

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Acknowledgements | 9 |
| Tables and Figures | 10 |
| Abbreviations and Acronyms | 11 |
| 1 Introduction | 13 |
| 1.1 Counterterrorism Cooperation and International Bureaucracies: Research Questions and Objectives | 13 |
| 1.2 State of Research | 18 |
| 1.2.1 Research on Counterterrorism Cooperation | 18 |
| 1.2.2 International Bureaucracies in International Relations Theory | 22 |
| 1.3 Research Design and Methods | 26 |
| 1.3.1 The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison | 26 |
| 1.3.2 Case Selection | 28 |
| 1.3.3 Sources | 31 |
| 1.4 Outline | 32 |
| 2 Analyzing International Bureaucracies: A Theoretical Framework | 35 |
| 2.1 International Governmental Organizations: From Instruments to Actors | 35 |
| 2.2 From International Governmental Organizations to International Bureaucracies | 38 |
| 2.2.1 The Theory and Practice of Bureaucracy | 40 |
| 2.2.2 Transferring the Bureaucracy Concept to the International Level | 43 |
| 2.3 The Autonomy of International Bureaucracies | 48 |
| 2.3.1 Conceptualizing Bureaucratic Autonomy | 49 |
| 2.3.2 Basic Indicators of Bureaucratic Autonomy | 52 |
| 2.4 From Bureaucratic Effectiveness to the Performance of Bureaucratic Functions | 55 |
| 2.4.1 Problems of Studying Bureaucratic Effectiveness | 57 |
| 2.4.2 The Performance of Bureaucratic Functions as Alternative Indicator | 60 |
| 2.5 International Relations Theory and Three Functions of International Bureaucracies | 62 |
| 2.5.1 International Bureaucracies as Entrepreneurs | 63 |
| 2.5.2 International Bureaucracies as Managers | 66 |
| 2.5.3 International Bureaucracies as Think-Tanks | 69 |
| 2.6 Conditions of Bureaucratic Autonomy and Functions: Preliminary Assumptions | 73 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 3 | Terrorism, Counterterrorism, and International Cooperation: Surveying an Ambivalent Field | 78 |
| 3.1 | Terrorism: Construction and Contention | 79 |
| 3.2 | Counterterrorism: Prevention and Coercion | 82 |
| 3.3 | Counterterrorism Cooperation: Functional Governance and Political Contestation | 85 |
| 3.4 | Chapter Conclusion | 89 |
| 4. | The United Nations and the European Union in the Fight against Terrorism | 91 |
| 4.1 | The Organizational Field of UN Counterterrorism Cooperation | 92 |
| 4.1.1 | The Institutional Framework of UN Counterterrorism Cooperation | 92 |
| 4.1.2 | The Historical Roots of UN Counterterrorism Cooperation | 98 |
| 4.2 | From Hegemonic Leadership to System-Wide Effort: UN Counterterrorism Cooperation 2001-2010 | 101 |
| 4.2.1 | Responding to 9/11: The United States, the Security Council, and Resolution 1373 | 102 |
| 4.2.2 | Monitoring Compliance: Early Successes and First Reforms in the Counterterrorism Committee | 105 |
| 4.2.3 | Broadening Counterterrorism: The Secretary-General, the General Assembly, and the Global Strategy | 112 |
| 4.2.4 | Adapting to the Strategy: A Pragmatic Response in the Security Council | 115 |
| 4.2.5 | Implementing the Strategy: The UN System and the Global Strategy | 118 |
| 4.3 | The Organizational Field of EU Counterterrorism Cooperation | 121 |
| 4.3.1 | The Institutional Framework of EU Counterterrorism Cooperation | 122 |
| 4.3.2 | The Historical Roots of EU Counterterrorism Cooperation | 126 |
| 4.4 | From Acceleration to Incrementalism: EU Counterterrorism Cooperation 2001-2009 | 129 |
| 4.4.1 | Responding to 9/11: A Window of Opportunity for Internal Security Policy | 130 |
| 4.4.2 | Accelerating Counterterrorism: The Madrid Bombings and a New Momentum | 134 |
| 4.4.3 | Broadening Counterterrorism: The London Bombings and the EU Strategy | 138 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 4.4.4 | Implementing the Strategy: Towards Technical Incrementalism | 142 |
| 4.5 | Chapter Conclusion | 147 |
| 5. | Case Study 1: The United Nations Secretariat | 149 |
| 5.1 | The Bureaucratic Autonomy of the UN Secretariat | 149 |
| 5.1.1 | Resources | 150 |
| 5.1.2 | Leeway | 155 |
| 5.1.3 | Interests and Culture | 160 |
| 5.2 | The Bureaucratic Functions of the UN Secretariat | 163 |
| 5.2.1 | The UN Secretariat as Entrepreneur | 164 |
| 5.2.2 | The UN Secretariat as Manager | 171 |
| 5.2.3 | The UN Secretariat as Think-Tank | 177 |
| 5.3 | Chapter Conclusion | 181 |
| 6. | Case Study 2: The UN Counterterrorism Committee Executive Directorate | 183 |
| 6.1 | The Bureaucratic Autonomy of CTED | 184 |
| 6.1.1 | Resources | 184 |
| 6.1.2 | Leeway | 189 |
| 6.1.3 | Interests and Culture | 194 |
| 6.2 | The Bureaucratic Functions of CTED | 196 |
| 6.2.1 | CTED as Entrepreneur | 196 |
| 6.2.2 | CTED as Manager | 197 |
| 6.2.3 | CTED as Think-Tank | 205 |
| 6.3 | Chapter Conclusion | 207 |
| 7. | Case Study 3: The European Commission | 209 |
| 7.1 | The Bureaucratic Autonomy of the European Commission | 210 |
| 7.1.1 | Resources | 210 |
| 7.1.2 | Leeway | 214 |
| 7.1.3 | Interests and Culture | 218 |
| 7.2 | The Bureaucratic Functions of the European Commission | 220 |
| 7.2.1 | The European Commission as Entrepreneur | 220 |
| 7.2.2 | The European Commission as Manager | 229 |
| 7.2.3 | The European Commission as Think-Tank | 234 |
| 7.3 | Chapter Conclusion | 240 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 8. Case Study 4: The EU Counterterrorism Coordinator | 242 |
| 8.1 The Bureaucratic Autonomy of the EU Counterterrorism Coordinator | 242 |
| 8.1.1 Resources | 243 |
| 8.1.2 Leeway | 246 |
| 8.1.3 Interests and Culture | 250 |
| 8.2 The Bureaucratic Functions of the EU Counterterrorism Coordinator | 251 |
| 8.2.1 The EU Counterterrorism Coordinator as Entrepreneur | 251 |
| 8.2.2 The EU Counterterrorism Coordinator as Manager | 252 |
| 8.2.3 The EU Counterterrorism Coordinator as Think-Tank | 255 |
| 8.3 Chapter Conclusion | 256 |
| 9. Conclusion | 257 |
| 9.1 Case Study Findings and Comparative Analysis | 258 |
| 9.1.1 Autonomy: Resource Dependence, Bounded Leeway, and Pragmatic Interests | 258 |
| 9.1.2 Functions: Situational Entrepreneurs, Cautious Managers, and Ambiguous Think-Tanks | 261 |
| 9.1.3 Conditions: Hard Constraints and Soft Opportunities | 266 |
| 9.2 Rethinking International Counterterrorism Bureaucracies: A Case of “Successful Failure”? | 268 |
| 9.3 International Bureaucracies in International Relations Theory: Contributions and Desiderata | 272 |
| References | 277 |
| Annex: List of Interviews | 325 |