The Development of the European Security and Defence Policy – An Assessment of Preferences, Bargains and Outcomes

PÅL JONSON

Pål Jonson

The Development of the European Security and Defence Policy
– An Assessment of Preferences, Bargains and Outcomes

Issuing organization	Report number, ISRN	Report type
FOI – Swedish Defence Research Agency	FOI-R--1967--SE	Scientific report
Defence Analysis SE-164 90 Stockholm	**Research area code**	
	1. Security, safety and vulnerability analyses	
	Month year	**Project no.**
	February 2006	A 1103
	Sub area code	
	11 Policy Support to the Government (Defence)	
	Sub area code 2	
Author/s (editor/s) Pål Jonson	**Project manager**	
	Approved by Jan-Erik Rendahl	
	Sponsoring agency FOI	
	Scientifically and technically responsible Prof. Anthony Forster and Dr Klaus Goetz	

Report title

The Development of the European Security and Defence Policy – An Assessment of Preferences, Bargains and Outcomes

Abstract

This study assesses the development of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) between 1998 and 2001. It argues that the key fault-lines of the negotiation process for the ESDP rested on three core issues. Firstly, the dichotomy between Atlanticist and Europeanist preferences; secondly, the shifting preferences for the balance between military and civilian crisis management tools and thirdly (to a lesser extent) the shifting preferences between intergovernmental and federal approaches to the implementation of the ESDP.

The study, furthermore, test the validity of the theoretical framework Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI) in reference to the ESDP process. It cast doubts on LI's core assumptions of 'unitary actor behaviour' and 'rationality' since they underestimates factors such as historical points of reference, norms and values. The empirical findings indicate that these factors seem decisively, albeit not exclusively, have influenced the preferences in the field of European security and defence co-operation.

Keywords

European Union, NATO, European Security and Defence Policy, Integration, Negotiations, Liberal Intergovernmentalism.

Further bibliographic information	Language English
ISSN 1650-1942	**Pages** 275 p.
	Price acc. to pricelist

Sammanfattning

Studien analyserar utvecklingen av den europeiska säkerhets och försvarspolitiken (EFSP) mellan 1998 och 2001. Konfliktytorna i förhandlingarna om EFSP kretsade kring i allt väsentligt kring tre kärnfrågor. För det första skiljelinjerna mellan atlantistiska och Europacentrerade preferenser; för det andra avvägningen i balansen mellan militära och civila krishanteringsinstrument; för det tredje stödjet för mellanstatliga respektive överstatliga beslutsfattningsstrukturer för EFSP.

Studien prövar även det teoretiska ramverket Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI) förmåga att beskriva förhandlingsprocessen för EFSP. Framförallt ifrågasätter studien validiteten i LI grundantaganden unitary actor behaviour och rationality. De empiriska analyserna pekar på att dessa faktorer underskattar den vikt som historiska referenspunkter, normer och värderingar tenderar att spela när medlemsstaterna utvecklar sina preferenser för säkerhets och försvarspolitiskt samarbete.

ABSTRACT

This study assesses the development of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) from an empirical and theoretical perspective. The empirical aim of this study is to analyse and trace the evolution of the ESDP process from its emergence in 1998 to the declaration of its partial operational readiness in December 2001. More specifically, the objective is to provide an understanding of the main characteristics of the process and identify the sources of diverging preferences between the state governments within the negotiation process for the ESDP.

The study argues that the key fault-lines of the negotiation process for the ESDP rested on three core issues. Firstly, the dichotomy between Atlanticist and Europeanist preferences; secondly, the shifting preferences for the balance between military and civilian crisis management tools and thirdly (to a lesser extent) the shifting preferences between intergovernmental and federal approaches to the implementation of the ESDP.

Subsequently, the study tests if the hypotheses of the theoretical framework 'Liberal Intergovernmentalism' can accurately explain how the state governments formulated their preferences and bargained during the ESDP negotiations and if the outcome of the negotiations corresponded to Liberal Intergovernmentalism's prediction in this regard. Secondly, the study, on a more profound basis, elaborates on the core assumptions of 'unitary actor behaviour' and 'rationality' that are at the heart of Liberal Intergovernmentalism. It concludes by providing some factors that point to the explanatory limits of these assumptions since they ignore or pay minimum attention to aspects, such as historical points of reference, norms and values, which occasionally seem to decisively, albeit not exclusively, have influenced the preferences in the field of security and defence co-operation. The conclusion is drawn that the dynamics for the ESDP process is too multifaceted to be explained by the narrow national interest based rational choice paradigm of Liberal Intergovernmentalism.

CONTENTS

Contents

Contents

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a Ph.D. dissertation between 2001 and 2004 has not always been an easy task for someone with a keen interest in international affairs. Dramatic events have unfolded, which have had a formative impact on the international security environment during these dynamic years. Thus, developments in the 'real world' have indeed been a constant source of distraction whilst trying to write this dissertation. Also, the European Security and Defence Policy has been something of a moving target during these years. Consequently, a study like this that focuses on the 'early'- 'early' years of this policy (1998-2001) might come across as overtaken by events. Hopefully, it will still provide some important pieces to the gigantic jigsaw puzzle that maps the complicated ESDP process.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Beatrice Heuser, who was kind enough to keep me on as a research student even though she left the Department of War Studies at King's College to become Director of Research at the Military History Research Institute in Potsdam. I have greatly benefited from her constructive criticism, helpful input and kind encouragement.

Dr. Mike Winnerstig, Captain Lars Wedin and Ms. Hélen Jarlsvik, who have all read and commented on different parts of the study, have also provided very helpful advice. For this I am deeply grateful. Mr. Niklas Granholm has been a helpful discussion partner and provided good ideas during those times when I felt that I had reached a dead end.

The Swedish Defence Research Agency has been an understanding and very helpful employer during these years of writing the Ph.D. In this context, I would, in particular, like to thank two persons, without whose support this study would never have been written. Mr. Bo Ljung has provided constant in-house backing and has assured that I have been able to find the necessary time and support in order to finish this study. Dr. Ingemar Dörfer has been a great source of inspiration and has provided indispensable assistance with the task of identifying funding for my research.

Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude goes to my parents Bosse and Marja for their support and encouragement, to Regiana for all her help and patience, and lastly, but most of all, to my daughter Diana who has seen too little of her busy father during these hectic years. I devote this study to her.

ABBREVIATIONS

ARRC	Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corps
AWACS	Airborne Early Warning and Control system
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CCC	Capabilities Commitment Conference
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CIVCOM	Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management
CJTF	Combined Joint Task Force
COREPER	Committee of Permanent Representatives
DCI	Defence Capability Initiative
DSACUR	Deputy Allied Commander Europe
ECAP	European Capabilities Action Plan
ECJ	European Court of Justice
EMU	European Monetary Union
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EDC	European Defence Community
EP	European Parliament
EPC	European Political Co-Operation
ERRF	European Rapid Reaction Force
ESDI	European Security and Defence Initiative
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUROCORPS	European Corps
EXSPEC	Exercise Programme and Exercises Specifications
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
GAC	General Affairs Council
HFC	Helsinki Force Catalogue
HHC	Helsinki Headline Catalogue
HPC	Helsinki Progress Catalogue
HQ	Head Quarters
HTF	Helsinki Headline Goal Task Force
IFOR	Implementation Force

Abbreviations

IGC	Intergovernmental Conference
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
JHA	Justice and Home Affairs
LI	Liberal Intergovernmentalism
LOI	Letter of Intent
MC	Military Committee
MS	Military Staff
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
ÖVP	Österreichische Volkspartei
PARP	Planning and Review Process
PfP	Partnership for Peace
POCO	Political Committee
PSC	Political and Security Committee
RPF	Rassemblement du Peuple Français
SEAD	Suppression of Enemy Air Defence
SFOR	Stabilisation Force
SHAPE	Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe
TEU	Treaty of European Union
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
UN	United Nations
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
VVD	People's Party for Freedom and Democracy
WEU	Western European Union

Chapter One

1. Introduction

'The Franco-British Agreement on European Defence let the genie out of the bottle.'[1]

The decision taken at the European Council Summit in Cologne in June 1999 that the European Union (EU) should develop the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) has opened up a new chapter in the European integration process. For almost 50 years the European Community (EC) and since 1992 the EU has been described by many as a 'civilian power'.[2] Integration within the field of what is commonly referred to as low politics, such as commerce, trade and agriculture, has been both comprehensive and has included measures of supranationalism.[3] The Union has, therefore, become an important and potent international actor in these spheres. It has not, however, played an equally important role in the field of high politics, such as defence and security, and the degree of integration has consequently been considerably less extensive in this field. Yet, the integration process has indeed made considerable advancements in many new fields after the end of the Cold War. The implementation of the European Monetary Union (EMU), the establishment of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and co-operation in the field of Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) all indicate that the pace and scope of European integration have increased during the last decade. As the EU embarks on yet another chapter of European integration by including security and defence policy co-operation as one of its activities, it does touch upon an area that has been considered to be the last line of defence for state sovereignty and called the ultimate challenge to the European integration process.[4] Thus, it

---

[1] See speech by former Policy Director at the British Ministry of Defence Richard Hatfield. Richard Hatfield, 'The Consequences of St Malo', Institute de Francais des Relations Internationale, Paris, 28 April 2000.

[2] Hanns W. Maull has, among others, elaborated upon the concept of the EC as a 'civilian power'. See, for example, Hanns W. Maull, 'Germany and Japan', <u>Foreign Affairs</u>, 1990, pp. 91-106.

[3] Stanley Hoffman has been one of the leading advocates of the need to make a distinction between high politics and low politics when conducting foreign policy analysis. High politics is often defined as policy issues and non-material issues of security and grandeur that are of vital importance to national security considerations, such as foreign policy and defence issues, while low politics is considered to be issues of lesser or no importance to national security, such as, for example, trade policy and commercial policy. Within the area of low politics elements of supranationalism have been used in the integration process. This implies, for example, that the Commission has been delegated the monopoly on the right of initiatives and decisions are predominately taken by qualified majority rather than by unanimity in the Council of Ministers. See Stanley Hoffman, 'The European Process at Atlantic Cross Purposes', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, 1991, pp. 85-101.

[4] Jolyon Holworth, 'European Integration and Defence: The Ultimate Challenge?', <u>Chaillot Papers</u>, No. 43, Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, 2000, p. 2.

is reasonable to assume that this process will be one of the greatest tests for the viability of the integration process and a litmus test for the limits of European integration.

At the same time as there has been an expansion of the fields of European integration, there has also been considerable progress made in the advancement of European integration theory. The European integration theory debate has during the last decade subsequently moved beyond the stagnating Neofunctionalism versus Intergovernmentalism debate and several new theories have been developed often in response to older empirically outdated ones. Possibly one of the most influential of these new approaches to European integration is Andrew Moravcsik's theoretical framework, Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI). A noteworthy feature of LI is that it is not a classical theory of European integration that intends to explain European integration by *one* single overarching factor. Rather, it is a state-centric mid-range theoretical framework that at the macro-level, in the words of Moravcsik, 'demystifies' the European integration process by stating that the process is a reflection of LI's two core assumptions of *unified actor behaviour* and *rational choice*. This implies that the integration process basically is a product of a set of rational choices made by state governments trying to manage an increasingly transnational world.[5] LI is unusual insofar that it is then possible to disaggregate its macro-level assumptions about the European integration process into clear and testable micro-level hypotheses about which actors are important in the integration process, how they develop preferences and negotiate as well as what the outcome of these negotiations tend to be. LI's considerable influence and its testable micro-level hypotheses make it a coherent and interesting framework to be tested against the development of the ESDP process.

Aims and Questions of the Study

This study has both an empirical and theoretical aim. The empirical aim of the study is to trace and analyse the evolution of the ESDP process from its emergence during the Austrian EU Presidency in 1998 to the declaration of its partial operational readiness by the end of the Belgian EU Presidency in December 2001. The objective of this task is two-fold. Firstly, the

---

[5] Moravcsik prefers the term 'theoretical framework' rather than 'theory' to describe LI since a framework is a concept of a set of assumptions that makes it possible to disaggregate certain phenomena into elements that each can be explained separately. The elements in a framework can then be aggregated to create a multidimensional explanation for such a multifaceted process as multilateral agreements. See Andrew Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht, (London: University College London Press, 1998), p. 19.

study aims at highlighting the gradual development of the ESDP in order to cover a lacuna of diplomatic history within the field of European integration with the intention to provide a deeper understanding of the background and main characteristics of the process. Secondly, the study attempts to identify the key fault-lines and sources of diverging preferences between the state governments within the negotiation process for the ESDP.

The theoretical aim of the study is to examine what guidance the core assumptions and key hypotheses of LI can provide for accurately explaining the development of the ESDP process between 1998 and 2001. Thus, the study examines if LI can explain how and on what basis the state governments formulated their preferences towards the ESDP; how the state governments bargained in the negotiations for the ESDP process and if the outcome of the negotiation process corresponds to the key hypotheses of LI in this respect. The final section of the last chapter puts special emphasis on scrutinising LI's core assumptions of rational choice and unified actor behaviour in order to identify the explanatory possibilities and limits of a rationalist approach to the development of European security and defence co-operation. Given the above stated aims, the study attempts to answer the following four questions in regards to the empirical and theoretical aims:

• Which factors seem to have led to the sufficiently converging preferences among some or all of the state governments in order to assure the establishment of the ESDP?

• What issues have constituted the key fault-lines for the shifting preferences of the state governments within the negotiation process for the implementation of the ESDP between 1998 and 2001?

• Is LI able to accurately explain how and on what basis the state governments formulated their preferences towards the ESDP process?

• Can LI's hypotheses regarding the characteristics and outcome of the bargaining process accurately be applied to the ESDP negotiations?

Introduction

Key Definitions

This study is focused on the policies of the state governments *towards* the ESDP as a process rather than on their policies *within* the ESDP as an external policy. Thus, the actual content that this policy produces, including its external nature, is not assessed. The fact that the study tests the empirical relevance of a theoretical framework does not mean that it is a theoretical study.[6] Rather, the theoretical framework that this study tests is used to guide its structure and focus and it provides some limits to the empirical research that has to be undertaken. Furthermore, the theoretical framework ensures that theoretical perspectives are taken into account when analysing the ESDP process. The lion's share of the study is focused on the empirical analysis of different aspects of the development of the ESDP process. It can, therefore, be referred to as a theoretically *informed* contemporary historical study.

When this study refers to integration, it uses Anne Deighton's definition of integration in a security context 'as a means to achieve specific outcomes and integrative methods *ranging* from co-operation and collective action to an institutionalised interdependence that can lead to complete absorption of individual states' military forces as well as of their policies'.[7] Thus, the study maintains a rather broad approach to the concept of integration since it does not merely associate this with the formal transfer of sovereignty from the state governments to supranational decision-making bodies, which is an approach that is commonly used within the area of European integration studies.

The ESDP can be seen as consisting of EU activities within the fields of military crisis management, civilian crisis management and conflict prevention.[8] The European Council has not yet adopted a common definition of these three pillars within the framework of the ESDP process. Arguably, it is possible to functionally deduce what is meant by military crisis

---

[6] It does not, for example, advance or compare different competing theories of European integration in relation to the ESDP process beyond the brief introduction to theoretical approaches to European integration that is given in chapter two of this study.

[7] Anne Deighton (ed.), <u>Western European Union 1954-1997 Defence, Security and Integration</u>, (Oxford:European Interdependent Research Unit), 1998, p.3.

[8] This is based on the Presidency Conclusions – Cologne 3 and 4 June 1999: 'the ability to take decisions on the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the Treaty of the European Union as the Petersberg Tasks'. For additional support, see The High Representative for the CFSP, Dr. Javier Solana's Speech at the Danish Institute of International Affairs in Copenhagen, 'Europe's Place in the World', 23 May 2002. Yet, it should be noted that the fact that it is possible to divide the ESDP into three different pillars does not necessarily imply that these pillars should be seen all the time as separate entities. Some have been very careful to stress that these categories should be seen as merely different instruments for the same aim in order to create a holistic crisis management system for the EU. See Carl Hallergård, 'The Council's Efforts in Building a Coherent EU Civilian Crisis Management Capability', <u>Conference Report</u>, 20 April 2001, Stockholm.

management insofar that the military functions of the EU have been designed to be able to fulfil the so-called Petersberg Tasks, which are humanitarian, rescue and peacekeeping tasks as well as tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace making.[9] Thus, when this study refers to military crisis management, it equates this with the Petersberg Tasks.

Civilian crisis management is somewhat more difficult to identify since no explicit aims have been set for this function and the Commission has within the first pillar of the Union also been active in this field for a long time. From a functional perspective, it has, however, been agreed upon that the EU's civilian crisis management capabilities should focus on policing, the rule of law, civilian administration and civil protection.[10] Thus, when the study refers to civilian aspects of crisis management, it is these sectors that are at the core of such aspects. Nor have the Member States agreed on any common definition of 'conflict prevention'. However, the Commission's Directorate for Development has defined conflict prevention as 'actions undertaken in the short-term to reduce manifest tensions and/or to prevent the outbreak or recurrence of violent conflict', which gives an indication of the conceptual underpinnings of this term.[11]

Relevance

There are normally two criteria that a study of this sort should fulfil.[12] First, it should pose questions that are of empirical or theoretical relevance to a specific field. Second, it should make a contribution to the existing scholarly literature 'by increasing the ability to construct verified explanations of some aspects of the world.'[13] It will be argued that this study fulfils both these criteria since it assesses the development of a new and highly relevant EU policy against the predictions of an influential theoretical framework on European integration.

---

[9] Treaty of the European Union, Title V Article 17.2.
[10] At the European Council Summit in Feira the state governments agreed to establish the so-called Feria Capability Targets, which included policing, the rule of law, civilian administration and civil protection.
[11] http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/prevention/defintion.htm
[12] Gray King, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verb, <u>Designing Social Inquiry Scientific: Interference in Qualitative Research</u> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 10.
[13] Ibid. p. 15.

Introduction

The decision to establish the ESDP process has broken an almost 50-year-old taboo regarding defence co-operation within the EC/EU and possibly opened up 'Pandora's box' for further integration in this field. Thus, given the nature of the European integration process, where the authority of the EU tends to expand rather than diminish over time once a policy field has been opened for integration, it seems as if the ESDP process could have a dynamic future. The ESDP might then have both external and internal long-term consequences, which makes it an important area of research.

Firstly, on the external dimension of the ESDP, it is possible that this process might transform the state of affairs for transatlantic relations, which have been at the core of the European security structure for over 50 years. Previously, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), with its unique transatlantic inclusiveness, maintained an unchallenged position with regard to defence co-operation in Western Europe.[14] The fact that security and defence co-operation in Europe now takes place within both the framework of the EU and NATO means that it is possible that a stronger autonomous European identity might be developed within this field. The desirability and main consequences of such a development have been disputed by a number of policy makers and academics. According to some scholars, the main consequences of such a development would be that it leads to a marginalisation of NATO and thereby to the exclusion and isolation of the United States within the European security structure. The ESDP process would consequently undermine transatlantic relations, which also would have a destabilising effect on the international order at large since other aspiring great powers would be tempted to challenge and exploit the relative weakening of the transatlantic community within the world order.[15]

On the other hand, other scholars claim that the development of the ESDP would have positive implications for transatlantic relations since it would force the EU state governments to take a larger responsibility for their own security environment.[16] An enhanced European ability to

---

[14] The Western European Union (WEU) was indeed purely a European forum for defence co-operation. However, given that it has been dormant within the European security structure, it can hardly be described as a relevant challenger to NATO's role in European security. For an analysis of the WEU's role in European security, see, for example, Guido Lenzi (ed.), WEU at 50, WEU Institute for Security Studies, 1998.

[15] See, for example, John Borawski and Thomas-Durell Young, NATO After 2000: The Future of the Euro-Atlantic Alliance (Westport: Praeger Publisher, 2001), p. 40.

[16] Several review processes of the EU state governments' armed forces have indicated that there is a need to undertake considerable procurement of various military capabilities in order for the state governments to be able to conduct the full range of the Petersberg Tasks. See, for example, Implementation of the Common European Security and Defence Policy and WEU's Future Role, - reply to the annual report of the Council, Assembly of the Western European Union, The Interim European Security and Defence Assembly, 6 December 2000.

conduct crisis management operations in and around Europe could, according to these scholars, actually strengthen transatlantic relations since it would reduce pressure on the United States to participate in such operations and assure more able European contributions to US-led operations outside the European continent.[17]

Secondly, the internal dimension of the ESDP might possibly, in a longer-term perspective, have important consequences for the defence planning procedures of the state governments, some of which see the initiation of the ESDP as a first step towards a deep-seated security and defence integration within the Union. The arguments in favour of such a development are, among others, based on the assumption that there is a need for a rationalisation of European defence expenditures since there is considerable unnecessary duplication among the armed forces in Europe.[18] The combination of shrinking defence budgets and the increasing cost of defence technology could make a case for increased European defence integration to assure that principles of economics of scale are taken into consideration when conducting defence planning.[19] Some even go so far as to suggest that the EU institutions, with their long experience of integration, a common budget, a relatively well-functioning supranational executive arm in the Commission and a legal system, could provide the framework for such integration.[20] Yet other scholars take a much more sceptical view of the feasibility of any kind of deep-seated defence and security integration inside or outside the EU framework.[21] These scholars stress the assumption that state governments are unwilling to engage in any kind of integration in high politics that will constrain their leverage and freedom of action in defence and security issues. Disregarding these speculations, the fact remains that, as a new subject within the field of European integration, with possible long-term implications for security and defence, the ESDP process deserves to be analysed in some detail.

Beyond the relevance of the ESDP at large, this study argues that the approach to the subject that this study takes provides it with research originality on, at least, three accounts. Firstly, the ESDP has indeed received considerable attention from policy analysts, defence intellectuals and researchers. However, the overwhelming majority of the literature written about the ESDP

---

[17] See, for example, Philip H. Gordon, 'Their Own Army? Making European Defense Work', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2000, pp. 12-17.

[18] See, for example, Klaus Naumann, 'Europe's Military Ambitions', Centre for European Reform, 20 June 2000.

[19] Richard Medley, 'Europe's Next Big Idea', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 78, No. 5, 1999, p. 22.

[20] It should, however, be noted that the EU state governments have explicitly declared that the ESDP process does imply the beginning of the creation of a European army.

[21] See, for example, John Mearsheimer, 'The False Promise of International Institutions', International Security, Vol. 54, No. 4, 1994, pp. 5-49.

process has focused almost solely on the military dimension of this process. It is obvious that this dimension is the most important aspect of the ESDP process for several reasons. Firstly, it is this dimension that most importantly changes the nature of the EU as an international actor when the Union makes the transition from being a purely civilian power to also include different aspects of military tasks as part of its authority. Secondly, the intersection between integration and defence can, at least, conceptually challenge traditional notions and interpretations of state sovereignty. Thirdly, the military aspect of the ESDP is also the dimension, which might have the greatest implications for transatlantic relations and NATO's standing. Fourthly, the military aspect of the ESDP has by far been the dimension that has absorbed the most political energy and political capital within the ESDP process. It is within this sphere that the political stakes are the highest. Yet, it is still somewhat unfortunate that the lion's share of the literature on the ESDP ignores the aspects of conflict prevention and civilian crisis management since it gives a somewhat incomplete picture of the development of the ESDP process and the Union as an international actor.[22] All of the three components of the ESDP, conflict prevention, civilian crisis management and military crisis management deserve to be analysed since they were all relevant parts of the negotiation process and this study argues that one can hardly be understood without the other. The relevance of the ESDP's civilian dimension is also manifested in the fact that the first crisis management operation that the EU has undertaken under the aegis of the ESDP is civilian.[23] The study, therefore, attempts to have a holistic perspective on the ESDP, where conflict prevention and civilian and military crisis management are treated as different sides of the same coin, which will be a relatively new research angle for the ESDP. Furthermore, the study provides a rather comprehensive review of the development of all three aspects of the ESDP process by examining Presidency by Presidency between 1998 and 2001. This is because the formative process has not yet been documented in any major publication on the ESDP with any great detail.

Secondly, one of the deficits in the current debate on the dynamics for the ESDP is that it is primarily focused on conceptual approaches to this process. Most of the debate, therefore, provides intuitive explanations for the development of the ESDP that are either difficult to quantify or hard to accurately prove. Thus, a primary methodological weakness of the current debate is that relatively little attention has been attributed to detailed analyses of the negotiation

---

[22] The fact that the EU makes an identity transition from being a purely civilian power to also include military aspects does not, of course, mean that the EU will become solely a military power in itself. Rather the use of military force will probably be the last instrument of resort for the EU as an international actor and it has many other tools that it can exercise in order to exert an influence.

[23] Since 1 January 2003 the EU has been responsible for the multinational police mission in Bosnia, which is called the European Union Police Mission (EUPM).

process based on interviews with people who have operated within policy making circles for this area of European integration. By the autumn of 2004 no such analysis had yet been made and the knowledge about the negotiation process has been the preserve of insiders, such as some diplomats and a few political leaders. This is quite remarkable given the relevance of this research approach. The way that the state governments acted in the negotiations for the ESDP from 1998 to 2001 can give important insights into the dynamics of this process and how it will develop in the future. It is the negotiation process that exposes the main differences of preferences among the state governments and it is, of course, the outcome of the negotiations that determines the direction of the process.

Thirdly, arguably another weak point of the debate on the development of the ESDP process, at least from a political science perspective, is that few attempts have been made to assess this process from a theoretical perspective. This is unfortunate since many European integration theories make ambitious claims about being able to explain and predict the very nature of the integration process and, therefore, need to be tried against detailed case studies in order to assess the empirical relevance of these theories. This study, therefore, assesses the ESDP from a theoretical perspective by applying the core assumptions and key hypotheses of LI to the development of the ESDP process in order to enrich the debate on the ESDP in this regard.

Moving on from the relevance of the ESDP process to the importance of the chosen theoretical framework, it seems that LI is relevant to test in reference to the development of the ESDP both because of its decisive impact on theoretical thinking regarding European integration and also for its methodological advantage vis-à-vis many other European integration theories. First, LI is currently one of the most influential theoretical frameworks within the field of European integration studies. Robert O. Keohane has referred to LI as 'the most compelling and significant analysis yet of the European Community'.[24] Bernard H. Moss claims that 'Rarely has a scholarly book [The Choice for Europe] appeared to stand out that immediately above its peers as the marker especially in such a burgeoning field as European Community studies that have attracted leading analysts of politics and society'.[25] Anthony Forster has stated that LI 'clearly contains important analytical advances and methodologically remains the most sophisticated variants of

---

[24] See the cover of Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe.
[25] Bernard H Moss, 'Round Table on Theory and Methodology in Moravcsik's *The Choice for Europe*', The 12th International Conference of Europeanists, and a biennial event organised by the Council for European Studies. www.europanet.org/conference 2000/abstracts/moss.htm

the classical theories'.[26] Thus, LI has had a decisive impact on influencing the academic debate about European integration studies. It is, therefore, desirable that the relevance of this theoretical framework is further tested against detailed empirical studies of European integration.

Secondly, the strength of LI is, according to Andrew Moravcsik, in the methodology of this theoretical approach, which has been carefully tested against detailed case studies. LI provides very clear hypotheses for predicting and explaining the direction of European integration, which are based on assumptions of pre-determined national interests and an institutional-specific bargaining process. It also describes on what basis the state governments find agreement on institutional arrangements for the integration process. LI thereby combines domestic and system-based explanations for how the state governments negotiate in a bargaining process. Thus, the clarity of LI and the fact that it was constructed after a detailed empirical analysis makes it an instrumental theoretical framework to be tested vis-à-vis the empirical track record of the ESDP process. The methodological approach of this study hopefully assures that pioneering insights about both European security and integration are obtained by evaluating a new policy sector, such as the ESDP, against a new and highly influential theoretical framework of European integration.

A potential challenge to assessing the empirical relevance of LI against the negotiations for the ESDP process is that LI often has been considered to be a political-economic theory of European integration. The key argument of LI is that the integration process has proceeded not because the primary interests of the state governments were to achieve ideological or geopolitical goals through economic integration, but rather because the integration process corresponded to their political economic interests.[27] However, Andrew Moravcsik has confirmed the applicability of the key hypotheses and core assumptions of LI also to defence and security integration. According to Moravcsik, LI is primarily concerned with issue-specific interests rather than economic theory and it contains clear hypotheses and a relatively solid micro foundation that can be applied to the ESDP process.[28] Thus, LI does not exclude any policy area in its approach to European integration. What makes LI interesting, from a theoretical perspective, is not just the main conclusions, which are that the primary dynamics for integration have been political-

---

[26] Anthony Forster, 'The State of the Art: Mapping the Landscape of European Integration', <u>Journal of International Relations and Development</u>, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1999, p. 20.
[27] Moravcsik, <u>The Choice for Europe</u>, p. 3.
[28] Andrew Moravcsik and Kalypso Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, Vol. 37, No. 1, 1999, p. 60. This is also based on correspondence with Andrew Moravcsik, 23 July 2002.

economic interests, but rather that this is a theoretical approach, which also claims to give predictive and explanatory guidance for *how* and *when* the state governments engage in the integration process. Moravcsik has an ambitious agenda for his framework, claiming that economic interest, relative power and credible commitments account for the *form, substance* and *timing* of the major steps towards European integration.[29] Thus, given the fact that the content of the ESDP does not seem to create any immediate economic implications for the state governments, the focus of this study will not be upon testing the hypothesis of the primacy of economic interest for further integration but rather to determine what guidance the notion of issue-specific interdependence can give for explaining the preference formation of the ESDP process.

Methodology and Structure

As noted, the methodological approach of this study's theoretical aim is basically founded on 'theory testing'. However, Andrew Moravcsik, of course, claims that LI is *not* a traditional political science theory that attempts to explain the European integration process by one overarching factor, but rather a theoretical *framework* that can provide predictive and explanatory guidance for how, when and where European integration proceeds. Yet, like most social science theories, LI is a reasoned speculation about answers to a research question, including a statement about why the suggested answer is right.[30] Furthermore, it attempts to organise existing knowledge by generating hypotheses.[31] Thus, the fact that LI is a theoretical framework rather than a theory actually makes it more suitable to be tested against the development of the ESDP process from an empirical perspective.

What makes this study original in methodological terms is that it tests LI against the emergence of a new area of integration vis-à-vis several different state preferences. This reduces the risk of drawing conclusions that are too far-reaching on a single case study based on the preferences of a single state government. While there have also been other advanced and very helpful empirical studies conducted to test the predictive and explanatory validity of LI in reference to defence integration, these studies have applied LI to a single national negotiation position during an

---

[29] Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 4.
[30] Gray King, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verb, Designing Social Inquiry Scientific: Interference in Qualitative Research, p. 19.
[31] Alan C. Isaak, Scope and Methods of Political Science (Pacific Grove: Dorsey Press, 1985), p. 169.

Intergovernmental Conference (IGC).[32] However, if LI is a valid theoretical framework, with predictive and explanatory value for the European integration process, it should also be able to withstand empirical scrutiny on several detailed accounts even outside the framework of the IGCs. This is especially the case given that Moravcsik has stated that much of the relevant development of European integration takes place outside the IGCs, which tend to codify the informal policy making between these conferences.[33] Thus, instead of testing LI against a single national position or against the grand bargaining that took place at the IGCs, this study tests LI against the development of the ESDP process under the aegis of the EU Presidencies over a three-year period. This approach increases the empirical relevance of the study at the same time as it assures that the conclusions of the study are deduced based on a more comprehensive empirical research.

The study also differs from LI in its methodological approach since it does not provide an overview of the competing hypotheses of the other contending European integration theories when it assesses the empirical relevance of LI regarding the ESDP process. There are two reasons for this study's methodological approach. Firstly, the aim of this study is to test the relevance of LI and obtain important empirical findings with regard to the dynamics for the ESDP process rather than test all European integration theories against the track record of the ESDP negotiations. Furthermore, as Wayne Sandholtz and John Zysman point out, there is an inherent danger and a false sense of scientism in testing competing theories and assuming that the one that is most accurate has the ability to explain the integration process.[34] This study claims that there are some factors that are more important than others in explaining the ESDP process, but that there is no single theory or theoretical framework that can accurately explain the development of the ESDP process. A comparative theory approach would, therefore, force the

---

[32] See Robert Dover's Ph.D. dissertation 'British European Defence Policy 1997-2000: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Critique of Domestic Policy Formation' (Ph.D. dissertation: University of Bristol, 2004) and Anthony Forster's article 'Britain and the Negotiation of the Maastricht Treaty: A Critical Analysis of Liberal Intergovernmentalism', Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 36, No. 3, September 1998. These contributions focus their critique primarily in reference to LI's inability to predict and explain the British positions and preferences at the Maastricht IGC in 1991 and on the development of the ESDP at the Nice IGC in 2000.

