

Annex

A1: Share of knowledgeable EU citizens between 2004 and 2015³⁷

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average over membership years	Comparison to EU average
EU average	61	54	54	50	67	64	60	63	69	66	62	
Austria	52	42	50	40	53	47	47	55	57	47	49	Below average
Belgium	67	57	58	60	60	64	58	59	57	58	60	Below average
Bulgaria				48	74	75	73	79	88	86	75	Above average
Croatia								72	73	78	74	Above average
Cyprus	77	67	70	63	88	84	83	89	84	84	79	Above average
Czech Republic	52	46	41	37	56	49	52	55	65	60	51	Below average
Denmark	66	67	69	69	74	72	68	65	75	71	70	Above average
Estonia	50	46	37	36	60	61	52	56	62	57	52	Below average
Finland	69	63	58	59	77	73	64	73	76	72	68	Above average
France	53	44	43	38	45	45	41	44	47	45	45	Below average
Germany	58	51	44	42	53	47	43	47	60	52	50	Below average
Greece	85	74	77	75	87	85	85	83	86	86	82	Above average
Hungary	53	36	45	37	65	60	57	57	68	62	54	Below average
Ireland	63	63	65	63	71	67	64	64	68	71	66	Above average
Italy	57	53	47	41	58	56	50	47	58	54	52	Below average
Latvia	40	35	49	34	59	65	53	61	73	60	53	Below average
Lithuania	62	56	49	45	72	72	68	76	82	81	66	Above average
Luxembourg	75	65	62	62	67	63	61	54	65	62	64	Above average
Malta	77	80	79	78	88	85	85	91	89	88	84	Above average
Netherlands	61	46	50	42	54	51	41	44	53	43	49	Below average
Poland	60	53	56	52	71	65	68	69	73	67	63	Above average
Portugal	59	53	52	42	64	61	56	56	73	58	57	Below average
Romania				48	74	68	62	71	73	74	67	Above average
Slovakia	64	50	58	55	81	79	74	71	80	77	69	Above average
Slovenia	73	63	59	52	79	78	68	67	79	73	69	Above average
Spain	59	53	49	48	56	53	52	49	56	60	54	Below average
Sweden	51	47	42	40	63	59	53	66	78	69	57	Below average
UK	53	44	51	46	55	53	51	51	60	57	52	Below average

³⁷ Own portrayal and calculation based on data provided by Eurobarometer (62), 2004; (64) 2005; (66) 2006; (67) 2007; (73) 2010 (75) 2011; (78) 2012; (80) 2013; (82) 2014; (84) 2015. The question used is: For each of the following statements about the EU could you please tell me whether you think it is true or false. – The members of the European Parliament are directly elected by the citizens of each member state -. There was no data available for 2008 and 2009. When two Eurobarometer surveys in the same year are available, this thesis uses the autumn editions for better comparability. When the EU member state is not in the EU, it is only the average of the years the country has been a member in the EU.

A2: Share of respondents that tend to agree that their voice counts in their member state³⁸

	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average over membership years	Comparison to EU average
EU average	48	51	51	50	48	56	56	52	
Austria	62	69	70	71	73	78	70	70	Above average
Belgium	61	63	61	59	65	60	66	62	Above average
Bulgaria	25	32	33	42	29	48	48	37	Below average
Croatia					69	73	80	74	Above average
Cyprus	44	43	43	28	22	25	20	32	Below average
Czech Republic	32	32	32	30	37	49	43	36	Below average
Denmark	90	93	93	92	92	91	92	92	Above average
Estonia	41	52	56	51	36	44	34	45	Below average
Finland	77	72	77	81	78	84	81	79	Above average
France	71	71	73	77	67	71	66	71	Above average
Germany	62	64	66	70	72	74	70	68	Above average
Greece	21	28	23	11	20	32	27	23	Below average
Hungary	29	33	49	37	44	54	42	41	Below average
Ireland	48	50	38	47	41	55	62	49	Below average
Italy	19	26	25	22	17	27	30	24	Below average
Latvia	17	16	24	30	27	36	38	27	Below average
Lithuania	21	18	15	22	19	26	32	22	Below average
Luxembourg	65	65	72	65	60	55	57	63	Above average
Malta	54	51	45	46	64	67	64	56	Above average
Netherlands	79	80	81	80	75	81	78	79	Above average
Poland	44	50	60	54	48	64	65	55	Above average
Portugal	34	46	37	33	32	41	49	39	Below average
Romania	19	25	18	18	20	47	49	28	Below average
Slovakia	41	47	50	46	45	64	55	50	Below average
Slovenia	74	62	64	60	42	49	51	57	Above average
Spain	48	56	50	35	23	35	40	41	Below average
Sweden	90	91	91	92	91	95	93	92	Above average
UK	36	38	45	49	44	53	53	44	Below average

³⁸ Own portrayal based on yearly data from 2008 to 2015 provided by Eurobarometer Interactive (a), 2016 for all years except for 2011. The data for 2011 could not be retrieved. The question used is: Please tell me for each statement, whether you tend to agree or tend to disagree – My voice counts in (Our country). When two Eurobarometer surveys in the same year are available, this thesis uses the autumn editions for better comparability or the survey of the year where the data for the member state is provided. When the EU member state has not been in the EU for the time under investigation, it is only the average of the years the country has been a member in the EU.

A3: Share of respondents stating that their country's voice counts in the EU³⁹

	2004	2007	2008	2009	2010	Average over membership years	Comparison to EU average
EU average	64	58	58	58	58	59	
Austria	45	45	43	46	42	44	Below average
Belgium	77	72	73	69	70	72	Above average
Bulgaria		35	35	39	43	38	Below average
Cyprus	63	36	52	51	43	49	Below average
Czech Republic	31	37	44	45	40	39	Below average
Denmark	80	80	77	79	86	80	Above average
Estonia	57	60	56	56	64	59	Above average
Finland	62	63	69	68	72	67	Above average
France	87	86	83	81	79	83	Above average
Germany	81	79	79	78	81	80	Above average
Greece	60	45	40	37	33	43	Below average
Hungary	65	51	47	47	59	54	Below average
Ireland	70	60	59	62	56	61	Above average
Italy	56	41	41	46	50	47	Below average
Latvia	48	41	39	31	32	38	Below average
Lithuania	67	48	46	48	42	50	Below average
Luxembourg	81	79	77	73	78	78	Above average
Malta	69	72	62	66	61	66	Above average
Netherlands	75	73	81	76	77	76	Above average
Poland	67	66	62	64	67	65	Above average
Portugal	58	42	46	64	53	53	Below average
Romania		40	36	41	30	37	Below average
Slovakia	37	46	49	50	62	49	Below average
Slovenia	75	69	79	59	65	69	Above average
Spain	66	61	52	64	61	61	Above average
Sweden	76	79	83	83	84	81	Above average
UK	56	47	48	43	47	48	Below average

³⁹ Own portrayal and calculation based on yearly data from 2004 to 2010 provided by Eurobarometer Interactive (b), 2016 for all years except for 2005 and 2006. This data could not be retrieved on the country-level. The question used is: Please tell me for each statement, whether you tend to agree or tend to disagree – (Our country's) voice counts in the European Union. When two Eurobarometer surveys in the same year are available, this thesis uses the autumn editions for better comparability or the survey of the year where the data for the member state is provided. When the EU member state has not been in the EU for the time under investigation, it is only the average of the years the country has been a member in the EU or has been excluded if it has not been a member at that time (Croatia).

A4: Share of respondents that see terrorism as one of two most important issues facing their country⁴⁰

	2001*	2002*	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2014	2015
EU average	83	79	9,1	9,1	8,7	8,9	5,6	2,9	2,3	2,0	0,9	1,1	2,9	6,5
EU Median	83	82	4	5	4	5	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	5,5
Austria	70	62	4	5	3	5	9	4	2	3	1	2	5	9
Belgium	78	76	4	6	5	9	4	2	2	3	1	2	2	9
Bulgaria							1	1	1	1	0	1	1	5
Croatia												0	0	2
Cyprus				3	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
Czech Rep.				4	3	5	3	2	1	2	1	1	1	7
Denmark	79	77	12	20	32	36	17	11	9	3	1	2	6	11
Estonia				2	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Finland	69	67	2	5	5	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	2
France	91	88	9	10	10	11	6	3	2	2	2	1	5	18
Germany	85	75	3	4	4	7	11	3	3	2	3	2	11	10
Greece	91	86	4	2	1	3	2	1	5	2	1	3	1	1
Hungary				5	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Ireland	83	82	2	6	6	6	4	1	1	0	0	1	1	4
Italy	92	92	9	17	11	15	7	3	4	5	1	1	3	9
Latvia				2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Lithuania				3	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Luxembourg	84	85	7	10	4	6	3	3	3	1	0	1	2	6
Malta				2	2	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	9
Netherlands	76	69	4	12	40	26	9	6	3	5	0	1	12	12
Poland				6	3	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	5
Portugal	90	85	3	4	1	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	0	2
Romania						4	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	6
Slovakia				4	5	6	5	2	1	1	1	1	1	6
Slovenia				3	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Spain	90	82	51	59	31	29	37	14	12	11	1	1	1	5
Sweden	83	78	6	6	6	5	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	3
UK	83	85	17	28	34	35	17	9	6	6	3	4	16	24

⁴⁰ Data for table provided by Eurobarometer (60), 2003; (62), 2004 and Eurobarometer Interactive (c), 2016 for the years of 2005-2015. Question that were asked to respondents is “What do you think are the two most important issues facing (our country) at the moment.” (asked between 2005-2015) and “Please tell me, if, personally you are afraid of terrorism”. Data for 2011 is not available. If no values are in the table for a specific year, the country was not yet a member of the European Union.

