibility to include all relevant factors and concentrate on all aspects of this one single case (ibid, 2228). Case study method has three disadvantages that could lead to irrelevant results. The number of variables, the balance between the concepts and the indicators and the risk of omission of the main variables. It is easy to consider too many variables and delimit them adequately to the research (ibid, 40). It will not lead to a generalized conclusion about the subject, but it can provide the reader with descriptive and concrete answers about the EU and its measures in the fight against terrorism.

Donmoyer (2000) is mentioning three benefits of using case study method. The first one is accessibility. It makes it possible to discover and experience a case in its full picture, including all variables and perspectives. The second is about being able to see through the researches eyes. While reading a case study it is achievable to see the whole process of the study. Also, to discover things that may not be mentioned in other types of studies. And most importantly, it does not mean that a case study is subjective, and the researchers opinions are included in the text. A case study can be very easily conducted as a neutral description of the analysed phenomenon or institution, etc. Last advantage of case study method that Donmoyer is pointing out is what he calls a decreased defensiveness. According to him it may be easier and more convenient to discover a case by reading about it than by being a part of it, and in that way, people are less resistant to learn more about it (Donmoyer, 2000:61-65). The most important benefit of using this type of research method is that the meaning of the whole situation can be included, together with all factors and backgrounds (Esaïasson, et.al. 2007:237).
3.2 Material

The selection of the material and data for a case study is a broad process, which is why this method can be intensive and requires a lot of time (Goodrick, 2014).

The material that is relevant for the analysis of EU’s measures in the fight against terrorism will be chosen from the primary sources. The study will cover the period of time starting with what the EU has done before the 9/11 attacks until today. Primary sources are the original documents made by political actors, organizations, institutions, etc. It can also be photos, meeting notes, etc: EU documents. They reflect the ideas and opinions of the authors and does not include any previous analysis, only the facts. Secondary sources, former texts and analysis of the EU documents made by other researchers, but also articles that contain both facts and analysis, will also be used in this research.

3.3 Validity & Reliability

The researcher will make sure that a high validity is achieved. Validity is measuring what is relevant for the subject and using the correct information. There are three ways of obtaining a high validity. To be consistent with theoretical and operational indicators, the absence of systematic errors and to measure what is supposed to be measured. The first two are construct validity and the last one is the results validity (Esaiasson, 2007:63). The concept of reliability is about obtaining the results in various tests. However, it does not mean that a result is valid only based on the reliability tests, but it can mean that there are no random or systematic errors in the research (Esaiasson, 2007:70). Validity can be divided into internal and external. Internal validity indicates conclusions of descriptive or explanatory type, looking at the analytical units used in the research. External validity is about the possibilities of generalisation of both descriptive and explanatory conclusions (Esaiasson, 2007:64).

Using qualitative methods can result in many outcomes, where the reliability may not be a useful indicator. The researcher will focus on achieving high validity in the results, that is to prove that the research is measuring what was said to be measured. Internal validity will be taken into consideration, by collecting the material and using mainly primary sources, such as the EU Commission reports, press releases, etc. Doing a one case study is also increasing the
validity, because the marginal for the errors is lower than with multiple case study. At the same time, it can be seen as a limit for the generalization of the results which is the external validity (Esaiasson, 2007:58).

3.4 Delimitations

This research will focus on the most relevant and powerful measures that the EU has taken in the fight against terrorism. Since there is a huge number of them, coming from different EU institutions but also from the EU Member States, the researcher will choose those that seem suitable for the research problem and the analysis. Focus will be on Europol and EU Commission, but there will be other aspects included as well.
4 Analysis

This chapter will analyse the measures that the EU has taken to combat terrorism. It is divided into five parts: before 9/11, after 9/11, from 2017 onwards, Europeans’ attitude towards security and an analysis of the measures with help of hard & soft power theory. It provides a description of the established organisations and institutions together with new laws and regulation in the EU. This researcher finds this division most relevant for the subject, in order to facilitate the comprehension of the issue for the readers. Since the 9/11 attacks have changed the world and started a new era of global terrorism, this date has been selected as a point of reference for the analysis.