[33] Moravcsik has noted that the IGCs often have served as facilitators for decisions that require changes in the founding treaties of the EU. This has been especially common during the last decade when the number of IGCs has drastically increased as a consequence of the increased pace of the European integration process. It is important to note that the ESDP process has only required changes in three articles of the provisions in Chapter V of the Treaty of the European Union. Thus, there are EU summits other than the grand bargaining that took place at the IGC over the Nice Treaty that also are relevant to analyse when assessing the dynamics for the development of the ESDP process.

[34] Wayne Sandholtz and John Zysman, 'Recasting the European Bargain', World Politics, Vol. 42, No.1, 1992.

study to deviate from this position and settle for the next best solution that, at best, would only be partly correct and, at worst, misleading.

Methodologically, LI focuses almost solely on French, German and British policy, which is a reflection of the assumption that it is only the 'big three' that substantially affect the direction and pace of the European integration process.[35] However, since this study claims that other state governments occasionally can have a substantial impact on the ESDP process, it does not solely focus its analysis on the preferences of the 'big three'. Yet, in order to limit the scope of the empirical research to pertinent variables and avoid the risk of being descriptive at the expense of qualitative analysis, the study does not assess the positions and preferences of all the state governments within the negotiation process for the ESDP with the same amount of detail. Instead, based on the analysis of the negotiation process provided in chapter three, it identifies what it refers to as the main fault-lines or key negotiation issues that generated shifting preferences within the implementation of the ESDP. Founded on this evaluation the study then singles out what it calls the *core-promoter* states and the *core-sceptic* states within the negotiation process for the ESDP.[36] It is the dynamics between the preferences of the core-promoter states and those of the core-sceptic states that determine the outcome of the negotiation process and thereby also the direction of European integration. The study then provides a detailed analysis of what the sources of the shifting preferences between the core-promoter states and the core-sceptic states were and how these states have gone about formulating their preferences.

This study consequently backtracks the ESDP process since it first provides the narrative for the negotiation process, or the bargaining process as LI would refer to it, and then gives a detailed account of the preferences of some of the key state governments. The reason for the selection of this methodological approach is based on the assumption that it is first necessary to provide an objective account on the key fault-lines within the negotiation process and then, based on that account, identify which state governments had the strongest shifting preferences, rather than just merely assuming it is only the 'big three' that determine the direction and outcome of the

---

[35] Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 2.

[36] The term 'core-promoter state' is defined as the state within the negotiation process that has had the strongest preferences and devoted the most efforts to lead the integration process in a certain direction. A 'core-sceptic state', on the other hand, is defined as the state that has had the strongest preferences that oppose such a development and has devoted the most efforts to prevent the integration process from moving in the direction of the preferences of the core-promoter states. For example, this study identifies the UK as a core-promoter of an Atlanticist structure of the ESDP process, while France was the core-sceptic of such a development.

integration process. After the assessments of the negotiation process and the preferences of the core-promoter states and the core-sceptic states respectively, the study compares the empirical findings vis-à-vis LI's core assumptions and key hypotheses.

Sources

This study is based on four major forms of sources of information. Firstly, in line with the methodology of LI, the study is predominately based on primary sources for its empirical analysis.[37] The advantage of such sources is, of course, that they are original documents that are not based on other sources and, therefore, have not been subject to rewritten interpretations by other researchers. On the development of the ESDP, the various Presidency Reports and Presidency Conclusions from the European Council Summits have been the centrepiece of the literature for the study. Also EU Presidency work programmes, position papers, non-papers and major speeches have been useful sources of information.

Secondly, this study, more than most, relies heavily on interviews. This is because of the contemporary character of the empirical research subject, which makes it difficult to gain access to declassified archival material. Moreover, interviews are normally a more helpful source of information the less time has passed between the events and the interview since memories tend to fade away over time. However, interviews are always a problematic source of information. In retrospect, people tend to magnify their own importance and there are often hidden agendas for wanting to give particular portrayals of past events. Thus, the interviews that have been conducted with high-ranking national civil servants, political leaders, political advisors and representatives from the EU institutions have been cross-checked and corroborated with other sources.

---

[37] It should be noted that Andrew Moravcsik claims to maintain a rather high demand on empirical research and argues that the pre-eminence of his theoretical framework is superior to competing theories partly because of the sources that it is based on. Moravcsik, for example, states that 'The case studies of major decisions in this book [The Choice for Europe] are backed by hard primary sources (direct evidence of decision-making) rather than 'soft' primary sources (public statements and journalistic or academic commentary in which authors have less incentive to report motivations accurately)'. Moravcsik thereby deviates from conventional definitions when he claims that public statements are 'soft' primary sources. From a strict research methodology perspective, public statements are, of course, primary sources. However, according to Moravcsik, public statements are usually used to send signals of intentions to the consumers of these statements, rather than outlining the essence of decision-making on a certain issue. See Andrew Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p.10

Since most of the information rarely has been presented in open sources, the interviews have been particularly important in order to obtain information about certain episodes during the negotiation process for the ESDP and the underlying preferences of the state governments and how they went about formulating them.[38] Each Presidency that has been assessed in this study has included interviews with persons that represented the Presidency as well as representatives of other state governments and persons within the institutions. It should be noted that it has been particularly helpful to interview persons within the Council Secretariat since they often maintain the institutional memory of the process and, therefore, have good knowledge about the various Member States' positions in regards to the ESDP process. Several interviews have also been conducted with leading academics that have had important insights into the ESDP process since they tended to have access to policy making circles. Moreover, they were able to discuss more freely, although still from a position of reasonably good knowledge, about the underlying reasons for the preferences of the states as well as the conceptual underpinnings for the development of the ESDP process.

Thirdly, the secondary sources for the study, such as books, articles and research reports, have predominantly been used for the presentation of the theoretical perspectives of the European integration process, but also in order to set the historical context for the preference formation processes of the state governments. However, occasionally, research papers based on solid empirical analyses of specific aspects of the ESDP process have also been helpful in order to obtain detailed information about the development of the negotiation process for the ESDP.

Fourthly, the study has also been supplemented by information drawn from the media. *Agence Europe*, *European Voice*, *Atlantic News*, *Financial Times*, among others, have provided the study with various insights. Background information has also been obtained through research at the websites of media outlets, such as the BBC and Euronews. These sources of information have occasionally been helpful in trying to establish the train of events or identifying important episodes.

---

[38] A disproportionately large number of interviews have been conducted with Swedish civil servants. The reason for this is based on the fact that the author has had very good access to such people. Thus, in the trade off between either conducting less interviews in order to balance the selection of the nationalities interviewed and conducting an asymmetrical large number of interviews with Swedish civil servants in order to obtain a better understanding of the process, the second alternative has been chosen.

Finally, it should be noted that the study has also been written using knowledge based on information obtained from classified diplomatic correspondence on the ESDP negotiations. However, these sources of information have not been quoted directly and only serve as background information and as sources of informal verification vis-à-vis the interviews conducted.

Chapter Outlines

After having provided a brief presentation of the aims, methodological explanations and scope of the study in the introductory chapter, the second chapter gives an overview of the theoretical approaches to European integration in general and to defence and security co-operation within the area of European integration in particular. It, furthermore, offers a comprehensive presentation of LI by discerning the core assumptions and key hypotheses of this theoretical framework. The chapter also reviews the principal criticism that LI has been subjected to since it was introduced into the academic debate on European integration studies in the early 1990s. The study then reorients its focus away from the theoretical framework and onto the empirical aspects of the ESDP process in chapters three and four while still keeping in mind that the empirical research is guided by eventually testing the key hypotheses and core assumptions of LI in the final chapter.

Chapter three reviews the gradual evolution of the ESDP process between 1998 and 2001. The chapter intends to provide an understanding of the *process-questions*, such as what the predominant characteristics of the development of the ESDP process have been; which subjects constituted the most critical negotiation issues and what the outcome of the negotiations were. The conclusion is drawn that the ESDP was shaped by the very strong leadership that the UK and France provided for the process. Where these two states could agree most others would follow. Another very important characteristic of the process was its bottom-up approach, whereby the state governments set specific capability targets and then worked towards those targets, rather than agreeing on a strategic concept for how, when and where the EU's crisis management capabilities should be used. Thus, the process was thereby very much shaped by the use of creative ambiguity, which, to a large degree, explains its dynamic pace in an area of integration that is highly politicised. The key fault lines for the negotiation process rested on three core issues. Firstly, the dichotomy between Atlanticist and Europeanist preferences for the

operational structure of the ESDP process; secondly, shifting preferences between intergovernmental and federal approaches vis-à-vis the implementation of the ESDP process; thirdly, shifting preferences for the emphasis and balance between military and civilian crisis management tools within the ESDP process.

Based on the review in chapter three, chapter four then analyses the positions and preference formation processes of what it has identified as core-promoter states and the core-sceptic states regarding various aspects of the ESDP process. It also attempts to identify the factor that generated sufficiently converging preferences that opened the way for the establishment of the ESDP process. In the chapter, the UK is identified as a core-promoter of an Atlanticist structure of the ESDP and France is singled out as a core-promoter of a Europeanist structure. Germany has most frequently advocated the federalist view of the ESDP and the most vocal supporter for the ESDP's civilian dimension has been Sweden. Regarding the factors that generated the sufficient convergence of the preferences, the chapter provides a tri-partisan explanation based on the intrastate conflicts in the Balkans, American reluctance and European inability combined with the British government's strong conviction that it wanted to be 'at the heart of Europe'.

The final chapter first applies the key hypotheses of LI to the development of the ESDP process in order to assess their predictive and explanatory value. More specifically, the study tests if the hypotheses can explain how and on what basis the state governments formulated their preferences: how the state governments bargained during the negotiations and if the outcome of the negotiations corresponded to the LI's prediction in this regard. Secondly, the chapter, on a more profound basis, elaborates on the core assumptions of unitary actor behaviour and rationality that are at the heart of LI. It concludes by providing some factors that point to the explanatory limits of these concepts since they do not take into account factors, such as historical points of reference, norms and values, which also seems to influence preferences in the field of security and defence integration.

Chapter Two

2. Theoretical Perspectives on European Integration

> 'European integration theory will amount to a rather long but not very prominent footnote in the intellectual history of twentieth century social science'.[39]

Introduction

There are a number of competing theoretical explanation models for the nature of the European integration process and why this process will or will not include a security and defence dimension. Integration theory has undoubtedly had a decisive impact on shaping the academic debate on contemporary scholarly work on European integration.[40] It has also been used with different degrees of success to provide a comprehensible road map for an exceptionally complex area of social science.

Before this study presents a detailed assessment of the structure and content of LI, it reviews as its point of departure some of the other influential theories on international relations in general and theories of European integration in particular. The aim is to present the abilities of these theories to be assessed vis-à-vis the development of the ESDP process. Since the European integration process hardly can be separated from the international context, in which this process takes place, the study will first assess what guidance traditional theories of international relations can give to the dynamics of European integration.

There are, from an international relations theory perspective, two leading schools of thought; namely, Neorealism and International Liberalism, which could provide explanations for why European integration has proceeded.[41] Andrew Moravcsik refers to these international relations theories as the 'geopolitical' schools since they explain the main dynamics for European integration through the spectrum of internal or external security perceptions, where the

---

[39] Donald Puchala, 'The Integration Theories and the Study of International Relations' in C.W. Kegley and E. Wittkopf (eds.), The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives (New York: Random House, 1984), p. 198.
[40] See, for example, Dimitris N. Chrysochou, Theorizing European Integration (London: Sage Publications, 2001), p. 9.

economic integration process is primarily seen as an instrument for achieving higher aims; namely, peace and security.

Neorealism

Neorealism, which has predominately been developed by Kenneth Waltz, points out that the international system is anarchical and thereby a self-help system, where all states have to ensure their security by themselves.[42] Neorealism, furthermore, claims that all states can be analysed from a unitary actor behaviour perspective, which implies that all states have the same top foreign policy priorities when engaging in external relations; namely, safeguarding their national security. Consequently, Neorealism attributes little relevance to the role that factors, such as cultures, values and norms, play in international politics. Neorealism instead puts strong emphasis on balance of power paradigms and claims that unipolar international systems tend to be short-lived since other states will try to balance the hegemon of the international systems by coalition building.[43] However, states can also choose to co-operate with the hegemon if there exists common interests to do so. This sort of strategic behaviour is most often used by smaller states in the international system and is called 'bandwagoning'.

Neorealism would assume that it has been external security threats that have been the primary driving force for the economic integration process in Europe. The EC state governments engaged in economic integration to strengthen their economies in order to obtain geopolitical goals and bandwagon with the US because the Western European states and the US had a common interest in strengthening the West against the potential expansion of the Soviet empire. Within the integration process of 'low politics', the state governments were competing for relative gains among each other.[44] Neorealism would explain the absence of defence

---

[41] International Liberalism has also been called 'Neoliberalism', 'Transnationalism' and 'Idealism'. One of the common denominators of these theories is that they flow from the intellectual heritage of Woodrow Wilson's normative vision of the international system. For a more exhaustive analysis of the concept, see Charles W. Kegley, 'The Neoliberal Challenge to Realist Theories of World Politics: An Introduction,' in Charles W. Kegley (ed.), Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and Neoliberal Challenges (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995), pp.1-24.
[42] Kenneth N. Waltz, Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959).
[43] For an interesting analysis of this argument, see Christopher Lanye, 'The Unipolar Illusion: Why New Powers Will Rise', International Security, Vol. 17, No. 4, spring, 1993.
[44] Kenneth N. Waltz, Theory of International Politics (Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1979).

integration within the EC by claiming that defence was provided with other and better means, i.e., NATO, and, in turn, the security commitment provided by the United States.

According to Neorealism, the development of the CFSP and the ESDP, all done in a strict intergovernmental fashion with no immediate implications for the sovereignty of the state governments, could be seen as a reflection of the new security environment after the end of the Cold War. Europe would, according to Neorealism, have an interest in trying to balance the primacy of the US in the international system since the Soviet threat had disappeared and there is no longer an apparent need for Europe to bandwagon with the United States. Furthermore, a post-Cold War Neorealist explanation for the continued European economic integration would be based on the assumption that this is done with the intention of strengthening the EU against other superpowers in the international system. Consequently, integration would precede with the intention to bolster EU autonomy vis-à-vis other superpowers and make the Union more powerful against its core competitors.[45]

International Liberalism

The other main classical international relations theory that could be used to identify the driving forces behind the European integration process is International Liberalism. This theory has not been as equally influential as Neorealism in shaping the theoretical paradigms of international relations and it has, to a large extent, been developed as a counter-theory to Neorealism. One of the most prominent advocates of this theory has been Bruce Russett.[46] International Liberalism is based on the assumption that the integration process is undertaken because it will advance peaceful interstate relations among the state governments of the EU. Further integration will, according to this school of thought, increase interdependence since members of a union do not fight wars against each other.[47] This assumption is based on the Kantian notion of democratic peace.[48] International Liberalism recognises the relevance of the state in the international system, but also claims that there are other pluralistic factors, such as international institutions,

---

[45] John Mearsheimer, 'Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War', International Security, Vol. 9, No. 4., 1990.

[46] See, for example, Bruce Russett and Henry Starr, World Politics: The Menu for Choice (New York: W.H. Freedman and Company, 1993).

[47] Ernst-Otto Czempiel, 'Kants Theorem oder Warum sind die Demokratien Perspective, Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1996, pp. 79-101.

[48] For a persuasive argument against the notion of democratic peace, see Christopher Layne, 'Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace', International Security, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1994.

norms and international law, that affect the consideration of how states make decisions. Sovereignty is, according to this school of thought, divisible and connected to international co-operation and protection of national security and it is not the only consideration that states have in mind when making decisions.[49] According to International Liberalists, pressure for co-operation is abundant and war among industrialised countries is less likely because democracies tend not to solve international differences by using military force since this will have unintended consequences for their economic performance because it will undermine the possibilities for trade and exchange. In practical terms, war is thereby also harder to wage since democracies tend to specialise in their comparative advantage for export and this thereby increases the opportunity cost for waging warfare. The reason for this being that they are highly dependent on trade for their economic well being, which, according to International Liberalism, is a core value for democratic state governments because it promotes public support for the current domestic political situation. According to International Liberalists, international institutions play a key role in the international system, not least because of their ability to work as organisations, where democracies can resolve conflicts peacefully and thereby avoid engaging in warfare.[50]

International Relations Theories in Reference to European Integration

After a closer look at classical theories of international relations, it is obvious that they are unable to explain or predict the dynamics of European integration with a high degree of accuracy. Even though Neorealism and, to a lesser degree, International Liberalism intuitively could make a reasonably convincing argument for the driving forces for some aspects of the European integration, the theories would hardly be able to maintain their empirical relevance against a more detailed analysis of the dynamics and the preference formation behind the integration process. This is not surprising since they are not developed for this purpose. The theories can provide a framework for assessments of international relations in a long-term perspective but are hardly the right instruments for assessing the nature of the European integration process in the short- to mid-term timeframe. The predictive value of the international relations theories is further undermined by the fact that these theories do not have

---

[49] Carol Webb, 'Theoretical Perspectives and Problems' in Helen Wallace, William Wallace and Carol Webb (eds.), <u>Policy-Making in the European Communities</u> (London: John Wiely, 1983).
[50] Karl Deutsch et al., <u>Political Community and the North Atlantic Area</u> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

a micro-foundation that provides testable hypotheses, which can explain the causality of each separable stage in the negotiations for the integration process. Consequently, even though the direction of the development of the European integration process might occasionally reinforce the predictions of a certain classical international relations theory, it is difficult to identify if the causality for this was based on the core assumptions of that specific theory. International relations theories can, therefore, rightly predict the outcome of the integration based on misconceived assumptions, which lead to deducing conclusions based on the wrong causality.

For obvious reasons the explanatory value of classical international relations is arguably even lower than its predictive value to the European integration process. These theories do not explain the institutions or technical context in which the European integration process takes place. It is difficult to accurately explain the dynamics of European integration without providing an assessment of what role relevant actors, such as the European Council, the Council of Ministers, the Commission, the European Parliament and the ECJ, play or do not play in the integration process. Neither do classical international relations theories provide any explanation for the nature of the intergovernmental bargaining procedure that precedes the integration process. Important factors that affect the negotiation process, such as, for example, issue linkage, bargaining techniques or institutional preference arrangements, remain unaccounted for in the classical theories of international relations. The simple reason for this is that international relations theories are not constructed for analysing the European integration process *per se*. However, they are considerably more useful as schools of thought when the EU is assessed as an actor in the international system.

European Integration Theories

Given the fact that traditional theories of international relations offer limited guidance to analyse the nature of European integration, it seems necessary that any theory that intends to explain the nature of this process has to be specially adapted to take into consideration both the endogenous and exogenous conditions within which this process takes place. Consequently, the theories that specifically grapple with the nature of European integration are more useful for the purpose of this study. The most well-known of these integration theories are Neofunctionalism and Intergovernmentalism.

Neofunctionalism

The Neofunctionalist model for the advancement of the integration process is primarily focused on its internal dynamics. This theoretical framework was first developed by Ernest Haas in 1958 and claims that the advancement of the integration process is assumed to be a reflection of technical, functional and political spillover. Neofunctionalism thereby reputes the Intergovernmentalist idea that integration has proceeded in a state-centric international system, where the state governments deliberately agree to pool some sovereignty in low politics because of certain geopolitical developments. Neofunctionalists recognise the distinction between high politics and low politics but argue that the integration process will start with low politics, such as trade and commerce, and then spread to high politics, such as security and defence policy. This process would proceed because there is a socialisation process and a learning curve of how to handle the integration process that would lead political leaders to adhere to supranational solutions in order to make the integration process more manageable. Neofunctionalism also claims that there is a functional logic to the spread of the integration process from low politics to high politics. This is because all policy fields are interconnected both in domestic politics and when the state governments negotiate during the IGCs. Thus, the separation between low politics and high politics would not be rational in the long run because of the 'expansive logic of sector integration'.[51] According to Neofunctionalist logic, the *finalité* in the integration process would be a new kind of political community beyond the traditional concepts of the 'nation state'.[52]

It is difficult to find substantive support for Neofunctionalism, either from an empirical perspective or from the perspective of the intentions of the state governments or the supranational actors. The historical track record of European integration indicates that the integration process is much more complex than the logic of Neofunctionalism would indicate and after almost 50 years of the process there are still important policy fields, which are either outside the integration process or outside the legal framework of the EC.[53] An apparent weakness of Neofunctionalism is, therefore, that it does not provide a timeframe for its

---

[51] Ernst B. Haas, <u>The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces 1950-57</u> (London: Stevens, 1958).
[52] Ibid.
[53] The EU does, for example, not have any influence over the national taxation policies of the state governments and co-operation in the fields of Justice and Home Affairs and the Common Foreign and Security Policy is conducted predominately outside the EC.

predictions. Even one of the fiercest advocates of European integration and a former President of the Commission, Jacques Delores, has stated that his vision of Europe is 'a federation among strong nation states not a single European super-state'.[54] Furthermore, few state governments in the EU would like to see their influence entirely marginalised in order to create a new political community, in which the state governments play a subordinate role vis-à-vis a centralised power in Brussels.

According to the predictions that Neofunctionalism would make with regards to the ESDP, the EU should by now have an integrated military capacity with a supranational decision- making capacity. Thus, it is clear that Neofunctionalism fails to acknowledge the unique conditions that surround security and defence integration on, at least, two accounts. First, the methodology of Neofunctionalism is an inward looking functional framework and it, therefore, fails to pay sufficient attention to the external security environment. The resources that the ESDP consists of are predominately maintained for external use outside the Union's borders. Consequently, it is the external security environment rather than just the logic of functional, technical or political spillover that affects the conditions for the development of the ESDP. Secondly, there are few indications that the ESDP is moving in a direction towards complete supranational EC framework of decision-making procedures, as Neofunctionalism would have predicted. The reason for the failure of Neofunctionalism to predict this development is that it does not pay appropriate attention to the sensitivity that is involved in defence issues when it comes to national sovereignty. It is, for example, indicative that the proposal for the establishment of the European Defence Community (EDC), based on principles of supranational decision making procedures, failed to be ratified just because it was perceived that such a decision making procedure would impinge too heavily on the sovereignty of the state governments in security and defence issues.

Thus, Neofunctionalism has little predictive ability in the field of security and defence policy and can, at best, be seen to be a pre-theory, which is generated from scholarly work conducted on theories of interdependence.[55] However, there have been attempts made to reform Neofunctionalism and use it as a mid-range theory, where some useful concepts are being used for an explanatory rather than a predictive purpose. George Ross has done this most notably in

---

[54] Moravcsik, <u>The Choice for Europe</u>, p. 472.
[55] Forster, 'The State of the Art', p. 15.

his scholarly work on the impact that Jacques Delores has had on the integration process.[56] Some of the most influential work that has been done in reference to EC legal integration and political theory has been written by Anne-Marie Burley and Walter Mattli, in which the authors have assessed the role that the ECJ has in the integration process.[57] But while these new theoretical attempts also predominately focus their analysis on the supranational actors, such as the Commission and the ECJ, they assess other aspects of European integration, such as issue-linkage and bargaining technique, and very often do this from a bottom-up perspective. These mid-range theoretical attempts can thereby avoid the pitfall of being too ambitious in their aims and do not claim to be able to provide a complete picture of the nature of the integration process as such. Instead, they are useful tools that can explain certain aspects of the process. Yet these new theories, with more modest ambitions than their predecessors, do not provide any helpful explanations for the dynamics of the ESDP since they tend not to focus their analysis on the state governments, which are the primary actors in the area of security and defence co-operation.

Intergovernmentalism

The other main European integration theory besides Neofunctionalism has been Intergovernmentalism. This integration theory, of which Stanley Hoffman has been a leading proponent, is based not only on the premises of the centrality of the state governments in the international system, but also on the important role that governments play in the interstate bargaining process and the significance of assessing the national interests, especially from an economic perspective, when trying to grasp the nature of European integration.[58]

The main difference between Intergovernmentalism and Neofunctionalism is that they differ on whether it is only the governments that are relevant actors in the process or whether supranational actors, such as the Commission and the ECJ, can have an important role to play. The theories also disagree over whether integration is a reflection of unintended consequences caused by political, functional or technical spillover or whether the state governments have

---

[56] George Ross, <u>Jacques Delores and European Integration</u> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
[57] Anne-Marie Burley and Walter Mattli, 'Europe Before the Court: A Political Theory of Legal Integration', <u>International Organizations</u>, Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 41-76.
[58] Stanley Hoffman, 'Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation State and the Case of Western Europe', <u>Daedalus</u>, Vol. 95, No. 4, 1966, pp. 862-915.

deliberately and, with retained control, agreed to pool sovereignty. Finally, the theories disagree on whether the ultimate objective of the process is to create a new political community beyond the nation state or to only engage in a process that will actually strengthen the state governments. Robert Keohane has tried to link Intergovernmentalism with Neofunctionalism by claiming that the former best explains the interstate bargaining process, while the latter best explains the spillover that proceeded in-between the interstate bargaining process.[59] However, Keohane attributes the primacy of Intergovernmentalism over Neofunctionalism since it is perceived as almost impossible to explain the expansion of the EC without focusing on the agreements that were reached in the intergovernmental bargaining process.

The criticism of Intergovernmentalism is based on the view that it has failed to adopt a coherent framework for how state governments develop a policy preference since Intergovernmentalism does not provide a detailed explanation of the concept of 'national interests'. This also touches upon a criticism of Intergovernmentalism with regard to security and defence co-operation. Since Intergovernmentalism does not provide any testable hypotheses for how the state governments formulate their interests, it is very difficult to assess the validity of this theory against the track record of the ESDP.

According to some scholars, Intergovernmentalism also fails to adequately conceptualise how the integration process affects the state governments as the process becomes increasingly advanced.[60] Thus, for example, the initiation of the ESDP process is going to generate functional procedures that will have an impact on the ability of the state governments to influence the content of the day-to-day policy making procedures of the EU. Even though this will not necessarily lead to functional and technical spillover becoming the main driving force for further integration, it is still a weakness of the explanatory value of Intergovernmentalism that it fails to recognise *how* the integration process is affected by this development.

There have been attempts to improve Intergovernmentalism in order to make it more adaptable to the empirical nature of the integration process. Alan Milward has addressed some of the above stated weaknesses of Intergovernmentalism, especially in reference to the poorly defined concept of 'national interests'. Milward claims that the integration process has proceeded since

---

[59] Robert O. Keohane and Stanley Hoffman, 'Conclusions: Community Politics and Institutional Change', in William Wallace (ed.), The Dynamics of European Integration (London: Printer/RIIA, 1992), pp. 276-300.
[60] Lykke Friis, 'Challenging a Theoretical Paradox: The Lacuna of Integration Policy Theory', Global Society, 1997, pp. 359-381.

it has served the particular interests of the state governments to do so because further European integration will actually strengthen the sovereignty of the state governments. Milward's argument is that the EU governments will be better prepared to meet the challenges of increasing economic interdependence by engaging in the integration process and thereby enhancing their economic performance given the economic advantages of free trade.[61]

New Theoretical Approaches

Traditional theories of European integration do not correspond very well with the contemporary European integration process in general and the development of the ESDP in particular since the integration process gradually has evolved from the forms of co-operation that had taken place within the EC.[62] The theoretical debate about European integration has consequently moved beyond the Neofunctionalist versus Intergovernmentalism debate and has undoubtedly become more advanced during the last decade as new theories have emerged and some old theories have become modified and improved. Many of these new theories have been written in response to old theories that have failed to explain the nature of European integration in a meaningful way. Thus, as the integration process proceeds and the EU becomes a more multidimensional and multifaceted organisation, the easier it has become to discredit classical theories of European integration.

The so-called governance school, represented, among others, by Ann Branch, claims that both Neofunctionalism and Intergovernmentalism fail to explain the most important factor of European integration; namely, the uneven pace of the process in the different policy sectors.[63] Thus, a key criticism by the governance school of the Neofunctionalism versus Intergovernmentalism debate is that it is primarily focused on what actors are involved rather than the nature of the process itself. Furthermore, the governance school argues that the methodological approach of focusing on the actors has led Neofunctionalism and Intergovernmentalism to 'go native' insofar that both theories overemphasise the roles of either supranational actors like the Commission and the EJC or that of the state governments. By

---

[61] Alan Milward, Francis Lynch, MB Ranieri Ruggiero, Frederico Romero and Vibecke Sferensen, <u>The Frontier of National Sovereignty: History and Theory 1945-1992</u> (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 437.
[62] Henrik Larsen 'Explaining the Common Foreign and Security Policy - The New Research Agenda' in A. Wivel (ed.) <u>Explaining European Integration</u> (Copenhagen: Copenhagen Political Studies Press, 1998).
[63] Ann P. Branch and Jakob C. Öhrgaard (eds.), 'Trapped in the Supranational-Intergovernmental Dichotomy. A Response to Stone, Sweet and Sandholtz', <u>Journal of European Public Policy</u>, Vol. 6, 1999.

concentrating on different actors the supranationalists are automatically going to focus on the dimensions where the supranational actors have the most influence, which normally is the day-to-day business of the Union, while the Intergovernmentalists are going to focus on the intergovernmental bargaining process. The governance school claims that the analysis of European integration should focus on why and how integration proceeds rather than who governs the process. However, even though the governance school might be accurate in its criticism of the Neofunctionalism versus Intergovernmentalism debate, it provides few explanations by itself to explain why and how European integration proceeds. Thus, the governance school is not an instrumental framework for explaining the dynamics for the development of the ESDP process.

The governance school has, however, been a source of inspiration for the multilevel governance school, which indeed has made important contributions to explaining the CFSP and the ESDP process from a conceptual perspective. Multilevel governance is focused on explaining how the foreign polices of the state governments gradually are affected and shaped by the CFSP and vice-versa. Christopher Hill, who has been an advocate of the multilevel governance school, notes, for example, that, even though co-operation in the field of foreign policy is intergovernmental, the Member States take both the interests of the Union and the other Member States into consideration when they formulate their national foreign policies. Hill also claims that 'The limits of the logic of diversity in European actorness are just as firm as those set by the aquis politics on unilateralism'. According to Hill, the CFSP process in itself leads to common norms and rules of the representatives in Brussels.[64]

David Allen has developed this argument further and refers to this factor as the 'Brusselisation' of European foreign policy. Even though much of the formal power over the development of foreign and security policy remains in the European capitals, it has become more difficult for the state governments to maintain control over the foreign policies.[65] It is the diplomats within the second pillar that are increasingly conducting the foreign policy. This has often led to conflicts between the Political Directors at the various foreign ministries and the Permanent Representatives in Brussels who are often under pressure from the High Representative, the Commission or other state governments. Allen, therefore, claims that the centrifugal powers of

---

[64] Christopher Hill, 'Closing the Capabilities-Expectation Gap?', in John Peterson and Helen Sjursen (eds.), A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of the CFSP (London: Routledge, 1996).

[65] Jolyon Howorth argues along the same lines in what he has referred to as 'Brussels-Based Intergovernmentalism'. See Jolyon Howorth, 'European Integration and Defence: The Ultimate Challenge?'.

EU membership have very important consequences for the foreign and security policies of the state governments.[66] According to Ben Tora, who has also written extensively on multi-level governance, political co-operation improves the effectiveness and increases the capabilities of foreign policy making for several of the smaller states within the Union. Thus, even if their freedom of formulating a national foreign policy has been constrained by EU membership, the influence and the effectiveness of the content that the common foreign policy produces have brought considerable gains to these state governments.[67]

The limitation of the multilevel governance school, from this study's perspective, is that it exclusively points to certain factors that affect the state governments' *behaviour* within foreign and security policy. It gives no explicit guidance as to on what basis the state governments formulate their preferences towards the ESDP process itself and it gives no indication of the outcome of negotiations within the field of the ESDP. In essence, it does not elaborate on the fundamental dynamics for integration within this process as much as it focuses on how the state governments act within the process.

An alternative to the governance school and the multilevel governance school is the comparative school, which criticises the Intergovernmentalism versus Neofunctionalism debate. According to this school, the EU is such a multifaceted organisation that an analysis of the Union cannot be limited to either the daily policy-making process or constitutional issues that are negotiated during the IGCs since both are necessary to understand the EU.[68] Thus, there needs to be a synthesis between these different levels of analysis. Alberta Sbragia argues that a comparative political methodology for assessing the nature of European integration is much more helpful to understand the process rather than using an actor-centric grand theory like Intergovernmentalism or Neofunctionalism.[69] However, according to Sbragia, it is first necessary to recognise that the EU is not a unique international organisation since such an assumption would hinder the possibility of assessing the EU through the perspective of comparative politics. Simon Hix, in his contribution to the theoretical debate, makes a very useful distinction between the study of the EU as an international organisation, in which

---

[66] David Allen, 'Who Speaks for Europe? The Search for an Effective and Coherent External Policy' in John Peterson and Helen Sjursen (eds.), <u>A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?</u>

[67] Ben Tora, 'Denmark and Ireland' in Ian Manners and Richard Whitman (eds.), <u>The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States</u> (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

[68] Forster, 'The State of the Art', p. 23.