A5: Basis of calculation for shares of salience above EU average or above EU median ⁴¹

Member state	Years above EU average/Membership years	Years above EU median/Membership years
Austria	6/14	7/14
Belgium	4/14	9/14
Bulgaria	0/8	0/8
Croatia	0/3	0/3
Cyprus	0/11	0/11
Czech Republic	1/11	3/11
Denmark	11/14	11/14
Estonia	1/11	1/11
Finland	0/14	1/14
France	10/14	13/14
Germany	8/14	10/14
Greece	4/14	5/14
Hungary	1/11	1/11
Ireland	1/14	5/14
Italy	11/14	12/14
Latvia	0/11	0/11
Lithuania	0/11	0/11
Luxembourg	5/14	10/14
Malta	1/11	1/11
Netherlands	9/14	9/14
Poland	0/11	2/11
Portugal	3/14	4/14
Romania	1/9	2/9
Slovakia	0/11	4/11
Slovenia	0/11	0/11
Spain	10/14	10/14
Sweden	0/14	3/14
United Kingdom	13/14	13/14

⁴¹ Values for table are read off Annex A4, 87.

A6: Balance of citizens' trust to the EU⁴²

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average over membership years
EU average	2,1	21,6	9,6	17,2	22,4	17,6	19,7	6,7	-9,1	-13,9	-14,6	-1,5	-12,9	5,1
Austria	-16	6	-8	-3	3	-7	2	-11	-25	-18	-13	-7	-39	-10,5
Belgium	-2	32	17	26	35	24	17	17	4	-5	0	-6	-15	11,1
Bulgaria					39	37	53	37	36	36	27	18	9	32,4
Croatia											-21	-12	-2	-11,7
Cyprus		30	19	26	22	28	27	-8	5	-33	-58	-44	-55	-3,4
Czech Republic		20	15	32	25	25	24	4	-17	-26	-27	-6	-36	2,8
Denmark	-7	1	0	7	27	24	25	26	8	2	-1	12	6	10,0
Estonia		30	17	40	48	46	48	46	12	9	23	34	11	30,3
Finland	-20	-5	-17	-5	-8	3	16	6	-6	-1	-1	20	5	-1,0
France	-12	10	-9	-8	17	0	-6	-12	-30	-22	-35	-16	-38	-12,4
Germany	-7	3	-14	-12	-8	2	1	-17	-27	-29	-31	-17	-35	-14,7
Greece	35	32	25	31	30	15	22	-15	-39	-64	-57	-53	-63	-7,8
Hungary		41	28	35	31	15	18	25	3	-8	0	5	-9	15,3
Ireland	26	38	27	30	33	15	12	1	-36	-28	-22	-10	-19	5,2
Italy	32	29	23	12	10	-6	19	1	-17	-22	-39	-24	-21	-0,2
Latvia		15	0	18	18	3	1	-11	-11	-9	-2	10	-10	1,8
Lithuania		53	27	38	38	28	28	24	14	12	18	34	34	29,0
Luxembourg	15	32	21	6	21	8	33	12	2	-10	-6	15	-1	11,4
Malta		31	27	28	30	36	24	22	5	12	20	26	15	23,0
Netherlands	-6	8	-10	-2	15	27	30	14	-9	-8	-17	1	-4	3,0
Poland		23	19	32	41	27	23	18	6	6	6	20	-2	18,3
Portugal	36	41	36	30	27	15	38	-2	-25	-24	-43	-11	-6	8,6
Romania					47	37	45	22	12	5	6	29	29	25,8
Slovakia		36	24	35	29	47	47	37	3	-3	-3	7	-12	20,6
Slovenia		32	17	46	37	27	5	-1	-18	-17	-21	-9	-32	5,5
Spain	28	34	17	21	32	24	21	-1	-32	-52	-50	-31	-36	-1,9
Sweden	-33	-21	-31	-8	-5	8	-1	-6	-9	-29	-14	8	4	-10,5
United Kingdom	-37	-12	-30	-26	-28	-32	-39	-48	-56	-50	-48	-35	-40	-37,0

⁴² Own illustration based on Eurobarometer Interactive (d), 2016. Values are based on the difference between the values “tend to trust” and “tend not to trust”. The full Eurobarometer question is: “For each of the following institutions, please tell me if you tend to trust it or not: The European Union.” If the value is negative, more respondents in the specific country over years answered that they tend not to trust. If the value is positive a larger share of respondents in the country answered that they tend not to trust. Empty cells indicate that the country has not been a member of the EU yet. Do not knows are not included.

A7: Role of security actors in the provision of security to citizens⁴³

Share of answers that assign an overall important role to → in %	Police	Army	Judicial system	EU's institutions and agencies	Citizens' associations	Citizens themselves
EU	93	77	89	69	64	79
Austria	94	72	89	59	61	73
Belgium	91	64	88	71	58	72
Bulgaria	98	88	96	85	76	85
Croatia	90	73	87	68	64	76
Cyprus	96	76	92	88	85	90
Czech Republic	97	90	93	62	53	78
Denmark	96	53	94	63	74	83
Estonia	94	85	86	66	72	85
Finland	95	81	90	53	46	73
France	93	82	90	67	64	78
Germany	93	64	90	59	48	76
Greece	94	70	91	76	79	85
Hungary	91	77	89	78	80	83
Ireland	95	75	90	76	78	91
Italy	91	82	90	80	72	74
Latvia	92	75	87	63	57	81
Lithuania	94	80	87	72	68	86
Luxembourg	93	45	87	69	55	70
Malta	96	95	90	83	78	88
Netherlands	97	56	95	57	67	89
Poland	91	93	88	74	67	77
Portugal	85	72	80	66	63	66
Romania	96	92	92	80	72	82
Slovakia	94	86	88	77	62	79
Slovenia	88	67	89	69	68	85
Spain	89	67	88	75	73	82
Sweden	95	69	98	62	61	90
United Kingdom	95	85	89	68	63	85

⁴³ Values in Table based on Special Eurobarometer (432), 2015, T33-T38. The question asked was: "In your view what role should each of the following play in ensuring the citizens in (our country)?" The values indicated in the table are the share of respondents that assigned a very important role or a fairly important role to the EU's institutions and agencies. Rank indicates the position of importance among the given answers: "the police, the army, the judicial system, the EU's institutions and agencies, citizens' associations, citizens themselves".

A8: Share of respondents asking for a joint-decision making with the EU on international terrorism⁴⁴

	2001	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Average across membership years
EU average	81,1	82,3	87,3	81,9	82,4	84,4	81,0	84,3	83,1	81,9	83,4
Austria	83	72	81	73	69	73	76	76	79	72	75,4
Belgium	90	88	92	87	87	89	85	83	87	86	87,4
Bulgaria						83	84	91	88	87	86,6
Cyprus			88	85	81	85	79	89	79	86	84,0
Czech Republic			91	88	89	90	88	88	88	87	88,6
Denmark	86	83	89	87	91	91	90	91	92	92	89,2
Estonia			93	88	89	90	88	88	91	87	89,3
Finland	83	83	90	83	82	87	86	85	84	79	84,2
France	86	87	90	81	84	86	82	86	85	85	85,2
Germany	85	87	86	82	88	92	87	88	87	85	86,7
Greece	35	80	90	73	74	82	77	79	68	69	72,7
Hungary			87	90	86	92	90	89	89	84	88,4
Ireland	82	80	84	76	76	76	72	79	78	73	77,6
Italy	90	86	78	72	73	77	70	76	71	73	76,6
Latvia			92	88	88	89	89	89	91	89	89,4
Lithuania			90	84	87	88	84	86	90	89	87,3
Luxembourg	88	79	83	86	84	87	89	91	91	92	87,0
Malta			87	86	85	87	85	91	88	86	86,9
Netherlands	85	90	90	88	88	90	89	87	86	89	88,2
Poland			92	88	90	87	85	84	85	82	86,6
Portugal	74	76	80	75	77	80	38	78	76	70	72,4
Romania						80	80	83	75	73	78,2
Slovakia			93	91	91	91	92	89	89	87	90,4
Slovenia			86	79	84	84	83	85	80	85	83,3
Spain	84	87	85	67	69	64	63	73	75	72	73,9
Sweden	88	84	88	87	88	90	90	90	89	90	88,4
United Kingdom	78	73	77	63	61	68	67	63	63	62	67,5

⁴⁴ Own table based on data provided by Eurobarometer Interactive (e), 2016. Croatia is not mentioned as it was not a member of the EU at that time. “Do not know” respondents are excluded. Values indicate the average share of respondents that responded that decisions on international terrorism should be made jointly with the EU. Missing values indicate that country has not been a member of the EU yet. Data for 2002 was not available as the question was not asked in this year. If the question was asked twice in the year, the autumn edition of the Eurobarometer was considered.