4.1 Before 9/11

Before 9/11 attacks many of the EU member states have had their own counterterrorism policies, but a lot of them were weak and there were no concrete laws, and therefore the terrorists have been expanding fast, as in Germany or Belgium. France and Spain had established a counter-terrorism special forces and judges and had succeeded in finding and detaining many attacks and attempts (Keohane, 2005). However, the first European collaboration against terrorism goes back to 1975, when the Terrorism, Radicalisation, Extremism, and International Violence group (TREVI) was established, with the main goal to exchange information and assist countries with the crime investigations. The Police Working Group on Terrorism and the Counter Terrorist Group (CTG) were also set in motion (Deflem, 2010:130).

Another important institution that was established and is still functioning is The European Police Office (Europol). It was installed to ensure cooperation of the EU Member States together with the law enforcement agencies. The idea of a common European Police came into light in 1992, in the Maastricht Treaty. It was specified in the Article K.3. The first operation carried out by European Police office were in 1994, with focus on drug enforcement. Later, it was protracted to organized crime. In July 1995 a Europol Convention was written in Brussels, but no before 1998, the Council of European Union Ministers, by mandate from all Member Stater, officially extended Europol’s power and made it possible for the agency to cover counterterrorism as well. In July 1999, Europol started to work as a fully functional institution. It was also a beginning of the discussion about starting a separated counterterrorism unit within Europol, but it was not set in motion until after the 9/11 attacks in New York. The focus areas
of investigation in Europol are human, drug and vehicles trafficking, falsification and laundering of money and finally, terrorism. When more than two Member States are involved or when it is about an organised group the issue gets priority ((Deflem, 2010:127-128).

4.2 After 9/11

Following the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, the EU established a list of persons, groups and entities involved in terrorist acts and subject to restrictive measures. A few months after the 9/11, the Counterterrorism Task Force and a year later this special unit was integrated into Europol’s Serious Crime Department. However, after the attacks in Madrid in 2004 the unit was turned back to be a separated one (Deflem, 2010:131).

The mandate of the Europol was enlarged in 2002 and the organisation received mandate to deal with all types of international crime such as corruption or computer crime. But Europol does not have any executive force, rather a supporting and consulting one. ‘The Europol Computer System’, ‘EU Customs Information System’ and FIDE, ‘Identification File of Customs Investigations’ are some of the most powerful instruments of Europol (ibid, 128). However, it is not enough to be an EU Member State to become a part of the Europol. New Member States must adopt the Europol Convention and later apply by sending a special request form to the EU. Europol’s director is chosen every 5 years by the EU Council of Ministers of Justice and Home Affairs, which decides the budget and acts as a control body as well. Europol is a support centre for all the law enforcement operations and expertise but also a main centre for information and criminal activity in Europe. The core activity is the analysis and reports, such as TE-SAT or SOCTA (Europol, 2018).

Until 2003, the EU did not have a common strategy to fight terrorism. The European Security Strategy, a document made and accepted by all member states in December 2003, was set in motion. European countries realised that terrorism became they common threat and it could be fought only as a one force. It states clearly that the fight against terrorism was not only about military, but required a mix of intelligence, judicial and police measures. After the attack on 9/11 in the US, the EU have introduced an EU- wide arrest warrant, established a common definition of terrorism and created a list of already known terrorist groups. National police forces started to cooperate and exchange information (Keohane, 2005).
Eurojust, a law enforcement agency, has also been established. The objective was to increase the cross-border cooperation and investigations. The European external borders agency has begun to work, to encourage countries to collaborate, in order to control the EU borders and the flow of people and goods. In 2004, EU has created a five-year plan, also known as ‘The Hague programme’, which was an agreement of the EU’s interior and justice ministers, from JHA, justice and home affairs council. It was planned to introduce it in 2010, and cover all possible aspects of security and justice, and cooperation between the member states. Some of the significant changes were that in 2008, the police officers from every state would be able to access information held by any office in the EU (ibid, 2005). Furthermore, the member states have also made a request to the Commission to prepare a system for sharing information about air passengers, and for the transportation of chemicals and explosives. At the same time, the interior ministers wanted to lead the fight against terrorism in the EU, only with a slight cooperation with EU foreign ministers (ibid, 2005).