[69] Alberta Sbragia, 'Federalism in Comparative Context' in Alberta Sbragia (ed.), <u>Europolitics</u> (Washington, D.C.: Brooking's Institution, 1992), pp. 259-268.

theories of international relations can be reasonably useful analytical tools, and the study of the politics of the EU in which comparative political models are to be preferred as analytical tools.[70]

However, according to Anand Menon and Andrew Hurell, the European integration process is so fundamentally unique and complex that neither the comparative schools nor the classical theories can explain the nature of this process. The reason for this is that there are other dimensions to the integration process than just the grand bargaining at the IGCs and the day-to-day policy-making process. Instead, there should be attempts made to obtain a better understanding of how the grand bargaining at the IGCs and the day-to-day policy making process are linked together.[71] Anthony Forster also points out that there hardly exists any satisfying theoretical framework that can accurately describe the nature of the European integration process. Forster is of the opinion that there currently does not exist any theory or theoretical framework that can explain both history-making treaty negotiations and routine decision-making.[72]

As previously noted, there have been rather few attempts made to test what guidelines theoretical approaches can give to explain the dynamics of the ESDP process.[73] Thus, the intention of this review of the theoretical debate on European integration has been to provide an overview of the landscape of European integration theory and assess whether there is a theory or theoretical framework that is well equipped to explain and predict the development of the ESDP process. Yet, with the exception of the multilevel governance school, which, on the other hand, can hardly be defined as a theory given its descriptive rather than predictive attempts, it is difficult to identify any theory that seems appropriate for this task.[74] The field seems to be at a pre-theory stage, where new theories are being developed in response to older and outdated theories, but there does not yet exist any theory that can meaningfully explain the essence of security and defence co-operation. However, that being said, given the impact that

---

[70] Simon Hix, 'Approaches to the Study of the European Community and the Challenge to Comparative Politics', West European Politics, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1994, pp. 1-30.

[71] Anand Menon and Andrew Hurell, 'Politics Like No Other? Comparative Politics, International Relations and the Study of the EU,' West European Politics, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1996, pp. 386-402.

[72] Forster, 'The State of the Art', p. 24.

[73] For a few exceptions, see Christopher Hill, 'Theoretical and Conceptual Approaches to CFSP/ESDP', Presentation Fornet, Brussels, 25 April 2003; Anthony Forster, 'Defence and European Integration', Journal of Theoretical Politics, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1997 and K.E Jörgensen, Reflective Approaches to European Governance (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

[74] Roy Ginsberg, 'Narrowing the Capabilities-Expectation Gap', Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 37, No. 3, September 1999, p. 433.

LI has had on the academic debate about European integration, combined with the clear predictions and the testable hypotheses that it provides, it seems that this approach offers one of the more relevant framework to be tested against the development of the ESDP process. The following section will, therefore, in detail present some of the core assumptions that are associated with LI before this framework is tested in the final chapter of the study vis-à-vis the development of the ESDP process between 1998 and 2001.

Core Assumptions and Key Hypotheses of Liberal Intergovernmentalism

In order to provide an in-depth analysis of LI's relevance in reference to the development of the ESDP process, the study undertakes two tasks. Firstly, it provides an assessment of the content of LI and outlines its basic concepts and hypotheses about how the state governments interact in EU negotiations. This assessment is divided into a macro- and micro-level of analysis. The macro-level of analysis assesses the foundation of LI, which is based on the core concepts of 'unified actor behaviour' and 'state-centrism'. The micro-level of analysis assesses the structure of LI and the testable hypotheses of 'preference formation', 'bargaining process' and 'institutional choice' that are derived from the macro-level concepts. Secondly, the study presents the principal criticism of LI since its introduction in the early 1990s in order to identify what is already known about the potential pitfalls of this framework. The criticism is, in particular, reviewed based on three accounts; namely, the choice of case studies, the assumptions of what actors are involved in the integration process and the choice of dependent variables for causality.

However, it is first necessary to identify the sources that constitute the foundation of this study's interpretation of LI, which has been something of a moving target as the framework has evolved and improved since the foundation for it first appeared in 1991. It was first named Liberal Institutionalism and it was at that time intended primarily to explain the outcome of the negotiations leading to the Single European Act in 1986.[75] This study predominately assesses LI based on the presentation of the framework in the book *The Choice for Europe*, but the study also takes into account some of the minor modifications done in the latest article about LI in reference to the negotiations for the Amsterdam Treaty.[76] A major difference between earlier work by Moravcsik on LI and the version in *The Choice for Europe* is that the latter is considerably more ambitious in its scope since it tries to explain the dynamics for the integration process for all the five IGCs between 1955 and 1991.

---

[75] Andrew Moravcsik, 'Negotiating the Single European Act: National Interests and Conventional Statecraft in the EC', <u>International Organizations</u>, Vol. 45, 1991, pp. 19-56.
[76] It should be noted that LI has been renamed the Liberal Intergovernmental Approach in the article and is less ambitious in its attempt to clarify the European integration process since it is primarily focused on explaining the economic aspects of the IGC at Amsterdam. Moravcsik and Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam'.

Core Assumptions of LI

Andrew Moravcsik has stated that no single general theory can explain European integration just as there is no single theory of, for example, American politics.[77] LI thereby rejects most of the assumptions that other traditional grand theories, such as Intergovernmentalism and Neofunctionalism, would make in reference to the dynamics for further European integration. The central theme of LI is that the primary dynamics for further European integration are founded upon the interests of the state governments themselves rather than as a consequence of geopolitical developments or functional, technical or political spillover. As previously noted, LI, therefore, can instead be described as a state-centric mid-range theoretical framework for regional integration negotiations based on a rationalist framework, which draws much of its findings from Neorealism.[78]

Rational Unitary Actor Behaviour

A rationalist framework is based on the assumption that all state governments formulate their preferences based on a rational and objective calculation of their national self-interests and the material cost and benefits of certain decisions.[79] Rationality, in the context of LI, is consequently based on the assumption that the state governments arbitrate between different and at times competing domestic interests. Moreover, they form a policy that maximises their predominately economic interests, thereby acting according to their national interests rather than the collective interests of the Union when exposed to various options of European integration in the intergovernmental negotiation process.

This framework could then be seen in opposition to for example a constructivist framework, which assumes that the state governments formulate their preferences based on, for example, identities, cultures and norms. A rationalist paradigm would also argue against the autonomous influence of factors, such as democracy, ideology, international law, special relations or

---

[77] Ibid., p. 60.

[78] Principle differences with Neorealism are that LI contends that the primary source of the reason for the integration process can be found in economic interests rather than the strive for security. Moreover, the state governments' preferences are predominantly formulated based on domestic factors rather than by the external security environment. Ibid.

[79] Andrew Moravcsik, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach, <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, Vol. 31, No. 4, 1993, p. 480.

historic experiences and organisations, on world politics playing an important role in how the state governments formulate their basic preferences. It sought instead to highlight the accumulation and balancing of material power by sober, unsentimental statesmen and especially the limits which the international distribution of power places on such efforts. Taking such a rationalist approach Moravcsik thereby attempts to demystify European integration and claims that altruistic explanations for the integration process, such as attempting to prevent another war among the state governments or create a united Europe without nation states, fail to explain the most important causes for the integration.[80] Rather, the main argument of LI is that integration proceeded because it is in the political-economic interest of the state governments to engage in this process. There are obvious economic advantages of the integration process that improve the ability of the state governments to cope with an increasingly trans-national and interdependent world. Moravcsik thereby claims that the integration process reflects three factors: patterns of commercial advantage, the relative bargaining power of the important state governments and the incentive to enhance the credibility of agreements among the state governments.[81] Consequently, Moravcsik contends that the rational mid-range theory of economic interest, bargaining and institutional choice are more applicable and useful for the purpose of describing the nature of European integration than grand theories, such as Intergovernmentalism and Neofunctionalism.[82]

State-Centrism

Andrew Moravcsik rejects the idea that the integration process has progressed as a result of a technocratic practice whereby integration proceeds primarily as a result of unintended consequences caused by previous decisions. Unlike supranational bargaining theories, LI does not attribute any relevance to the hypothesis that supranational actors have an advantage in the distribution of information and ideas.[83] According to LI, low costs, which are relative to stakes, assure that information is spread to all the state governments. Moravcsik does not see any technocratic advantage for EU officials versus the state representatives in the bargaining process that would in any way give supranational actors an advantage. It is, first and foremost,

---

[80] Moravcsik, <u>The Choice of Europe</u>, p. 5.
[81] Ibid., p. 3.
[82] Ibid., p. 19.
[83] Moravcsik, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community', p. 477.

the asymmetry of preferences regarding the different issues that have a decisive impact on the outcome of the negotiations.[84]

Since LI presupposes that it is the states that are the only decisive actors in the process and that nothing precedes the sovereignty of the state, the negotiations are believed to take place in a non-coercive environment. Moreover, the state governments will not refrain from using their right to veto if they feel that it is in their interest to do so.[85] Furthermore, no state government will approve of decisions that will make them worse off either politically or economically.[86] The integration process cannot proceed if it is perceived as being detrimental to the interests of any of the state governments since the primary actors of the integration process are the state governments. LI rejects the idea that supranational actors, such as the Commission, the European Parliament or the ECJ, would have had a decisive impact on the integration process. Rather, LI states that, for example, a pro-active Commission can have unintended consequences and can actually further undermine its role in the integration process since it would be politically curtailed by the state governments.[87]

Structure and Key Hypotheses of LI

The aspect that makes LI different from most other European integration theories is its methodological approach and structure. LI is structured around three assumptions on how the state governments develop their preferences, what priorities they will have when bargaining and how they will act in the negotiation process. First, the preference formation of state governments is the aggregate sum of pressure from relevant domestic interest groups in combination with the interest of the state. Secondly, the intergovernmental bargaining process is a reflection of coalition building by the large states. Thirdly, the state governments are instrumental actors that will prioritise the preservation of state sovereignty and only pool or delegate sovereignty when it is in their interest to do so. Thus, the structure of LI is based on preference formation, interstate bargaining and institutional choice, from which a number of testable hypotheses can be discerned. For the sake of clarity, these testable hypotheses are

---

[84] Moravcsik, <u>The Choice for Europe</u>, p. 63.
[85] Consequently considerations, such as the state governments' self perceived standing and reputation within the integration process, are not important factors for determining the basis for how the state governments formulate their preferences.
[86] Correspondence with Andrew Moravcsik, 23 July 2003.
[87] Moravcsik, <u>The Choice for Europe</u>, p. 55.

presented in a table on page 51. However, given the complexity of LI, coupled with its far-reaching claims, LI's structure deserves to be explained in greater detail.

Preference Formation

The first part in providing an explanation for the results from international negotiations is to identify the preferences of the negotiating parties. LI defines preferences as 'an ordered and weighted set of values placed on future substantive outcomes often termed states of the world that might result from international political interaction'.[88] The preference reflects the aggregated objectives of those groups that can influence the state apparatus in combination with the state's preference.[89] LI makes an important distinction between preferences, which are exogenous to a specific international political environment, and policies, which are sheer instruments to achieve preferences. The preferences in reference to European integration can, according to LI, generate both positive- and zero-sum gains.

Geopolitical and economic interests are, according to LI, the two broad sources of motivation that have shaped preferences for or against European integration over the last 40 years.[90] Consequently, a successful analysis of the dynamics of European integration must, therefore, identify the relative weight of geopolitical- and economic preferences during the negotiation process. While the geopolitical school explains the economic integration process indirectly by claiming that the primary reason for these decisions was the consideration of security externalities, the economic school explains the integration process by identifying political-economic goals as the primary driving force for integration.[91]

According to LI, foreign and defence policy preferences vary among the state governments and are driven by political-economic imperatives or issue-specific interdependence based on politico-military threats.[92] However, changes in preference for integration do not occur as a

---

[88] Ibid.

[89] Moravcsik, 'Taking Preference Seriously', p. 517.

[90] Geopolitical interest reflects threats to national sovereignty and territorial integrity while economic interest in this context reflects interdependent economic factors, such as cross-border trade and movement of capital flows etc.

[91] Joanne Gowa, Allies, Adversaries, and International Trade (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994). Gowa has termed the process in which military-political goals are achieved by economic integration as 'security externalities'.

[92] Correspondence with Andrew Moravcsik, 23 July 2003.

consequence of geopolitical events, but as an onset of major economic problems and the preference varies across different policy fields of European integration. Thus, unintended consequences of a more international economic situation, such as capital mobility and rising trade flows, are the real dynamics for integration and follow as a result of the state governments' increasing awareness that these challenges cannot be met unilaterally.

The Interstate Bargaining Process

The preference formation process is, according to LI, followed by the interstate bargaining process, which identifies how the state governments' different preferences are converged into a predictive outcome. Asymmetrical preferences define relative power when the outcome of the negotiations is going to be affected by three specific realities; firstly, the value of unilateral alternatives in relation to the status quo, which make the foundation for credible commitments; secondly, the value of other coalitions, which reinforce credible commitments to hinder an agreement; thirdly, the opportunity for issue linkage or packet deals.[93] The state governments have very little flexibility in making concessions beyond their interests in economic issues, which leads the state governments to reach agreements that are a result of the lowest common denominator among the state governments' interests.[94] The results from the negotiations thereby reflect the intensity of the state governments' interests rather than just the sum of their preferences.

Regarding the forms of the negotiation process, LI claims that it tends to be the state governments with the most intense preferences that take a lead in the process. They work pro-actively with the intention to create coalitions and build support for their initiatives. The more reluctant state governments tend to be reactive to the initiatives and try to overhaul or slow down the process.[95] Supranational actors, such as the Commission, have no real impact on the outcome of the process, even though it formally has the power to initiate proposals. Most importantly the focal point in the negotiations is, according to LI, related to the comparative gains among the state governments in this process.[96] Each state government, therefore, tries to

---

[93] Moravcsik and Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', p. 63.
[94] Moravcsik, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community', p. 495.
[95] Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 61.
[96] Moravcsik and Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', p. 74.

influence the negotiations to assure that the results from the process are as close as possible to their preference.

Regarding the outcome of the negotiations, LI states that it is the governments that have the most to gain that will offer the most significant compromises since they are most eager to reach an agreement. The more reluctant states can, therefore, obtain considerable gains with regard to their demands for a compromise at certain stages of the negotiation process.[97] Credible threats of vetoes caused by policy constraints are of utmost importance for the process since other state governments are going to accommodate demands made in order to assure that they can obtain, at least, part of their preference. It is important to note that state governments with highly attractive unilateral alternatives and whose policy shifts are deeply appreciated by the other state governments are more likely to receive concessions because their co-operation is highly valuable. The alternative to unilateral vetoes is the formation of alternative coalitions, which strengthen the bargaining power of their members.[98] The negative externalities of such coalitions are the greatest for those state governments that have strong preference for an agreement on a certain issue. If these coalitions also include non-EU state governments or alternative kinds of co-operation outside the realm of the EU, such coalitions could have drastic consequences for the integration process, even in a long-term prospective.

Since the EU is a multidimensional actor that includes a wide variety of policy fields, interstate bargaining is always going to take place in different policy fields simultaneously. The matter of issue linkage is, therefore, always going to re-emerge when analysing the dynamics of the negotiation process. LI has a sceptical view of the frequencies of the issue linkages that are used in the integration process. According to the bargaining theory that LI is based upon, issue linkage only occurs when the state governments have shifting preferences on different issues and where marginal gains are more important in some areas rather than others.[99]

The reason why LI has a rather sceptical approach to issue linkage is that it contradicts LI predictions on preference formation. When domestic opposition is strong, there is very little room for cross-issue linkage and even within issues such linkage is rare since the preferences of the domestic groups are very strong and issue linkage often creates domestic losers.

---

[97] Moravcsik, <u>The Choice for Europe</u>, p. 63.
[98] Ibid. p. 64.
[99] Ibid. p. 65.

Consequently, issue linkage occurs more frequently with the intention to equalise gains rather than balance gains and loses so that the negotiations are parento-effective. This domestic dimension is, of course, more important in IGCs than in the day-to-day policy making of the EU since the agreements reached at the IGCs require ratification by the various national parliaments of the state governments. According to LI, issue linkage occurs under the following three circumstances: within issue-areas where the losses and the gains are internalised to the same domestic interest groups; where the gains are very apparent and the costs are devoted to vaguely defined domestic groups that might not have a strong institutional movement to protect their rights; and where the choice to implement the decision, i.e., the cost of the issue linkage, is vaguely defined, which creates a greater degree of uncertainty about the costs.[100] In principle, there is, according to LI, hardly any issue linkage in the negotiations between different fields of integration and linkages are only used as a last resort when everything else has failed. Issue linkage should, therefore, be most common in matters that concern side-payments or symbolic concessions on institutional agreements within the EU. Thus, according to LI, the state governments will thereby have a high degree of flexibility in the negotiation process because they do not need to accommodate domestic interest groups. According to LI, security externalities are the first aspect that can be relinquished during negotiations while the major bargaining demands are a reflection of economic interests.[101] There has been little debate and few interest groups are active in defence and security issues in the post-Cold War era. The domestic influence on these issues is, therefore, marginal and the state governments have, according to LI, considerable leeway to make concessions and are not constrained by domestic factors in defence and security issues.

In reality, it is only the 'big three', the United Kingdom, Germany and France, that have a decisive impact on the direction of the European integration process and integration will only proceed in areas where these three have converging interests.[102] After these three actors have developed their positions in a certain area, the other state governments will follow unless it is clearly to their detriment. Consequently, the medium and small states do not have a highly relevant impact on the orientation or development of the European integration processes. However, this being said, it should be noted that the negotiations are non-coercive since decisions are reached by consensus. All the state governments can and will, therefore, reject

---

[100] Ibid.
[101] Moravcsik, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community', p. 499.
[102] Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 5.

decisions that make them worse off than unilateral policies.[103] The primary distinction between the big three and the other state governments lie thereby in the agenda setting ability of the three big states.

The Institutional Choice Process

The third factor in LI's analytical approach is the aspect that assesses the institutional choices that the state governments make in reference to delegate or pool sovereignty or maintain a strict intergovernmental arrangement for the decision-making process. LI makes a distinction between the pooling of sovereignty, which means that decisions are taken by a two-thirds majority rather than by unanimity and the delegation of sovereignty, which is undertaken when state governments allow supranational actors to take autonomous decisions without interference from the state governments.[104]

According to LI, the decision to delegate sovereignty takes place when the state governments are concerned about compliance and the decision to pool sovereignty takes place when there is a risk of state governments trying to obstruct the decision making process. LI rejects the idea that it has been adherence to federalist ideology or technocratic management that has led the EU to develop some aspects of supranational decision making power. Rather, in line with the rational choice framework that LI represents, it states that the decision to pool or delegate decision making capacity varies according to the issues and the countries in question. Institutional pooling occurs only when there are common interests to do so because certain state governments might have an incentive not to ignore the rules under strict intergovernmental decision making procedures.[105] Furthermore, state governments with extreme preferences, which might be at a greater risk of being outvoted, would be more hesitant to allow for the decision making process to be supranational. The institutional form of the decision making process is organised to ensure that complacent and fair decisions are reached and the state governments limit the scope of the mandate for the process. To assure

---

[103] This is especially true regarding treaty amending negotiations since these are subject to parliamentary ratification. Ibid., p. 60.
[104] Ibid., p. 67.
[105] Moravcsik and Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', p. 76.

that the credibility of the process is maintained, it is, according to LI, necessary that the democratic involvement is limited.[106]

---

[106] Moravcsik, <u>The Choice for Europe</u>, p. 69.

Key hypotheses of Liberal Intergovernmentalism

Preference formation	
	● Preference formation is based on the aggregated sum of the domestic interest groups' preferences and the state government's own preferences. ● Preferences are economic rather than geopolitical. In the case of public goods, the economic imperatives are somewhat less apparent and can sometimes be challenged by issue specific interdependence. ● Domestic interest groups have a less relevant role in the preference formation in defence and security, which makes it easier for the state governments to make concessions in this field.
Interstate bargaining	
	● The state governments only will approve of integration if it accommodates their preferences. ● Asymmetries of preferences will determine the bargaining behaviour of the state governments. ● The state governments that will gain the most will offer the most significant side-payments. ● Credible threats of withdrawing or/and exclusion shift the outcome towards the states making the threat. ● Issue-linkage is rare and tends to be symbolic rather than substantial when it takes place. ● The convergence of the preference of the United Kingdom, France and Germany is a precondition for the bargaining process and it will set the agenda for the negotiations.

Institutional choice	● Institutional delegation and pooling takes place when joint gains, risks of withdrawal and future uncertainty demand a stable decision making capacity. ● State governments with extreme preferences tend to disapprove of transferring sovereignty. ● The state governments carefully limit the mandate of the supranational actors and any such actor that takes a proactive role in the integration process against the preference of the state governments will be politically curtailed.

Criticism of LI

When LI first appeared in the early 1990s, it caused considerable debate among academic circles within the field of European integration since it dismissed the value of previous theories of European integration in general and Neofunctionalism in particular. Given its rejection of all other European integration theories and the ambitious scope of LI in reference to explaining and predicting the European integration process, it comes as no surprise that it too has received considerable criticism from many academics with different perspectives within the field. The following summarises some of the principal criticisms of LI and how Andrew Moravcsik has responded to these objections.

The criticism of LI is predominately on three accounts. Firstly, the selection of case studies chosen for LI.[107] LI only focuses its analysis on the integration process of the IGC negotiations. When LI first appeared it was based on the assessment of the European Single Act in 1986. The empirical foundation of the most comprehensive LI text *The Choice for Europe* is based on the five IGCs from Messina to Maastricht and the latest article on LI is based on an analysis of the Amsterdam Treaty.

Daniel Wincott has suggested that this is the major weakness of LI since it fails to take into account the everyday policy making aspect of the EU, such as the daily decisions in the General Affairs Council or the continuous implementation of decisions carried out by the Commission.[108] Anand Menon and Andrew Hurrell also find fault with LI on this point and claim that it is necessary to create theoretical frameworks that both encapsulate the day-to-day business and the IGC negotiations. The EU should, therefore, in contrast to the assumptions of LI, be treated as a special case in regional integration studies.[109] Anthony Forster has asserted that LI gives a very incomplete picture of European integration since, even though LI consists of a solid micro foundation, with a set of hypotheses that could be disaggregated, it is still unable to explain how the IGCs are effected by the everyday policy making process.[110] James

---

[107] It should be noted that Andrew Moravcsik claims that LI is not centred on case studies since it covers all the IGCs between 1957 and 1991.

[108] Daniel Wincott, 'Institutional Interaction and European Integration: Toward an Everyday Critique of Liberal Intergovernmentalism', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1999.

[109] Menon and Harrell, 'Politics Like No Other?'.

[110] Forster, 'The State of the Art', p. 29.

Caporaso also suggests that the case study selection is unfortunate.[111] Rather than selecting cases of major policy changes, which might have included such incremental processes as the establishment of a distinctive Brussels-based bureaucratic style and culture, the development of formal and informal norms around the Council of Ministers, and the gradual acceptance of the supremacy of EC law, LI simplifies the process by only looking at the IGC negotiations. Fritz W. Scharpf also points out that the choice of case study is one of the drawbacks of LI, both because of its sole focus on the three big Member States and the fact that the day-to-day policy making process is not taken into account. [112] Moravcsik, however, claims that he sees the IGCs as occasions when the everyday policy making process is codified and consolidated. Thus, Moravcsik does not see a conflict by focusing on IGCs since they are a *reflection* of everyday policy making.

Secondly, LI has been attacked for failing to take into account all relevant actors of the integration process. LI is, in large parts, written in opposition to Neofunctionalism and, therefore, attributes almost no relevance to the role of the supranational actors in advancing the integration process. However, the ECJ has, for example, on several instances interpreted EC law in a way that has affected the direction of the process in a pro-integration manner. Daniel Wincott touches upon this criticism when he claims that the internal biases in LI, which exclude the analysis of actors like the Commission and the ECJ, fail to give a complete picture of the integration process.[113] Furthermore, Wincott points out that LI is too statically constructed to take into account the policy feedback of previous decisions that generate the expansion of power within the Commission, which follows as a result of the continuous augmentation of the integration process over the years.[114] Fritz Scharpf shows that there are indeed occasions when supranational actors are likely to exercise influence and have a decisive role in international negotiations, thereby explaining the 'exceptional' case of the Single European Act (SEA), in which Commission and Parliament officials played a significant role. Scharpf also points out the fact that all negotiations under the auspices of the Common Commercial Policy are conducted by the leadership of the Commission on behalf of the state governments, which is unavoidably going to give the Commission an influential role. Scharpf,

---

[111] James A. Caporaso, 'Toward a Normal Science of Regional Integration' in Helen Wallace, James A. Caporaso, Fritz W. Scharpf, Andrew Moravcsik, Review Section Symposium: The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht. Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1999.

[112] Fritz W. Scharpf, 'Selecting Cases and Testing Hypotheses' in Helen Wallace, James A. Caporaso, Fritz W. Scharpf, Andrew Moravcsik, Review Section Symposium: The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht.

[113] Daniel Wincott, 'Institutional Interaction and European Integration'.

[114] Ibid.

therefore, suggests that LI would need to modify its claims regarding the secondary relevance of supranational entrepreneurialship.[115]

Helen Wallace calls attention to the fact that the success of the Commission in the integration process is very difficult to measure since its role is somewhat more invisible than that of the state governments. However, there can be no doubt that it has on certain occasions played a central role in advancing the integration process.[116] Wallace also criticises the choice of actors from a different perspective. She points out that one apparent criticism of LI is as a result of its sole focus on British, French and German roles in the integration process.[117] She, furthermore, shows that, even though their relative importance is undeniable in the history of the EU, other states have also played a very important role, albeit much less powerful, in coalition building and EU Presidencies, which should deserve more attention. Moravcsik responds to this critique by stating that the role of the Commission does indeed matter within the integration process, especially in daily decisions.[118] However, even when taking the consequences of policy feedback into account, the Commission's role is only on the margins of the integration process since it lacks agenda-setting authority, especially in the IGC, where it is the state governments that are the primary actors.[119] Furthermore, Moravcsik claims that if the assumption is made that the integration process is pushed forward with supranational entrepreneurialship, this creates a doubtful presupposition that the process is, in reality, brought forward by unintended consequences from the perspective of the state governments. As for solely focusing on the three large states, Moravcsik agrees that it would be desirable to have a more detailed account of the role of some of the smaller states, but he maintains that the three large states were by far the most important and influential and that the integration process could not have processed without these three being onboard.[120]

Thirdly, there has been substantial criticism of LI on the basis of the manner in which conclusions are drawn within this theoretical framework. The methodological approach of LI is founded on a system where conclusions can be drawn based on hypotheses of micro-level analyses of EU negotiations, instead of being, for example, deduced based on intuitive

---

[115] Fritz W. Scharpf, 'Selecting Cases and Testing Hypotheses'.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Andrew Moravcsik, 'Liberal Intergovernmentalism and Integration: A Rejoinder', Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1995, p. 612.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Andrew Moravcsik, 'A Response to James Caporaso, Fritz Scharpf and Helen Wallace', in Review Section Symposium: The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht.

geopolitical arguments. However, these micro-level analyses are, according to several academics, founded on very general assumptions that are difficult to prove wrong.[121] An inherent problem of LI is, therefore, identifying the correct variables and the focal point in the causation of the dynamics of European integration.

While the outcome of, for example, the ESDP negotiations can be evaluated and the positions of the state governments can fairly easily be revealed after assessing the minutes of Council meetings, there are great difficulties in analysing aspects, such as intentions and motives, that formulate the preferences with a satisfactory degree of certainty. Even though LI provides a detailed analysis of the factors that effect preference formation, there are, by nature, always aspects that are going to be omitted by such a framework since each negotiation is conducted under a unique set of circumstances. This tendency is especially evident in defence integration, where LI claims to be able to predict the outcome of such negotiations without devoting considerable efforts to assess geopolitical aspects. Anthony Forster has, therefore, claimed that LI has failed to disaggregate the concepts of 'nation state' and 'national government' in the IGC and consequently has failed to grasp how the state governments pick and chose in these negotiations.[122] It also seems as if LI has been unable to open up the 'black box' of the nation state since LI is founded on a deterministic notion of rational choice that corresponds poorly to the empirical reality. In short, the empirical track record of European integration, according to Forster, points to the fact that the integration process and the preference formation process are much more multidimensional than LI would suggest.[123] The nature of the political system in democracies, where governments are elected through popular elections, leads to the fact that the state governments very often are more concerned with how they come across in the domestic political arena than what they agree on in the EU. Thus, the LI's parameters of preference are somewhat incomplete. Anthony Forster, therefore, claims that LI does not explain outcomes adequately and fails to identify all relevant variables for the preference formation process.[124] Regarding the vagueness of LI, Forster states that LI is deliberately so ambiguous in its methodological approach that it thereby manages to adapt the empirical facts

---

[121] See, for example, Forster, <u>Britain and the Negotiation of the Maastricht Treaty</u>; Wincott, 'Institutional Interaction and European Integration' and Menon and Hurell, 'Politics Like No Other?'.
[122] Forster, 'The State of the Art', p. 20.
[123] Forster, <u>Britain and the Negotiation of the Maastricht Treaty</u>.
[124] Ibid., p. 364.

to the theoretical framework.[125] This fact, according to Forster, undermines the analytical reach of LI to a pre-theory of European integration.[126]

Along the same line of argumentation, Anand Menon and Andrew Hurell assert that LI is so vague that it can be applied to any policy field and claim that it can explain and predict the dynamics of the integration process.[127] Since its micro-foundation is based on a three-step analysis, where the first variable claims that issue-specific interdependence creates the demand for further integration and the two other steps, bargaining and institutional choice, are drawn from traditional negotiation theory, the assessment that LI makes is not sufficiently adopted to the unique set of circumstances that surrounds EU negotiations and the conclusions, therefore, correspond poorly to the empirical record.

Daniel Wincott claims in keeping with the principles of epistemology that LI is insufficiently formal and does not make a necessary distinction between deductive and inductive conclusions. According to Wincott, the vagueness of LI leads it to become irrelevant and lose its explanatory value. It, therefore, seems that LI comes close to failing what Karl Popper calls the principle of 'falsifiabillity', which claims that a theory has to be stated clearly enough that it could be proven to be wrong.[128] William I. Hitchcock also notes that Moravcsik at times overstates his arguments by claiming that economic priorities almost always supersede geopolitical priorities when it is almost impossible to separate these two motive forces.[129] Thus, there is an inherent uncertainty regarding on what basis Moravcsik draws his conclusions. Along the same lines of deduction, Helen Wallace criticises LI for solely focusing on political economic factors by pointing out that the primacy of political economic factors does not mean that all geopolitical factors are irrelevant.[130] This tendency to over play the economic factors at the expense of other explanations makes LI come across as being very biased towards a certain explanation.[131]

---

[125] Ibid. p. 366.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Menon and Hurell, 'Politics Like No Other?'.
[128] Karl R. Popper, <u>The Logic of Scientific Discovery</u> (New York: Harper and Row, 1968).
[129] William I. Hitchcock, 'Book Review of Andrew Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe', <u>The American Historical Review</u>, December, 1999.
[130] Helen Wallace, 'Piecing the Integration Jigsaw Together' in Helen Wallace, James A. Caporaso, Fritz W. Scharpf, Andrew Moravcsik, Review Section Symposium: The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht.
[131] An indicative example of this is the dialogue between Andrew Moravcsik and Stanley Hoffman in regards to the French veto of the British application to the EC in 1963. Hoffman, being a well-known expert on the De Gaulle era, states in response to Moravcsik's controversial claim that the French veto of the British application to

The so-called 'Garbage Can' School represented by, among others, Jeremy Richardson and John Petersen also questions the assumption of rationality that LI's conclusions are drawn upon.[132] This school of thought claims that issue linkage and log rolling are key components of the negotiation process. Michael Cohen takes the argument further and claims that multilateral negotiations are, in stark contrast to the assumptions of LI, characterised by problems of identifying preferences and the inability of the state governments to realise the long-term implications of their decisions.[133] Moravcsik's answer to this critique is that LI is the only theoretical framework where the line of argumentation is possible to follow at the micro level with testable hypotheses and that most mid-range theories are constructed on the same premises as LI. Hence, if LI should be dismissed on the grounds of deduction, almost all social science theories should be dismissed for the same reasons.[134]

---

join the EC was based on economic rather than political prerogatives that the economic factors mattered, in the French view. This was given the fact that they set the conditions for modernization and grandeur. However, the source of Charles De Gaulle's preference regarding the British application was, first and foremost, found at the grand strategic level rather than as a reflection of domestic based interest groups. See Stanley Hoffman, 'Comment on Moravcsik', Journal of Cold War Studies, Vol. 2, No. 3, 2000.