A9: Terrorist incidents in EU member states between 2001 and 2005⁴⁵

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Average of incidents over membership years
EU average	12,1	6,1	6,2	2,5	4,0	5,0
Austria	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium	0	3	8	0	0	2,2
Cyprus	1	0	0	1	0	0,4
Czech Republic	1	0	1	0	0	0,4
Denmark	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estonia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finland	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	21	32	34	11	33	26,2
Germany	8	3	1	3	3	3,6
Greece	14	11	12	4	6	9,4
Hungary				0	0	0
Ireland	2	0	1	0	0	0,6
Italy	10	7	16	3	6	8,4
Latvia				0	0	0
Lithuania				0	0	0
Luxembourg	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malta				0	0	0
Netherlands	1	2	3	1	0	1,4
Poland	1	0	0	0	0	0,2
Portugal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slovakia				0	0	0
Slovenia				0	0	0
Spain	79	38	20	31	24	38,4
Sweden	0	0	0	3	1	0,8
United Kingdom	92	20	21	5	26	32,8

⁴⁵ Own table based on GTD, 2016. Incidents on all types of targets and by all types of perpetrators are included, if they fulfill the criterion that they are aimed at a political, economic, religious or social goal. Unsuccessful attacks and ambiguous cases are included. Missing values in the table are due to non-membership in the EU in this year. Values in italic were used for the corresponding graph.

A10: Terrorist incidents in EU member states between 2006 and 2014⁴⁶

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	<i>Average of incidents over membership years</i>
EU average	19,9	21,6	19,1	11,3	9,2	6,4	8,1	5,4	7,1	<i>11,6</i>
Austria	1	1	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	<i>1,8</i>
Belgium	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	<i>0,4</i>
Bulgaria		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	<i>0,3</i>
Croatia								0	0	<i>0</i>
Cyprus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Czech Republic	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	<i>0,1</i>
Denmark	0	1	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	<i>0,8</i>
Estonia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Finland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
France	294	267	147	95	84	85	125	63	52	<i>134,7</i>
Germany	13	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	<i>3,8</i>
Greece	25	2	14	15	21	6	1	14	7	<i>11,7</i>
Hungary	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0,4</i>
Ireland	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0,3</i>
Italy	11	9	9	3	8	5	11	7	12	<i>8,3</i>
Latvia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Lithuania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Luxembourg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Malta	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Poland	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0,1</i>
Portugal	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0,3</i>
Romania		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Slovakia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Slovenia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0</i>
Spain	145	279	263	171	90	47	54	33	18	<i>122,2</i>
Sweden	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	<i>0,1</i>
United Kingdom	5	2	74		40	26	24	35	109	<i>39,3</i>

⁴⁶ Own table based on TE-SAT reports 2007-2015 (each report refers to the previous year). Incidents of all types of targets and all types of perpetrators are included if they fulfill they criteria for a terrorist offence as stated in the 2002 Council Framework Decision. Terrorist offences are therein defined as intentional acts with the aim of intimidation, coercion or destabilization. Included are foiled, failed and successfully executed attacks. Empty fields in the table are due to non-membership or lack of data submitted to Europol (as in the case of the UK in 2009). Values in italic were used for the corresponding graph.

All: Terrorism-related suspects arrested between 2006 and 2014⁴⁷

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	<i>Average over membership years</i>
EU average	28,1	38,7	37,4	22,6	22,6	17,9	19,9	19,1	27,6	25,5
Austria	1	8	0	8	5	2	2	3	31	<i>6,7</i>
Belgium	14	10	22	4	20	4	8	20	72	<i>19,3</i>
Bulgaria		4	0	1	0	3	10	15	21	<i>6,8</i>
Croatia								1	0	<i>0,5</i>
Cyprus	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	<i>0,4</i>
Czech Republic	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	1	<i>1,1</i>
Denmark	6	9	3	0	6	7	5	0	1	<i>4,1</i>
Estonia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0,0</i>
Finland	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4	<i>0,9</i>
France	342	409	402	315	219	172	186	225	238	<i>278,7</i>
Germany	20	15	12	5	25	30	8	11	18	<i>16,0</i>
Greece	0	0	0	5	18	15	3	23	13	<i>8,6</i>
Hungary	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	<i>1,8</i>
Ireland	4	24	52	31	62	69	66	41	27	<i>41,8</i>
Italy	59	44	53	29	29	30	43	14	39	<i>37,8</i>
Latvia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0,0</i>
Lithuania	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0,3</i>
Luxembourg	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	<i>0,2</i>
Malta	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>0,0</i>
Netherlands	6	16	4	2	39	3	62	6	17	<i>17,2</i>
Poland	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	14	<i>2,1</i>
Portugal	0	32	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	<i>4,2</i>
Romania		3	0	0	16	4	16	8	0	<i>5,9</i>
Slovakia	3	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	<i>1,1</i>
Slovenia	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	<i>0,3</i>
Spain	85	261	197	169	118	64	38	90	145	<i>129,7</i>
Sweden	3	2	3	0	4	4	0	0	0	<i>1,8</i>
United Kingdom	156	203	256		45	62	84	77	132	<i>126,9</i>

⁴⁷ Own table based on TE-SAT reports 2007-2015 (each report refers to the previous year). Numbers indicate arrests because of terrorism-related charges as defined by the 2002 Council Framework Decision. Terrorist offences are therein defined as intentional acts with the aim of intimidation, coercion or destabilization. Empty fields in the table are due to non-membership or lack of data submitted to Europol (as in the case of the UK in 2009). Values in italic were used for the corresponding graph.

A12: Terrorism-related convicted persons in EU member states between 2006 and 2014⁴⁸

	2006	2007	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	<i>Average over membership years</i>
EU average	11,2	11,8	10,1	8,9	8,9	11,0	9,2	12,3	10,0
Austria	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0,6
Belgium	18	5	7	9	8	4	8	41	12,5
Bulgaria		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0
Croatia							0	1	0,5
Cyprus	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0,1
Czech Republic	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	1	1,3
Denmark	0	5	11	1	4	3	5	3	4,0
Estonia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0
Finland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0,5
France	21	52	74	40	45	70	49	35	48,3
Germany	16	7	10	12	17	10	14	11	12,1
Greece	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	10	2,1
Hungary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0
Ireland	0	4	7	15	8	0	6	0	5,0
Italy	7	28	23	16	4	12	8	2	12,5
Latvia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0
Lithuania	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0,4
Luxembourg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0
Malta	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0
Netherlands	15	3	7	8	5	0	4	4	5,8
Poland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0
Portugal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0,1
Romania		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0,1
Slovakia		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0,1
Slovenia		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0
Spain	172	181	87	122	137	167	95	114	134,4
Sweden	4	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	1,5
United Kingdom	4	33	45	14	8	25	52	115	37,0

⁴⁸ Own Graph based on TE-SAT reports 2007-2015 (each report refers to the data of the previous year). Numbers indicate convicted persons by national courts on terrorism-related offenses as defined by the 2002 Council Framework Decision. Terrorist offences are therein defined as intentional acts with the aim of intimidation, coercion or destabilization. Member states report the data to Eurojust and it is then portrayed in TE-SAT reports. The year 2009 is excluded because the data was not available (TE-SAT, 2010, 16)

A13: Country profiles on member states' counter-terrorism preferences

Austria:

Austria's counter-terrorism policy is mainly focused on an EU approach that is further strengthened. The EU is the "central framework for action of Austria's security policy" (Austrian Interior Ministry, 2013, 12). However, it is not the aim of Austria to use existing structures but rather to "gradually create and actively shape an architecture of internal security within the EU" (Austrian Interior Ministry, 2013, 13). Secondly, Austria envisions regional approaches to take a larger role, for instance with the planned Central European Security Cluster, or the Salzburg Forum Vision 2020 (Austrian Interior Ministry, 2013, 13). Both of these ideas use regional efforts to combat terrorism. Lastly, the priority of Austria is also to provide a holistic counter-terrorism approach that is also based on social peace and freedom (CODEXTER Austria, 2012, 1).

Belgium:

Belgium's main emphasis in the fight against terrorism is the approach to tackle the root causes of terrorism and empower the civil society to prevent radicalization (Coolsaet/De Swielande, 2007, 11). One case study on the Belgian approach class this the "characteristic sensibility" (Coolsaet/De Swielande, 2007, 17) approach. Secondly, Belgium's priority is also to delegate competences to the EU level and proposed to create a European Intelligence Unit (Coolsaet/De Swielande, 2007, 11). The last priority of Belgium is to respect human rights and also lobbies for this on the EU level (CODEXTER Belgium, 2014, 1). According to the experts, "Belgium has historically approached counter-terrorism measures with caution and an emphasis on the need for providing suspected terrorists with due process" (Counter-extremism Project, 2016, 7)

Bulgaria:

In Bulgaria, terrorism is mostly seen as an international phenomenon and therefore the action against terrorism is seen, first and foremost as global action, also carried out by the external action of the EU (CODEXTER Bulgaria, 2013, 1). Terrorism should be mainly countered in third countries (Bulgarian Ministry of the Interior, 2014, 4). Secondly, Bulgaria wants to ensure that existing measures on the EU level are used and fully implemented rather than creating new measures (Bulgarian Ministry of the Interior, 2014, 3). Thirdly, Bulgaria has a strict and relentless internal policy on terrorism symbolized by the deportation of persons considered to be national security risks (Bulgarian News Agency, 2016). The preferences of Bulgaria are in line with its recent exposure to terrorism through the 2012 Burgas bus bombing, an attack on Israeli tourists, carried out by a Canadian and Australian citizen by order of Hezbollah.