In March 2004, just before the terrorist attack in Madrid, Javier Solana, the former EU’s foreign and security policy chief, presented a report of what the EU has managed to do against terrorism so far. The report stated clearly that some of the countries were not following the EU counter-terrorism agreements and norms. One example of this could be the established common arrest warrant. There was also lack of resources and cooperation between the member states and law enforcement workers. After the bombings in Madrid, Solana selected, with the approval of all member states, Gijs de Vries as the administrator and adviser for the EU’s counterterrorism actions. Nonetheless, he didn’t have any real power or influence. There was no budget or official legislation, only persuasion. De Vries was not even able to set up a meeting for foreign ministers of the member states. The main task he had was to define the role of EU in the fight against terrorism and to reassure cooperation of national policies (Keohane, 2005).

The Council, together with the member states, have prepared a list of around 150 measures that should be applied by the EU and all the governments. It was called ‘the EU counterterrorism action plan’. De Vries role was to oversee its progress and implementation of it, but only as an observer. He did not have a power to enforce it. For instance, Italy was four years behind with the implementation of the common arrest warrant. It was established in 2001 and Italian government have waited until 2005 with introducing it. Despite many hints and disagreements with the Member States, De Vries managed to adopt new rules and laws. For example, regarding terrorist funding and he also convinced many non-EU countries to join the UN in the fight
against terrorism. De Vries was also working with establishing a better co-operation between the Council and the Commission. The main obstacle for the EU counter-terrorism work was the amount of different institutions that were not co-ordinated and could not agree on many new policies, such as Europol and Eurojust, or ‘a foreign policy working group on terrorism’. Some of the member states, for example UK, have many times suggested that Europol should have a leading role in the fight against terrorism from the very beginning. But some of the national forces and leaders did not agree on that. There were also misunderstandings and conflicts between the member states about the leading role of the Europol (ibid, 2005).

After the Madrid attack in 2004, the results of the EU against terrorism has not been very successful. The above-mentioned action plan included the needed measures and possible responses to terrorism threat, but the EU was still missing power and prosecution possibilities to act as one whole force. It was still the member states that were trying to fight terrorism on their own. EU was only encouraging them to improve their police and judicial systems, but many of the countries were not collaborating on the information share system and chose not to contribute with their findings to the common EU channels. Gijs de Vries was also trying to help the member states to increase their capacity to respond to the attacks and be able to act rapidly and properly. He meant that the member states and their governments are not doing enough to ensure peoples security and that they are not taking European adjustments and advices seriously enough. And terrorism can be fought only as one force and internationally. That is why there was a need of a common EU counter-terrorism strategy that can guide all the governments and institutions (ibid, 2005). The directives were about the common goals and strategies of EU in the fight against terrorism, which was to isolate potential terrorists in Europe. Achieving this goal would require a full cooperation between the member states and unite all crucial parts; law enforcement, foreign and domestic policies and information exchange (ibid, 2005).

EU IRU, EU Internet Referral Unit, was launched by Europol in July 2015. More than 80 percent of all the internet content that EU IRU was working with has been removed from the terrorist support webpages. To meet the new security challenges in Europe, Europol created in January 2016 the European Counter Terrorism Centre (ECTC). It is the main tool in the fight against terrorism. The focus areas are operational support for investigations in the Member States, tackling foreign fighters, Terrorist Tracking Programme, Financial Intelligence Unit, online terrorism propaganda, illegal arms trafficking and international cooperation with other authorities that are fighting terrorism. The ECTC is built on Europol’s previously established
tools and networks but has a few new features and tasks. An example of an effort of Europol is a taskforce called Fraternité, that was set up after the attacks in Paris. 60 officers were assigned to support the investigations (Europol, 2018).