[132] See, for example, Jeremy Richardson, 'Governments, Interest Groups and Policy Change', Political Studies, Vol. 48, No. 5, 2000 and John Peterson, 'Decision Making in the European Union: Toward a Framework for Analysis', Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2000.

[133] Michael Cohen, James March and Johan P. Olsen, 'A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice', Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 17, 2001.

[134] Andrew Moravcsik, 'Liberal Intergovernmentalism and Integration', p. 613.

Chapter Three

3. The Negotiation Process: The Evolution of the ESDP - Presidency by Presidency

'The ESDP should be nominated to replace US-Canadian relations as the most boring issue on the transatlantic circuit'[135]

Introduction

The development of the ESDP has been fast by any international yardstick and stunningly swift by EU standards.[136] This is rather surprising given the sensitivity that has historically surrounded defence co-operation within the EU framework. There have been few attempts to combine defence and European integration since the failure of the European Defence Community (EDC) in 1954 and none of them successful. Put in an historical perspective, the rapid development of the ESDP process between 1998 and 2001, therefore, comes across as being of an almost revolutionary character, especially compared to the almost complete absence of co-operation within this sphere of integration during the last half century.[137] It is undoubtedly the case that once the state governments agreed to set the political guidelines to pursue this line of policy, they have acted very swiftly. Still, even though most state governments had a fairly clear view of what they wanted the ESDP to be all about by 1998 and the process clearly included some important pre-set 'do's and don'ts', none of them could precisely predict the shape and content of it by 2001. The basic point here is that the ESDP process, as all other aspects of European integration, is partly about the difference between input and output and the middle game is negotiations. This middle game demands compromises and concessions, which make it difficult to predict the outcome of the process since there are so many factors that tend to influence the

---

[135] This citation is taken from an interview with former Pentagon official Richard Perle in *The Washington Times*. Even though the author of this study does not always agree with what Richard Pearle says regarding international affairs, it is easy to sympathise with this statement given the complexity of the tedious structure of the ESDP process. The Washington Times, 8 December 1999.
[136] For a contrast see former Chairman of NATO's Military Committee General Klaus Nauman's statement on the swiftness of the development of the ESDP: 'If in NATO we had ever had the same speed, NATO would have been a marvellous organisation by this point in time', Klaus Nauman, oral witness to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 13 December 2001.
[137] For example, see Gilles Adréani, Christoph Bertram and Charles Grant, 'Europe's Military Revolution', Centre for European Reform, 1998.

basis on how the state governments reach agreements. Thus, it is possible to trace a certain evolutionary character of this process, where details have been settled and compromises reached at different stages on key defining issues that have gradually formed the shape and content of the ESDP process.

Consequently, in order to grasp the character and basic features of the ESDP process, it is helpful to review the progress made during each Presidency of the EU between the Austrian Presidency that commenced in July 1998 and the Belgian Presidency that concluded in December 2001. This is because the founding cornerstones of the ESDP were laid during these years.[138] Furthermore, this corresponds to the empirical aim of this study; namely, to analyse and trace the development of the ESDP within this time period in order to cover a lacuna of diplomatic history within the field of European integration.[139] Of course, this cannot be done regarding every element agreed upon because of the myriad of details that this process has entailed. Such an approach would, furthermore, make the chapter very descriptive at the cost of qualitative analysis. Rather, the aim of this chapter is to assess the broad evolution of the development of the ESDP on some key defining issues, such as the setting of military and civilian capability targets, the efforts to establish EU-NATO relations and the asymmetrical dichotomy between intergovernmentalism and federalism in favour of the former within this process.[140] The intention is to visualise how the process has been driven forward, and what some of its defining characteristics and the empirical content of the process have entailed.

While this chapter focuses on the *process* for the development of the ESDP, i.e., the main negotiation aspects and its outcomes, chapter five then focuses in detail on what basis some of the state governments, with particular strong preferences, have formulated these *within* this process. The final chapter thereafter tests what guidance the key hypotheses of LI can or cannot provide in order to accurately explain and predict the development of the ESDP, particularly

---

[138] Hence, the emphasis here is not on the accomplishments of each of the specific Presidencies *per se*; rather they are used to provide a timeline to assess the progress of the ESDP process between 1999 and 2001.

[139] There has been some good analytical work done on the development of the ESDP process between 1999 and 2001; see, for example, Jolyon Holworth, 'European Integration and Defence: The Ultimate Challenge' and Simon Duke, The EU and Crisis Management. These studies have been excellent works in their own right, but they have not looked at the negotiation process for the development of the ESDP *per se* and, more importantly, have not been based on interviews with persons who have been associated with the process.

[140] The decision taken in 2001 to finalise the period to be researched is based on the fact that the EU's crisis management capabilities were declared partly operational at the European Council Summit in Laeken in December 2001. It should, however, be noted that there did still exist very serious shortfalls in the capability to conduct high intensity military crisis management operations.

regarding the preference formation process and the factors that seem to have influenced the outcome of the negotiations.

Institutional Ramifications

The ESDP process has been subject to some important institutional ramifications, which are necessary to take into consideration when assessing the evolution of the process. The formal responsibility for advancing the process has been given to the state government holding the EU Presidency. To a certain extent, it has been the degree of effectiveness and commitment of each EU Presidency to the ESDP process that has determined the amount of progress made during each Presidency. The Presidency of the Union entails four principal functions, which, although not specified in the Treaty of the European Union, affect the pace and direction of the integration process and thereby have a bearing on the progress of the ESDP process. Firstly, it prepares and administrates the work in the Council by scheduling and setting the minutes of the meeting. Furthermore, it provides the necessary information for these meetings through the publication of reports and assessments of various issues. Secondly, the Presidency is assigned the role of providing a programme and a list of priorities that it intends to work on during the Presidency. Thirdly, the Presidency should work as a consensus builder and an honest broker between different parties in order to facilitate the grounds, on which the decisions are taken. Fourthly, the Presidency is assigned the task of representing the Union externally vis-à-vis other countries and organisations. This means that it is designated the role of taking the lead on establishing relations between the EU and organisations like the UN and NATO, which entails important implications for the ESDP process.

The Presidency is assisted by the Council Secretariat, which among other things provides advice and information about procedural issues as well as the positions of the other state governments on various matters. The Council Secretariat, therefore, provides certain continuity in the integration process that the rotating Presidency cannot account for since the Council reflects the Union's institutional memory. There are, of course, structural differences between smaller and larger Member States in their ability to handle the Presidency. Smaller states have a disadvantage insofar as they normally have smaller bureaucracies and, therefore, tend to rely more on the Council Secretariat. Their weight and influence in international affairs are also considerably smaller than the larger states and they consequently sometimes experience difficulties in

representing the Union internationally. However, on the other hand, the Presidencies of the smaller states tend to be appreciated since they often promote policies that are in the interest of the Union at large rather than specific national interest based policies.[141]

The ESDP process has been taken forward on three different levels. The quarterly meetings by the Heads of States at the European Councils constitute the highest level. It has been at this level, where the final accords often have been reached on ESDP matters and issue linkage has been able to be conducted since the Heads of States are responsible for all areas of European integration. These meetings have also provided the final political impetus for the process when this has seemed necessary or desirable. It is also on these occasions that the Presidency Conclusions and the Presidency Reports have been presented and these products have, in reality, constituted the essence of the ESDP process. The second level of meetings has been the monthly meetings of the Foreign Ministers and occasionally the informal Defence Ministers' meetings, where the state governments have tended to use the opportunity to facilitate political compromises on technical details and have paved the way for final decisions. At the lowest level, the process has been preceded by the efforts of the of Member States' Permanent Representation to the Union. There also exists a number of working groups that deal with specific aspects of the ESDP process. Here, the legal aspects have been worked out and the actors have drafted articles and negotiated the wordings of these articles. There is no standard structure for how a concept or idea is developed within the EU. However, it is possible to trace a natural progress that most new proposals tend to undergo within the EU framework. First, a concept or a proposal is launched at a European Council Summit or at a General Affairs Council Summit. Secondly, it is defined and structured by the state governments. Thirdly, the idea is transformed into a draft article at the Permanent Representative level. Fourthly, the concepts become subject to intense negotiations between the state governments depending on their preferences.

---

[141] Hanna Ojanen, 'Participation and Influences: Finland and Sweden Post-Amsterdam Developments of the CFSP', Occasional Paper, No. 11, Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, 2000.

The Austrian Presidency, July-December 1998

At the beginning of the Austrian Presidency there were no expectations to make progress on the European defence issue and the Austrian Government had not made any preparations for taking the lead on this issue.[142] However, at the informal EU Council Summit in Pörtschach in October 1998, Prime Minister Tony Blair somewhat unexpectedly announced that the United Kingdom for the first time ever was willing to reconsider its views on the role of the EU and WEU within the European security structure.[143] Blair mentioned different options for how this could be done and proclaimed that the United Kingdom did not have a blue print in mind for this issue. The only prerogatives that the United Kingdom brought to the negotiation table were that the institutional aspects were of secondary importance, the process would lead to an enhancement of European military capabilities and it would not undermine NATO's role in the European security structure. It should also be noted that France had proposed similar ideas at the time. President Jacques Chirac had in August proposed that the WEU should become the defence agency within the confines of the EU and thereafter become progressively absorbed by the EU.[144]

The First Informal EU Defence Ministers' Meeting

Shortly after Blair's announcement, the Austrian Presidency called for the first ever-informal meeting of the EU Defence Ministers to take place. The initiative for the meeting was taken by Austrian Defence Minister Werner Fasslabend. This was based on his own assessment 'that the time was right' for this given the current security environment, in which the EU could not work as a credible actor in defence and security affairs if it did not have the ability to resort to military force.[145] In a statement to *The Guardian*, Werner Fasslabend expressed the general feeling at the time caused by the deteriorating situation in Kosovo by saying that the Europeans had to get to grips with conflicts on the continent if necessary also without the co-operation of the United States —'before hundreds of thousands of people have been killed and millions driven from their homes'.[146]

---

[142] Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.
[143] Informal European Summit, Pörtschach, 25-26 October, Press conference with Prime Minister Tony Blair.
[144] See the speech by Jacques Chirac to the meeting of French Ambassadors, Paris, 26 August 1998.
[145] Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.
[146] The Guardian, 5 November 1998.

However, the proposal by Fasslabend for the historic first-ever informal EU Defence Ministers' Meeting was almost defeated because it was met with a great deal of reluctance within the Austrian Government by both the Federal Chancellor Victor Klima and the Vice-Federal Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel. According to Fasslabend, it was only thanks to the intervention of former EU Commissioner Hans van deer Brook that these key persons could be persuaded that it was absolutely vital that the formative stage of European defence was used to make it possible for the EU to 'get its act together' in this regard.[147] It should also be noted that the Austrian Presidency was led by a relatively new coalition government, whose persistence regarding the question of Austrian neutrality was somewhat less stringent compared to the former government. Also the Social Democratic Party, normally very critical of ideas with regards to relinquishing Austrian neutrality, was able to be persuaded to approve of the meeting since it was assumed that this initiative could facilitate a more Europeanist defence structure, which was the party's preference.[148] Furthermore, it gave the Austrian Presidency an opportunity to provide the venue for the first informal Defence Ministers' meeting within the EU framework, which was an important incentive in itself since this was perceived as a boost to an otherwise rather lame Presidency.[149]

The call for the meeting was overall well received by the Member States since it was seen as providing a glimmer of hope to a Europe that clearly was bothered by its inability to deal in particular with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Kosovo.[150] It is interesting to note that the Austrian Presidency did not act at the request of France or the United Kingdom. These state governments that would later come to dominate the ESDP process, starting with the German Presidency, did not exert any pressure on the Austrian Presidency to pursue any specific initiative.[151] The reluctant partners involved in this meeting were Sweden and, to a lesser degree, Ireland. The meeting caused severe concern within the Swedish Government since it was felt that further developments in this field could threaten Sweden's non-alignment.[152] Sweden had previously invested considerable political capital and energy during the Amsterdam negotiations

---

[147] According to Fasslabend, it is also possible that the fact that he was, at the time, the longest serving Defence Minister within the EU and the experience and credibility that this brought with it played a role in both galvanising support within his own government as well as gaining the backing of other state governments for holding the summit. Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.
[148] Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.
[149] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.
[150] Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.
[151] Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.
[152] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.

in order to assure that the defence co-operation was kept outside the confines of the EU. Moreover, the inclusion of the Petersberg Tasks in the Treaty of the European Union was as far as Sweden could go on the issue of European defence.[153] Sweden, therefore, tried to stop the informal Defence Ministers' Meeting, but was unable to muster any substantial support from any of the other state governments, with the exception of Ireland, since the perceived external security environment indicated the wisdom of the meeting.[154] The option of vetoing the meeting was at this stage not seriously considered despite Sweden's grave discomfort with it. There was an assumption among some leading Swedish policy makers that 'this is something that you just don't do especially as a small and new member of the Union'.[155] The fact that it was a non-aligned state government that had proposed to have the Summit made it all the more difficult for Sweden to gain support for not having it. In hindsight, it is possible that this was one of the most important factors for the future development of the ESDP process since it indicated that the non-aligned state governments were more or less onboard this process. The meeting, which took place in Vienna on 4 November, did not have a specific agenda and the intention was to have an open discussion and brainstorming session about European defence.[156] At the end of the meeting the United Kingdom announced that it wanted to see a streamlining of institutions and could consider a merger between some functions of the WEU and the EU.[157] The former as an organisation would then have fulfilled its role regarding European security. This position was supported by most of the other state governments.

The St Malo Summit

At St Malo on 4 December 1998, the United Kingdom and France for the first time ever stated a common view on European defence by claiming that the EU would be better able to play its full role in international affairs if it had access to autonomous military resources.[158] Thus, St Malo

---

[153] The IGC and the Security and Defence Dimension – Towards an Enhanced EU Role in Crisis Management, Memorandum, 25 April 1996, Finland, Sweden.
[154] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003. The most natural ally for Sweden on this issue would have been Finland but it did not share Sweden's concerns. Furthermore, Finland did not want to be perceived as a non-constructive partner in the European integration process since it was preparing to take-over the EU Presidency after Germany in 1999. Finland was also assured that the Austrian initiative would not cause any problems for Finland since Austria was a non-aligned country. Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 20 February 2004.
[155] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.
[156] Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.
[157] Interview with Political Advisor at the Foreign and Common Wealth Office, 21 September 2001.
[158] Franco-British Summit, Joint Declaration on European Defence, 4 December 1998.

was the conciliation point between the United Kingdom and France and constituted the consolidation of a process that had been initiated by Blair at Pörtschach. The achievements at St Malo were also reinforced by the signing of a letter of intent on defence co-operation between France and the United Kingdom in order to make it easier to undertake joint military operations.[159] Yet even though the Franco-British agreement was necessary, but not sufficient to develop the ESDP, it did, in the words of the Policy Director at the Ministry of Defence Sir Richard Hatfield, 'let the genie out of the bottle'.[160] For both the United Kingdom and France, it marked an agreement with ambitious goals, an uncertain end state, no guaranteed outcome and no easy escape route.

The negotiations between France and the United Kingdom at St Malo included a wide set of options ranging from a completely autonomous European defence structure to an ESDP in the closest possible co-operation with NATO. The United Kingdom, with its strong Atlanticist preferences and a pre-eminent position within NATO, preferred to have a solution, whereby the EU and NATO would be as closely knit together as possible. France, with its strong Europeanist preferences and being outside NATO's integrated military command structure, was striving for a solution with the maximum amount of independence for the EU vis-à-vis NATO. This constant struggle between the Atlanticist and Europeanist preferences would continue during the years to come and were the most fundamentally divisive aspect of the entire ESDP process.

The main negotiators during the St Malo meeting were on the British side, Policy Directors at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and at the Ministry of Defence Eremy Jones-Parry and Richard Hatfield, and their French opposite numbers, Gilles Adréani and Henry Zipper de Fabiani, who together worked out an agreement for their political masters during the night of 4 December. Consequently, all of the main concerns of the negotiating parties were taken into consideration. Prime Minister Tony Blair and President Jacques Chirac then had less then 15 minutes to consult the final document before they presented the agreement at the press conference.[161] The agreement was based on a compromise and a trade of words between France and the United Kingdom. The word 'NATO' appears two times in the document, as does the word 'autonomous'.[162] It was an explicit demand from the United Kingdom that the word

---

[159] UK/French Letter of Intent on Co-operation in Crisis Management and Operations.
[160] Richard Hatfield, 'The Consequences of St Malo', Institute de Francais des Relations Internationale, Paris, 28 April 2000.
[161] Interview with Political Advisor at the Foreign and Common Wealth Office, 21 September 2001.
[162] Interview with Political Advisor at the Foreign and Common Wealth Office, 21 September 2001.

'autonomous' be used instead of 'independent' since the latter would indicate a considerably stronger separation between NATO and the EU.[163] Basically there were four main points that France and the United Kingdom had agreed upon at the St Malo declaration.[164] Firstly, the EU needed the capacity for autonomous action backed by credible military force, the means to decide to use it and a readiness to do so. Secondly, NATO remained the foundation for collective defence through the North Atlantic Treaty, but a collective defence commitment through Article V of the modified Brussels Treaty had to be maintained. Thirdly, the EU would need to obtain the ability to assess and analyse intelligence and facilitate the decision-making ability in military issues on a strategic level. Fourthly, all structures for decision-making within the field of security and defence had to be based on intergovernmentalism. The institutions of the European Community would not have a role within this process.[165] The St Malo declaration came as something of a surprise to the other state governments, even if the other EU state governments were aware that something would result from the summit regarding the future of European defence. Yet the writings provided the state governments with more questions than answers, and there was a genuine uncertainty as to where this initiative would take the integration process within the field of security and defence co-operation.[166]

The European Council Summit in Vienna

The United Kingdom had declared that it did not intend to make any major advances on the St Malo initiative at the European Council Summit in Vienna 11-12 December. Rather what it wanted was an acceptance to further accelerate the process during the German Presidency. The critical aspect of the Summit was, therefore, how the other state governments would position themselves vis-à-vis the St Malo agreement. The key negotiation issues were whether the state governments should recognise or welcome the initiative taken at St Malo and whether they should wait to take any action on this issue until after both NATO's Washington Summit and the Amsterdam Treaty had come into force on 1 May 1999 or if they should entrust the German Presidency with advancing the process immediately. The federally oriented countries, namely, Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, Spain and Italy, welcomed the initiative at St Malo as a basis

---

[163] Interview with Charles Grant, 22 September 2002.
[164] Richard Hatfield, 'The Consequences of St Malo', Institute de Francais des Relations Internationale, Paris, 28 April 2000.
[165] Franco-British Summit, <u>Joint Declaration on European Defence</u>, 4 December 1998.
[166] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.

for advancing the debate on European defence. They were also very careful to stress that they wanted a complete merger between the WEU and the EU within the second pillar.[167] Greece stressed that it was vital that the EU was better able to take responsibility for crises in its vicinity, in particular in the Balkans, and, therefore, welcomed the initiative. It also wanted a complete integration of the WEU into the EU. These countries also wanted to give the green light to the German Presidency to speed up the process. At the Council Summit, the Commission, which must be described as likeminded in this respect, also applauded the initiative taken at St Malo, but it was concerned that the agreement had totally sidelined its role in the process.[168]

The strong supporters of Atlanticism, Portugal and the Netherlands, were considerably more defensive and emphasised the importance that the role of NATO would not be undermined by the process and non-EU state governments that were part of NATO would be able to participate in the process.[169] Both Portugal and the Netherlands wanted to slow down the process and wait for the results of the Washington Summit before any more action was taken. It should, in this context, be noted that the largest party in the Netherlands, the liberal-conservative People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD), had voiced rather stern opposition to the agreement and there was, at least, initially within the Netherlands a great deal of ambiguity to the St Malo initiative because of the implications it could have for transatlantic relations.[170] The Netherlands was somewhat calmed by the fact that the United States had not voiced any major disagreement with the initiative, partly because the Clinton administration had great faith in Tony Blair, but also partly because it needed the support of the United Kingdom in Operation *Desert Fox* in Iraq.[171] Yet it should be noted that Secretary of State Madeleine Albright had in an article in *The Financial Times* a few days after the St Malo Summit set out some important American guidelines for the ESDP process, which also reflected the concerns of the Netherlands.[172]

It is interesting to note that the non-aligned states were rather divided in their positions on the desirability of the St Malo agreement. Austria did, of course, welcome it as it thought of it as a

---

[167] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.

[168] Interview with representative from the Commission, 22 June 2004.

[169] Interview with Representative from the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 30 July 2004.

[170] Interview with representative from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 6 November 2001.

[171] The United States and the United Kingdom engaged in punitive air strikes against Iraq a few days after the St Malo agreement because of the unwillingness of Saddam Hussein's regime to co-operate with the United Nation's disarmament efforts. Charles Cogan, The Third Option –The Emancipation of European Defense 1989-2000, Praeger, Westport, 2001, p. 101.

[172] Albright stated in the article that there were three D's that the EU should heed as it developed the ESDP process: no discrimination of non-EU allies, no duplication of NATO resources and no decoupling of the transatlantic link. See Madeline Albright, 'The Right Balance Will Secure NATO's Future', The Financial Times, 7 December 1998.

product of its initiative during its Presidency. Ireland expressed its criticism of the initiative internally among the other state governments at the Council Summit, but its public diplomacy was careful not to voice any major opposition.[173] To understand Ireland's concern, it is important to acknowledge the country's domestic political dimension, which emphasises a strong distaste for NATO in general and the dimension of nuclear deterrence in particular.[174] Any steps that would be perceived as Ireland accommodating closer relations between the EU and NATO would generate domestic political opposition. Other Irish concerns also regarded the use of the word 'force projection' in the St Malo agreement, which, in the Irish view, evoked unfavourable connotations of the offensive use of military force. Ireland, therefore, wanted to wait to advance the ESDP process until after the Amsterdam Treaty provisions had come into force and also asked the other state governments to recognise the sensitive domestic political situation in Ireland in regards to this dimension of European integration.

At the European Council Summit, Finland expressed strong support for the initiative taken at St Malo.[175] Prime Minister Paavo Lipponen also stated that he had received assurances that France and the United Kingdom had acknowledged that considerations had to be given to the non-aligned countries in order not to encounter difficulties. He, therefore, did not see any reason to try to slow down the process.[176] Sweden stated at the Council Summit that it was good that a discussion had emerged on how to strengthen the CFSP's ability to deal with armed conflicts and that it was very important that the non-aligned countries would be able to participate on an equal basis in this process. However, it was very reluctant to the idea of a merger between the WEU and the EU and, like Ireland, it also voiced similar concerns about the use of the word 'force projection'. Sweden did not want the EU to take any more steps within this process, at least not until the Amsterdam Treaty had come into force.[177]

In the end, the state governments agreed to welcome the impetus injected by France and the United Kingdom into the process. There was a rather intensive debate whether the words 'recognise' or 'welcome' should be used in the Presidency Conclusions. Sweden and Ireland would have preferred to use 'recognise' rather then 'welcome', but had to back down on this

---

[173] Interview with representative from the Irish Ministry of Defence, 28 May 2004.
[174] Interview with representative from the Irish Ministry of Defence, 28 May 2004.
[175] Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Defence, 20 February 2004.
[176] Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Defence, 20 February 2004.
[177] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

issue because the other state governments were very persistent on using the latter.[178] The Presidency Conclusions also declared that the positions of various states had to be taken into account, including the obligations of some Member States to NATO. Moreover, the state governments were, in the end, able to agree on requesting the German Presidency to move the process further on, rather than wait for the outcome of the Washington Summit and the implementation of the Amsterdam Treaty.[179] The outcome of the negotiations indicated a rather strong momentum for the St Malo initiative and it forced some of the reluctant and minimalist-oriented state governments, such as Sweden and Ireland, to give in to the pressure exercised by the more positively inclined state governments.

The German Presidency, January-June 1999

The task of moving the Franco-British initiative forward and implementing a common European policy on this issue fell, as previously noted, to Germany, which took over the EU Presidency in January 1999. The next six months would prove to be a dynamic and volatile time for the EU caused by the introduction of the Euro and the so-called double crisis; namely, the resignation of the Santer Commission and the Kosovo conflict.[180] The declaration of intent for the German Presidency by Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer to the European Parliament on 27 January was prudent and vigilant in regards to the ESDP and focused almost solely on institutional issues and the future relations between the EU and the WEU. It was clear that the Presidency did not have a clear road map of where it wanted to go with the ESDP process, even though it had been exposed to working with this issue in the lead-up to the Amsterdam IGC. It also seemed as if it lacked a certain degree of self-confidence in this new area of European integration, where traditionally Germany has had a weak role both because of its size, in terms of proportionally limited capabilities, and obvious historical reasons.[181] The German Presidency's Paper on European Security and Defence, which was published on 25 February, raised considerably more questions than providing guidelines for the development of the ESDP process.[182] The paper's main focus was on institutional matters, rather than on capabilities and it only elaborated on the modalities for military crisis management.

---

[178] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.
[179] European Council Vienna, 11-12 December 1998, Presidency Conclusions.
[180] Wolfgang Brauner, 'Evaluation of the German Presidency', Dossier, Deutsche-Aussenpolitik, 2000, p.1.
[181] Interview with representative from the Council Secreteriat, 22 July 2003.
[182] German Presidency Paper on Strengthening European Security and Defence Policy, Bonn, 24 February 1999.

Germany had not been pre-consulted about the St Malo initiative and this caused considerable frustration within German policy-shaping circles, both because Germany was holding the subsequent EU Presidency and Germany and France had held a bilateral summit the day before the St Malo Summit, where nothing was mentioned to Germany about the forthcoming agreement between the United Kingdom and France.[183] This 'culture of secrecy' that surrounded Franco-British co-operation within the ESDP process was a source of constant aggravation among the other state governments throughout the ESDP process.[184] During these six months the German Presidency was within this field almost entirely dominated by France and the United Kingdom, which set the agenda for the ESDP process. However, the German Presidency, broadly speaking, appreciated this initiative and it was satisfied that France and the United Kingdom for once actually were able to agree on a common European Defence and Security policy.[185] It should in this regard also be noted that it had been an objective of Germany ever since its unification to promote some form of European defence co-operation with supranational elements. Thus, Germany regarded the ESDP process as the *first move* in this direction.[186] Furthermore, Germany, in line with its pro-European ideology, perceived that after the introduction of the Euro the ESDP would be the next big project for the European integration process.[187]

The Eltville Meeting

The first step forward by the German Presidency took place at an informal meeting of EU Foreign Ministers at Reinhartshausen Castle in Eltville on 13-14 March 1999. The meeting can be seen as the first gathering, where some key defining guidelines were agreed upon in reference to the scope and focus of the ESDP process. Since, as noted, the meeting was informal, the participants did not have official decision-making authority, but, nevertheless, it provided an opportunity for the state governments to negotiate and reach unofficial agreements on matters of principle.

---

[183] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.
[184] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[185] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.
[186] Yet it is important to note that a federal structure was never a negotiation issue during the period 1999-2001 since the United Kingdom and France had so clearly stated that they were only prepared to accept an intergovernmental structure of the ESDP process. Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[187] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.

There were four critical negotiation issues during the Eltville meeting. Firstly, in regards to EU-NATO relations, the state governments agreed that it would be the CFSP, and not NATO or the WEU, which would be the venue for the political process of the ESDP. There was a consensus on this position among the state governments. The Eltville meeting also elaborated, in principle, upon the modalities for EU-NATO co-operation, but without going into the issue in detail and the discussion was centred on the proposals outlined in a German Presidency Paper.[188] This was based on the premise that the EU state governments that were non-aligned would, in keeping with the Berlin Accords, be able to participate in EU-led operations on an equal footing with all the other state governments. Furthermore, it was, in principle, agreed that the European allies of NATO, who were not members of the EU, would be fully associated with the ESDP process, while respecting the EU's decision-making autonomy.[189] Germany made the assumption that it would be possible to transfer the WEU arrangement over to the EU in this regard. However, when the Germany Presidency launched this proposal, it encountered very stern criticism from France, which, under no circumstances, could accept such an arrangement.[190] The interpretation of this arrangement would then later be subject to intense negotiations between the state governments. The fault line in the negotiation was between the Atlanticist-oriented state governments that wanted the closest possible co-operation between the EU and NATO and the Europeanist state governments that preferred to see a higher degree of autonomy for the EU.

Secondly, in regards to the institutional framework, the Germany Presidency had distributed a draft document that, among other things, proposed the establishment of a military committee consisting of military representatives within the EU, which was to be supported by a military staff.[191] These bodies were to provide strategic planning, intelligence and situational assessments for the EU. Furthermore, there was a more profound idea behind the proposals for these new bodies. The Commission's role within the first pillar had been very successful in advancing the integration process. The second pillar lacked such an engine for the integration process. Germany assumed that new security bodies in the second pillar could provide the EU with a similar engine for also advancing security and defence co-operation.

---

[188] The establishment of an agreement for EU-NATO relations was saved for later Presidencies since it was assumed that this process would be rather demanding and time-consuming. Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[189] Informal Meeting of EU Foreign Ministers in Eltville, 13-14 March 1999.
[190] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004..
[191] German Presidency Paper on Strengthening European Security and Defence Policy, Bonn, 24 February 1999.

The Atlanticist-oriented state governments, including the United Kingdom, were lukewarm to the idea of establishing a military committee, even though they recognised its merits.[192] Ireland and, to a lesser degree, Sweden opposed it, partly because of the implications that it would have for domestic debate about the security and defence co-operation within the EU. However, they could live with it as long as the ESDP's decision-making authority rested in the hands of the Member States.[193] The federally oriented countries were, by and large, in favour of it and saw it as an important impetus for deepening co-operation within this field and assuring that the EU could preserve a certain degree of autonomy from NATO. In the end, the state governments agreed, in principle, to advancing this idea further.

Thirdly, at the meeting in Eltville, the United Kingdom took the opportunity to propose the establishment of a permanent political committee in Brussels in order to assure political guidance for the ESDP process.[194] It was intended to supplement the Political Committee (POCO) consisting of the Political Directors at the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and was to be tightly pegged to the national capitals.[195] This was a step to reassure the intergovernmental nature of the process by ensuring the close involvement of the capitals.[196] This proposal was met with some reluctance by the federally oriented countries, Germany, Belgium and Italy, but was greatly supported by France together with Sweden and Ireland.[197] Given the fact that both the United Kingdom and France were behind the initiative, the federally-oriented countries did not bother to fervently oppose this given the leading role of both France and the United Kingdom within the ESDP process and the proposal was adopted in the declaration that stemmed from the meeting.[198]

Fourthly, the discussions at Eltville centred on the future of Article V in the Modified Brussels Treaty. The initial proposal that had been put forward by the United Kingdom had indicated that Britain considered a complete merger of the WEU and the EU with a separate fourth pillar for defence that applied to the WEU Member States.[199] Hence, that the key negotiation issue was

---

[192] Atlantic News, No. 3090, 17 March 1999.

[193] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

[194] This was the embryo of the so-called Political and Security Committee.

[195] Alyson Bailes, 'European Defence and the Changing Politics of the European Union: Hanging Together or Hanging Separately?', Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 39, No. 3, 2001.

[196] Ibid.

[197] Italian Foreign Minister Alberto Dini stated explicitly in reference to this initiative that Italy, in particular, wanted the ESDP to be built within the EU and not on an intergovernmental basis. Atlantic News, No. 3090, 17 March 1999.

[198] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.