Croatia:

The dominant theme in Croatia is the perception of terrorism as an international threat that can be fought with international measures such as the establishment of democracy in third countries (CODEXTER Croatia, 2011, 1). An internal counter-terrorism approach is the second priority. However this takes place in a formal and cautious manner, emphasizing the civil society and

public-private partnerships (Peresin, 2013, 11, 15). Thirdly, given its geographical position, Croatia favors regional approaches (CODEXTER Croatia, 2011, 23).

Cyprus:

Because of the low number of terrorist incidents in Cyprus, the first and most important preference is the international fight against terrorism on the global level. This is visible by several bilateral treaties, also with non-EU members and by the fact that the fight against terrorism is mostly included in the foreign policy department (Cyprus Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). Secondly, Cyprus wants to ensure the functioning of the EU approach on terrorism and created in 2010 the position of a national counter-terrorism coordinator to oversee the implementation of EU measures (CODEXTER Cyprus, 2011, 1). Thirdly, Cyprus has the preference to tackle root causes of terrorism and respect civil liberties (CODEXTER Cyprus, 2011, 1).

Czech Republic:

In the Czech Republic's national counter-terrorism strategy and also voiced by one Czech counter-terrorism official in a presentation at Charles University, it becomes evident that terrorism is primarily perceived as a global threat that needs a global response. According to the official Oldřich Krulík, there is "no sense of dividing security in outer and inner security" (Krulík, 2015). Hence, the first and also a long-time preference is the global fight against terrorism (CODEXTER Czech Republic, 2012, 10). Secondly, the protection of human rights is a preference often emphasized by the Czech Republic for instance with the review of every measure with regard to security and freedom of the individual (Czech Security Policy Department, 2013, 10; CODEXTER Czech Republic, 2012, 10). Thirdly, the cooperation with allies and other EU member states is outlined (Krulík, 2015).

Denmark:

In a foreword to the 2012 government report on counter-terrorism efforts by the at the time Danish minister of foreign affairs Sovndal, it is emphasized that fighting terrorism in Denmark means primarily fighting the root causes of terrorism with a broad policy ranging from development assistance to de-radicalization efforts (Danish Government, 2012, Foreword; CODEXTER Denmark, 2007, 1). Secondly, the foreword and other sources emphasize the continuing preference for safeguarding citizen's rights and prohibit further radicalization (Danish Government, 2012, Foreword). Thirdly, despite the mentioning of the EU as a platform for counter-terrorism, the global level with the UN is prioritized as "core element" and "framework" (Danish Government, 2012, Foreword).

Estonia

The 2013 fundamentals of counter-terrorism, approved by the Estonian government, line out three major preferences by Estonia. First and foremost, the threat of terrorism is seen as a global threat that can be countered with global measures. It is striking that the heading of one of the sections is "terrorism in the world and in Estonia" (Estonian Government, 2013, 2) and even global counter-terrorist missions are considered (Estonian Government, 2013, 4). Secondly,

these global measures should tackle the root causes and establish “stable, economically sustainable and democratic societies” (Estonian Government, 2013, 4). Thirdly, it is important to Estonia that human rights and citizen’s freedoms are maintained (Estonian Government, 2013, 1).

Finland:

Finland’s 2010 national counter-terrorism strategy clearly states the most important priority in its counter-terrorism efforts as “to prevent terrorism by tackling and addressing the root causes of terrorism” (Finnish Ministry of the Interior, 2010, 4). This is emphasized with further emphasis on the prevention of social exclusion and the involvement of the civil society in combating terrorism (CODEXTER Finland, 2014, 1). Secondly, the Finnish strategy also has a priority on human rights and fundamental freedoms in all specific measures against terror (CODEXTER Finland, 2014, 1). Lastly, the Finnish point to the existing EU guidelines that need to be effectively implemented (CODEXTER Finland, 2014, 9).

France:

France perceives terrorism mostly as a global threat and therefore demands principally for a global response. This is visible with the global measures France is taking since the occurrence of terrorism in France with the *Groupe Islamique Armé* of the 1990s and the recent involvement of France in the coalition against *Daesh*. (French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). Additionally, France used its G8 presidency in 2003 and 2010 mainly for the fight against terrorism (CODEXTER France, 2013, 6-7). Secondly, France aims at EU actions on terrorism by enhancing “dialogue and cooperation within the existing framework (French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). Hence, implementation is prioritized before new measures or delegation to the EU level. Thirdly, France emphasizes the principle of human rights and civil liberties given to terrorist suspects which should help in the fight against radicalization (CODEXTER France, 2013, 2).

Germany:

Germany’s counter-terrorism preferences cannot be easily ranked. However, the dominant perception of being a target of a global threat and considering the experts’ judgement that international and bilateral rather than European cooperation is highly significant in Germany, the preference for global action is ranked first (CODEXTER Germany, 2011, 9). Just after this, the action and the implementation of the EU’s strategies has to be mentioned as the second priority (CODEXTER Germany, 2011, 10). Thirdly, the fight against root causes and radicalization with an active civil society approach is another preference of Germany (German Interior Ministry, 2016).

Greece:

The dominant preference of Greece is the implementation of EU-actions and strategies. This is because the Greek national terrorism law is mostly based on the EU’s framework decisions (Triantafyllou, 2015, 361) and because Greece has self-claimed a “leading role in promoting EU policy in the area of combating terrorism” (Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016).

Secondly, the geographical position on the borders of Europe have led Greece to also taking a regional approach to counter-terrorism, also outside of the EU (FG News, 2016). Lastly, Greece emphasizes the need for the respect of human rights (CODEXTER Greece, 2012, 1).

Hungary:

The national security strategy and the experts' opinion on the Hungarian counter-terrorism efforts emphasizes global action as the first priority. It states that the nature of terrorism is mainly perceived as global and thus requires cooperation with allied countries and non-allied countries when similar interest are pursued (Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2012, 12, 22). Secondly, this international action should tackle the root causes which are perceived as instability, poverty and the lack of democracy (Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2012, 10). The last preference is the preservation of fundamental freedoms (CODEXTER Hungary, 2012, 1). Finally, it is interesting that the Hungarian security strategy sees bilateral cooperation as the most essential (Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2012, 12).

Ireland:

The documents on and by Ireland point to a dominating preference on a domestic approach. The Department of Justice of Ireland states that the "responsibility of combating international terrorism lies primarily within individual member states" (Irish Department of Justice, 2016). It is also striking that the strategy is mainly published on the pages of the Department of Justice and not as in other cases on the webpages of the Ministry of Foreign affairs. Secondly, the Irish Government fully supports "all actions" (CODEXTER Ireland, 2007, 4) on the EU level. Lastly, Ireland has the approach to create social peace and inclusion to prevent terrorism (CODEXTER Ireland, 2007, 1).

Italy:

Italy strongly favors global action and sees international cooperation as the keystone of counter-terrorism (Italian Foreign Ministry, 2016). Therefore, Italy was focused on the introduction of "most appropriate legislation to assure the highest level of coordination at the international level" (CODEXTER Italy, 2008, 1). Another main goal is to set up partnerships between countries in the Western world and possible host countries of terrorism to prevent the emergence of terrorism (Italian Foreign Ministry, 2016). Secondly, Italy focuses on strict domestic measures and is commended on this by experts (Luttwak, 2016). The "Escort to the border" section of Law 155 allows Italy to deport foreigners immediately if they present a threat to the danger of the security of the state (CODEXTER Italy, 2008, 6). Hence, the number of potential terrorist suspects is kept low and the security agencies can effectively monitor the remaining suspects (Luttwak, 2016). Thirdly, Italy is strongly involved in the implementation of the measures on the EU level (Italian Foreign Ministry, 2016).

Latvia:

Latvia sees global action as the first priority in counter-terrorism. The Baltic state sees it as essential that domestic measures are taken in accordance with coordinated measures at the international level and therefore concludes multiple bilateral treaties (Latvian Ministry of

Foreign Affairs, 2016; CODEXTER Latvia, 2013, 4). Secondly, Latvia fully supports the existing EU approach on counter-terrorism and states on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs its active involvement in the development of the existing EU measures (Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). Thirdly, the rule of law and the consideration of citizen's rights is emphasized and the experts' report clearly states that every extradition request is evaluated on the topic of human rights (CODEXTER Latvia, 2013, 4).

Lithuania:

Lithuania's first priority in the fight against international terrorism is global action. The 2014 Annual Review of the State Security Department points to the exposure Latvia's to international events (Lithuanian State Security Department, 2014, 24) and also experts acknowledge that Latvia takes "every effort to contribute to international cooperation" (CODEXTER Lithuania, 2005, 1). This emphasis can be considered to persist with the protests and radicalization of the domestic population due to the propaganda by Russia and the conflict in Ukraine (Lithuanian State Security Department, 2014, 24). Secondly, it is well acknowledged that Lithuania is part of the Schengen area and therefore, despite not being directly affected by terrorism in recent years, cooperation within the EU framework is necessary to prevent terrorism in Europe (Lithuanian State Security Department, 2014, 25). Lastly, the experts' judgement accentuates the priority for the "consideration to the protection of human rights and the rule of law" (CODEXTER Lithuania, 2005, 1).