In 2016, ECTC started an Advisory Group on Online Terrorist Propaganda, linking EU IRU together with experts and academics in this field. That cooperation is working on establishing new methods for technological solutions and observation. It is a tool that Europol and EU Member States can use to have a better control of the terrorist groups, their members and online propaganda. Many valuable and important publications, for example ‘Computer support to analyse IS propaganda and Deconstruction of Identity Concepts in Islamic State Propaganda’ (Europol, 2017). EU IRU is also part of the EU Internet Forum. It is a public-private cooperation initiated by the EU Commission. It was established in December 2015. The main objective of this forum is to control and reduce the terrorist propaganda online but also to entrust civil society actors to be more committed and increase the alternative online content (ibid, 2017).

EU has also a part of a joint action against IS propaganda. EU Member States, Canada and the USA made an agreement to cooperate and the operation is coordinated by the European Union Internet Referral Unit (EU IRU), which is a part of ECTC. The goal is to hinder IS’s capability to spread terrorist messages online (Europol, 2018b). The process started in 2015 by Europol informing the EU Member States about the increased activity of terrorist groups on the internet, such as Amaq News Agency. Not until August 2016 a first attempt to take-down Amaq’s mobile application was made by both EU Member States and non-EU countries. In June 2017 a second try was held by the Spanish Guardia Civil and Europol with support of the USA. The new system that Guardia Civil introduced made it possible to identify radicalised individuals and groups in many parts of the world. The latest take-down was coordinated by EU IRU and with the support of Eurojust on 25-26 of April 2018. It was successful and not only Amaq’s media but also other IS channels has been compromised (ibid, 2018b).

‘With this ground-breaking operation we have punched a big hole in the capability of IS to spread propaganda online and radicalise young people in Europe...’ - Rob Wainwright, Executive Director of Europol.

Commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos has also commented this action: ‘Today’s international take-down action, with the support of Europol, shows our global strength and our unwavering resolve to fight against terrorist content online. Daesh is no longer just losing territory on the
ground- but also online. We will not stop until their propaganda is entirely eradicated from the Internet.’

The main web tool for IS is called Amaq and has been in use since 2015. In December 2017 the online propaganda was available in nine languages and was including newsletters and online services. In 2016 it was used to claim the attacks in Paris, Brussels, Berlin, Barcelona, and other places. EU IRU, EU Internet Referral Unit at Europol, is responsible for monitoring all online propaganda activities of the jihadist organisations that are listed in the EU (Europol, 2018b).

4.2.1 EU Commission

EU Commission believes that terrorism is a major problem for the society in the EU Member States. Therefore, a wide range of measures has been taken to fight it. The EU Counter-Terrorism strategy has been adopted in 2005. The open, free movement area in the EU is an easy target for the terrorists. That is why this common strategy has been implemented, in order to commit all the EU Member States to combat terrorism on EU territory but also globally. It includes four pillars: prevent, protect, pursue and respond. To prevent people from joining terrorist groups and stop future expansion on them, to protect the people and infrastructure by acting more efficient counter terrorist attacks. To pursue the terrorists and cut their funds for traveling and communicating and bring them to justice. And lastly, to respond in an organised and prepared way to the consequences of a terrorist attack. This requires improving the capacity and management (EU Commission, 2018).

EU Commission has also a main role in the EU’s Prevention and Protection programme. The central task is to assist EU Member states and their authorities in actions and new ideas, but also with legal work if relevant and respecting EU principles, for example subsidiarity principle (ibid, 2018).