[199] Ambassador Robert Cooper suggested in June 1998 in an internal classified FCO report that Britain take a lead in assuring the development of a common security and defence policy by merging the WEU and the EU and creating a

never whether the non-aligned members would have to abandon their security arrangements in order to be incorporated into an EU collective defence arrangement. However, if there was to be such an arrangement within the EU, it was only applicable to the WEU state governments. At the Eltville meeting, the United Kingdom took a more agnostic position on this issue and stated that this was not an important priority. France, however, was very determined to secure some form of inclusion of Article V into the EU framework and was supported by Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy, Spain and, in principle, Germany, even though the latter realised that such an effort would require lots of time and energy spent on this issue, which might undermine the overall achievements of the Presidency.[200]

Ireland and Sweden were totally against the inclusion of Article V into the EU on the official basis that it was unimportant at the time because of the Kosovo conflict and the implications it might have for relations with Russia.[201] More importantly, however, was the fact that the domestic political implications would have been very grave for both countries if the EU had assumed a role to play in the area of collective defence.[202] They were also hesitant to an inclusion of subsidiary WEU bodies, such as the Satellite Centre and the Institute for Security Studies, into the EU. Denmark was somewhat more satisfied with the proposal insofar that it assumed that the WEU would then be scraped; this was an organisation that Denmark never had much affection for.[203] Finland was less critical than the other non-aligned countries of the integration of Article V into the EU. It did not support it since it would make the process more cumbersome, but it was also keen to stress that it was important that Article V was not entirely abandoned after a possible transfer of the WEU's subsidiary bodies into the EU. In Austria, the SPÖ and the ÖVP had, as previously noted, been deeply divided over security policy. The Social Democrats were strong supporters of non-alignment, while the Christian-Democrats supported an Austrian membership of NATO. The ESDP had functioned as a point of conciliation between these parties. Yet the SPÖ, which was in charge of the Chancellery, did not want an inclusion of Article V, while the Defence and Foreign Ministries (ÖVP) were, in principle, positive to an inclusion, even if it was not applicable to Austria as long as it was non-aligned.[204] It should also

---

fourth pillar for collective defence applicable to those state governments that would like to participate in it. Interview with Charles Grant, 15 September 2002.

[200] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

[201] Sweden was also concerned that any adoption of collective defence provisions within the EU might make it more difficult for the Baltic States to join the Union since such security guarantees without NATO commitment would not be credible. Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

[202] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

[203] Interview with representative from the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 6 November 2001.

[204] Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.

be noted that the WEU Assembly tried to influence the debate on the ESDP process in reference to collective defence by adopting a 'Plan for Action' on 15 March. In this document, the Assembly reaffirmed its goal of a gradual integration of the WEU into the EU and the establishment of a 'genuine common defence' that would be applicable to all the EU state governments.[205]

In the end, the state governments affirmed that the focus of the ESDP's efforts would be on crisis management within the scope of the Petersberg Tasks since this was the area, where a European capacity to act was most urgently required.[206] At the meeting in Eltville, it was also stated that NATO remained the foundation for collective defence. The Modified Brussels Treaty and its collective defence provision would be preserved although it would be reviewed on an institutional basis in order to assure that whatever happened to the Treaty, it would only be applicable to those who were NATO allies.[207] This reinforced the notion that collective defence would be kept outside the development of the ESDP. The issue, which, per definition, would automatically raise objections from the EU state governments that adhered to non-alignment, was thereby solved, thus drastically relieving some of the non-aligned state governments. In realistic terms, this was also the lowest common denominator that the state governments could reach a decision on at the time. The issue of Article V was compromised insofar as the issue was taken off the agenda for the time being, but it would be settled during future negotiations.

Getting the Non-Aligned Onboard

Towards the end of its Presidency Germany, at one point, tried to push ahead with a proposal for the complete inclusion of Article V of the Modified Brussels Treaty into the Treaty of the European Union. This was in the shape of an arrangement, whereby the non-aligned state governments would have had to opt-out of this provision.[208] This was probably done partly in

---

[205] There were some members of the Assembly that held reservations about the provisions of the document since it reeked of Gaullist tendencies. The document, for example, stated that 'We want a strong and effective NATO in a multi-polar, not a mono-polar conception of geostrategy for our planet. We want a NATO that guarantees peace and security over an area stretching from the Americas to Europe but which is not an instrument for globalisation or the world's policeman'. See Time for Defence Draft Plan for Action Proposed by the Assembly of the WEU, 15 March 1999, p. 2.
[206] Informal Meeting of EU Foreign Ministers in Eltville, 13-14 March 1999, German Proposal.
[207] Informal Meeting of EU Foreign Ministers in Eltville, 13-14 March 1999, German Proposal.
[208] Laura C. Ferreira-Pereira, The Military Non-Aligned in the CFSP of the 1990's, <u>European Integration Online Papers</u>, No. 3, Vol. 7, 2004, p. 8.

order to be able to say to France that it had, at least, tested the ground for this option.[209] The proposal was supported by France, Belgium, Luxembourg and Spain, but was withdrawn after Sweden threatened to veto it. The role of non-alignment and its compatibility with security and defence co-operation within the EU would implicitly be a sensitive issue at almost every stage of the development of the ESDP process during the next two years. The German Presidency had to devote considerable efforts to persuade the non-aligned countries in general and Ireland and Sweden, in particular, that the development of the ESDP process was necessary and desirable.[210] Sweden and Ireland claimed that they preferred the current structure in reference to WEU-EU relations and saw no need to change that arrangement. The agreement of the first official initiation of the ESDP process was reached a few weeks before the Cologne Summit, but even during the Summit there were intense negotiations.

Sweden's persistent opposition to the ESDP process did cause some animosity amongst the other state governments. At the WEU Council Summit in Bremen on 10-11 May, the Member States welcomed the integration of the WEU into the EU. Sweden objected to this statement at a POCO meeting in connection with the Summit and claimed that nothing had been agreed on this point. It also expressed dismay since Sweden thought that that the ability of a non-aligned country to participate in EU-led crisis management operations on an equal footing had not been pointed out in the declaration from the Summit in Bremen. This made an infuriated Joschka Fischer intervene personally and, in rather blunt terms, he explained to a high-ranking Swedish diplomat that if Sweden was going to continue to obstruct the process, it might as well consider withdrawing from the Union altogether.[211] This led to a modification of Sweden's tone and approach to the ESDP process since it brought about a realisation that its previous approach to the ESDP process was indeed undermining its overall standing in the integration process. It should also be noted that the ability of the non-aligned countries to hinder the development of the ESDP was, in political terms, de facto limited seeing as the non-aligned members had approved of not stopping the development of a European defence policy when they negotiated the arrangements for their memberships in 1994. This was a very important factor that also shaped Sweden's position.[212] It was also a key EU objective to safeguard that it was possible to

---

[209] On 28-29 May the 73rd Franco-German Summit was held in Toulouse. At the Summit, the two countries stated that they wanted to see a complete integration of the WEU into the EU, but they also wanted to transform Eurocorps into a rapid reaction force for the EU.

[210] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

[211] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

[212] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

continue with 14 Member States.[213] Further opt outs, besides Denmark, would have undermined the credibility of the process. Thus, Sweden never had the option to veto the development of the ESDP altogether during the German Presidency since this could simply not be done at such a late stage. Rather, the tactic was to link the policy in as much as possible and focus on developing a civilian dimension to the ESDP process.[214]

The Kosovo Operation

As so often as has been the case before in the sphere of foreign and security co-operation within the EU framework, there were some important changes in the external security environment that provided an important impetus for moving the process forward. The opportunity to make headway on the ESDP process during the German Presidency was clearly accentuated by the Kosovo conflict and Operation *Allied Force,* which commenced on 26 March and concluded on 10 June 1999.[215] The operation showed that the capability gap between the United States and Europe had gone so far that it had seriously undermined the two parties' ability to engage in joint coalition warfare operations.[216] Among the Europeans there was a lack of capabilities, such as secure communications, all-weather precision munitions, air-to-air re-fuelling and offensive electronic warfare capabilities.[217] Arguably, even more importantly, the United States had also shown a great deal of reluctance to become involved in the operations since it perceived it as primarily a European problem.[218] When it finally did become involved in the operation, it did so with a reservation that it would not use ground troops in this operation since it wanted to minimise the risk of casualties.[219] It was clear that the European allies had to take larger responsibilities for similar operations in the future and, therefore, needed to enhance their military capabilities. In sum, the Kosovo conflict drastically increased the sense of urgency among the state governments in regards to security and defence issues and there was a general feeling that the current state of affairs was unsustainable. It was also very helpful for public

---

[213] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 June 2004.

[214] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 19 August 2004.

[215] Interview with Charles Grant, 22 September 2002.

[216] Hans-Christian Hagman, "European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities", Adelphi Papers, No. 353, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2003, p. 15.

[217] Charles G. Cogan, The Third Option: The Emancipation of European Defence 1989-2000, p. 105.

[218] Charles A. Kupchan, "In Defence of European Defence: An American Perspective", Survival, Vol. 41 No. 2, 2000, p. 20.

[219] However, it should be noted that the United States took this position in concert with several European countries, which also shared the same concern.

diplomacy as it reiterated the importance of providing the EU with the necessary means to take a larger responsibility for its security in and around Europe.[220]

The Washington Summit

Further impetus to carry the ESDP process forward was drawn from the NATO Summit in Washington in April 1999, where a number of decisions were reached regarding the ESDP process. The Alliance acknowledged the EU's resolve to have the capacity for autonomous action so it could take decisions and approve of military action, where the Alliance, as a whole, was not involved.[221] The Alliance also declared that the EU, in principle, should have assured access to NATO planning capabilities in order to be able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations, even though the modalities for this would have to be worked out.[222] This was perceived as a US approval of the WEU's inclusion in the EU and the further development of the ESDP process.[223] After receiving approval from NATO, the EU state governments intensified their effort to structure the proposal that was initiated in St Malo in 1998.

The EU Council Summit in Cologne

In 1999, at the EU Council Summit on 3-4 June in Cologne, much effort centred on the developments in Kosovo, the adoption of a common strategy towards Russia and the announcement of Dr. Javier Solana as the High Representative of the CFSP. However the most important progress was made concerning the ESDP process. The Summit's overarching aim was to be able to reach an agreement on a tentative work programme for the next 18-months in order

---

[220] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

[221] In particular, the following was, in principle, approved of: 1) Assured access to NATO planning capabilities in order to be able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations 2) The presumption of availability to the EU of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU-led operations 3) Identification of a range of European command options for EU-led operations further developing the role of DSACUR in order for him to assume fully and effectively his European responsibilities 4) The further adaptation of NATO's defence planning system in order to incorporate more comprehensively the availability of forces for EU-led operations. For more information see North Atlantic Council Washington Summit Communiqué 1999, especially article 9a.

[222] North Atlantic Council, Washington Summit Communiqué 1999, article 10a.

[223] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

to make the necessary arrangements for the intergovernmental conference in Nice by the end of 2000.[224]

In the Presidency Conclusions for the Summit the state governments reaffirmed that the EU needed to be given the capacity for autonomous action backed by a credible force. This was the same wording that originated in the St Malo agreement, which indicates the high degree of influence that the Untied Kingdom and France have had on the process. The state governments, therefore, approved the German Presidency's Report, which included proposals for the future establishment of General Affairs Council (GAC) meetings with the Defence Ministers; a Political and Security Committee, a Military Committee, a Military Staff, a Situation Centre and the transfer of the WEU's Satellite Centre and Institute for Security Study to the EU. [225]

The relevance of defence technology and industrial co-operation was also highlighted in the Presidency Report.[226] As regards military capabilities, it was affirmed that the main characteristics would include deployablity, sustainability, interoperability, flexibility and mobility.[227] This clearly indicated the importance that the United Kingdom had in influencing this process since all of these concepts had previously been developed within the British *Strategic Defence Review* in 1997.[228] It seems as if there was a recognition among the other state governments that the pre-eminence of the British armed forces made the United Kingdom the appropriate lead-nation to provide a framework for some of the key defining features of the EU's military crisis management capabilities.[229] France and Germany wanted to insert references to the Eurocorps as a sort of rapid deployment force to the EU in the Presidency Conclusions but was prevented from doing so by the United Kingdom, which clearly stated that it would not approve of such a measure seeing as it did not participate in Eurocorps itself. Sweden and Ireland was very relieved by the United Kingdom's position since they did not want to see the

---

[224] Atlantic News, No. 3113, 2 June 1999.
[225] A key challenge for the Germany Presidency was the issue of branding. All the initiatives that it came up with as far as the function of the security bodies needed different names than those in NATO since it would otherwise be assumed that the EU was duplicating many of the functions within NATO. Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[226] Declaration of the European Council on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence, European Council Summit, Cologne 3-4 June 1999.
[227] Ibid.
[228] It should also be noted that the same concepts appears in NATO's guiding documents on the Defence Capability Initiative (DCI).
[229] Interview with Lawrence Freedman, 15 May 2002.

development of an autonomous military rapid reaction force within the EU.[230] Neither did they appreciate the references to military capabilities and especially in relation to issues, such as strategic lift and deployablity, but it was realised that it would be pointless to become embroiled in a battle over words at this stage of the process.[231]

In regards to EU-NATO relations, the principles that were agreed upon at Eltville were inserted into the Presidency Conclusions. It was also stated that the EU would only develop the necessary arrangements so to be able to ensure political control and strategic direction of EU-led operations. The operational planning of such operations would either be done through the Berlin Accords and NATO or through autonomous national headquarters. All unnecessary duplication with regards to existing capabilities within NATO should at all times be avoided.[232] The state governments claimed that the efforts to strengthen European defence and security would contribute to NATO's effectiveness by strengthening the European pillar. This would lead to more complementarities, co-operation and synergy.[233] This was a statement that was intended to please the United Kingdom's concern in regards to NATO and, in turn, an attempt to allay the United States' anxiety about the ESDP process.[234]

The issue of whether the EU would need an explicit UN mandate for conducting military operations was also negotiated upon in Cologne. The non-aligned countries together with France, which have always been careful to protect the supremacy of the UN Security Council, wanted a statement that clearly explained this.[235] However, the Untied Kingdom was more sceptical to this approach, not least since the experiences from the Kosovo operations had highlighted the difficulty of obtaining such a mandate.[236] In the end, the state governments decided on a compromise and the Presidency Conclusions stated that 'The European Union is committed to

---

[230] It should be noted that Finland, however, did not share Sweden and Ireland's concern. On the contrary, Prime Minister Paavo Lipponen had, in a recent article, proposed that the EU should indeed set up a EU military force for crisis management operations, to which all Member States, including the non-aligned countries, should contribute forces. The Financial Times, 1 June 1999.

[231] Interview conducted with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

[232] Declaration of the European Council on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence, European Council Summit, Cologne 3-4 June 1999.

[233] Ibid.

[234] However, there were some American concerns with the Cologne Summit's conclusions in regards to which organisation would be the first option for an operation. The US administration claimed that the EU leaders' declaration could be read to imply that EU's position would be to act outside of the Alliance whenever possible. Yet these American concerns would later be allayed by the EU Council Summit in Helsinki that stated that the EU would only act when NATO already had declined to act. US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbot 'America's Stake in a Strong Europe', RIIA, London, 7 October 1999.

[235] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

[236] Interview with representative from FCO, 12 September 2002.

preserve peace and strengthen international security in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter as well as the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the objectives of the Charter of Paris as provided for in Article 11 of the Treaty of the European Union'.[237] This was interpreted by virtually all state governments, except by Sweden, that a UN mandate was desirable, but not a formal prerequisite.

It should be noted that the first initiatives during the spring of 1999 by the German Presidency to establish the ESDP did not mention aspects of civilian crisis management and conflict prevention. The primary occasion when aspects of conflict prevention and civilian crisis management were referred to in relation to the development of the ESDP was at the Cologne Summit. This decision had been preceded by very intense negotiations between in particular Sweden and Finland, on the one hand, and France on the other.[238] The former persisted on including civilian aspects of crisis management while the latter claimed that diversifying the ESDP process to also include civilian aspects would make it less focused and more cumbersome, especially in light of the implications it would have for the EU's pillar structure.[239] France also objected to the development of a civilian crisis management function since it would divert the focus from developing a military dimension. Furthermore, it would be the military rather than the civilian dimension that would be the defining aspect of the ESDP process.[240] Developing a civilian crisis management function also undermined the notion of creating a *Puissance d'Europe* with a strong military dimension, which was the main reason why France had approved of the ESDP process in the first place.[241]

The issue was settled during last minute negotiations particularly between Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs Anna Lindh and President Jacques Chirac, which saw the latter finally, but very reluctantly, approve of the inclusion of two sentences regarding civilian crisis management and conflict prevention in the Presidency Conclusions from the Summit. The endorsement of the development of a civilian crisis management capability was, at least, in part done as a reward for

---

[237] Declaration of the European Council on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence, European Council Summit, Cologne 3-4 June 1999.
[238] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.
[239] The wordings of the civilian aspects and conflict prevention was, from a French perspective, to prove to be a so-called Trojan horse given the fact that as soon as the words were inserted into the Presidency Conclusions, Sweden and Finland took the opportunity to demand that these initiatives were developed further and transformed into durable policy agreements. It should, however, be noted that France reduced its opposition to the development of civilian crisis management functions during the later stages of the ESDP process.
[240] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.
[241] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 6 June 2002.

especially Sweden's acceptance of the ESDP process since the Swedish Government had encountered harsh domestic criticism from some political parties because of the development of a military component within the EU. This seemed to derive from a maturity factor within the integration process, whereby the actors involved always make sure that they do not force other state governments out of office and occasionally exercise constraint in order to take domestic political factors into consideration.[242]

In the end, the Presidency Conclusions, therefore, pointed out that the EU needed the necessary capabilities to 'fully assume its tasks in the field of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the Treaty on European Union, the Petersberg Tasks'.[243] The Presidency Conclusion also claimed that the EU state governments would aim to better co-ordinate their non-military response tools, including perhaps the possibility of a stand-by capacity to pool together such resources. By inserting these sentences into the Presidency Conclusions, the possibility had emerged to develop both the EU's role in conflict prevention and civilian or 'non-military aspects' of crisis management, as it was initially called.[244] The European Council in Cologne, therefore, mandated the High Representative and incoming Finnish Presidency to continue work on all aspects of security, including the enhancement and better co-ordination of the non-military response tools of the Union and its Member States.[245]

The Presidency Report from the Cologne Summit was a remarkable leap forward by any standard in a process that was unthinkable less than a year earlier. The report also corresponded with the formal introduction of the Amsterdam Treaty on 1 May 1999, which, among other things, stated that the EU *gradually* should develop a common defence policy. Thus, the ESDP process was thereby officially initiated and some intense years of negotiations about the content and substance of this policy would follow.

---

[242] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

[243] Declaration of the European Council on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence, European Council Summit, Cologne 3-4 June 1999. It is noticeable that civilian crisis management and conflict prevention are not the sorts of missions that are explicitly mentioned in the Petersberg Tasks.

[244] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.

[245] Declaration of the European Council on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence, European Council Summit, Cologne 3-4 June 1999.

The Finnish Presidency, June-December 1999

The Finnish Presidency had to handle a number of external events, such as the aftermath of the Kosovo conflict, the escalation of violence in Chechnya and East Timor as well as the disastrous earthquake in Turkey.[246] Yet the accomplishments achieved during the Presidency were impressive, not least within the ESDP process where it had inherited an ambitious agenda from the German Presidency, which predominately had focused on institutional issues and modalities for military crisis management.[247] This agenda now needed to be filled with instruments and capabilities.

The Finnish Presidency declared that, as its contribution to the ESDP process, it especially intended to prioritise the development of non-military aspects of crisis management.[248] Foreign Minister Tarja Halonen said at her opening statement to the General Affairs Council on 19 July 1999 that the international community had not paid enough attention to the recovery phases in post-conflict environments. She compared this to the health care system, where it would be unthinkable to give first aid but not have made any effort to prepare after-care and rehabilitation.[249] Halonen also said that the work that was undertaken in Kosovo could serve as a model for establishing two separate, but concurrent military and civilian crisis management functions. According to Halonen, the previous focus on the military aspects of crisis management would change under the Finnish Presidency and she claimed that non-military crisis management was, at least, as important as military crisis management.[250] The aim of the Finnish Presidency was, therefore, to discuss all sub-sectors of security within the Union in order to further the non-military aspects of crisis management, but also to assure the closest possible co-ordination between the EU and other international organisations, such as the OSCE, NATO and the UN.[251]

---

[246] Pertti Torstila, 'Finland's Successful Presidency', Speech at the Hungarian Atlantic Council, 22 March 2000.

[247] Some Finnish diplomats claim that the only mistake that Finland made was that it worked so hard in the interest of the EU that they actually forgot about Finnish media and the Finnish general public. Bo Bjurulf, "How did Sweden Manage the European Union?", ZEI Discussion Paper, 2001, p. 25.

[248] Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 20 February 2004.

[249] Opening Statement by Foreign Minster Tarja Halonen, President of the Council at an open debate on the General Affairs Council, 19 July 1999, Brussels.

[250] Opening Statement by Foreign Minster Tarja Halonen, President of the Council at an open debate on the General Affairs Council, 19 July 1999, Brussels.

[251] Statement of Priorities for the Finnish Presidency, June 26 1999.

The Finnish Presidency also indicated that it wanted to add its own flavour to this post. Unlike the German Presidency, it was ambiguous towards the idea of France and the United Kingdom dictating the substance of the Presidency within the sphere of ESDP.[252] As previously noted, the British and French approach during the German Presidency had been to heavily influence the Presidency behind closed doors, while publicly attributing the sources of the progress as almost solely the product of German efforts.[253] The Finnish position in this regard was a reflection of the fact that Finland perceived the ESDP process to be too much of an elite project that was driven by these two states.[254] This approach later created tension between the Finnish Presidency and France and the United Kingdom, which finally required Finish President Marti Ahtisaari to intervene and demand that the Finnish Presidency undertake a more pragmatic approach regarding the role that the two most important state governments would play in this process.[255] Thus, one of the striking aspects of the Finnish Presidency was the discrepancy between, on the one hand, its statements of intent, which signalled a strong focus on civilian crisis management and less attention to substantiating the military side, and, on the other hand, the Presidency Conclusions and Presidency Reports that especially elaborated on an advanced system for establishing a military capability target and a Headline Goal.[256] Indeed, the Finnish Presidency will, first and foremost, be remembered for the Helsinki Headline Goal, which became a defining aspect of the ESDP process, not withstanding the fact that there also was substantial progress made on the civilian dimension of crisis management. However, in all, the Finnish Presidency was, in the end, greatly appreciated since it was very well run and did not promote its own national concerns. Instead, it undertook the role of a broker between the different preferences that existed among the state governments and also gave lots of attention to the views of France and the Untied Kingdom.[257]

Thus despite the Finnish Presidency's statement of intent, it was indeed the military dimension of crisis management, rather than the civilian aspect, which was the focus of attention from the start of the Presidency. The need for the military aspects of crisis management was, of course, underlined in a very visible way by Operation *Allied Force*, which reinforced the previously

---

[252] Hanna Ojanen, 'Hopes, Expectations and Worries –the Challenging Task of Heading the Development of the CFSP/ESDP in a Diversifying Union', in Hans Zettermark, Magnus Hägg and Caroline von Euler (eds.), The Baltic Room: Extending the Northern Wing of the European House, Strategic Yearbook 2001(Stockholm: Nordstedts Tryckeri, 2000).
[253] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.
[254] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.
[255] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.
[256] Hanna Ojanen, 'Hopes, Expectations and Worries'.
[257] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

known fact that NATO's European allies had critical shortfalls in their capability to engage in certain forms of military crisis management operations.[258] A number of political initiatives were, therefore, taken to enhance European military capabilities, while there were few public initiatives for the civilian dimension.

The WEU's Audit of Assets and Capabilities

The WEU's Audit of Assets and Capabilities for European Crisis Management Operations in November 1999 was based on the forces under the aegis of the WEU and was helpful since it pointed out some of the shortcomings that the EU state governments would experience if they conducted autonomous operations.[259] In particular, the Audit emphasised the shortcomings in precision strike capabilities, combat rescue and search operations and heavy lift capabilities.[260] Furthermore, the study highlighted the fact that European military capabilities were heavily dependent on roads for their mobility and that tactical airlift was limited. The study was rather critical in its tone and provided a sober analysis of the forces available in Europe. Given the fact that the results from the Audit were non-binding, there was little meddling from the state governments or the defence industry into the study results. Therefore, it provided a relevant basis for the expansion of the military Headline Goal that would follow in Helsinki in December 1999.[261] Yet some of the non-aligned state governments in general and Sweden, in particular, had concerns about the heavy emphasis on high-tech weaponry in the Audit. Hence, the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs Anna Lindh requested that this emphasis should not provide the focus for the development of the Headline Goal since the use of such weaponry would go beyond the scope of intensity of the Swedish interpretation of the Petersberg Tasks.[262] Furthermore, some people in Swedish policy-making circles feared that the heavy focus on high-tech weaponry was a result of the lobbying by the defence industry.[263] However, since Sweden

---

[258] Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 20 February 2004.
[259] The Audit pointed out that there were 66 infantry battalions, 18 armoured regiments, three aircraft carriers, ten amphibious ships, 75 destroyers and frigates, 59 mine counter measures vessels, 62 sealift and support ships, 137 attack aircraft, 152 air-defence fighters and 144 light to medium transport aircraft that came under the aegis of the WEU.
[260] WEU Council of Ministers Audit of Assets and Capabilities for European Crisis Management Operations, Luxembourg, 23 November 1999.
[261] Hans-Christian Hagman, 'European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities,' p. 52.
[262] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.
[263] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

reminded outside the WEU, it had a very limited ability to have an impact on the substance of the Audit.

The Franco-British Summit in London

The Franco-British Summit in London on 25 November 1999, which attempted to formally outline the military assets necessary to establish an improved crisis management capability, further put the limelight on the military rather than the civilian aspects of the EU's crisis management functions. The key proposal to emerge from the meeting between Tony Blair and Jacques Chirac was the establishment of the European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF).[264] The joint declaration issued at the end of the Summit stated that France and the United Kingdom urged the other state governments to strengthen European military capabilities without unnecessary duplication. At the Helsinki Summit, the EU was called on to set itself the goal of: 'Member States, co-operating together, being able to deploy rapidly and then sustaining combat forces, which were militarily self-sufficient up to Corps level (up to 15 brigades or 60,000 troops) with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, combat support and other combat service support and appropriate naval and air combat elements.'[265] All these forces were, according to the Franco-British statement, to have the full range of capabilities necessary to undertake the most demanding crisis management tasks.[266]

The Summit's significance to the ESDP process in general and to the outcome of the Helsinki Summit in particular can hardly be underestimated, even though the Franco-British St Malo meeting one year earlier received considerably more media attention.[267] Two aspects emerged from the Summit as especially important. Firstly, the Summit once more emphasised that the two driving forces behind the ESDP process, which clearly were the United Kingdom and France, still were heavily committed to the process despite the Blair government having been severely

---

[264] Despite the fact that the term 'European Rapid Reaction Force' was used, it is important to note that the Franco-British initiative did not, by any means, intend to create a standing military force that would exercise and operate as a military unit. Rather it was to constitute a model for creating a catalogue of forces that, at short notice, could be available for crisis management operations by the EU.

[265] Other decisions at the Summit included the two leaders agreeing to make their joint service headquarters – France's Centre Opérational Inter-armées and the UK's Permanent Joint Headquarters – available as options to command EU-led operations. Reference was also made in the joint declaration to future British involvement in Eurocorps and the need to strengthen European strategic airlift capabilities. See Anglo-French Summit London, 25 November 1999, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence'.

[266] Anglo-French Summit London, 25 November 1999, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence'.

[267] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.

criticised for this initiative by the Conservative Party.[268] Secondly, by having proposed the establishment of the ERRF, France and the United Kingdom had indicated that it was time for the ESDP process to shift focus from merely being about the institutional merger between the WEU and the EU to also embracing the active pursuit of military capabilities.[269]

Dual Roles for the High Representative

Another key issue that emerged during the Helsinki Presidency was the appointment of Javier Solana as both the High Representative of the CFSP and the Secretary General of the WEU. This had been as a result of a proposal that the German Presidency had launched at the WEU Council Summit in Bremen. The issue of Javier Solana's 'double hatting' created a rift between the non-aligned countries and the WEU Member States within the EU. The opposition of the non-aligned countries was both procedural and substantial. The WEU states had reached the decision among themselves and had not consulted the non-aligned countries in this process. Furthermore, the 'double-hatting' of Solana indicated incremental steps towards the establishment of a collective defence dimension within the EU. The international press did, however, portray it as a case of the non-aligned countries stopping a rightful and logical development of the ESDP process and, in the end, they reluctantly accepted the appointment of Solana as Secretary General of the WEU. Nevertheless, this decision was not mentioned in the Presidency Conclusions from the Helsinki Summit.[270]

The European Council Summit in Helsinki

---

[268] The Blair government was subjected to a co-ordinated assault by the Conservative Party a few days before the Helsinki Summit, when several leading members of the Party expressed their dismay over the St Malo initiative. On 7 December, Lady Thatcher took the lead in this process and stated in a speech to the English Speaking Union in New York that 'the real drive towards a separate European defence is the same as that toward a single European currency – namely the Utopian venture of creating a single European super-state to rival the United States on the world stage'. Also British newspapers were increasingly sceptical of the Blair government's engagement policy with the EU in general and particularly its ambitions for a leadership within the ESDP process. After the Helsinki Summit the Blair government was described as being 'Isolated at the Heart of Europe', The Daily Mail, 12 December 1999.
[269] Interview with representative from FCO, 12 September 2002.
[270] Bulletin Quotidien Europe, No. 7574, 16 October 1999.

There were several critical issues negotiated upon at the European Council Summit in Helsinki on 10-11 December 1999. Normally most issues have been settled before the Council Summits. However, since the final arrangements for the ESDP process, which, it should be noted, were very far reaching, came at a rather late stage and had almost entirely been the product of Franco-British efforts, much remained to be agreed upon at the Council Summit in Helsinki.[271]

The Helsinki Summit contained two principal proposals within the sphere of the ESDP; namely, the development of rapidly deployable European military capabilities and the establishment of new security working bodies. Thus, the Summit effectively built upon the recommendations of the Franco-British Summit less then a month earlier. The main goal set at the Summit was building upon the guidelines established at the Cologne European Council Summit to develop a framework for European military capabilities. The Member States set themselves the Headline Goal of establishing a multinational corps-level force of 50,000-60,000 personnel capable of mounting an autonomous European mission if NATO 'as a whole was not engaged' by the year 2003.[272] The last part of the wording came from a compromise between the Untied Kingdom and France, where the latter could not accept a sentence that clearly stated that NATO would always have the right of first refusal on crisis management operations.[273] France was very careful to stress that it did not want to see a hierarchy between NATO and the EU in the European security structure. The United Kingdom, however, was very determined to obtain recognition for the notion that NATO would be the first choice for any crisis management operation in order to accommodate the United States' concern over the ESDP process. Thus, the lowest common denominator that the two were able to agree on was the above stated concept, which, at least, was considered, in part, to be a victory for the United Kingdom's position. Furthermore, co-operating voluntarily in EU-led operations, Member States should, according to the Presidency

---

[271] Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 20 February 2004.

[272] The increased emphasis on NATO being the first choice for crisis management at the European Council Summit in Helsinki was very much appreciated by the United States, which, as previously noted, had raised concerns regarding the wording of EU-NATO relations at the Cologne Summit. The following statement by US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott is indicative of this: 'Helsinki represented, from our perspective, a step – indeed several steps – in the right direction. We welcome Helsinki's focus on improving European military capabilities, its recognition of NATO's central role in collective defence and crisis management and that the EU can act 'where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged.' On the subject of European defence, he continued: We're not against it, we're not ambivalent, we're not anxious, we're for it. We are for a stronger European defence. We want to see a Europe that can act effectively through the Alliance or, if NATO is not engaged on its own through the European Union. Period, end of debate'. See US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 15 December 1999 – http://www.nato.int

[273] The Finnish Presidency was also involved in the process insofar that it had pre-consulted the United States, Norway and Turkey on their preferences for the EU-NATO dichotomy in this regard. The United States greatly appreciated this gesture and it continuously demanded that the Europeans provide greater transparency for the development of the ESDP process. Interview with Hans Bennendjik, 5 May 2002.