Luxembourg:

Luxembourg's primary preference is to ensure that on the EU level a "systematic and enhanced use of existing instruments" (Luxembourg Government, 2015) is ensured and dedicated large parts of its 2015 Presidency in the European Council to this goal. However, the strong emphasis on citizen's rights as the second priority and the perseverance of a strict banking privacy law may contradict some of these efforts for instance in the area of terrorism financing (Khandekar, 2011, 12). Lastly, Luxembourg also takes an approach that makes use of an "extended international cooperation" (CODEXTER Luxembourg, 2005, 5).

Malta

Malta's geographical position and its exposure to developments in the North of Africa, for instance the failed state of Libya have led Malta to have global action as its first priority in the fight against terrorism (Scicluna, 2015). This is visible with Malta's foreign policy that depicts the fight against terrorism as one of the competences of the foreign policy department (CODEXTER Malta, 2008, 1). The next priorities are the delegation of interior and external security to the EU level, because Malta's capabilities are considered to be weak and are envisioned to be increased with more action on the EU level (Corpi d'Elite, 2016). Thirdly, Malta emphasizes the respect to citizen's rights as one of their priorities.

Netherlands:

Documents about the counter-terrorism strategy of the Netherlands suggest that the first priority in the fight against terrorism is to tackle root causes and empower the civil society

(CODEXTER Netherlands, 2008, 1). It is stated that the Netherlands' main strategy is to "take action at the earliest possible stage (CODEXTER Netherlands, 2008, 1). Additionally, to combat radicalization, support for families and a point of contact for citizens to report radicalized individuals (Dutch National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism, 2015, 8). The next priority for the Netherlands is to enhance the effectiveness of actions on the EU level with further improving information exchange and implementation (CODEXTER Netherlands, 2008, 6). This is also one of the goals the Netherlands have set for their 2016 EU presidency in 2016 (Dutch National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism, 2015, 9). Lastly, the Netherlands also include Global Action into their preferences with International fora such as the Foreign Terrorist Fighters forum and the Global Counter-terrorism Forum (Dutch National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism, 2015, 9)

Poland:

In Poland, terrorism is mainly perceived as a transnational phenomenon that globally threatens international peace. Hence, global action against terrorism is perceived as the first priority and hence, the slogan of the Polish effort can be named as "no country is able to tackle terrorism alone" (CODEXTER Poland, 2012, 1). After this priority, Poland emphasizes the need for the implementation of the EU efforts and therefore actively participates in the effort of the EU (CODEXTER Poland, 2012, 9). As a third priority, Poland underlines the respect for citizen's rights (CODEXTER Poland, 2012, 1).

Portugal:

Portugal has not been exposed to terrorism often so far, however its geographical position close to unstable countries in North Africa had its effect on the policy of Portugal (de Faria Costa, 2015, 343). Accordingly, firstly, global action is central to Portugal efforts against terrorism. This happens through multiple agreements, for instance within the Community of Portuguese-speaking countries (CODEXTER Portugal, 2006, 3). Hence, experts acknowledge Portugal an "unprecedented level of international cooperation" (CODEXTER Portugal, 2006, 1). The next priority of Portugal is a strict domestic approach with a cooperation of the armed forces and the internal security forces and a new law introduced in 2016 that allows public prosecutors to deny citizenship to individuals that would be a peril to national security or are involved in terrorism (Safe Communities Portugal, 2016). Thirdly, Portugal is actively involved in the implementation of EU policies (de Faria Costa, 2015, 343).

Romania:

Romania perceives terrorism mainly as a global threat and accordingly, the responsibility for the fight against terrorism "lies within the entire international community" (Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). This conviction is also seen in Romania's 50 bilateral anti-terrorism cooperation agreements (Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). The next priority for Romania is the implementation of actions on the EU level and since it has been a quite recent new member (2007), this implementation of existing strategies is prioritized over the start of new EU-wide counter-terrorism projects (CODEXTER Romania, 2008, 1). Thirdly, Romania emphasizes the need for the protection of human rights and fundamental freedom rights (Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016).

Slovakia:

Since Slovakia has not been subject to major terrorist attacks, its fight on terrorism mainly centers on the international level and adequate global action (Slovak Spectator, 2015). Hence, a strong focus of the policies lies on the international level and Slovakia has to ensure that it is not used as a base of terror groups (CODEXTER Slovakia, 2007, 1). Next, the second priority lies in the implementation of measures on the EU level (CODEXTER Slovakia, 2007, 1). Lastly, and most recently, strict domestic measures are emphasized. After the attacks, Slovakia intensified the monitoring of Muslim citizens and stressed the security risks of migration (Slovak Spectator, 2015).

Slovenia:

The Slovenian counter-terrorism approach is mainly based on global action, because it is perceived that the interdependence in matters of security is dominant for Slovenia's considerations of terrorism (Slovenian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). Hence, Slovenia has concluded multiple bilateral agreements and sees "the UN as the only truly global forum for combating terrorism" (CODEXTER Slovenia, 2010, 1). Secondly, Slovenia has the fight against the root causes as another major priority and sees this as most important long-run solution (CODEXTER Slovenia, 2010, 1). Lastly, the full respect for human rights and democracy is outlined (CODEXTER Slovenia, 2010, 1).

Spain:

The ending of the terrorism threat of ETA to Spain announced by the group in 2011 has set new priorities in the counter-terrorism strategy of Spain (CODEXTER Spain, 2013, 1). First and foremost, Spain now and also has before focused on international cooperation to combat terrorism (CODEXTER Spain, 2013, 7). The country is considered to be "extremely active in all the international fora" (CODEXTER Spain, 2013, 8) and has multiple bilateral treaties. The 2013 strategy states that the past experience of Spain with terrorism puts Spain "in an ideal position to provide considerable added value to international collaboration in counter-terrorism." (Spanish Government, 2013, 26). Secondly, Spain works actively for the implementation of the measures on the EU level (CODEXTER Spain, 2013, 7). Thirdly, the experience with ETA has led Spain to also include the concept of social peace and freedom into their strategy and preferences (Spanish Government, 2013, 25). According to 2013 National Security Strategy, "the maturity of the Spanish society" (Spanish Government, 2013, 25) together with the rule of law have led to the end of ETA.

Sweden:

The Swedish counter-terrorism strategy clearly states international cooperation as the main priority for Sweden (Swedish Government, 2014, 2). This can also be seen with the fact that Sweden is one of the largest donors for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in Vienna with its Terrorism Prevention Branch (CODEXTER Sweden, 2010, 10). The next priority for Sweden is to tackle the root causes with an active civil society in which a lot of institutions are involved and where preventive work is in the center (CODEXTER Sweden, 2010, 1). Lastly,

Sweden also works to implement a more effective EU level approach and “is playing an active role” (Swedish Government, 2014, 11) in these efforts.

United Kingdom

The counter-terrorism strategy of the United Kingdom prioritizes global action as the most suitable answer to terrorism. It is clearly stated in their 2011 anti-terrorist strategy that the success of counter-terrorism highly “depends on international collaboration” (UK Government, 2011, 8). Moreover, this international strategy has also proven to be successful against al-Qaeda and hence will be further pursued (UK Government, 2011, 3). The next priority in the fight against terrorism is to address the root causes which are outlined as conflict, instability, the lack of participation possibilities and limited educational or employment opportunities (UK Government, 2011, 3-5; CODEXTER United Kingdom, 2007, 1). Lastly, the UK emphasizes the respect for citizen’s and human rights and for instance does not deport terrorism suspects if they are subject to harm in their home country (UK Government, 2011, 8).

A14: Table of member states preferences on counter-terrorism

Member state	Preferences in Counter-Terrorism
Austria	Delegation of competences to the EU, Non-EU regional solutions, Increase of social equality and freedom
Belgium	Address root causes and empower the civil society, Delegation of competences to the EU, Global action
Bulgaria	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures, (Strict) Domestic measures
Croatia	Global action, Address root causes and empower the civil society, Non-EU regional solutions
Cyprus	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures, Address root causes and empower the civil society
Czech Republic	Global action, Focus on civil rights, Implementation of existing EU measures
Denmark	Address root causes and empower the civil society, Focus on civil rights, Global action
Estonia	Global action, Address root causes and empower the civil society, Focus on civil rights
Finland	Address root causes and empower the civil society, Focus on civil rights, Implementation of existing EU measures
France	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures, Focus on civil rights
Germany	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures, Address root causes and empower the civil society
Greece	Implementation of existing EU measures, Non-EU regional solutions, Focus on civil rights
Hungary	Global action, Address root causes and empower the civil society, Focus on civil rights
Ireland	(Strict) Domestic Measures, Implementation of existing EU measures, Increase of social equality and freedom
Italy	Global action, (Strict) Domestic Measures, Implementation of existing EU measures
Latvia	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures, Focus on civil rights
Lithuania	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures, Focus on civil rights