After 2005, the EU Commission has been working with different policies and laws for prevention of terrorism but also crisis management and help for the terrorism victims. The main efforts that have been done concern terrorism financing, access to explosives and chemical material. Programme for the Protection of Critical Infrastructure and the TFTP (EU-US Agreement on Terrorist Finance Tracking Programme) have been established. Focus has been
laid on preventing people from joining terrorist organisations, by dealing with the causes of radicalisation in their roots. There are also programmes that provide assistance for the victims of terrorist attacks and their families. The Commission is also involved in several security research projects and international collaborations with different actors, such as UN and OSCE (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe). Member States have responsibility for crisis management, but since most of the terrorist attacks involve many countries and have a cross-border nature, the Commission can support them and coordinate the actions after an attack (ibid, 2018).

The TFTP has made it possible for the US and EU law enforcement authorities to track terrorist globally and at the same time protect the privacy of the EU citizens. The agreement entered into force in August 2010. Main features of the agreement are that it ensures data protection rights and transparency. Any person that has been analysed by the system has a right to check it and find out all the processed information. Due to the agreement Europol is responsible for choosing the relevant data for the fight against terrorism in EU and makes sure the data follows the conditions of the agreement. There are also independent overseers and personal appointed by the EU Commission that monitor the data. EU has also power to review all the movements and actions taken under the agreement. The last review report was conducted in March 2016 and presented in January 2017. The EU Commission is also working with the development of the TFTP in order to fulfil the existing gaps (ibid, 2018).

According to the EU Commission the EU must be prepared to respond fast to the attacks and disasters both on the EU territory and outside it. However, it has been demonstrated that there are things that have to be improved, for example rapidity of deployment or operational and political coordination (ibid, 2018).

EU Commission adopted in 2010 the Internal Security Strategy in Action, which requires solidarity of the EU Member States in responses to the attacks and a common prevention of the possible risks. It is DG Home Affairs, a department of the EU Commission, that is responsible for the international risk management and has also a supporting role in the development of security polices in the EU. The Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (Art.222) is a legal obligation for the Member States to support each other when a country has suffered a terrorist attack or any kind of disaster. Its aim is to make EU more efficient and better prepared for the crisis management (ibid, 2018).
Several crisis management mechanisms have also been set up by the EU Commission. One of them is the EU Emergency and Crisis Coordination Arrangements (EU-CCA), that exemplifies the rules for cooperation between the Member States and EU institutions. There is also EU-ICMA, that specifies the cross-border effects and EU arrangements of the attacks, which main goal is to simplify the practicalities of the collaboration between the Member States. Another important input from the EU Commission is the rapid alert system called ARGUS. It gathers all relevant institutions, information and services to provide a fast and well-prepared response to a terrorist attack. (ibid, 2018).

EU has been working on cutting terrorist founding. In May 2015, the Third Anti-money Laundering Directive came into life. It has regulations that control the money flow on the European territory (EU Commission, 2018). Controlling terrorist founding has been very important and its development and improvement is crucial for future success in the fight against terrorism. It does not only stop the money flow but gives information about the possible attacks and suspected people and group. Together with the Europol’s data bases and the information collected from the Member States it is a powerful tool.