Conclusion, be able to contribute forces ready to be deployed within 60 days and sustained for at least 1 year, which were capable of the full range of the Petersberg Tasks.[274]

Yet these agreements did not come without hard negotiations. Firstly, Ireland wanted at the Summit to insert a sentence into the Presidency Conclusions that the establishment of the Headline Goal did not imply a creation of a European army.[275] Sweden and the Finnish Presidency also supported this initiative. France, which, together with the Untied Kingdom, had worked out much of the content of the Presidency Report, was very critical of this proposal and felt that it was too late to take such action. In the end, however, the state governments agreed to adopt the Irish proposal, not least since the United Kingdom was positive to the idea given that it would be useful for public diplomacy in Britain. Belgium and, to a lesser degree, Germany wanted to amend the wording of the Irish proposal in a way so that it would not indicate that a creation of a European army was ruled out for the future; they were, however, unable to obtain the necessary support for this amendment.[276]

The state governments also decided to develop collective capabilities in the fields of command and control, intelligence and strategic transport. The specific areas for expansion were identified: developing and co-ordinating the monitoring and early warning military capabilities, making the existing joint national headquarters available to officers coming from other Member States, reinforcing the rapid reaction capabilities of existing European multinational forces, preparing the establishment of a European air transport command, increasing the number of readily deployable troops and enhancing strategic sea lift capacity. This was a particularly sensitive issue for the non-aligned state governments. The development of collective capabilities was deeply resented by some of the non-aligned members since it was thought that the credibility of their security arrangements would be undermined if their armed forces were too closely linked with those of the NATO allies within the EU.[277] However, especially Germany with its federal tendencies favoured such arrangements and saw them as cost effective solutions to dire problems.[278]

---

[274] Presidency Progress Report to the Helsinki European Council on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence.
[275] Interview with representative from the Irish Ministry of Defence, 28 May 2004.
[276] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.
[277] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.
[278] German Defence Minister Rudolf Scharping had, for example, in an interview on 1 November proposed a joint European air command for the sake of accelerating the ESDP process. The Financial Times, 1 November 1999.

It was also agreed at the Helsinki Summit that the General Affairs Council, together with the Defence Ministers, would elaborate on the modalities for a review process of the Headline and capabilities goals and how these goals could be met.[279] In reference to the modalities for setting the Headline Goal, the United Kingdom had at the Council Summit Meeting tried to circulate a paper that was a draft of what would later be called the *Toolbox Paper* without issuing it at the pre-consultations in the GAC and POCO meetings. The United Kingdom wanted the other state governments to adopt the paper right off the bat. France, which had participated in drafting the paper, supported the British proposal but the other state governments voiced major frustration over the fact the paper had not been opened up for negotiations in advance. The Finnish Presidency refused to distribute the paper at the meeting and the British participants instead circulated it immediately afterwards.[280]

It should be noted that the term 'Helsinki Headline Goal' was, from a political perspective, rather useful and timely because it also invoked an association with the convergence criteria for the Economic and Monetary Union without clearly stating so.[281] It also provided a yardstick that each state governmentwould be measured against. This created a certain degree of peer-pressure on the state governments to deliver military capabilities to the Headline Goal in order not to be named and shamed.[282] The European Council Summit at Helsinki had thereby *de facto* set out the EU's predominant ESDP agenda for the next three years and the following years would, therefore, be a continuous search for military capabilities in order to reach the Headline Goal by 2003.

In accordance with the guidelines established at the European Council Summit in Cologne, the forms of the decision-making process also further developed in Helsinki. It was agreed that all the measures taken within the ESDP process would support the CFSP and reinforce the Union's comprehensive international role.[283] All the decisions in the ESDP process would be taken on an intergovernmental basis in accordance with Article 23 of the Treaty of the European Union, while still respecting the jurisdiction of the European Community. A critical negotiation issue

[279] Presidency Progress Report to the Helsinki European Council on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence.
[280] Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 20 February 2004.
[281] It is also, as Professor Esko Antola of Turku University, Finland, has pointed out, somewhat ironic that, for the first time, when the EU decided to develop a military dimension, the process was given the name 'Helsinki', a capital of a country that has little inclination to support the use of military force.
[282] Interview with Professor Lawrence Freedman, 15 May 2002.
[283] European Council Helsinki, 10-11 December 1999, Presidency Conclusions.

that emerged from the Helsinki Summit was whether the amendments of Articles 17 and 23 required changes to the Treaty of the European Union at the Nice IGC. Ireland was very reluctant to this idea since it feared that this might cause problems during the referendum on the Treaty given the animosity in Ireland towards the ESDP process. However, the Netherlands and Germany were very favourable to the idea of adopting the treaty provisions in order to assure the coherence and structure of the ESDP process.[284] It was agreed that the issue would be further elaborated upon during the Portuguese Presidency, where the Legal Service at the Council was to provide an assessment on this matter. The three new security bodies first mentioned at the European Council Summit in Cologne were also refined in the adopted Presidency Report.

Firstly, it was agreed upon to establish a standing Political and Security Committee in Brussels, which would be composed of senior national representatives. The Political and Security Committee would deal with all aspects of the CFSP, including the ESDP, in accordance with the provisions of the EU Treaty and without prejudice to the Community's authority. In the case of a military crisis management operation, the Political and Security Committee would exercise, under the authority of the Council, the political control and strategic direction of the operation. For that purpose, appropriate procedures would be adopted in order to allow effective and urgent decision taking. The Political and Security Committee would also forward guidelines to the Military Committee. A critical negotiation issue was whether it would be the High Representative or the state government holding the EU Presidency that would chair the meetings of the Committee. In the end, the state governments agreed on the latter option since they wanted the power of the Committee to be firmly vested in the Member States.[285]

Secondly, it was agreed that a Military Committee would be established, which composed of the Chiefs of Defence and was represented by their military delegates. The Military Committee would meet at the Chiefs of Defence level as and when necessary. This Committee would then give military advice and make recommendations to the Political and Security Committee, as well as provide military direction to the Military Staff. The Chairman of the Military Committee would attend Council meetings, when decisions with defence implications were to be taken. A key negotiation issue here was whether there would be a permanent Chairman of the Committee or if this position would be rotated in accordance with the EU Presidency. Some of the state governments that favoured strict adherence to Intergovernmentalism wanted a rotating solution.

---

[284] Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Defence, 20 February 2004.
[285] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 June 2004.

However, for the sake of continuity and effectiveness, the Member States, in the end, agree on a permanent Chairman.[286]

Thirdly, it was agreed to establish a Military Staff within the Council structures, which was intended to provide military expertise and support to the ESDP, including the conduct of the EU-led military crisis management operations. The Military Staff was to perform early warning activities, situation assessments and strategic planning for the Petersberg Tasks, including identification of European national and multinational forces according to the Presidency Report. Essentially the Political and Security Committee would exercise the political control and strategic direction of military operations in a crisis. It would receive advice from the Military Committee comprising of the Chiefs of Defence. It, in turn, would give military directives to the Military Staff, which consisted of representatives from all branches of the Member States' armed forces, provided the Military Committee with expert advice. These institutions appear to echo a proposal made by the German Foreign Minister, Joschka Fischer, at the informal meeting of EU Foreign Ministers in Eltville in March 1999 and was very much based on the existing institutional structure within NATO.[287]

However, it should be noted that not all the state governments were entirely pleased with these decisions. Sweden instead promoted the establishment of a so-called Petersberg Committee, rather than a military committee within the second pillar, which would focus both on military and civilian aspects of crisis management. In September, the Finnish Presidency had also supported this proposal and first outlined it at a press conference after a meeting of the Foreign Ministers in Saariselkä in Finland.[288] The objectives of this committee were threefold. Firstly, it was to assure the closest possible connection between military and civilian aspects of crisis management. Secondly, it was to guarantee that the civilian aspects of crisis management would be dealt with at the same diplomatic level as the military aspects. Thirdly, the committee's name would emphasis that the purposes of its activities were only confined to the Petersberg Tasks and there would not be any kind of mission creep into collective defence assignments.[289] The reason behind Sweden's initiative was that it wanted to avoid the formation of purely military institutions, emphasising instead the need for providing both military and civilian advice to the

---

[286] The first Chairman of the Military Committee was the Finnish General Gustav Hägglund, which is, in itself, noteworthy given the fact that Hägglund came from a non-aligned country.
[287] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.
[288] Atlantic News, No. 3136, 8 September 1999.
[289] Hanna Ojanen, 'Participation and Influence: Finland, Sweden and the Post-Amsterdam Development of the CFSP', p. 9.

Political and Security Committee. However, in the end, Sweden did not receive the necessary support for this proposal, partly because this solution would have made it more difficult to make the security bodies within the EU compatible with those of NATO. Furthermore, there was a deep-seated suspicion of the Swedish proposals at the time. This was because of Sweden's sensitivity towards the development of a military capability within the EU.[290] From some quarters within the EU, it was feared that Sweden would try to water-down the military dimension of the ESDP's development into something of a UN model for peacemaking.

In relative terms, the military dimension of crisis management undoubtedly overshadowed the civilian aspect during the European Council Summit in Helsinki, and the latter was placed on the backburner. Consequently, the focus of the ESDP negotiations in Helsinki was unquestionably on the process to establish a Headline Goal for military crisis management through the establishment of the ERRF. The mechanism for civilian crisis management was, on the other hand, considered as something of a 'side show' during the negotiations.[291] However, it should be noted that the Finnish Presidency did break some important ground on the civilian side of crisis management. The Presidency Conclusions from the Summit referred to the need to establish a mechanism for 'non-military' crisis management in order to more effectively co-ordinate the various civilian resources at the disposal of the Union and establish a committee for civilian crisis management and a conflict prevention programme. The aim of the mechanism for civilian crisis management was, however, even more vaguely defined than the military aspects of crisis management.[292] According to the Presidency Conclusions, the non-military aspects were provided as a part to strengthen the common European policy on security and defence. A reference was also made to the ability to 'restore to the whole range of instruments from diplomatic activity, humanitarian assistance and economic measures to civilian policing and military crisis management operations' which indicated the role of the ESDP's civilian dimension.[293] This conceptual underdevelopment of what it was that civilian crisis management entailed would continue to haunt the effectiveness of this dimension of crisis management throughout the ESDP process.

---

[290] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 June 2004.
[291] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.
[292] The aim of the military aspects of crisis management was to be able to undertake the so-called Petersberg Tasks, which have no common definition between the state governments of the EU beyond what is stated in the Treaty of the European Union.
[293] Annex IV Presidency Report on the Helsinki European Council on Strengthening the Common Policy on Security and Defence.

Sweden had failed to reach an agreement on the establishment of a Petersberg committee. Its second option was to establish a Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM). Sweden, therefore, wanted to obtain recognition for this in the Presidency Report. France opposed this proposal because it did not want to see two parallel structures being developed within the ESDP process and, furthermore, pointed out that many of the activities for civilian crisis management were already being undertaken in the first pillar. There were intensive negotiations regarding this issue during the Council Summit. Anna Lindh, the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs, took the opportunity to raise the issue of CIVCOM at the Council Summit just after President Jacques Chirac had suddenly left the venue, where the negotiations were being held. When Chirac returned after 20 minutes and found out the state governments had approved of the agreement on CIVCOM, he did not bother to take up the issue for negotiations again.[294]

The significance of the non-military aspects was reinforced by the fact that this task was presented in a separate Presidency Report.[295] This was clearly an important achievement by the Finnish Presidency that, together with Sweden, had fought, in part, an uphill battle to raise the awareness of the relevance of civilian crisis management and conflict prevention among some of the other state governments. The Presidency Report on Non-Military Crisis Management of the European Union, as it was called, specifically stated that the experiences from Kosovo had underlined the importance of the non-military aspects of crisis management.[296] This report reflected the previously mentioned challenges regarding the development of a civilian crisis management function and tried to pre-empt these challenges by emphasising the importance of both effective inter-pillar- and interlocking interaction with other international organisations. The incoming Portuguese Presidency and the High Representative were therefore among other things, entrusted with further developing the military and civilian aspects of crisis management, including the development of CIVCOM and the establishment of a conflict prevention programme.[297]

---

[294] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.
[295] The substance of this report had predominately been outlined by Sweden, Finland and the United Kingdom.
[296] Annex II to Annex IV The Presidency Report on Non-Military Crisis Management of the European Union.
[297] Presidency Report on the Helsinki European Council on Strengthening the Common Policy on Security and Defence.

The Portuguese Presidency, January- June 2000

Important progress was made for both the military and the civilian crisis management functions during the Portuguese Presidency of the EU. This Presidency would more than any before or after it centre on the adoption of a framework for the development of more capabilities. The negotiations did, thereby, to a certain degree, change character, both in form and substance. Firstly, in regards to form, while the previous Presidencies had had intensive negotiations at the General Affairs Council and European Council Summit levels, most of the negotiations during the Portuguese Presidency were conducted within working groups at the Permanent Representative level.[298] Secondly, the substance of the negotiations also changed character since the focus of the negotiations was on implementing the agreements reached at the Cologne and Helsinki Summits. Thus, the issues of negotiations touched less on fundamental core preferences of what the ESDP should be all about since this more or less had been settled and, instead, more on the bureaucratic and technical implications of the process, even though the latter, to a certain degree, reflected the former.[299]

On 24 January 2004, Foreign Minister Jaime Gama stated in the declaration on the Portuguese programme to the General Affairs Council that the Presidency would work towards a balanced approach between military and civilian means for crisis management operations.[300] Among other things, the Presidency regarding the civilian side prioritised the establishment of a Headline Goal for the civilian aspects of crisis management and the implementation of the necessary institutional arrangement within the EU for the conduct of civilian crisis management operations. Yet the first month of the Portuguese Presidency focused predominately on the military side since it was entrusted with transforming the aspirations of the Headline Goal into military authenticity.[301] Work concentrated on the identification of military capabilities, implementing an interim structure for the new security bodies and establishing EU-NATO relations. It should be noted that the Presidency was shaped by a number of outside initiatives, especially from the United Kingdom and France, which moved the ESDP process further on, but somewhat limited

---

[298] Interview with representative from the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 29 July 2004.
[299] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.
[300] Foreign Minister Jaime Gamma Statement on the Portuguese Work Programme at the General Affairs Council, 24 January 2000.
[301] Interview with representative from the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 June 2004.

Portugal's influence on the process.[302] However, this was, in reality, not a very controversial issue since Portugal did not have many explicit preferences for the shape and substance of this process.[303]

The Toolbox and Food for Thought Papers

Further progress was made on enhancing the military dimension of the ESDP process at the informal Defence Ministers Summit in Sintra on 28 February. And this Summit was arguably one of the most important summits to have laid the ground for establishing a framework for the identification of military capabilities.[304] It was also important for the development of the ESDP process in general, not least since it provided answers to many of the questions that had rightfully been raised after the Helsinki Summit. The Informal Defence Ministers' Council approved of two important reports during the Summit; namely, the so-called *Food for Thought Paper* and the *Toolbox Paper*.[305] These two papers would govern almost the entire military capability work within the ESDP process. The United Kingdom and France presented the reports as more or less fait accompli documents and the two states clearly indicated that they were not willing to negotiate the content of the papers.[306]

The *Food for Thought Paper* provided a methodology to identify forces and capabilities required by Member States in order to meet the Headline Goal and set out a timetable for the implementation of the capability goals. The document, which acknowledged that the Headline Goal presented in Helsinki was insufficient for military planning, identified and tried to provide responses to three of the first six key steps that needed to be taken in order to meet the Headline Goal.[307] When agreements were made on the first three steps, it was stated that progress could be made on the remaining ones. The framework with the six steps was somewhat complicated to

---

[302] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.

[303] Interview with representative from the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 29 July 2004.

[304] Ireland expressed frustration over the fact that most governments seemed to perceive the agreements from Sintra as official, even though it was an informal summit and the Defence Ministers lacked official decision-making capacity.

[305] Ireland later voiced opposition that the final document stated that the Defence Ministers had reached decisions on certain issues. Since it was an unofficial meeting nothing, according to the Irish interpretation, could be decided on at these meetings. Yet Ireland seemed rather isolated in this regard. Meeting of European Union Defence Ministers, Sintra, 28 February 2000.

[306] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.

[307] Elaboration of the Head Line Goal 'Food for Thought'. Annex to the document Meeting of European Union Defence Ministers, Sintra, 28 February 2000.

grasp, but it was very formative for the development of military capabilities and it provided some key defining aspects of the ESDP process without necessarily bringing them up to the political level and thereby opening them up for negotiations. Thus, the six steps are, therefore, presented and briefly analysed below.

As a first step, according to the *Food for Thought Paper,* the state governments needed to outline the overall strategic context within which the EU state governments would have to operate. Here, it was stated that the governments faced new risks, such as ethnic and religious conflicts and competition for scarce resources, environmental degradation and population shifts. This demanded that the EU state governments would be able to intervene and hinder the escalation of conflicts across the full Petersberg spectrum. The key words from the *Strategic Defence Review*, such as 'deployability', 'sustainability' and 'mobility', were once again reiterated as defining features of the military forces necessary to meet the challenges of the strategic context, which, despite its broad approach to security, could hardly be seen as satisfactory to provide any serious guidance for military planning given its brief, but still very vague statements. Furthermore, it was far from being what could be described as a strategic concept equivalent to the Strategic Concept available within the NATO framework. However, it did indicate that the focus of the ESDP process was still on conflict intervention and predominately on intrastate conflicts. Thus, it sent the message that the focal point of the development of the EU's crisis management capabilities would continue to be centred on the lessons learned from the various interventions made in the Balkans in the 1990s.[308] The problem with this approach was, to a certain extent, that it meant 'planning for the last war', rather then for future military operations.[309] However, it was seen as the lowest common denominator on what the state governments could agree on.

As a second step, the *Food for Thought Paper* clarified what was meant by some of the key planning assumptions for ERRF that had been presented at the EU Council Summit in Helsinki. The target date for when in 2003 the Headline Goal should be reached was specified as by, if possible, June 2003 and by December 2003 at the very latest.[310] The geographic area, in which the military capabilities should be able to operate within, was, just as had been the case for the

---

[308] Interview with British researcher, 23 September 2002.

[309] Pål Jonson, Användandet av marinstridskrafter vid militära krishanteringsinsatser (The Use of Naval Forces in Military Crisis Management Operations), FOI Rapport-0211-SE, September 2001.

[310] It was later agreed at the European Council Summit in Laeken in 2001 that the EU was ready to conduct some crisis management operations. The declaration of its entire military operational readiness was made at a Capability Pledging Conference in Brussels on 19 May 2003.

WEU, said to be unlimited. However, the paper assumed that the most demanding operations would take place in and around Europe. The unlimited geographical scope of the EU's crisis management function made it, at the time, different from NATO's, which had set the geographical limits for its out of area operations to within the Euro-Atlantic area. However, at the North Atlantic Council meeting in Reykjavik in May 2002, all such geographical constraints upon NATO were abandoned.[311] Given the fact that strategic mobility was a serious shortfall among the EU state governments, it was logical that there was an agreement that the most comprehensive military crisis management operations would only be focused on the area in and around Europe.[312] This was necessary in order to avoid creating a capabilities-expectation gap regarding the ERRF. Furthermore, it is within this area that the EU state governments have some of their most vital interests.

As noted, there has not been any political consensus reached among the state governments on what actually constitutes the higher end of peace enforcement operations.[313] However, for the sake of agreeing on some basic operational planning assumptions, the *Food for Thought Paper* stated that the scale of effort at the higher end of the Petersberg Tasks was considered to be an elaborate peace enforcement operation in a complex joint environment.[314] This would require access to various types of combat brigades and the necessary combat support elements that go with such brigades and the appropriate maritime and air elements.[315] Some have stated that an adequate interpretation of the most demanding EU peace enforcement operations, therefore, would be equivalent to operation *Deliberate Force* in Bosnia in 1995, but on a larger scale and simultaneously against two belligerents.[316] Most likely it will not be the political definitions that will set the limits as to what is entailed in higher end peace enforcement operations, but rather the shortage of capabilities. It seems, for example, clear that the EU state governments would be unable to maintain sufficient operational tempo, precision engagement capacity and necessary force protection to conduct an operation similar to that of *Allied Force* in 1999.[317] According to

---

[311] Final Communiqué, Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council Held in Reykjavik on 14 May 2002.

[312] Interview with British researcher, 23 September 2002.

[313] The German Presidency considered opening up the Petersberg Tasks for negotiations but quickly realised that this would be like lifting the lid off Pandora's box. Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

[314] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.

[315] Hans-Christian Hagman, 'European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities,' p. 38.

[316] Ibid.

[317] That is not to say that the EU state governments would not be able to achieve the war-aims of Operation *Allied Force*. As Julian Lindley-French has pointed out, the issue is not just about the EU's inability to undertake an operation *à la America*, but how the Europeans would do so if the Americans would not participate. It would require robust ground forces and the air component would have to be used differently compared to Operation *Allied Force*.

one analyst, an EU operation would have considerable problems if deployed in a non-permissive environment in the near future, not least because it would have very limited room for effectively engaging in force escalation.[318] Thus, if the EU would have to act, it would have to hope for what has, by the same analyst, been referred to as an "Ikea Crisis" small, comfy and easily put together.[319] Regarding concurrency, it was stated in the *Food for Thought Paper* that the EU should be able to conduct a single corps size operation, while, at the same time, able to undertake more limited operations, such as rescue operations and some forms of humanitarian operations.[320]

The *Food for Thought Paper* reiterated the ambition that the corps size operation would have to able to be undertaken for 12 months. This would require the state governments providing the necessary forces for such a commitment given the strains it might put on personnel and the sustainability of the forces. Maintaining 60,000 personnel for one year would probably require a pool of, at least, 120,000 people, but, in reality, most likely closer to 200,000.[321] This would be a challenge for some state governments that had difficulties in identifying persons for positions that are difficult to recruit for, such as logistics experts, engineers, helicopter crews and other specialists.[322] The entire force would, as previously noted, be ready to be deployed within 60 days.[323] Deploying 15 brigades within 60 days is a considerable commitment and the EU state governments will most likely not be able to undertake such a mission given their limited strategic mobility within this time frame unless it regards already established forces with pre-arranged sea and airlift capabilities.[324]

As a third step, the *Food for Thought Paper* stated that the size and composition of the Headline Goal would be based on scenario planning. The scenarios, which were going to be used, were

---

It would certainly claim more casualties. Thus, even though the EU would prevail in the end, it would come at a high human and political cost that the EU state governments would most likely not be prepared to pay. Julian Lindley-French, 'Memorandum on the Recent Developments in the Common European Security and Defence Policy, written evidence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 16 June 2001.

[318] Ibid.

[319] Ibid.

[320] Elaboration of the Head Line Goal 'Food for Thought'. Annex to the document Meeting of European Union Defence Ministers, Sintra, 28 February 2000.

[321] It was assumed that the force would contain one third each for combat, combat support and logistics. See Jolyon Holworth, "European Defence: The Ultimate Challenge?", p. 17.

[322] Hans-Christian Hagman, 'European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities', p. 38.

[323] This figure follows NATO standards where the entire ERRF would have to be able to be deployed in 60 days while smaller response units would be deployed at seven days' notice and special forces groups at one to three days' notice. See Julian Lindley-French, 'Memorandum on the Recent Developments in the Common European Security and Defence Policy, written evidence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 16 June 2001.

[324] Hans-Christian Hagman, 'European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities', p. 38.

predominately based on the work that had been undertaken by the WEU in 1996 and were at the time called the WEU's Illustrated Profiles.[325] These scenarios had been adopted to specify the military requirements for rather traditional peace support operations. However, the EU state governments modified them in order for them to be relevant to the strategic context in 2000.[326] The use of the four WEU scenarios was, in part, a reflection of the fact that the Union represented many different geopolitical interests and it would have been a very cumbersome process to reach an agreement on entirely new scenarios. In reality, the scenarios hardly provided the basis for adequate operational planning, but they were proven rather useful as a source for reaching political agreements on the level of military capabilities that the state governments should commit to the ESDP process.[327] However, according to some, the scenarios were modified and tailored to justify procurement demands and safeguard the European defence industry and it seems as if the planning process for these scenarios was considerably more politicised than the process for the WEU Audit of Assets.[328]

After the three first initial steps, the *Food for Thought Paper* recommended that the fourth step be that the state governments undertake to identify specific force capabilities necessary to support the scenarios. As a fifth step, the paper stressed the importance of the development of illustrative force packages that have the required capabilities and confirmation of their effectiveness against the planning scenarios. Regarding the sixth step, the state governments, by using these different force packages, needed to define the full range of requirements implicit in the Headline Goal. After establishing the six necessary steps to develop targets for military crisis management, the state governments were then assigned the task of identifying the military shortfalls that existed among them in order to conduct the whole range of the Petersberg Tasks. In brief, this was the approach that would virtually govern the military side of EU's military crisis management capabilities.[329] It would prove to be useful since it constituted a pragmatic

---

[325] WEU's Illustrated Profiles are secret, but consisted of four different scenarios for military crisis management operations: humanitarian operations, assistance to civilians, separation of parties by force and evacuation operations.
[326] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.
[327] Julian Lindley-French, 'Memorandum on the Recent Developments in the Common European Security and Defence Policy', written evidence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 16 June 2001.
[328] Julian Lindley-French has, for example, stated that the pledges to the Headline Goal will be fulfilled because they were structured in such a way that would make failure very difficult. The basic problem then was that the EU state governments tried to tailor the security environment to fit the forces available rather then the other way around. Thus, it is possible to claim that the process was product-led rather than market-led. Julian Lindley-French, 'Memorandum on the Recent Developments in the Common European Security and Defence Policy, written evidence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 16 June 2001.
[329] The issue whether the *Food for Thought Paper* constituted *the* concept or *a* concept for the development of the EU's military crisis management capabilities was, however, subject to three weeks of lengthy negotiations. The state

agreement on capabilities, while putting the issues of defining the range of the Petersberg Tasks and the characteristics of the security environment off to a later day.[330]

The second paper adopted at the EU Defence Ministers Meeting in Sintra, the so-called *Toolbox Paper,* dated back to an exercise conducted by four state governments in July 1999 on the initiative of Richard Hatfield at the British Ministry of Defence. The exercise, therefore, also went by the name of 'the Hatfield exercise'. It was later developed further by the 15 Political Directors of the EU state governments in October the same year and then in its final version labelled as the *Toolbox Paper* at the EU Defence Ministers' Summit in Sintra. Its aim was to provide an impetus to the capabilities conference that would take place during the French Presidency. The *Toolbox Paper* mainly elaborated on the role and composition of the new security bodies within the EU and the modalities for the planning and conduct of EU-led operations. Furthermore, the paper provided an annex with important definitions of some of the key terminology within the sphere of planning and conducting military crisis management operations within the EU framework.

Developing the Civilian Dimension

During the second half of the Portuguese Presidency the civilian aspects of the development of the EU's crisis management capabilities started to assume a more prominent role. The progress on the civilian function was clearly enhanced by the fact that Commissioner for External Relations Chris Patten had on 1 March 2000 urged the state governments to set up capability goals for civilian aspects of crisis management. This bolstered the willingness of the federally oriented state governments to support the development of the civilian crisis management function. These countries had previously been reluctant to develop a civilian crisis management function within the second pillar, but since the Commission thought that more capabilities would be beneficial for the Commission, the civilian crisis management function gained support from these state governments.[331]

---

governments eventually agreed on the latter principle, but, in reality, implemented it according to the former principle. Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.
[330] Interview with British researcher, 23 September 2002.
[331] 'Patten to Make Proposal on Non-Military Crisis Management', <u>Atlantic News</u>, No. 3183, 3 March 2000, p. 4. However, it should be noted that Patten's views were not appreciated within all quarters of the Commission. There were other actors, such as Patten's Head of Cabinet, who were considerably more critical of the establishment of a

Another factor that contributed to the increased pace of the development of the civilian crisis management function during the second half of the Portuguese Presidency was the formal introduction of the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM). CIVCOM was set up based on a Council decision adopted on 22 May 2000 and the Committee held its first meeting on 16 June 2000. Its mandate was to 'provide information, formulate recommendations and give advice on civilian aspects of crisis management to the Political and Security Committee and to the other appropriate Council bodies in accordance with their respective competencies'.[332] Thus, the intention of CIVCOM was to operate as a working party within the Council on civilian crisis management. Yet there were clearly some challenges that undermined CIVCOM's effectiveness during its initial stage. CIVCOM was met with scepticism by those state governments that had preferred a supranational model for the civilian crisis management function since these states feared that it would undermine the Commission's role in this area. However, CIVCOM was prevented from having any influence on first-pillar activities that concerned civilian crisis management functions. Furthermore, CIVCOM's mandate was evidently both weak and unclear.[333] CIVCOM could, for example, not decide upon first pillar issues. This was a considerable weakness since many of the civilian functions come under the domain of the Commission. The fact that the Commission and CIVCOM represented different pillars within the pillar structure also has financial implications. A crisis management mission undertaken by the Commission is financed by the EC budget, while a second pillar operation is covered by the Member States. This was a dilemma for the role of CIVCOM since it lacked its own funding ability.[334] The representatives were to consist of various civilian crisis management experts and diplomats and the Committee was intended to be a civilian counterpart to the Military Committee, but the political influence and status that CIVCOM carried would prove to be considerably less.[335] It was deliberately kept weak, in terms of manpower and influence,

---

civilian crisis management capability within the second pillar. Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 28 May 2004.

[332] Official Journal of the European Communities, L 127, 27 May 2000, p. 1.

[333] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.

[334] Lars Wedin, 'The European Security and Defence Policy from the Factory Floor', in Elisabeth Davidson, Arita Eriksson and Jan Hallenberg (eds.), Europeanization of Security and Defence Policy. Publication of a conference held at the Swedish National Defence College in Stockholm, 5 December 2001.

[335] The fact that the Military Committee consists of high ranking officers with long experience of military operations, while CIVCOM comprises diplomats often with limited expertise of multifaceted civilian crisis management operations, makes CIVCOM considerably weaker then the Military Committee. CIVCOM also lacks a permanent staff - the equivalent of the Military Staff. Sara Myrdal (ed.), EU som civil krishanterare, (The EU as a Civil Crisis Manager), p. 19.

partly because of French insistence since France did not want the civilian dimension of crisis management to overshadow the military aspect.[336]

The European Council Summit in Feria

The European Council Summit in Feria on 19-20 June put considerable emphasis on moving the ESDP process further along and a rather lengthy Presidency Report was presented. Beyond the already stated military capability goals, the Summit was also the most important one for the development of the civilian crisis management capabilities.[337] An agreement was reached at the European Council Summit in Feria, in which particular attention was to be given to those areas where the international community had previously shown particular weakness in order to assure 'added value' to the Union's activities.[338] Thus, the Union's capability to prevent the eruption or escalation of conflicts, consolidate peace and internal stability in periods of transition, ensure complementing the military and civilian aspects of crisis management covering the full range of Petersberg Tasks was highlighted.[339]

On the military side, the Presidency Conclusions from Feira reiterated, as agreed in Helsinki, the EU's determination to meet the Headline Goal targets by 2003.[340] Achieving the Headline Goal involved identifying military capabilities required for the various Petersberg scenarios. At Feira, it was decided that this work would be undertaken by the Interim Military Body (later to become the EU Military Committee in its permanent form) that would draw up a 'capabilities catalogue' in consultation with NATO experts. This catalogue would feed into a Capabilities Commitment Conference to be convened by the end of 2000 during the French Presidency. At this conference, the EU Member States and other interested countries would pledge military assets to a pool of

---

[336] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 June 2004.

[337] The achievements on the civilian side during the Portuguese Presidency were reached partly because the state governments had held an additional seminar on civilian crisis management in Lisbon on 3-4 April 2000, which had specified much of the work that needed to be done in this field.

[338] This statement was inserted to pre-empt criticism regarding claims that the EU was merely duplicating much of the work that had been undertaken by the OSCE and the UN regarding civilian aspects of crisis management. It is interesting to note that the British American Security Information Council (BASIC), normally known to be a fierce advocate of civilian, rather than military crisis management, has criticised some aspects of the development of the EU's civilian crisis management in general and the expansion of a police function in particular. BASIC did this based on the view that the EU was duplicating the OSCE's activities and because its membership structure excluded important partners in the process. See Ian Davis, BASIC, oral evidence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 5 December 2002.

[339] European Council Santa Maria da Feria, 19-20 June 2000, Presidency Conclusions.

[340] European Council Santa Maria da Feria, 19-20 June 2000, Presidency Conclusions.

forces to be used under an ESDP operation. The Presidency Report, therefore, adopted a framework, under the name 'Headline Goal Task Force' (HTF), for further work on identifying the need for specific military capabilities. The Interim Military Staff would then support the HTF in this work and serve as its secretariat. The HTF was to all intents and purposes based on the work and the six-point structure produced in the *Food for Thought Paper,* which was, as previously noted, presented earlier during the Presidency.[341] The Presidency Conclusions also stated that the EU would encourage third countries to contribute through supplementary commitments. To enable those countries to contribute to improving European military capabilities, appropriate arrangements would be made by the incoming Presidency regarding the Capabilities Commitment Conference. These arrangements would, in particular, take into account the capabilities of the six non-EU European NATO members. No agreement was reached at the Feria European Council on what the exact arrangements between the EU and NATO would entail. However, to combat this shortcoming, it was agreed to establish four ad hoc EU-NATO working groups, which should discuss issues, such as the development of capabilities, the modalities for EU access to NATO capabilities and assets as well as the definitions for permanent arrangements between the two organisations.