Luxembourg	Implementation of existing EU measures, Focus on civil rights, Global action
Malta	Global action, Delegation of competences to the EU, Focus on civil rights
Netherlands	Address root causes and empower the civil society, Implementation of existing EU measures, Global action
Poland	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures Focus on civil rights
Portugal	Global action, (Strict) Domestic Measures, Implementation of existing EU measures
Romania	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures, Focus on civil rights
Slovakia	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures (Strict) Domestic Measures
Slovenia	Global action, Address root causes and empower the civil society, Focus on civil rights
Spain	Global action, Implementation of existing EU measures, Increase of social equality and freedom
Sweden	Global action, Address root causes and empower the civil society, Implementation of existing EU measures
UK	Global action, Address root causes and empower the civil society, Focus on civil rights

Bibliography

Sources

- Austrian Interior Ministry (2013). Austrian Security Strategy. Available online at: <https://www.bka.gv.at/DocView.axd?CobId=52251> [27.06.2016].
- Becker, M./Niesen, C. (2016). Was der eine weiß, erfährt der andere noch lange nicht. Available online at: <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/bruessel-anschlaege-warum-die-eu-am-anti-terror-kampf-scheitert-a-1083992.html> [24.05.2016].
- Bulgarian Ministry of the Interior (2014). Comments of Bulgaria on the Internal Security Strategy for the EU 2015-2020. Available online at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/public-consultation/2014/docs/contributions/ms-os_bg_comments_iss_en.pdf [27.06.2016].
- Bulgarian News Agency (2016). Bulgaria in U.S. Department of State's Annual Country Reports on Terrorism 2015. Available online at: <http://www.bta.bg/en/c/DF/id/1349040> [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Austria (2012). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Belgium (2014). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Bulgaria (2013). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Croatia (2011). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Cyprus (2011). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Czech Republic (2012). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Denmark (2007). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Finland (2014). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER France (2013). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].
- CODEXTER Germany (2011). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Greece (2012). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Hungary (2012). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Ireland (2007). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Italy (2008). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Latvia (2013). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Lithuania (2005). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Luxembourg (2005). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Malta (2008). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Netherlands (2008). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Poland (2012). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Portugal (2006). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Romania (2008). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Slovakia (2007). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Slovenia (2010). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Spain (2013). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER Sweden (2010). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016].

CODEXTER United Kingdom (2007). Profiles on counter-terrorist capacity. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles.asp [27.06.2016]

- Corpi d'Elite (2016). International terrorism: Malta's security apparatus inadequate. Available online at: <http://corpidelite.net/afm/2015/02/international-terrorism-maltas-security-apparatus-inadequate/> [27.06.2016].
- Council of Europe (2014). Action against Terrorism: Background. Available online at: http://www.coe.int/t/dlapil/codexter/country_profiles_bg_en.asp [29.06.2016].
- Counter-extremism Project (2016). Belgium: Extremism and Counter-extremism. Available online at: http://www.counterextremism.com/sites/default/files/country_pdf/BE-04212016.pdf [27.06.2016].
- Cyprus Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2016). Measures against terrorism. Available online at: <http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa2006.nsf/All/200DAED54749D3BBC22571B100298AEB?OpenDocument&print> [27.06.2016].
- Czech Security Policy Department (2013). Strategy of the Czech Republic for the Fight against Terrorism. Available online at: http://www.legislationline.org/download/action/download/id/6022/file/Czech_NatAction_Plan_Combat_Terrorism_2013.pdf [27.06.2016].
- Danish Government (2012). Government Report on Counter-terrorism Efforts. Available online at: www.legislationline.org/download/action/download/id/6024/file/Denmark_government_report_counter_terrorism_efforts_2012_en.pdf [27.06.2016].
- Deutscher Bundestag (2013). Antwort der Bundesregierung. Europäische Zusammenarbeit in der Police Working Group on Terrorism [printed matter 17/13340]. Available online at: <http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/17/134/1713440.pdf> [20.05.2016].
- Dutch National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism (2015). Annual Plan 2015. Available online at: www.legislationline.org/download/action/download/id/6036/file/Netherlands_annual_plan_National_Coordinator_Security_Counterterrorism_2015_en.pdf [28.06.2016].
- Empirical Studies of Conflict (2016). RAND Database of Worldwide Terrorism Incidents. Available online at: <https://esoc.princeton.edu/files/rand-database-worldwide-terrorism-incidents> [15.06.2016].
- Estonian Government (2013). Fundamentals of Counter-Terrorism in Estonia. Available online at: https://www.siseministeerium.ee/sites/default/files/dokumendid/tvv_pohialused_2013_en.pdf [27.06.2016].
- EUR-Lex (2010). Sources of European Law. Available online at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3A114534> [31.05.2016].

- Eurobarometer (2001). Standard Eurobarometer 56. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/1404> [06.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2002). Standard Eurobarometer 58. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/331> [06.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2003). Standard Eurobarometer 60. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/yearFrom/1973/yearTo/2003/surveyKy/397> [06.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2004). Standard Eurobarometer 62. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/455> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2005). Standard Eurobarometer 64. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/833> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2006). Standard Eurobarometer 66. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/584> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2007). Standard Eurobarometer 67. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/617> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2010). Standard Eurobarometer 73. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/917> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2011). Standard Eurobarometer 75. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/1019> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2012). Standard Eurobarometer 78. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/1069> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2013). Standard Eurobarometer 80. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/1123> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer (2014). Standard Eurobarometer 82. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/2041> [09.06.2016].

- Eurobarometer (2015). Standard Eurobarometer 84. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/2098> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer Interactive (a) (2016). My voice counts in (our country). Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Chart/getChart/theMeKy/25/groupKy/292> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer Interactive (b) (2016). (Our country)'s voice counts in the EU. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Chart/getChart/theMeKy/25/groupKy/154> [09.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer Interactive (c) (2016). What do you think are the two most important issues facing (our country) at the moment. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Chart/getChart/theMeKy/42/groupKy/208> [06.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer Interactive (d) (2016). For each of the following institutions, please tell me if you tend to trust it or tend not to trust it? – The European Union. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Chart/getChart/theMeKy/18/groupKy/97> [16.06.2016].
- Eurobarometer Interactive (e) (2016). For each of the following areas, do you think decisions should be made by the national government or jointly with the EU? – The fight against international terrorism. Available online at: <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/Chart/getChart/theMeKy/10/groupKy/40> [16.06.2016].
- Eurojust (2016). History of Eurojust. Available online at: <http://www.eurojust.europa.eu/about/background/Pages/history.aspx> [23.05.2016].
- European Council (2002). Council Decision 2003/48/JHA of 19 December 2002 on the implementation of specific measures for police and judicial cooperation to combat terrorist. Available online at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32003D0048> [23.05.2016].
- European Council (2004). Declaration on combatting terrorism. Available online at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/DECL-25.3.pdf> [20.05.2016].
- European Council (2016). Joint statement of the EU Heads of State or Government and the leaders of the EU institutions on the terrorist attacks in Brussels. Available online at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/03/22-joint-statement-hosg/> [27.05.2016].
- European Counter Terrorism Centre (2016). Infographic. Available online at: <https://www.google.de/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwiy9ZDj0Y7OAhVBvRoKHZ4YBRMQFgg4MAI&url=https>

%3A%2F%2Fwww.europol.europa.eu%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2Fpublications%2Fectc_infographic_public.pdf&usg=AFQjCNHOzNxXUXRVDQM_etPw_nJg7NoUtw&bvm=bv.127984354,d.bGg [25.07.2016].

European External Action Service (EEAS) (2015). EU INTCEN Factsheet. Available online at: http://eeas.europa.eu/factsheets/docs/20150206_factsheet_eu_intcen_en.pdf [20.05.2016].

European Parliament (2006). Questions to the council. Available online at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20060518&secondRef=ANN-01&language=EN&detail=H-2006-0338&query=QUESTION> [23.05.2016].

Europol (2016). History. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/page/history-149> [20.05.2016].

Europol Press Release, January 25 (2016). Europol's European Counter Terrorism Centre Strengthens the EU's Response to Terror. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/ectc> [23.05.2016].

Finnish Ministry of the Interior (2010). National counter-terrorism strategy. Available online at: http://www.intermin.fi/download/24910_242010.pdf [27.06.2016].

FG News (2016). Anti-terrorism and migration crisis on the focus of Cyprus-Jordan-Greece trilateral cooperation. Available online at: <http://famagusta-gazette.com/antiterrorism-and-migration-crisis-on-the-focus-of-cyprusjordangreece-tr-p33426-69.htm> [27.06.2016].

French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2016). The principles of France's counter-terrorism action. Available online at: <http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/defence-security/terrorism/france-s-action/> [27.06.2016].

General Secretariat of the Council of the EU (2009). The Lisbon Treaty's impact on the Justice and Home Affairs Council. Available online at: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/111615.pdf [01.07.2016].

German Interior Ministry (2016). Terrorismus. Available online at: http://www.bmi.bund.de/DE/Themen/Sicherheit/Terrorismus/bekaempfung/Terrorismus/terrorismus_node.html [27.06.2016].

Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2016). Terrorism. Available online at: <http://www.mfa.gr/en/foreign-policy/global-issues/terrorism.html> [27.06.2016].

GTD (2016). Global Terrorism Database. Available online at: <https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/about/> [15.06.2016].