4.3 From 2017 onwards

The new EU regulation regarding the role of Europol (EU 2016/794), applicable since 1 May 2017, gives Europol full power and privileges in its role as the EU criminal information leader, by ensuring the integrated data management and information exchange. Europol can now access all the data bases of the EU and of each of the members states, which will increase and strengthen the efficiency and cooperation. Europol can for instance enter into the Schengen Information System (SIS), that includes data about arrest and specific objects of interests. The data can be cross-matched with Europol’s data which increases the chances of success. There have also been intents of giving Europol the access to VIS and Eurodac, other European data bases, but it has still not been achieved. Europol has today an important role in border controls and preventing organized crime and terrorism. However, there is still a gap in information exchange. The SIS, Europol Information System (EIS) and Europol must cooperate and monitor all the possible connections in their data (EU Commission, 2017).
The EU is focusing more on the roots of terrorism in Europe and radicalisation in the Member States. Stopping the recruitment of new members in the radicalised groups is now the main goal that has been outlined in the EU Internal Security Strategy. In the EU Commission Reports, radicalisation in this context is described as ‘a complex phenomenon of people embracing radical ideology that could lead to commitment of terrorist acts’ (EU Commission, 2018). EU-wide Radicalisation Awareness Network has been established to make the work against radicalisation more efficient. This organisation unites social workers, youth and religious leaders together with experts in this subjects and policeman working in this field (ibid, 2018).

EU Commission has presented five key principles that the union must follow in order to secure our future. The first principle is about ensuring full consent with fundamental human rights. The second one guarantees more transparency, democracy and accountability. The third one assures better implementation of the EU legal instruments. The fourth one is about contributing to a broader inter-agency collaboration and the fifth one is to connect all internal and external dimensions of security (EU Commission, 2018).

ECTC is also hosting Conference on Online Terrorist Propaganda. The first one was in April 2017. The event included participants from different organizations related to the fight against terrorism, for example Members of the ECTC Advisory Group on Terrorist propaganda and representatives of the EU Commission and EU Council. It is crucial for the fight against terrorism to work with online propaganda. Terrorist groups, such as IS, focus mainly on online activates to recruit new members and spread their ideology. It is the easiest and the most effective way to reach out to as many people as possible. Tackling this challenge should stay number one on the EU’s counterterrorism agenda (Europol, 2017).

4.4 Europeans’ attitudes towards security

Eurobarometer is a survey that is conducted twice a year by EU Commission. There is also a Special Eurobarometer that is focused on more in-depth themes. Last report related to security in EU was published in 2017 and show some interesting statistics about how secure people feels in the EU. Most of the people feel safe in their neighbours or in the cities where they live (91% and 90%) and 82% feels safe in their countries in general. However, the number of people that sees EU as a secure place has been dropping significantly, from 79% in 2016 till 68% in 2017 (Special Eurobarometer 464b, 2017). There have been several terrorist attacks in Europe since 2015, which can be a reason why people feel less secure. The unstable political situation in
many European countries and the shifting of power can also have an impact on peoples' attitudes towards security.

95% of the respondents chose terrorism as a major challenge for the European security. The numbers vary from country to country but there is a general trend that this issue is important for most of the people. 92% of the interviewed believes that there is a need of stronger cooperation between the Member States, especially when it comes to information sharing. People see also a lack of communication between the police and national law enforcement (ibid, 2017). It is clear that people feel threatened by the new security challenge in Europe, terrorism. It is also interesting to see that people have noticed that there is lack of collaboration between the Member States, which is affecting peoples’ security.

4.5 Hard & Soft Power

Europe has always been known for its soft power use. It has a strong cultural background and attractiveness, but also the variety of languages is an important factor here. English, Spanish, Portuguese and French are spoken worldwide and connect Europe with the rest of the globe. Another interesting soft power resources that Europe can use as advantages are the asylum politics, high life expectancy, economic development and public diplomacy (Nye, 2006:30-31) After the Second World War, Europe became ‘an island of peace’ and increasing prosperity. Even though many European leaders have supported the war on terror in Iraq 2003, Europe has still a very good public image. Gun control, climate change fight and civil rights are a few examples of issues that strengthens European Union’s image on the international level (ibid, 31). EU has also a history of solving problems in a peaceful way and investing a lot in public diplomacy but although it is united on trade, agriculture, monetary policy and human rights, here is still a lack of a united military force.