The Presidency Conclusions from Feria also further developed the poorly defined aims of the civilian crisis management functions that had been stated in Helsinki. The aim of the Union's activities in civilian crisis management was, according to the Presidency Conclusions, to save human lives in crisis situations, maintain public order, prevent further escalations, facilitate the return to peaceful, stable and self-sustainable situations, manage adverse effects on EU countries and address relevant problems for co-ordination.[342] Yet civilian crisis management capability still lacked well-defined aims and scopes beyond this rather ambiguous and general statement at Feria.[343] Thus, the inability of the state governments to agree on working definitions for components, such as aims and scopes, has indeed been a problem since it has made this function lack coherence and structure.[344] It has, furthermore, undermined the effectiveness of the civilian

---

[341] HTF's work was to be very useful and productive during the first year of its activities, but then it steadily declined since the meetings became less frequent. This was partly because of economic reasons and the work was increasingly being taken over by the military experts of the various EU delegations rather than by military experts from the capitals. Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.
[342] European Council Santa Maria da Feria, 19-20 June 2000, Presidency Conclusions.
[343] European Council Santa Maria da Feria, 19-20 June 2000, Presidency Conclusions.
[344] The absence of well-defined aims and scopes has also been a disadvantage when foreign diplomats, analysts and scholars of European security have assessed the relevance of this function. Some scholars have indeed questioned the degree of sincerity behind this initiative. Some, therefore, saw civilian crisis management as an appendix or even a 'counter culture' to the development of ESDP in a military direction and not as coherent programme on its own. It has also been perceived as a bargaining chip for the military crisis management function.

crisis management capability regarding when it should be used since no clear doctrinal guidelines were available. This has also made the development of the civilian crisis management capability dependent on the specific vision that each Presidency has had for this function; thus, making the process lack a certain degree of continuity.[345] The problem to agree on a working definition was obviously a reflection of the lack of consensus among the state governments on where civilian crisis management and conflict prevention fitted into the ESDP process.[346] The European Council Summit in Feria did, however, reach an agreement among the state governments on the identification of concrete targets in four areas for the civilian crisis management capability in the so-called Feria Capability Targets.[347]

Firstly, policing was the highest prioritised area of the civilian crisis management capability.[348] Future police missions should, according to the Study on Concrete Targets on Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management, be able to take place across the whole range of crisis prevention and crisis management operations in response to their specific needs. This indicated that the police could have executive, educational and supportive roles in the EU's civilian crisis management operations.[349] The Study on Concrete Targets on Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management also stated that the operations could be undertaken either under the aegis of the EU or in response to requirements for an OSCE or UN-led operations.[350] The Feria target to be met by 2003 was 5,000 police officers, who should be available to be deployed with three months' notice. Out of these 5,000 police officers, 1,000 were to be able to be deployed after one months' notice.

Secondly, some complementary aspects of law enforcement, including resources to develop a judicial and penal system accompanied the increased efforts of police resources within the framework of the civilian crisis management function. This area, termed 'the rule of law', requested that the Member States arrange for the selection of judges, prosecutors, penal experts

---

[345] Ambassador Anders Bjurner has defined the term 'capabilities' in reference to civilian crisis management as the combination of instruments, institutional arrangement, procedures and partnerships with other organisations. See Anders Bjurner, 'Vision and Achievements of the Swedish Presidency in Developing a Civilian Crisis Management Capability', Conference Report, Stockholm 20 April 2001.

[346] Renate Dawn, 'Themes to Be Dealt With and Challenges to Be Met', Conference Report, Stockholm 20 April 2001, p. 3.

[347] Interview with representative from the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 29 July 2004.

[348] It was within this area that the most serious deficits existed. The UN had, for example, requested 5,000 police officers for the police operation in Kosovo; after a year only 60 percent of this request had been met and the EU Member States had only provided 655 police officers for the operation.

[349] Annika S. Hansen, 'Civil-Military Cooperation: The Military, Paramilitary and Civilian Police in Executive Policing', in Renate Dawn (ed.), Executive Policing: Enforcing the Law in Peace Operations, Sipri Research Report No. 16, Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 70

[350] Appendix IV Concrete Targets for Police in Study on Concrete Targets on Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management.

and other relevant categories for deployment at short notice. In terms of specific numbers, the state governments later approved at the setting-up of a pool of specialists consisting of 200 law experts, who were to be available within 30 days.[351]

Thirdly, to enhance the EU's ability to support societies in transition from combat to post-combat environments, the state governments agreed to enhance aspects of civilian administration. Member States were, according to the Study on Concrete Targets on Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management, to improve selection, training and deployment of civil administration experts for duties in the re-establishment of collapsed administrative systems. The state governments were to set up a pool of experts to ensure the existence of a functional civil administration while promoting the transition to local ownership as soon as possible in the fields of social service, infrastructure and general administration.

Fourthly, the state governments also agreed to identify civil protection as an area of priority, including search and rescue in disaster relief operations. Civil protection was somewhat different from the other three priority areas.[352] The main challenge, especially in this field, was not the shortage of resources; rather, what were primarily lacking were co-ordination, common financing and transport within the auspices of the EU. The state governments would later agree to establish 2-3 assessment teams, each consisting of 10 experts available for dispatch within 3-7 hours of a natural or man-made disaster, in order to assist in assessing the damage and recommend additional civil protection from EU intervention teams. For this purpose, this group of 100 experts was to be on 24-hour call. The state governments also approved of intervention teams (up to 2,000 rescue workers) that could be deployed at short notice.

In sum, the most important achievement of the Portuguese Presidency was clearly the establishment of frameworks for how to develop capability targets for both the military and the civilian crisis management functions.[353] These frameworks, i.e., the Headline Goal and the Feria Capability targets became very formative for the ESDP process, especially in light of the fact that these capabilities lacked both well-defined aims and scopes.[354] What was not accomplished

---

[351] This agreement was reached at the European Council Summit in Göteborg in June 2001.
[352] Anders Bjurner, 'Vision and Achievements of the Swedish Presidency in Developing a Civilian Crisis Management Capability', p. 4.
[353] Interview with representative from the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 June 2004.
[354] Interview with representative from the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 June 2004.

by the Portuguese Presidency was a breakthrough on the status of EU-NATO relations.[355] This critical issue was not resolved despite intensive efforts taken by especially the United Kingdom and the state governments therefore asked the High Representative and the French Presidency to advance this issue as well as make the necessary preparations to assure that the process would be ready for the Intergovernmental Conference in Nice.

---

[355] However, the Portuguese Presidency was able to secure acceptance for the creation of a 'Security Task Force' to be created to set up liaison mechanisms between the EU and NATO, which, among other things, included the attendance of DSACUR at meetings with the EU Military Committee in case of an EU operation conducted with NATO assets. Charles Cogan, <u>The Third Option</u>, p. 122.

The French Presidency, July-December 2000

France had a challenging task awaiting it when it took over the EU Presidency from Portugal. Many of the capability development initiatives that had been taken during the Portuguese Presidency had yet to be implemented and there was an awareness that less progress would be made on these issues during the Presidencies following Frances' six-month rein of the EU since these Presidencies did not have the same keen interest in the ESDP process.[356] The French Presidency simultaneously also had to handle the IGC, which, above all, was intended to facilitate the necessary institutional reforms for the enlargement process of the EU. The key issues that had to be addressed by the IGC were the distribution of votes among the Member States in the Council of Ministers, which sort of issues could be taken by qualified majority voting, the numbers of commissioner that each state could have and how to frame the concept of 'reinforced co-operation'.

Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine stated in his opening address to the General Affairs Council that the focus of the French Presidency would be on finalising the Headline Goal, developing the ESDP's permanent structures and continuing the work to strengthen the civilian crisis management function.[357] Furthermore, President Jacques Chirac outlined the main objectives of the entire French Presidency to the German Bundestag on 27 June 2000.[358] The choice of venue was clearly selected with the intent to give momentum to the Franco-German partnership within the European integration process.[359] Unlike Védrine's statement, the speech did not elaborate in any detail on the ESDP process, but it did put considerable emphasis on the need to allow reinforced co-operation among the core state governments within the integration process and the spheres of security and defence. This was also in line with Chirac's earlier statement at the WEU Assembly, where he had claimed: 'I think defence is an area where it is natural for more far reaching co-operation to exist within a small group of countries that wish to advance further and more rapidly than others.' These announcements implied that Chirac wanted France and Germany to proceed with the integration within the ESDP in order to develop a defence union

---

[356] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[357] Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine, Statement on the Intentions of the French Presidency to the General Affairs Council, 12 July 2000.
[358] Notre Europe, Discours Prononce par Monsieur Jacques Chirac, President de la Republique Francaise, Devant Le Bundesdag Allemand, 27 June 2000.
[359] It was widely perceived that Franco-German co-operation, which previously had formed an unprecedented engine for European integration, had lacked pace and substance in the late 1990s because of the poor relations between President Chirac and Chancellor Schröder.

that would also include collective defence.[360] The French Presidency would later be criticised for this initiative as well as for several others because of its tendency to use the Presidency to push through the French agenda for the ESDP, instead of working as a facilitator for reaching common agreements between the state governments. This created a somewhat negative perception of the French Presidency among most of the other Member States.[361] One diplomat even referred to the French Presidency as 'a war with 14 against one', where the Presidency continuously started the negotiations from square one on issues that it did not like the agreement that had been reached by the EU.[362] This tendency, to a great extent, backfired on France and its ability to influence the integration process within defence and security relations was in reality undermined.[363] The French Presidency was also bothered by some intra-French bureaucratic infighting between the different security bodies within the EU, which, to some extent, diluted its work.[364]

Nevertheless, considerable progress was made during the French Presidency regarding the ESDP process. As with all the previous Presidencies, several external initiatives helped to advance the process. However, the French Presidency made it clear at an early stage that it would not approve of other states meddling in its leadership of the ESDP process.[365] In sum, it seems as if the process was intensified, when one of the two key state governments championing the initiative was at the helm of the EU Presidency. However, it came at a price; namely, increased controversy, suspicion and the problem of national government's setting agendas, which, in the long run, undermined the ESDP process since it exposed the diverging views between the Europeanists and the Atlanticists. Moreover, it made some of the adherents to the latter preference sceptical of whether the ESDP could be developed further without seriously undermining NATO.[366] Thus, it seems as if President Jacques Chirac was correct when he ended

---

[360] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[361] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.
[362] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[363] According to some sources, the possibilities of France appointing a Frenchmen as Head of the Military Staff were completely diminished because of the way it ran its Presidency. Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[364] The co-operative spirit between the French Chairman of the Interim Military Body and the French Chairman of the Political and Security Committee was to say the least less than optimal. This was, in part, because of tensions within the French Foreign Ministry regarding what role the French military establishment would have in the ESDP process. The French military establishment has by European standards always had a rather influential role vis-à-vis the French Foreign Ministry because of its direct access to the President of the Republic. Interviews with Representative from the Council Secretariat 6 June 2002.
[365] Interview with Charles Grant, 22 September 2002.
[366] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.

his speech to the European Parliament on 4 July on the note that Europe would no longer be quite the same after the six months of the French Presidency.[367]

First Ever PSC-NAC Meeting

The most challenging task for the French Presidency would prove to be to assure permanent arrangements for EU-NATO relations.[368] This task made a good start insofar that the first-ever meeting between the Interim Political and Security Committee and the North Atlantic Council was held in Brussels on 19 September 2000. The document from this meeting is not available for the public. However, the High Representative Javier Solana's statement at the meeting indicated that sufficient progress had been made on aspects, such as crisis management procedures and capability programmes, but that work still needed to be done on such areas as co-operation and transparency as well as the permanent arrangement.[369]

The process of identifying military capabilities needed for the Headline Goal was making considerable headway, especially during the latter part of the French Presidency. Substantial progress was made at an informal meeting of the EU Defence Ministers in Ecouen on 22 September 2000. The work had been undertaken in a good atmosphere, which helped to substantiate the work on defining the European capabilities necessary to achieve the Headline Goals set in Helsinki.[370] The European Union Chiefs of Defence (CHOD) had met the day before the Defence Ministers' Summit and had approved of an updated version of the so-called Helsinki Headline Catalogue.[371] The Interim Military Body had published the first version of this on 28 July 2000. There had been some revisions since the version published on 28 July. In the September version, it was stated that the EU would need approximately 80,000 soldiers, rather than the 60,000 that were mentioned at Helsinki. French Defence Minister Alain Richard also stated at the end of the Defence Ministers' Summit that the EU needed approximately 300 to 350

[367] Discours Prononce par Monsieur Jacques Chirac, President de la Republique Francaise, devant le Parlement européen, 4 July 2000.
[368] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[369] Intervention by Dr Javier Solana, High Representative for the CFSP, COPSi/NAC first joint meeting, Brussels, 19 September 2000.
[370] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.
[371] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.

fighter planes and 80 ships to reach the Headline Goal.[372] This was the first time that figures for the air and naval components were publicly mentioned.[373]

The Capabilities Commitment Conference

During the Portuguese Presidency the Member States had agreed to establish conferences, at which forces would be pledged, in order to reach the military capability targets of the Headline Goal. The first of these conferences, the so-called Capabilities Commitment Conference, was held in Brussels on 20-21 November. It was the first conference of its kind, which, in itself, was perceived to be an achievement for the French Presidency. In quantitative terms, the number of forces needed to reach the Headline Goal had been augmented even more since the Defence Ministers' Council in Ecouen. Approximately 100,000 soldiers, 400 combat aircraft and 100 ships were required according to the new version of the Helsinki Headline Catalogue presented at the Capabilities Commitment Conference.[374] The French Presidency had drafted a short list of 144 deficiencies in the Helsinki Headline Catalogue. This draft had caused some controversy since it was based on an operation in a very harsh environment similar to that of Operation *Allied Force* and included very high-end capabilities, such as theatre ballistic missile defence and early warning and distant detection capabilities.[375] The conference made it possible to identify a number of areas in which efforts would be made to upgrade existing asset investments and co-ordination in order to enhance the EU's ability to conduct autonomous operations. The declaration from the conference stated that this was the first step in a demanding process that would aim to assure that the ERRF would be fully operational by 2003.[376] However, the process would continue beyond this timeframe in order to achieve the collective capability goals since it was essential for the credibility of the ESDP process as a whole.[377] This statement did *de facto* recognise that the EU would because of shortfalls in capabilities not be able to achieve its Headline Goal as agreed by 2003. The declaration from the conference did, however, state that the EU would be able to carry out the full range of the Petersberg Tasks by 2003 but that certain

---

[372] Informal meeting of the EU Defence Ministers, Ecouen 22 September 2000, Presidency Conclusions.
[373] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[374] Regarding ground forces this was to include one-third combat forces, one-third combat support forces and one-third logistics. The air component would include eight or nine air wings supported by 180 support aircraft. The naval component was three or four task groups; each comprising of about 20 frigates or a carrier group supported by, among other things, a number of frigates.
[375] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.
[376] Informal meeting of the EU Defence Ministers, Ecouen 22 September 2000, Presidency Conclusions.
[377] Declaration at the Capabilities Commitment Conference Brussels, 20-21 November 2000.

capabilities needed improvements, both in quantitative and qualitative terms, in order to maximise the capabilities available to the EU.[378]

The first day of the Capabilities Commitment Conference was devoted to reviewing the pledges of the military capabilities that the EU state governments had made at the conference. It was confirmed that the EU state governments had reached 94 out of the 144 targets that the Helsinki Force Catalogue had identified. Efforts needed to be made to obtain support service, certain forms of weapons munitions and enhanced force protection.[379] Deficits were also recognised in the fields of strategic intelligence and sea and airlift operations. More specialised capabilities, such as cruise missiles, AWACS, Suppression of Enemy Air Defence (SEAD), UAVs and electronic intelligence, were also lacking.[380] Furthermore, many of the shortfalls would need procurement initiatives, which meant that it would take longer than two years to remedy these shortages.[381]

It might sound impressive that the EU state governments had reached 94 out of 144 shortfalls given the fact that the process had only been up and running for less than a year and that the state governments had two additional years to identify the remaining 50 shortfalls. However, it should be remembered that the Helsinki Force Catalogue only included three percent of the 1.8 million soldiers, 160 destroyers and frigates, 75 tactical submarines and 3,300 plus combat aircraft that the EU state governments, in theory, had at their disposal.[382]

Furthermore, many of the capabilities pledged for the Helsinki Force Catalogue had been double-hatted and had already been offered to other multinational groups.[383] This did, of course, constitute a problem insofar that it could not be assumed that these capabilities would be available at all times. Yet significantly, but maybe somewhat symbolic, several of the EU state governments offered more forces to the Helsinki Force Catalogue than what they had done to NATO.[384] This was significant, from a political standpoint, since it could indicate that the British

---

[378] Declaration at the Capabilities Commitment Conference Brussels, 20-21 November 2000.
[379] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.
[380] Hans-Christian Hagman, 'European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities'.
[381] Within the military establishment it often takes 5-10 years from the time that a decision is taken to procure, for example, a platform until it is an available as a military capability.
[382] Professor Michael Clarke, oral witnesses to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 19 July 2001.
[383] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.
[384] This was particularly apparent in the cases of Greece and Belgium, but also, to a lesser extent, Germany and the Netherlands. However, it should be noted that military capabilities that were earmarked for NATO's Planning and Review Process were 'item-specific,' i.e., it was a certain platform that was reserved for this process. For the

assumption that branding could play an important role to assure more European military capabilities had some relevance.[385] The second day of the conference focused on reviewing the contributions from NATO's non-EU allies. Yet the voluntary contribution from the non-EU allies within NATO did not reduce the pressure upon the EU state governments to achieve the Headline Goal since it had to be reached by the EU state governments alone.

Progress on Civilian Crisis Management and Conflict Prevention

The French Presidency was, together with the High Representative, also entrusted with further developing and implementing the EU's civilian crisis management capabilities, including the definition of concrete targets. The first substantial initiatives to develop a conflict prevention programme for the EU were also undertaken during the French Presidency.[386] It should be noted that the French Presidency was greatly assisted by the newly established CIVCOM to proceed with the development of the EU's civilian crisis management capability.[387] This was an important step for the development of this function since CIVCOM could pursue autonomous work on these issues. The advancement of the process was, therefore, less dependent on the state government holding the Presidency, which was helpful in this regard since France, in reality, did not devote much effort to the development of civilian crisis management. A reason for this was that the French Presidency was preoccupied with the work on the intergovernmental conference that would take place in Nice. Since civilian crisis management did not require any changes to the Treaty of the European Union, did the development of this function not receive a lot of attention during the French Presidency.[388]

Helsinki Force Catalogue, it was enough to earmark a general type of platform without identifying which specific platform it was that had been earmarked. Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.

[385] As previously noted, it was assumed that, in particular, some continental EU state governments would be more inclined to provide defence capabilities on behalf of the EU rather than on behalf of NATO. However, as Shadow Secretary of State for Defence and later the party leader of the Conservative Party Iain Duncan Smith pointed out: 'Hear we have 100,000 ground troops, some 400 combat aircraft and 100 ships. Where are they coming from? They are not new assets. They are assets from most of the NATO nations, nominated for NATO operations. There will not be a single extra solider, aircraft or ship created for this that is not allocated somewhere else.' Iain Duncan Smith, Shadow Secretary of State for Defence, oral statement to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 26 April 2001.

[386] However, it should be noted that conflict prevention had been on the negotiation table before the French Presidency. Sweden had for example at the Feria Council Summit been tasked to draft a report on this issue.

[387] Simon Duke, The EU and Crisis Management, p. 138.

[388] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.

Thus the development of a conflict prevention programme for the EU made progress during the French Presidency, even though this was not one of its highly prioritised areas. Aspects of conflict prevention were, as previously noted, first mentioned in the Presidency Conclusions from the European Council Summit in Cologne on 3-4 June 1999. The European Councils in Helsinki and Feria paid a rhetorical tribute to the relevance of conflict prevention, but little else, although the Feria European Council also invited the Commission and the High Representative to provide concrete measures to improve the EU's ability to engage in conflict prevention. However, the first real report generated from this process was presented at the European Council Summit in Nice. This document that had been produced jointly by the Commission and the High Representative provided a conceptual analysis of conflict prevention, but also a certain framework intended to provide guidance for the adoption of a EU programme in the field of conflict prevention.[389] The report's underlying message was that conflict prevention had to be a fixed priority in the EU's external relations. The report stressed that the Union needed to be pro-active, rather than reactive and had to co-ordinate its resources, such as trade, development assistance and the CFSP instruments, military and civilian crisis management for conflict prevention in a more efficient and coherent way. The Council, therefore, needed to develop priority areas for conflict prevention within the framework of the CFSP. The Commission acquired a very important role in the development of a conflict prevention programme, somewhat inconsistent given the fact that several state governments claimed that conflict prevention was an ESDP issue, which would undermine the role of the Commission.[390] However, given the resources at its disposal and the experience it had in conflict prevention, it was hardly surprising that the Commission indeed obtained a pivotal role.

The Commission was entrusted by the state governments with producing a document titled 'Communications on Conflict Prevention and on Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development'. This document also underlined the importance of assuring that the pillar structure did not undermine the possibility to finance measures of conflict prevention.[391] In addition, it

---

[389] Improving the Coherence and Effectiveness of the European Union Action in the Field of Conflict Prevention. Report to the Nice European Council by Secretary General/High Representative and the Commission, Nice, 8 December 2000.

[390] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 May 2003.

[391] The Commission's role in conflict prevention was also strengthened by the fact that it received the Conflict Prevention and Crisis Response Unit during the French Presidency. This unit was to be responsible for putting conflict prevention considerations into the activities of the Commission and co-ordinating the Commission's activities with the CFSP. Between 2000 and 2002, the Unit grew from one staff member to 15 according to an issue briefing by the International Crisis Group. "EU Crisis Response Capabilities: An Update", Issues Briefing, International Crisis Group, Brussels, 29 April 2002, p. 11.

suggested that the state governments should ratify the Rome Statute on the International Criminal Court and the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti Personnel Mines and on their Destruction. These were politically sensitive statements and several of the state governments expressed their dismay over the fact that the Commission, which had a limited political mandate for participating in the second pillar, had initiated such political proposals.[392] Nevertheless, besides this aspect, the paper was rather well received among the state governments and was not subject to intense negotiations.

Impetus From the European Parliament

To provide the political momentum for a more federal and far-reaching vision on the ESDP process and protect its interest in the process, the European Parliament passed a resolution named "Resolution on the Establishment of a Common European Security and Defence Policy" on 30 November.[393] This was certainly a maximalist vision of the ESDP. The resolution talked about the importance of developing a genuine European space policy for the purpose of surveillance and proposed the establishment of a European Union Space Command to support the ESDP. It also called on the state governments to establish a strategy for the use of military force and the principles of intervention and it advocated a drastically increased role for the European Parliament regarding the parliamentary scrutiny of the ESDP process. However, besides initiatives like this and a few others, it remained an indisputable fact that the European Parliament still had a minuscule role within the ESDP process compared to the state governments.

The European Council Summit in Nice

The European Council Summit in Nice on 7-9 December had an ambitious agenda insofar that it was intended to deal with the conclusion of the IGC as well as the Presidency Reports and the Presidency Conclusions from the French Presidency. The negotiations were very stormy and the

---

[392] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 May 2003.
[393] Resolution on the Establishment of a Common European Security and Defence Policy Rapporteur: Catherine Lalumère, European Parliament 30 November 2000.

results, even though in the end rather satisfactory for all state governments, did not signify a victory for the viability of the integration process in itself or the EU as an institution.[394] The negotiations actually had to be extended by an additional day in order to ensure that all the issues were finally resolved.[395] Swedish Prime Minister Göran Persson encapsulated the mood among the Head of States pretty well when he declared rather frankly after the Summit: 'We acknowledged it [the Nice agreement] as a great success since we always do that'.[396]

There were three issues regarding the IGC that were particularly difficult to reach agreements on. First and foremost, there was the critical negotiation issue of the distribution of votes in the Council of Ministers. In particular, France and Germany had very intense negotiations, which saw Germany wanting more votes than France given the fact that its population dwarfed France's by more than 20 million people. This, in part, seemed to reflect the views of the relatively new Schröder government that was less apologetic about Germany's past and wanted it to act like an ordinary European country.[397] Yet France was very critical of the German proposal. One French diplomat, when pressed for rational explanations for why Germany and France should have the same number of votes, even went so far as to give the enigmatic message that 'Germany might have a bigger population but France has nuclear weapons!'[398] In the end, the state governments agreed on a compromise, whereby Germany maintained the same number of votes as France, but an additional agreement was reached, which saw decisions by qualified majority voting also having to reflect the population sizes of the various Member States.

Secondly, the issue of whether the initiation of the ESDP process would require changes to the Treaty of the European Union was a critical negotiation point during the IGC. For a long time, it looked like the Member States would be unable to reach a compromise on this issue.[399] On one side of the negotiation spectrum, Ireland did not want any changes to the Treaty of the European Union at all with regards to the ESDP process, but it was rather isolated on this position. On the other hand, the Netherlands was especially willing to press Ireland on this issue since it feared that the absence of changes to the Treaty would generate confusion over the command structure for the ESDP process. It also claimed that the Treaty had to be changed in order to assure

---

[394] Timothy Garton Ash in <u>The Guardian</u>, 12 December 2000.
[395] This was primarily based on difficulties reaching an agreement on Saturday night's negotiations because of Belgium's insistence that it would have the same number of votes as the Netherlands in the Council of Ministers.
[396] <u>Die Press</u>, 11 December 2002.
[397] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[398] Charles Cogan, <u>The Third Option</u>, p. 143.
[399] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.

parliamentary accountability for the ESDP process. Also Belgium, Luxembourg and Italy stressed the importance of making changes to the Treaty. In the end, Ireland was forced to approve of moderate alterations to Articles 17 and 25 of the Treaty providing that these provisions did not mention anything about NATO since this would make it more difficult to secure the approval of the Irish population in the referendum on the Nice Treaty.[400] These decisions facilitated the establishment of the permanent political and military bodies and for the inclusion of the WEU's appropriate functions in the EU.

The third critical negotiation point regarded the scope and size of the concept 'reinforced co-operation'. Britain had gradually become more positive to reinforced co-operation during the ESDP process, but was concerned in the run-up to the Nice IGC that especially Germany and France were pushing the issue very hard.[401] The initial proposal presented by the French Presidency on reinforced integration at the Council Summit in Nice stated that initiatives for defence material co-operation and enhanced crisis management co-operation would be included.[402] The Atlanticist state governments led by the United Kingdom and the non-aligned Sweden disapproved of this proposal. The United Kingdom especially opposed the references that indicated that there would be a special link between Eurocorp and the ESDP process given the fact that Eurocorp was only partially attached to NATO. Sweden wanted to go even further and was keen to remove all references to defence related issues regarding reinforced co-operation.[403] It should be noted that it had the support of Ireland and Denmark regarding this position. However, Finland, which normally was a close ally of Sweden in the ESDP process, was less concerned about reinforced integration within the second pillar since Finland's main objective was to belong to the core of the EU. It would also accept reinforced integration on defence material issues since this was of interest for its defence industry.[404] The following day the French Presidency accommodated the concerns of Sweden and the United Kingdom and consequently presented a revised version of the provisions for reinforced co-operation that stipulated that enhanced co-operation 'cannot concern questions having military implications or those in the defence area'. It was, in the end, concluded that reinforced co-operation only would be applicable to decisions taken within the framework of Common Positions and Common

---

[400] Article 17 was changed, as it stood in the provisions of the Amsterdam Treaty, so that it stated that it would be the EU rather than the WEU that would undertake the crisis management operations. Article 25 elaborated on the roles of the new security bodies within the ESDP process. It should also be noted that article 27a was modified to make room for some increased use of reinforced co-operation within the CFSP framework.
[401] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.
[402] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[403] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foregin Affairs, 26 August 2004.
[404] Interview with representative from the Finish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 20 February 2004.

Strategies. Yet Article 17.4 changed the rules in the second pillar in order not to prevent two or more Member States on a bilateral basis through the WEU or NATO from becoming involved in reinforced co-operation.

In regards to the non-IGC related work that the French Presidency conducted on ESDP issues, it seems clear that the focus was on assuring permanent arrangements for EU-NATO relations and working towards achieving the military capability goals. However, before the issue became an EU topic, it was also necessary to make sure that NATO had a common position in this regard, which was indeed difficult to facilitate. Neither France nor Turkey (the two detractors within the negotiations) approved of starting negotiations with the EU until there was an agreement within NATO on its exact position.[405] The basic reason for this was that both countries wanted to use the EU-NATO axis as a bargaining chip. Neither of the two would have been particularly upset if the negotiations on this issue ended in failure, even though it was based on different assumptions since France expected that it would lead the EU to develop independent operational planning resources. Turkey, on the other hand, presumed that it would torpedo the ESDP process all together.[406] Turkey was not satisfied with the arrangements suggested by the French Presidency since they gave Turkey less influence than the NATO-WEU arrangements.[407] Turkey was also concerned that the ERRF could be used against Turkish interests, especially regarding Cyprus and, therefore, it demanded that it would automatically have the right to participate in all EU crisis management operations.[408] The Turkish position was rather static and probably also used as an instrument in its talks with the Union for when it could start EU membership negotiations.[409] Especially the General Staff in Turkey was critical of the proposed arrangements for EU-NATO relations.[410] Yet the French failure to reach an accord with Turkey partly was a reflection of the fact that the French Presidency was not as co-operative in this regard as might have first been expected since the preferred French solution to this arrangement was that the EU would have the maximum degree of independence from NATO.[411] Furthermore, the recent French recognition of the 'Armenian genocide' had made Franco-Turkish relations reach an all time low.

---

[405] Interview with representative from NATO International Staff, 6 November 2001.
[406] Interview with representative from NATO International Staff, 22 November 2002.
[407] Interview with representative from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 8 October 2002.
[408] Interview with representative from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 8 October 2002.
[409] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.
[410] Interview with representative from NATO International Staff, 22 November 2002.
[411] Michael Quinlan, "European Defence Co-operation", RUSI Journal, April 2001.

For the establishment of permanent EU-NATO relations, there were two procedural issues, which the EU had to take a position on and were especially difficult to reach agreements on. It should be noted that the French Presidency was very adamant about ensuring that the EU had a common position on these issues before starting the negotiations with NATO; otherwise France feared that NATO would exploit the divided positions among the EU state governments.[412] The first issue was the scope of EU-NATO consultations that, according to all countries, except France, was to go beyond mere military crisis management. The other issue was the frequency of meetings between the two organisations. France blocked the proposal that EU-NATO meetings could be done on an ad hoc basis if it was requested to do so by a national government. All state governments, except France, also supported the idea that it was going to be NATO's defence planning concept that would constitute the foundation for the EU's defence planning system.

The process of establishing EU-NATO relations was not helped by the fact that the first draft of the Presidency Conclusions that the Presidency provided at the Nice Summit was, according to one scholar of European affairs, referred to as 'outrageous' since it did an extremely 'Europeanist' interpretation of EU-NATO relations.[413] This experience did shape the British view of the desirability of further advancing the ESDP process in an unfavourable manner and given the way that France was acting the United Kingdom was seriously considering reducing its activism in this field.[414] The United States also expressed deep concern over the Nice process, which most likely also affected the British view. Assistant Secretary of State John Bolton claimed that the French proposal for the ESDP was 'a dagger point at NATO's heart' and if the EU and NATO were unable to work better together on security issues, the United States would stop intelligence sharing with the United Kingdom.[415]

The Presidency Report from the Nice Summit also described the measures that would be taken during non-crisis periods, both in the pre-operational and the operational phase. It was stated that the so-called Committee of Contributors would play the key role in the day-to-day management of an operation.[416] This indicated that the political influence that the contributing state governments would have would be in proportions to the size and relevance of their

---

[412] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.
[413] Interview with British researcher , 23 September 2002.
[414] Interview with Charles Grant, 22 September 2002.
[415] London Sunday Times, 15 December 2002.
[416] European Council Nice, 7-9 December 2000, Presidency Conclusions.

contribution.[417] This was an important incentive for non-EU NATO members to contribute to EU-led crisis management operations since they would then be able to participate on an equal footing in the operational planning process of such operations. Furthermore, it indicated that the lesson learned from Operation *Allied Force* by the state governments was that in order for multinational peace enforcements to function only the key contributing countries would influence the conduct of the operation in order to avoid the problems associated with 'war by committee'.[418]

A decision was also reached at the Nice Summit to make the EU ready to undertake some crisis management operations by the time of the European Council Summit in Laeken in December 2001. It was the United Kingdom and France that were pushing for this decision while some of the other Atlanticist state governments and the non-aligned nations would have preferred to wait with such a commitment. The proposal was a departure from the decision taken at Helsinki and done to ensure that the ESDP process did not lose momentum after the French Presidency. This was an apparent risk since the two following Presidencies (Sweden and Belgium) did not have the same political weight and keen interest in the ESDP process as France.