- Guttman, A (2016). So spionierte die Schweiz mit Israel Araber aus. Tageszeiger Online. Available online at: <http://www.tagesanzeiger.ch/schweiz/standard/So-spionierte-die-Schweiz-mit-Israel-Araber-aus/story/24626064> [21.05.2016].
- Harvard Law School (2016). Counter Terrorist Group. Available online at: <http://pilac.law.harvard.edu/europe-region-efforts//counter-terrorist-group-ctg> [21.05.2016].
- Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2012). National Security Strategy. Available online at: <http://2010-2014.kormany.hu/download/4/32/b0000/National%20Security%20Strategy.pdf> [27.06.2016].
- Irish Department of Justice (2016). Terrorism. Available online at: <http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Pages/terrorism> [27.06.2016].
- Italian Foreign Ministry (2016). Fight against terrorism. Available online at: http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/politica_estera/temi_globali/lotta_terrorismo [27.06.2016].
- Justice and Home Affairs Council (2016). Joint statement of EU Ministers for Justice and Home Affairs and representatives of EU institutions on the terrorist attacks in Brussels on 22 March 2016. Available online at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/03/24-statement-on-terrorist-attacks-in-brussels-on-22-march/?utm_source=dsms-auto&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Joint%20statement%20of%20EU%20Ministers%20for%20Justice%20and%20Home%20Affairs%20and%20representatives%20of%20EU%20institutions%20on%20the%20terrorist%20attacks%20in%20Brussels%20on%2022%20March%202016 [26.05.2016].
- Khandekar, G. (2011). The EU as a Global Actor in Counter Terrorism. Available online at: <http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/content/pdf/participant-papers/eu/Gauri-Khandekar-The-EU-as-a-Global-Actor-in-Counter-Terrorism.pdf> [27.06.2016].
- Krulik, O. (2015). Presentation given to the class “comparative counter-terrorism” given at Charles University Prague in November 2015. Slides available in online system of Charles University.
- Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2016). Fighting international terrorism. Available online at: <http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/policy/security-policy/directions-of-security-policy/fighting-international-terrorism> [27.06.2016].
- Luttwak, E. (2015). Italy has lessons to teach in counterterrorism. Available online at: <http://asia.nikkei.com/magazine/20151217-ASEAN-ECONOMIC-COMMUNITY-REALITY-CHECK/Viewpoints/Edward-N.-Luttwak-Italy-has-lessons-to-teach-in-counterterrorism?page=2> [27.06.2016].

- Luxembourg Government (2015). Achievements of the Luxembourg Presidency. Available online at: <http://www.eu2015lu.eu/en/actualites/articles-actualite/2015/12/21-pe-libe-schneider/index.html> [27.06.2016].
- Lithuanian State Security Department (2014). Annual Review. Available online at: <http://www.vsd.lt/Files/Documents/635718603371696250.pdf> [27.06.2016].
- Newsblog (Spiegel Online) (2016). Newsblog zu den Anschlägen in Brüssel. Available online at: <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/bruessel-u-bahn-bomber-war-laut-tv-sender-nicht-allein-a-1083861.html> [24.05.2016].
- Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2016). International Security. Available online at: <https://www.mae.ro/en/node/2858> [28.06.2016].
- Safe Communities Portugal (2016). Portuguese Government approves a National Strategy for Combatting Terrorism. Available online at: <http://www.safecommunitiesportugal.com/portuguese-government-approves-a-national-strategy-for-combatting-terrorism/> [28.06.2016].
- Scicluna, M. (2016). Counter-terrorism in Malta. Available online at: <http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20151125/opinion/Counter-terrorism-in-Malta.593453> [27.06.2016].
- Slovak Spectator (2015). Slovakia responds to the attacks in Paris. Available online at: <http://spectator.sme.sk/c/20063856/slovakia-responds-to-the-attacks-on-paris.html> [28.06.2016].
- Slovenian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2016). Fight against terrorism. Available online at: http://www.mzz.gov.si/en/foreign_policy_and_international_law/international_security/fight_against_terrorism/ [28.06.2016].
- Spanish Government (2013). The National Security Strategy. Available online at: http://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/Documents/estrategiaseguridad_baja_julio.pdf [28.06.2016].
- Special Eurobarometer 371 (2011). Internal Security. Available online at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_371_en.pdf [06.06.2016].
- Special Eurobarometer 432 (2015). Europeans' attitudes toward security. Available online at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_432_en.pdf [06.06.2016].
- Spiegel Online (2016). Europäische Geheimdienste richten Anti-Terror-Zentrum ein. Available online at: <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/terrorismus-europaeische-geheimdienste-richten-anti-terror-zentrum-ein-a-1078201.html> [23.05.2016].
- Swedish Government (2014). The Swedish Counter-terrorism strategy. Available online at: http://www.government.se/contentassets/b56cad17b4434118b16cf449dbdc973d/en_strategy-slutlig-eng.pdf [28.06.2016].

- TE-SAT (2007). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/publication/te-sat-2007-eu-terrorism-situation-trend-report-1467> [15.06.2016].
- TE-SAT (2008). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/publication/te-sat-2008-eu-terrorism-situation-trend-report-1469> [15.06.2016].
- TE-SAT (2009). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/publication/te-sat-2009-eu-terrorism-situation-trend-report-1471> [15.06.2016].
- TE-SAT (2010). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/publication/te-sat-2010-eu-terrorism-situation-trend-report-1473> [15.06.2016].
- TE-SAT (2011). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/publication/te-sat-2011-eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report-1475> [15.06.2016].
- TE-SAT (2012). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/publication/te-sat-2012-eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report-1569> [15.06.2016].
- TE-SAT (2013). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/te-sat-2013-eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report> [15.06.2016].
- TE-SAT (2014). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/te-sat-2014-european-union-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report-2014> [15.06.2016].
- TE-SAT (2015). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report. Available online at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/european-union-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report-2015> [15.06.2016].
- The Telegraph (2012). EU extradition on demand undermines justice. Available online at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3562149/EU-extradition-on-demand-undermines-justice.html> [10.03.2016].
- Treaty of Maastricht (1992). Treaty on European Union. Available online at: http://europa.eu/eu-law/decision-making/treaties/pdf/treaty_on_european_union/treaty_on_european_union_en.pdf [01.07.2016].
- Treaty of Amsterdam (1999). Treaty of Amsterdam Amending the Treaty on European Union. Available online at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/treaty/pdf/amst-en.pdf> [01.07.2016].

Treaty of Lisbon (2009). Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on the European Union. Available online at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:FULL:EN:PDF> [01.07.2016].

UK Government (2011). The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering Terrorism. Available online at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97994/contest-summary.pdf [28.06.2016].

Literature

- Andreoni, J. (1988). Why free ride?: Strategies and learning in public goods experiments. *Journal of public Economics*, 37(3), 291-304.
- Argomaniz, J. (2009). Post-9/11 institutionalisation of European Union counter-terrorism: emergence, acceleration and inertia. *European security*, 18(2), 151-172.
- Argomaniz, J. (2012). *The EU and counter-terrorism: politics, polity and policies after 9/11*. Routledge.
- Argomaniz, J., Bureš, O., & Kaunert, C. (2015). A decade of EU counter-terrorism and intelligence: a critical assessment. *Intelligence and National Security*, 30(2-3), 191-206.
- Armingeon, K., & Ceka, B. (2014). The loss of trust in the European Union during the great recession since 2007: The role of heuristics from the national political system. *European Union Politics*, 15(1), 82-107.
- Balzacq, T. (2008). The policy tools of securitization: Information exchange, EU foreign and interior policies. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 46(1), 75-100.
- Balzacq, T., & Hadfield, A. (2012). Differentiation and trust: Prüm and the institutional design of EU internal security. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47(4), 539-561.
- Bickerton, C. J., Hodson, D., & Puetter, U. (2015). The new intergovernmentalism: European integration in the post-Maastricht era. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 53(4), 703-722.
- Blatter, J., & Blume, T. (2008). In Search of Co-variance, Causal Mechanisms or Congruence? Towards a Plural Understanding of Case Studies. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 14(2), 315-356.
- Bossong, R. (2013). Public good theory and the 'added value' of the EU's anti-terrorism policy. *European security*, 22(2), 165-184.
- Bossong, R. (2014). EU cooperation on terrorism prevention and violent radicalization: frustrated ambitions or new forms of EU security governance?. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 27(1), 66-82.
- Bureš, O. (2008). Perceptions of the Terrorist Threat among EU Member States. *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies*, 4(1), 51-80.
- Bureš, O. (2011). *EU counterterrorism policy: a paper tiger?*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd..
- Bureš, O. (2012). Informal counterterrorism arrangements in Europe: Beauty by variety or duplicity by abundance?. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47(4), 495-518.
- Bureš, O. (2016). Intelligence sharing and the fight against terrorism in the EU: lessons learned from Europol. *European View*, 1-10.