European people do not approve the American idea of a ‘war on terror’ and tend to choose more peaceful ways of fighting terrorism. Long term solutions are preferable, instead of short term solutions such as bombngs of countries where terrorists have their bases. Many of the member states have criticised the acts of American or Russian president, for their military actions in the Middle East. Considering the European history with terrorism, today’s terrorism is a different threat. The former terrorist organisations acting in Europe were mostly freedom fighters with
strong political opinions. The IS or al-Qaeda have other reasons and backgrounds and are inspired by religious extremism (Europas publikationsbyrå, 2007) (June, 2011).

The EU is laying more focus on the people that carry out the attacks, their background and personal issues, rather than on the attacks themselves. As most of the terrorist in Europe are Muslims, the governments must consider the effect of the policies on the Muslim population. There are around 20 million Muslims in the EU today and it has been proved, for example by Europol, that terrorist organisations tend to recruit Muslims and non-Muslims that are European citizens (TE-SAT, 2017).

Europol is a particular international police organization, being set up by the EU and not by the local authorities or police officers as in most of the cases. It has a broader space for action and bigger support from the other international actors, because it is working on a mandate from the EU. However, it is also depended on other partners, such as the experts that are hired as a support team for the case analysis. In the last years, Europol has been focusing a lot on terrorism after the increased number of the attack and people joining extremist groups on European territory but also traveling to the Middle East, as it states in the TE-SAT report (2017). There have been many discussions about focusing on a common military force in the EU. That would be a huge step towards Hard Power, but so far there is no decision on that. However, the terrorism threat is increasing not only in the EU but also globally, which means that there is a need for development of the strategies and methods.

According to Nye (2004), the world has become multidimensional in the sense of power. It is no longer USA who is leading the world alone. China, Russia and European Union are also on top when it comes to economic development. However, Nye argues that it is only the EU that can face USA as an equal actor. At the same time, Nye thinks that the biggest problem of EU is integration and it has to be solved if all the Member States want to act as a union (Nye, 2004: 75-81).

According to Heywood (2011) and Nye (2004) hard power is a use of forces, economic sanctions, trade restrictions, etc. EU has not been using hard power as a main power tool and is globally seen as problem solver, mender and is one of the most important actors that protect human rights, women rights but is also protecting the environment. EU has no military forces, so it relies on multilateral negotiations, rules, laws and organizations from the member states.
and other countries. The EU’s work is based on agreements, which is a clear example of soft power.

Soft power means using culture, policies and ideals as tools for achieving peace and goals of a country or a union. The access to internet, knowledge and all kind of information makes it easier for people to follow the news and acts from the whole world. People have ideas and strong opinions about what is happening, and it is no longer simple to control them, especially in highly developed countries. It is also related to the spreading of democratic values, which makes it more difficult to use hard power without losing people’s support.

Adamski and Johnson (2006) argued that the structure of European Union makes it possible to enhance security due to the functional governments and law enforcement in the member states. Also, they mentioned that diplomacy, the main tool of soft power, is central for European foreign politics (Adamski & Johnson, 2006:164-166). EU is trying to avoid the use of military force at any price. Force can only solve a problem at the most extreme circumstances. The goal of creating a union in Europe was also to integrate all the countries and pursue supranational diplomacy. It serves as a multiple ‘carrot and sticks’, but at the same time connecting a range of countries, actors and organisations.

According to Cooper (2014), soft power is mainly used in international relations and it has been more effective in achieving peace in the world. It is simply using the authority without military forces. Legitimacy is also important, such as a good public image. EU has been always focusing on having a good imagine worldwide and trying to achieve a high level of support from as many EU citizens as possible. Nye (2006) is mentioning cultural attractiveness as an important factor in the use of soft power. Having similar culture facilities collaboration. In that way EU Member States can collaborate and function together, but it makes it possible to achieve connections and agreements with other international actors, such as US, NATO, etc. Western countries and democracies have a long history of collaboration, that had led to many successful operations and development of policies and trades. It is also applicable to international terrorism. Since it is more and more about a cross-border security threat, it is important to continue cooperate. As it is described above, people in the EU want to see more information exchange and support from all the countries, so the EU can be better in risk management and people security.
5 Conclusion

Terrorism has become a global threat and there is no doubt about it. The attacks in Spain, France, Belgium and in other Member States show the seriousness of this new security threat. Moreover, the number of attacks on European territory have been increasing drastically in the last few years. In order to defeat terrorism, the countries need to stay together and cooperate. The EU has an important role in the global fight against terrorism. It is also encouraging all the Member States to join their forces and prevent cross-border terrorism movements and exchange information about the suspects.