- Carrera, S., & Geyer, F. (2007). The Reform Treaty & Justice and Home Affairs-Implications for the Common Area of Freedom, Security and Justice. *CEPS policy brief*, (141).
- Cini, M. (2016). Intergovernmentalism. *Michelle Cini, Nieves Perez-Solorzano Borragan (Eds.): European Union politics. Oxford University Press*, 65-78.
- Chalk, P. (2000). The third pillar on judicial and home affairs cooperation, anti-terrorist collaboration and liberal democratic acceptability. *Fernando Reinares (Eds.): European Democracies Against Terrorism. Governmental Policies and Intergovernmental Cooperation, Aldershot*, 175-211.
- Chopin, T., & Lequesne, C. (2016). Differentiation as a double-edged sword: member states' practices and Brexit. *International Affairs*, 92(3), 531-545.
- Christiansen, T., Jorgensen, K. E., & Wiener, A. (1999). The social construction of Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(4), 528-544.
- Coolsaet, R., & de Swielande, T. S. (2007). *Belgium and counterterrorism policy in the Jihadi era (Egmont Paper 15)* (Vol. 15). Academia Press.
- De Faria Costa, J.F. (2015). Portugal. Kent Roach (Ed.). *Comparative Counter-terrorism Law*. Cambridge University Press, 326-343.
- De Mesquita, E. B. (2007). Politics and the suboptimal provision of counterterror. *International Organization*, 61(01), 9-36.
- De Wilde, P., Leupold, A., & Schmidtke, H. (2016). Introduction: the differentiated politicisation of European governance. *West European Politics*, 39(1), 3-22.
- Deflem, M. (2006). Europol and the Policing of International Terrorism: Counter-Terrorism in a Global Perspective. *Justice Quarterly*, 23(3), 336-359.
- Den Boer, M., Hillebrand, C., & Nölke, A. (2008). Legitimacy under Pressure: The European Web of Counter-Terrorism Networks. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 46(1), 101-124.
- Dyson, K. (2010). *Which Europe?: the politics of differentiated integration*. Springer.
- Edwards, G., & Meyer, C. O. (2008). Introduction: Charting a Contested Transformation. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 46(1), 1-25.
- Egeberg, M., Trondal, J., & Vestlund, N. M. (2015). The quest for order: unravelling the relationship between the European Commission and European Union agencies. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(5), 609-629.
- Gaisbauer, H. P. (2013). Evolving patterns of internal security cooperation: lessons from the Schengen and Prüm laboratories. *European security*, 22(2), 185-201.

- Gerspacher, N. (2010). The France and Europol relationship: explaining shifts in cooperative behaviour. *Lemieux, F. (Ed.): International Police Cooperation: Emerging issues, theory and practice. Portland: Willian Publishing, 144-166.*
- Goertz, G. (2006). *Social science concepts: A user's guide.* Princeton University Press.
- Goertz, G., & Levy, J. (2007). Causal Explanation, Necessity Conditions and Case Studies. *Levy, J., & Goertz, G. (Eds.): Explaining War and Peace: Case Studies and Necessary Condition Counterfactuals. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 9-45.*
- Haas, E. B. (1961). International integration: the European and the universal process. *International Organization, 15(03), 366-392.*
- Haas, E. B. (1980). Why collaborate? Issue-linkage and international regimes. *World Politics, 32(03), 357-405.*
- Hegemann, H., Heller, R., & Kahl, M. (2011). Terrorismusbekämpfung jenseits funktionaler Problemlösung: Was beeinflusst politisches Handeln im Kampf gegen den Terrorismus?. In *Terrorismusforschung in Deutschland* (pp. 281-304). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Holzinger, K., & Schimmelfennig, F. (2012). Differentiated integration in the European Union: Many concepts, sparse theory, few data. *Journal of European Public Policy, 19(2), 292-305.*
- Jansson, J. (2016). Building resilience, demolishing accountability? The role of Europol in counter-terrorism. *Policing and Society, 1-16.*
- Jasinski, F. (2002). The European Union and Terrorism. *The Polish Quarterly of International Affairs, 11, 35-55.*
- Jensen, C. (2016). Neo-functionalism. *Michelle Cini, Nieves Perez-Solorzano Borragan (Eds.): European Union politics. Oxford University Press, 53-64.*
- Kaunert, C. (2010). Towards supranational governance in EU counter-terrorism?-The role of the Commission and the Council Secretariat. *Central European Journal of International & Security Studies, 4(1), 8-31.*
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1977). *Power and interdependence: World politics in transition.* Boston: Little, Brown.
- Keohane, D. (2008). The Absent Friend: EU Foreign Policy and Counter-Terrorism. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 46(1), 125-146.*
- King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research.* Princeton university press.
- Kolb, R. W. (Ed.). (2007). *Encyclopedia of business ethics and society.* Sage Publications.

- Kroll, D. A., & Leuffen, D. (2015). Enhanced cooperation in practice. An analysis of differentiated integration in EU secondary law. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(3), 353-373.
- Leuffen, D., Rittberger, B., & Schimmelfennig, F. (2012). *Differentiated Integration: Explaining Variation in the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lowi, T. J. (1972). Four systems of policy, politics, and choice. *Public administration review*, 32(4), 298-310.
- Luif, P. (2007). *The Treaty of Prüm: A Replay of Schengen?*. Policy Paper. Available online at: <http://www.eu-consent.net/library/deliverables/D38c.pdf> [26.05.2016].
- Marin, L. (2008). The European arrest warrant in the Italian Republic. *European Constitutional Law Review*, 4(02), 251-273.
- Meyer, C. O. (2009). International terrorism as a force of homogenization? A constructivist approach to understanding cross-national threat perceptions and responses. *Cambridge review of international affairs*, 22(4), 647-666.
- Monar, J. (2001). The dynamics of justice and home affairs: laboratories, driving factors and costs. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39(4), 747-764.
- Monar, J. (2006). Cooperation in the justice and home affairs domain: characteristics, constraints and progress. *European Integration*, 28(5), 495-509.
- Monar, J. (2007). Common Threat and Common Response? The European Union's Counter-Terrorism Strategy and its Problems. *Government and opposition*, 42(3), 292-313.
- Monar, J. (2013). Eurojust and the European Public Prosecutor Perspective: From Cooperation to Integration in EU Criminal Justice?. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 14(3), 339-356.
- Monar, J. (2015). The EU as an International Counter-terrorism Actor: Progress and Constraints. *Intelligence and National Security*, 30(2-3), 333-356.
- Moravcsik, A., & Katzenstein, P. J. (1998). *The choice for Europe: social purpose and state power from Messina to Maastricht* (Vol. 1). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moravcsik, A. (1999). A new statecraft? Supranational entrepreneurs and international cooperation. *International organization*, 53(02), 267-306.
- Nugent, N. (2006). *The government and politics of the European Union*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Occhipinti, J. D. (2015). Still moving toward a European FBI? Re-examining the politics of EU police cooperation. *Intelligence and National Security*, 30(2-3), 234-258.

- Peresin, A. 2013. Croatian counter-terrorism strategy: Challenges, Prevention and Response System. *Research Paper of the Research Institute for European and American Studies*. Available online at: <http://www.rieas.gr/images/rieas160.pdf> [27.06.2016].
- Rittberger, B., Leuffen, D., & Schimmelfennig, F. (2014). Differentiated integration of core state powers. *Philipp Genschel/Markus Jachtenfuchs (Eds.) Beyond the Regulatory Polity? The European Integration of Core State Powers, Oxford University Press, 189-201*.
- Rosamond, B. (2016). Theorizing the European Union after Integration Theory. *Michelle Cini, Nieves Perez-Solorzano Borragan (Eds.): European Union politics. Oxford University Press, 79-96*.
- Schimmelfennig, F., & Rittberger, B. (2006). Theories of European integration. *Jeremy John Richardson (Eds.). European Union: power and policy-making. Routledge, 73-96*.
- Schimmelfennig, F., Leuffen, D., & Rittberger, B. (2015). The European Union as a system of differentiated integration: interdependence, politicization and differentiation. *Journal of European Public Policy, 22(6), 764-782*.
- Schneider, C. J. (2014). Domestic politics and the widening–deepening trade-off in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy, 21(5), 699-712*.
- Schreier, M. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. *Uwe Flick (Ed.) The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis, 170-183*.
- Schroeder, U. C. (2013). *The organization of European security governance: internal and external security in transition*. Routledge.
- Seawright, J., & Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection techniques in case study research a menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political Research Quarterly, 61(2), 294-308*.
- Stone Sweet, A., & Sandholtz, W. (1997). European integration and supranational governance. *Journal of European public policy, 4(3), 297-317*.
- Tekin, F. (2012a). Differentiated integration at Work. *Baden-Baden: Nomos*.
- Tekin, F. (2012b). Opt-Outs, Opt-Ins, Opt-Arounds? Eine Analyse der Differenzierungsrealität im Raum der Freiheit, der Sicherheit und des Rechts. *integration, 35(4), 237-257*.
- Triantafyllou, G. (2015). Greece. Kent Roach (Ed.). *Comparative Counter-terrorism Law*. Cambridge University Press, 344-362.
- Wagner, W. (2003). Review Section. *Journal of European public policy, 10(6), 1033-1039*.
- Walsh, J. I. (2006). Intelligence-Sharing in the European Union: Institutions Are Not Enough. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 44(3), 625-643*.

Zhelyazkova, A. (2014). From selective integration into selective implementation: The link between differentiated integration and conformity with EU laws. *European Journal of Political Research*, 53(4), 727-746.

Zimmermann, D. (2006). The European Union and post-9/11 counterterrorism: a reappraisal. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 29(2), 123-145.