Since 2003, the EU has made progress in managing the terrorism threat, by adapting new strategies and starting or giving more power to the several institutions, such as Europol. It has been easier to maintain a cross-border cooperation and investigation. The EU’s current counterterrorism strategy is built on human rights and international law. It is divided into four strategies: prevention of radicalization and the factors behind the recruitment, protection of possible targets, persecution of terrorists and remedying the consequences of the attacks.

A great deal has been done on the EU-level, to protect the citizens and societies from terrorism. But there is still much to do. The coordination and responses to the attacks could be improved, especially for the attacks with use of chemical weapons. There are also gaps in the process that control terrorism financing and information exchange, with consideration for the personal data protection rules. Integration and combating discrimination are two remaining problems to solve in the upcoming years. They have a big impact on radicalisation in Europe, but also transparency and flexibility are needed in order to have a fully working counterterrorism strategy.

Even though the EU has been working hard on improving the legal and other forces in the fight against terrorism and many changes have been made in the las decade, there is still a long way to perfection. The cooperation between the Member States must grow and get stronger. It has also been seen that EU is acting rapidly after the attacks on European territory but has not been making any significant moves otherwise. One of the problematics here is the independence of the Member States and the differences in how they see the terrorism and how important it is for each country. Even the results from the Eurobarometer about security from 2017 show that people feel less secure in EU and even though there are slightly difference between the numbers
from each country, the general trend is that people see terrorism as a big threat and would like to see a broader cooperation between the Member States and also a more developed information exchange.

EU has been acting and improving the already existing documents and regulations during many years. After analysing the subject and the measures that have been taken by the EU one can see that most of the changes were affected by terrorist attacks conducted in the last years. For example, the bombing in Madrid, in London or the shootings in Paris. The 9/11 attacks were an incentive for the European Union’s development of the counterterrorism strategy and the improvement and broader mandated for the Europol. Europol’s aim is to improve the cooperation of the EU Member States and the national police forces by preventing and encountering international organized crime, such as terrorism as one of the main focus areas. Europol is an interesting organization, because of its institutional management. On the one hand it is controlled by the EU and on the other hand professional experts and institutional autonomy, with the national police agencies included. All the Europol actions are supervised by the EU bodies and politicians. At the same time, it is clear that the organisation has strong autonomy.

More focus should be laid on the background factors to terrorism in Europe, such as radicalisation and integration. EU Commission has started a network to unite people that can deal with this problem in the Member States. There is also The European Agenda on Security, that is the most powerful, legal document that all the EU Member States must follow. However, terrorism is changing every year and there comes new types of threats to our countries. Cybercrime and online propaganda are two examples of such new aspects of security. The cross-border collaboration is crucial for tackling these threats. The EU has developed a wide range of legal and practical tools to ensure a quick response to terrorist attacks, but the collaboration between Member States still needs improvements.

When it comes to hard and soft power theory, the study has showed that EU is mostly using soft power in the international politics, but also on the national level. Factors such as cultural similarities, diplomacy, and implementation of regulations and directives are important for the work EU is doing in the fight against terrorism. Its power is in strengthening collaboration between the Member States and ensuring the enforcement of the legislative documents in all the countries. EU has an opinion of being a problem solver and mender in the international negotiations. That only supports the Soft Power image it has. EU’s work relies on negations, laws and directives that are based on common agreements. That is a strong example of soft power use.
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