Given the results of the French Presidency, which were, as previously outlined, somewhat innovative with advancing conflict prevention and relatively poor with promoting civilian crisis management, the Nice Presidency titled 'Report Strengthening of European Union Capabilities for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management' emphasised the connection and mutually reinforcing links between civilian crisis management and conflict prevention. The Report pointed out that the four priority areas for civilian crisis management also were needed to enable the Union to take more responsibility in the field of conflict prevention and vice-versa.[419] It entrusted the Swedish Presidency, which had stated that it would make civilian crisis management its highest priority, with moving the process along in this regard. In sum, the French Presidency, maybe more than any other before or after it, exposed the greatest challenge facing the ESDP process; namely, maintaining the unity of purpose for this process between the Atlanticist- and the Europeanist oriented state governments.

---

[417] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.

[418] Professor Lawrence Freedman explained the political dynamics behind this problem by saying that 'The most committed do not expect the least committed to tell them what to do; they are inclined to make their own decisions together since they are the ones that are taking the political and military risks'. Interview with Lawrence Freedman, 12 May 2002.

[419] Annex II to Annex VI Strengthening of European Union Capabilities for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management.

The Swedish Presidency, January-June 2001

The momentum for the ESDP processes slowed down somewhat after the French Presidency. There were several reasons for this stagnation of the process during 2001. Firstly, and most importantly, the process had advanced very rapidly up to the time of the IGC in Nice and it was, therefore, not surprising that it had reached a stage, where it had to be consolidated, rather than expanded. Secondly, the British Government was facing an election in May 2001, which made it, in the words of Professor Michael Clark, 'take its eyes off the ball' and it would be less proactive within the ESDP process up to the election.[420] Furthermore, the rejection of the Nice Treaty in the Irish referendum in June 2001 indicated that progress within this sphere was dependent upon obtaining more support among wider segments of the European population before it could be taken further.[421] Yet, the outlook for the ESDP process did not look entirely bleak at the beginning of 2001. The new security bodies were operating satisfactorily and even if there were serious shortfalls in the military capabilities, the Headline Goal process had gone better than many had expected.[422] Furthermore, even if the process was not expanded during 2001, there were important developments in the implementation of the process during this year.

The most key unresolved issue at the time was the unsettled permanent arrangement for EU-NATO relations. The expectations on the Swedish Presidency were not particularly high in reference to advancing the ESDP process in general and facilitating an agreement for EU-NATO

---

[420] Professor Michael Clarke, oral witness to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 19 July 2001.

[421] Interview with representative from the Irish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 19 May 2004.

[422] For a negative account on the ability of the EU state governments to achieve the Headline Goal, see Richard Medley, 'Europe's Next Big Idea'. Yet, on the military side, there were some European capability initiatives taken outside the EU during 2001, which arguably, in part, were done to, among other things, improve the chances of reaching the Headline Goal, at least based on a long-term perspective. The United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Germany, Luxembourg, and Turkey signed a Memorandum of Understanding on the A 400 at the Paris Air Show in June 2001. The Netherlands decided to spend a further £ 84 million on upgrading European capabilities in order to achieve the Headline Goal. The United Kingdom undertook several procurement programmes on sea- and airlift capabilities that were publicly justified in order to make it correspond to the demands of the Headline Goal process and the Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) within NATO. Greece defended its procurement of two new frigates, Apache helicopters and 50 F-15 jets on the grounds that these resources were needed to achieve Greece's contribution to the Headline Goal process. By January 2001, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy and France ratified a treaty to give legal status to OCCAR (Organisation for Joint Armament Cooperation), which has been designed to better co-ordinate the procurement of defence equipment. Thus, it seems plausible that the initiation of the ESDP process, at least on the periphery, had improved the development of more military capabilities among the EU state governments. However, it would take some time until the above procurement plans had been implemented and as the EU moved towards making its military and civilian crisis management functions operational, the remaining shortage of capabilities became more pressing.

relations in particular.[423] The reason for this pessimism was based both on the fact that Sweden had been a reluctant partner in the ESDP process and that it was not a NATO member. Furthermore, Sweden's diplomatic relations with Turkey, the key opponent to such an agreement, were not particularly good. Thus, the chances of resolving this issue during the Swedish Presidency looked very small.[424] The Swedish Presidency, therefore, undertook a pragmatic approach and made the decision that this issue was, first and foremost, an internal NATO problem. Sweden would, therefore, leave it to other actors to try to resolve this complicated problem.[425] This decision was probably also based on advice from the United Kingdom, which preferred to lead these negotiations by itself.[426] This gave the Swedish Presidency an opportunity to focus on making important progress, particularly regarding the civilian aspects of crisis management.[427]

Advancing Civilian Crisis Management

Civilian crisis management was indeed highly prioritised by the Swedish Presidency. The Minister for Foreign Affairs Anna Lindh gave a statement to the European Parliament on conflict prevention and civil crisis management, in which she stressed that it was absolutely vital that the EU improved its abilities in these fields.[428] The Swedish agenda for civilian crisis management and conflict prevention was very broad and included many aspects. The Swedish Presidency wanted, for example, to broaden the area of civilian crisis management beyond the Feria Capability Targets and include the skills, for example, of human rights- and disarmament experts. Furthermore, it produced a proposal for the modalities of participation by third party states in the civilian crisis management function.[429] According to the Swedish proposal, these third party states would have the same rights and obligations as the EU state governments in the day-to-day business of civilian crisis management operations and the modalities for the

---

[423] It should also be noted that the Council Secretariat issued a draft paper named 'Road Map after Nice'. This paper was, in part, intended to increase the pressure on the Swedish Presidency to advance the military side of the ESDP process. Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.
[424] Hanna Ojanen, 'Hopes, Expectations and Worries'.
[425] Bo Bjurulf, "How did Sweden Manage the European Union?", p. 20.
[426] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.
[427] The fact the Sweden was able to promote the relevance of civilian crisis management and conflict prevention within the EU was communicated to a Swedish public that generally had been reluctant about the development of the ESDP. This was evidence that Sweden indeed could influence the ESDP for the better, i.e., make it more peaceful. See Bjurulf, "How did Sweden Manage the European Union?", p. 20.
[428] Minster for Foreign Affairs Anna Lindh, "Conflict Prevention and Civilian Crisis Management – Statement in the European Parliament", 14 March 2001.
[429] Simon Duke, The EU and Crisis Management, p. 145.

arrangements seem to have been influenced by the framework provided for the military crisis management function in the same regards. The Swedish Presidency also developed an exercise policy named the EU Exercise Program and Exercises Specifications (EXSPEC), which entrusted the Political and Security Committee with the responsibility for the planning, training and evaluation of EU's military and civilian crisis management capabilities.[430]

The FYROM Crisis

As had proven to be the case for previous Presidencies, there were also external events and initiatives that influenced the Presidency. The development of a conflict prevention programme was boosted by the fact that the High Representative and the Swedish Presidency, together with the Secretary General of NATO, were able to prevent the outbreak of a violent conflict in the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia (FYROM). This was achieved by way of intense negotiations and mediation during the spring of 2001.[431] The EU also offered FYROM a preventive political action plan that was intended to reduce ethnic tension and stop some of the causes of conflict in the country.[432] This successful initiative also put conflict prevention higher on the political agenda within the EU and facilitated possibilities for making the EU programme on conflict prevention more substantial and effective.[433] Furthermore, the Commission published the document 'Communication on Conflict Prevention' on 11 April 2001, which took a very comprehensive and multifaceted approach to conflict prevention.[434] This document was also formative for the subsequent process to develop a conflict prevention programme that could be adopted by the European Council.[435]

---

[430] Exercises have throughout the ESDP process been very important in advancing it since they force the state governments to straighten out planning issues that previously had been covered by creatively ambiguous references. Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.

[431] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.

[432] It should, however, be noted that FYROM had been the subject of several conflict prevention initiatives even before the crisis broke out. The EU had provided unarmed monitors to FYROM, established a Trade and Cooperation Agreement and financed and assisted with political and economic reforms.

[433] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.

[434] The document 'Communication on Conflict Prevention' set out four main objectives for conflict prevention. Firstly, to attempt to mainstream a conflict prevention perspective into the EU's external relations within all three pillars. Secondly, the initiative intended to improve the efficiency of actions targeting what it perceived to be the causes of violent conflicts, such as poverty and ethnic tensions. Thirdly, the document highlighted the importance of improving the Union's ability to respond quickly to conflicts. Fourthly, the document stressed the relevance of improving co-operation between the EU and other international organisations that deal with conflict prevention, such as the UN, OSCE and the G8 Group.

[435] 'EU Crisis Response Capabilities', Issues Report No. 2, International Crisis Group, Brussels, 26 June 2001 p. 16.

The progress made on policing with regards to civilian crisis management was one of the most notable successes of the Swedish Presidency. At the first ever conference of National Police Commissioners of the EU Member States on 10 May 2001, a Police Action Plan was adopted. This action plan was intended to enhance the possibilities of planning and conducting European policing operations at the political-strategic level. This included practical measures, such as identifying a common legal framework, enhancing command and communications aspects and agreeing on the appropriate modalities for financing EU policing operations. A police unit within the Council Secretariat, which was to assist with planning and conducting police missions, was also agreed upon. This was very helpful since there was indeed very limited experience within the Council Secretariat of how to use police for civilian crisis management operations.[436]

Further Impetus for Military Crisis Management

Although at the Nice Summit the United Kingdom and France had clashed over arrangements for EU-NATO relations, the two decided to hold a bilateral summit in order to work towards reducing the shortfalls in military capabilities. This was because both states had invested considerable political capital in assuring that the EU state governments would reach the Headline Goal by 2003.[437] At a Franco-British Summit at Cahors on 21 February 2001, the French and British Defence Ministers held consultations on co-operation to develop such capabilities as SEAD, precision munitions and aircraft carriers.[438] A proposal was also made to hold a second Capabilities Commitment Conference at the end of 2001 that would focus on remedying the shortfalls in capabilities. This initiative later led to the informal Defence Ministers' Council Summit in Brussels on 6 April, where an agreement was reached that such a conference should be held in November the same year.

Further impetus for dealing with the shortfalls in military capabilities was provided by a German-Dutch Memorandum of Understanding on Mutual Co-operation to Reinforce European Air Transport Capacity in Brussels on 14 May 2001.[439] This initiative was taken to reduce some of the burden upon the United Kingdom and France, which were complaining that they were

---

[436] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.
[437] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.
[438] Franco-British statement on European Defence, Cahors, 21 February 2001.
[439] German-Dutch Memorandum of Understanding on Mutual Cooperation to Reinforce European Air Transport Capacity Brussels, 14 May 2001.

having to take a disproportionate large amount of responsibility for assuring that the state governments were making progress towards the Headline Goal.[440] The memorandum also proved useful in order for the Netherlands and Germany to obtain more political recognition for their procurement of the transport-plane A400.

The Swedish Presidency devoted sizeable efforts to advancing the military aspect of crisis management, even though it had a much more low-key approach to this compared to the French Presidency, which was appreciated by the other state governments.[441] This work had been prepared well in advance, not least through undisclosed co-ordination with the United Kingdom.[442] The Presidency had also worked on establishing better guidelines for the inclusion of non-EU members in EU-led crisis management operations and also developing military exercise policies.[443] Yet, as previously noted, military crisis management kept a low profile during the Swedish Presidency. This should not probably be blamed on the Presidency, but rather on EU-NATO relations, which were in a stalemate, and it was perceived as if the process had stagnated as a consequence.[444]

European Council Summit in Göteborg

The European Council Summit in Göteborg on 17-18 June was not a dramatic summit as far as the negotiation process was concerned. Rather it will, first and foremost, be remembered for the very violent riots in Göteborg caused by the Anti-Globalisation movement, which had gathered for a major demonstration in the city against the Summit. The high point of the Summit was the visit by the US President George W. Bush. The Summit, therefore, provided an opportunity to discuss some issues of key importance regarding transatlantic relations, such as the future of the Anti- Ballistic Missile Treaty and NATO enlargement.

On the civilian side of the ESDP process, new targets for strengthening the rule of law, civilian administration and civil protection were adopted at the Council Summit. In the area of the rule of law, it was agreed that general information on rule of law capabilities, including readiness as

---

[440] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[441] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[442] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.
[443] "Results of the Swedish Presidency", PM 01/07/2001, Prime Minster's Office.
[444] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2003.

well as specific national expertise, should be put into a rule of law database established by the Council Secretariat as part of CIVCOM. The state governments also agreed to create a pool of up to 200 specialists, who could be sent with 30 days' notice. In reference to civil protection, it was decided that since civil protection also was an area that came under the first pillar, it was agreed that CIVCOM would be responsible for the inter-pillar co-ordination in this field.[445]

There were also important decisions taken by the Council in Göteborg to strengthen the political dialogue between the EU and the UN and in an annex to the Presidency Conclusions the framework for the modalities for EU-UN co-operation in conflict prevention and civilian crisis management was presented.[446] This was an important achievement for Sweden, which has been a long-time supporter of the UN-system. The progress on conflict prevention during the Swedish Presidency was also marked at the European Council Summit in Göteborg. The Swedish Presidency devoted substantial efforts to developing 'The EU Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts' as this Council document was called. There was an awareness during the negotiations that the aim was not so much to develop new capabilities, but rather to guarantee that the EU had more of a coherent and co-ordinated approach to conflict prevention.[447] The Presidency Conclusions from the European Council in Göteborg, therefore, stated that conflict prevention was one of the main objectives of the Union's external relations and should be integrated in all relevant aspects, including the European Security and Defence Policy, development co-operation and trade.[448] The Council endorsed 'The EU Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts', which would provide the Union with increased early warning-, analysis- and action capabilities.[449] The programme was brief, concise and included clear recommendations that could be applied to the policy making process. The overarching intention was to guard that conflict prevention routines became a part of the Union's daily business. According to the programme, the Union would also aim at contributing to a global culture of conflict prevention. However it should be noted that even though few openly objected to the development of the conflict prevention programme some of the other state governments had a very sceptical view of what such a programme actually could accomplish and there were also

---

[445] It is interesting to note that for the first time there were not separate reports on civilian crisis management and military crisis management. Instead, there was an integrated report that included both aspects, which had been a long-standing objective of Sweden's ESDP policy.

[446] European Council Göteborg, 15-16 June 2001, Presidency Conclusions, Annex Council Conclusions on EU-UN Cooperation in Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management.

[447] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.

[448] European Council Göteborg, 15-16 June 2001, Presidency Conclusions.

[449] European Council Göteborg, 15-16 June 2001, Presidency Conclusions.

some dismay over the fact that the adoption of this programme consumed time that could be used to advance more important aspects of the ESDP process.[450]

In sum, the result of the Swedish Presidency reflected Swedish preferences in the ESDP process. Much ground was covered on rather unexplored concepts such as conflict prevention and EU-UN relations, which made the Swedish Presidency appear as rather successful. However, it should, of course, be noted that the reason why these concepts were rather unexplored was that they were not very highly prioritised by some of the previous presidencies since the military aspect of the ESDP process had been the focal point. Less progress was made regarding EU-NATO relations, but some important ground was covered concerning the military capability aspect. Overall, the style and manner, in which Sweden conducted the Presidency, was rather appreciated by the Member States.[451] The outgoing Presidency assigned the Belgians, who were next in line, the task of, for instance, establishing a police capability commitment conference and a military capability commitment conference as well as working towards being able to declare the EU's crisis management mechanism operational by the end of its six-month period.

---

[450] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.
[451] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

The Belgian Presidency, July-December 2001

Belgium had an ambitious agenda for its EU Presidency. On 4 July 2001, Prime Minster Guy Verhofstadt presented a record long list of 16 priorities for Belgium's six-month reign of the EU.[452] At the presentation he somewhat provocatively stated that the citizens of the Union would not regard Europe as a reality until it had a common defence policy.[453] The long-term goal of Belgium would be to work toward the realisation of such an arrangement. In the meantime, the Belgian Presidency would focus on developing the ESDP process, which was seen as the way to the higher end of a common defence for Europe.

At the first General Affairs Council meeting led by the Belgian Presidency it was announced that it would be focusing on enhancing the work to identify more military capabilities and drafting standard operating procedures for crisis management operations across the EU pillars. The latter task would, in the end, prove to consume a considerable amount of the Belgian Presidency's time and energy within the ESDP sphere since it demanded something of a cultural revolution within the EU, which still was very much shaped by the 'civilian power' identity.[454] However, the Belgian Presidency also brought a new set of issues to the negotiating table by proposing that the EU adopt a White Paper on European Defence, develop a public outreach programme for the ESDP process in order to cultivate public support and promote a system for common financing for military resources. However, the last proposal was 'dead on arrival', as one diplomat referred to it, since it did not acknowledge the political reality that neither France nor the United Kingdom could approve of any arrangement that would, in any way, infringe on the intergovernmental structure of the ESDP process.[455] The initiative was, therefore, described as a loss and waste of political energy. The Presidency also paid some attention to the relevance of conflict prevention and civilian crisis management by stating in the work programme that its efforts would focus on policing aspects, training personnel, strengthening civil protection and the rule of law.[456] The Belgian Presidency, furthermore, declared that it had ambitions to federalise

---

[452] Work Programme of the Belgian Presidency, Prime Minster Guy Verhofstadt, Address to the European Parliament, 4 July 2001.
[453] This statement strongly conflicts with the EU agreements reached at Cologne and Nice, which had explicitly highlighted the fact that collective or common defence would remain under NATO's jurisdiction and would not be part of the ESDP process.
[454] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.
[455] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.
[456] The Belgian Presidency of the European Union 1 July-31 December 2001, Priorities Note European Security and Defence Policy.

some aspects of civil protection, which required a legal framework and a technical basis. Belgium had previously been critical of the development of a civilian crisis management function on the basis that it would undermine the Commission's role within this sphere. Thus, it was rather symptomatic of the Belgian position on civilian crisis management that it wanted to federalise some aspects of the civilian crisis management function in order to strengthen the Commission's role.[457]

The Impact of 11 September 2001

No EU Presidency during the period from 1999 to 2001 was as influenced by changes in the external security environment as the Belgian Presidency. Thus, if there were any doubts left that the impact by the external security environment did not affect the pace and direction of the European integration process, they were all removed after 11 September 2001 since these events generated a number of initiatives to strengthen the security of the EU against the threat of international terrorism. The agenda of the Belgian Presidency was almost entirely overtaken by the terrorist attacks in the United States on 11 September and the implications this generated.[458] Yet the Belgian Presidency was, to a large extent, sidelined during the diplomatic process that followed across the Atlantic after 11 September. It is indicative that the Franco-German-British meeting intended to discuss the EU's response to the US operation in Afghanistan prior to the Ghent Summit on 19 October 2001 did not even bother to invite the Belgian Presidency.[459] Most EU state governments were eager to show their particular commitment to support the United States in its fight against international terrorism and, therefore, became active in bilateral dialogues with the United States rather than through the CFSP framework. The relatively new Bush administration also seemed more comfortable with dealing with the Europeans in this way. The experiences from 11 September, therefore, clearly indicated some of the frailties of the CFSP framework in general and the shortcomings of the rotating EU Presidency in particular. The larger EU countries demonstrated that they were not content with assuming a merely supporting role vis-à-vis the EU Presidency, when major international security events were taking place. They demanded to be at the forefront of a common European diplomacy policy

---

[457] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.

[458] Prime Minster Guy Verhofstadt also admitted this in his address to the European Parliament on 17 December 2001.

[459] Hendrik Vos and Emilie Baillieul, "The Belgian Presidency and the Post-Nice Process after Laeken", <u>ZEI Discussion Paper</u>, 2002, p. 12.

rather than just play second fiddle. Consequently, it seems as if the major states had to be represented on a permanent basis within the CFSP framework if it was to be sustainable during times of turmoil and instability.[460] It should be noted that the EU and the ESDP process had a lower international profile than NATO in the aftermath of 11 September. After a proposal from the Secretary General of NATO Lord George Robertson, Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty was activated on 12 September, which indicated that the terrorist attack on the United States was to be seen as an attack on all Member States. Even though the initiative did not generate many practical implications, it suggested that NATO had a role to play in the military efforts to combat international terrorism.[461] The EU was not granted an equivalent role by its Member States and, in reality, the events of 11 September did little to advance the development of the ESDP process.

The EU Action Plan

Beyond the diplomatic setback for the Belgian Presidency after 11 September, there were, however, a number of practical initiatives to protect the Union's citizens against the threat of terrorism adopted during its Presidency.[462] The merits of these measures can largely be attributed to the valued work that the Belgian Presidency did in this regard. On 21 September, an extraordinary European Council Summit in Brussels declared the state governments' total solidarity with the United States.[463] The state governments also declared their intention to strengthen the Union against terrorism.[464] This was to be done through enhanced police and judicial co-operation, developing international legal instruments, strengthening air security and co-ordinating the European Union's global action.[465] The state governments also agreed that 11 September had made it even more urgent to declare the military and civilian resources

---

[460] Jolyon Howorth, 'The European Security Conundrum: Prospects for ESDP after September 11 2001', Notre Europe Policy Paper, No. 1, March 2002, p. 7.

[461] The practical measures undertaken as a consequence of the activation of article five was that the Member States agreed to increase intelligence sharing, provide overflight rights for United States and other allied aircraft; redeploy elements of the Standing Naval Forces to the Eastern Mediterranean and deploy NATO's AWACS to support operations against terrorism.

[462] This generated into a debate among the state governments regarding whether the military and civilian crisis management capabilities could be used within the EU or if they were solely focused on operations outside the EU. Some of the state governments that adhered to non-alignment were concerned that the use of military crisis management resources for internal use could be considered as a form of collective defence. Other state governments proclaimed that it was vital that they enhance the 'homeland security' of the Union.

[463] However, thanks to the objections of Sweden and Ireland, the EU was unable to express its support for the activation of article five by NATO on 12 September. Europe's Security and Defence Policy Confronted with International Terrorism- Reply to the Annual Report of the Council, Report the Assembly of the Western European Union, 3 December 2001, p. 5.

[464] Extraordinary European Council Meeting, Brussels 21 September 2001, p. 2.

[465] Plan of Action: European Policy to Combat Terrorism, 21 September 2001.

operational at the earliest possible date.[466] This agreement, which was in line with the agreement from Nice, was based on the assumption that a military response by the United States against the Taliban regime and the Al Quida network would strain US military resources. Thus, it seemed likely that the US would reduce its military presence in the ongoing peace support operations in the Balkans, which would require greater European participation.

11 September 2001 and the ESDP Process

Most of the proposals to further develop the ESDP, which were based on the assumption that 11 September had given impetus for security co-operation, did not materialise.[467] The Spanish initiative to expand the Helsinki Headline Goal and the Feria Capability Targets to adopt them for the war on international terrorism were discarded as was the proposal to expand the Petersberg Tasks to include anti-terrorist operations.[468] The proposal to create a strategic concept within the EU as a consequence of 11 September was also rejected, as was an initiative to establish a collective defence provision as a result of the terrorist attacks.

The reason for the unwillingness to expand the ESDP process after 11 September can be traced to especially the British position, which was based on several arguments.[469] Firstly, the United Kingdom feared that the United States might perceive such initiatives as being taken in order to explore the fact that the United States was focused on other international issues and might not be able to voice its opposition to such an initiative. Good transatlantic relations in the new security environment after 11 September were imperative since the frontline against international terrorism was intelligence co-operation on both sides of the Atlantic. The risk of a major terrorist attack in Europe could not be excluded and if that were to happen, support from the United States would be indispensable. Secondly, given the strains on the ability to identify the necessary resources for the military Headline Goal, there was a reluctance to expand the missions that the

---

[466] Extraordinary European Council Meeting, Brussels 21 September 2001, p. 2.
[467] For an excellent analysis of how the EU state governments have reacted to the fight against international terrorism, see Térese Delpech, 'International Terrorism and Europe', <u>Chaillot Papers</u>, No. 56, European Union Institute for Security Studies, December 2002.
[468] It should be noted that this proposal did not come as a surprise since Spain had for a very long time worked to move the issue of terrorism higher up the EU's political agenda. Maartje Rutten, 'From Nice to Laeken European Defence: Core Documents', <u>Chaillot Papers</u>, No. 51, EU Institute for Security Studies, April 2002, p. 143.
[469] However, also Sweden was very critical to the idea to expand the ESDP process after 11 September and it repeatedly stated that the EU's crisis management capabilities only could be used for operations outside of the EU. This position derived from considerations over how an expansion of the ESDP process could affect Swedish non-alignment.

ESDP would have to undertake since this would force the capability process to be expanded further. Thirdly, since the Member States of NATO invoked Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty on 12 September 2001, it was assumed that it would be NATO, rather than the ESDP, which would be at the forefront in the fight against terrorism.[470] Fourthly, ever since the British experiences of the negotiations at the Nice IGC, there was an increasing reluctance among the British to the feasibility and sustainability of the ESDP process seeing as the unity of purpose for the process between France and the United Kingdom was all but evident at the time. Thus, the United Kingdom feared that some of the state governments, which were Europeanist inclined, would try to use 11 September to expand the ESDP process beyond its previous constraints and impinge upon the spheres of authority preserved for NATO.[471]

There were, however, during the Belgian Presidency some capability development initiatives taken regarding both the civilian and the military side of crisis management, which were outside the scope in the fight against international terrorism. On the civilian side, the Belgian Presidency played host to a police capabilities commitment conference in Brussels on 19 November 2001. At this conference, the state governments proclaimed that the Feria Capability Targets for the police had been reached and actually surpassed the 400 police officers that had initially been planned for. With regards to qualitative aspects, the state governments claimed that the two types of missions – strengthening and substituting local police forces – were to draw on all specialist-policing functions available in the Member States.[472] The Conference also emphasised the necessity to provide the Police Unit at the Council Secretariat with the necessary resources in order to assure the quickest possible implementation of the Police Action Plan. However, in hindsight, it is clear that the Belgian Presidency did not devote considerable efforts to substantiate civilian crisis management. The ministries responsible for civilian crisis management, for example, did not publish any detailed document on what priorities the Belgian Presidency had for civilian crisis management and there was only one person during the Belgian

---

[470] See, for example, the statement by the United Kingdom's Under-Secretary of State Ben Bradshaw: 'We accept that dealing with terrorism is a matter for collective defence so we are talking about NATO or individual nations, it is not a matter for the ESDP'. Under-Secretary of State Ben Bradshaw, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, oral statement to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 14 October 2001.

[471] It is indicative that the French Prime Minster Lionel Jospin emphasised in an address to the IHEDN on 24 September 2001 'That the 11 September attacks have brought us together. Defending peace also means protecting our own territory and it would therefore be paradoxical to consider the defence of the European Union solely from an external projection. Europe's Defence involvement in this area is, therefore, something that the Fifteen should consider'. Europe's Security and Defence Policy Confronted with International Terrorism - Reply to the Annual Report of the Council, Report to the Assembly of the Western European Union, 3 December 2001, p. 8.

[472] Police Capabilities Commitment Conference, Brussels 19 November 2001, p. 2.

Presidency who was assigned the task of further developing this area.[473] The results from the Belgian Presidency were consequently the most meagre of all the Presidencies in this field since the initiation of a civilian dimension within the ESDP process.

European Capability Action Plan

The Belgian Presidency did, however, devote substantial efforts to develop the military side of the EU's crisis management capabilities. By November 2001, the EU state governments had achieved 104 of the 144 capability requirements identified in the Headline Goal. This was then ten more than at the Capability Commitment Conference one year earlier. At the Capability Improvement Conference on 19 November, the state governments adopted the European Capability Action Plan (ECAP) to help achieve the Headline Goal, particularly for the 40 remaining shortfalls. The plan, which was proposed by the Netherlands, was based on the following four principles: the need for enhancing the effectiveness of military capabilities; the voluntary nature of the Member States' commitment; transparency and consistency with NATO and the importance of public support. A pilot country or group of countries was to be responsible for heading the work in the ECAP's different panels. Designating particular state governments as lead-nations in this process was vital to assure that the political momentum in the process increased. The pressure on the state governments to earmark capabilities to remedy the shortfalls were of a political, rather than a legal nature and, unlike NATO's capability initiatives, the ECAP had been a bottom-up programme.

The European Council Summit in Laeken

The European Council Summit in Laeken on 14-15 December was a rather turbulent meeting for several reasons. Firstly, there was a collective realisation that the CFSP instrument once again had failed to operate satisfactorily during times of crises. This was a major disappointment for most of the state governments, but it also raised the awareness of the problems ingrained in the current structure of the CFSP and it accentuated the demands for reform.

---

[473] European Security Review, April 2001, p. 3.

Secondly, at the Summit, the state governments announced that the Union now was able to 'conduct some crisis management operations' despite the fact that there were no permanent arrangements established between the EU and NATO.[474] The Presidency Conclusions stated that the capability targets for the civilian crisis management function by and large had been reached while, on the military side, there existed substantial shortfalls.[475] The institutional decision-making structures were in place, which, according to the same Conclusions, indicated that the EU would be able to conduct some of the lower end of the Petersberg Tasks. The Atlanticist countries led by the United Kingdom were very reluctant to approve of this declaration. However, since the United Kingdom had pushed for the early declaration during the French Presidency, it was for the sake of consistency desirable that it did not stop the declaration at the Laeken Summit.[476] Furthermore, the argument to declare the ESDP operational was also based on the assumption that the ESDP process could not be held hostage by the Turkish refusal to approve of safeguarding the EU's access to NATO assets and capabilities. Thus, the declaration was, in part, done to strengthen the EU's negotiation position vis-à-vis Turkey.[477] Additionally, since NATO could not, at the time, conduct out of area operations outside the Euroatlantic area, it was also perceived as being more urgent that the EU could undertake such operations.[478] The Bush administration was very critical of the declaration of operational readiness since the problem of establishing EU-NATO relations had not been solved during the Belgian Presidency and the United States feared that the ESDP would thereby increasingly develop separately from NATO.[479] On a more general note, it should, in this context, also be observed that the Belgian Presidency indeed had to devote considerable time and energy to going through the details of EU-NATO relations with the relatively new Bush administration.[480] However, the development of EU-NATO relations was not only a Turkish problem. Until 4 December Turkey had been threatening to veto the EU's guaranteed access to NATO's assets and capabilities based on concerns that the ESDP might be used against Turkish interests. After receiving assurances that Turkey's anxiety would be taken into account, it finally relinquished demands for the right to participate in all EU military operations not involving NATO planning assets. However, on 10 December, Greece blocked the agreement since it claimed that the agreement the Belgian Presidency had reached with Turkey undermined the EU's decision-making autonomy. This was

---

[474] European Council Laeken, 14-15 December 2001, Presidency Conclusions, Annex II.
[475] European Council Laeken, 14-15 December 2001, Presidency Conclusions, p. 1.
[476] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.
[477] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.
[478] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.
[479] Interview with representative from the United State's Department of Defense, 5 May 2002.
[480] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.

a major setback for the ESDP process and the declaration of operational readiness appeared to be more of a political aspiration than a realistic description of the EU's ability to militarily handle any potential crisis on its doorstep.

Thirdly, Belgian Foreign Minister Louis Michel also caused an uproar at the EU Council Summit in Laeken, when he tried to claim that the participation of the forces of the EU state governments in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan was a EU-led crisis management operation. This infuriated particularly the United Kingdom, which was the lead nation for this operation and there were no plans to test EU's decision-making structures at this stage.[481]

Fourthly, during the Belgian Presidency there had emerged a debate on the future of Europe and plans to establish a convention to facilitate a draft for a European constitution for the intergovernmental conference in 2003. The debate was indicative of an increasing sense of urgency that the current state of affairs within the European integration process was unsustainable and that there was a need for reform in order to be able to handle the enlargement process and, to a lesser extent, the new security environment after 11 September. However, the debate also illustrated the different viewpoints on both the purpose and future direction of the European integration process that indeed exists among the state governments.

In the end, it remained a fact that many of the aspirations of the Belgian Presidency for the ESDP process failed to materialise. The initiative to increase the public outreach for the ESDP process, based on the underlying assumption this could generate more public support for increased defence expenditures, ended up without any decisive results. The Belgian Presidency's White Paper proposal for European Defence was also poorly received by several of the EU state governments and the task of drafting the paper was, therefore, given to a research institute, which undermined its impact and relevance.[482] The initiative to establish common financing for creating more military capabilities also failed to materialise. The problem with these initiatives was not that they were not worthy and important causes, but that they lacked the sufficient diplomatic support of the Member States at the time. The reason for this was due to the poor co-ordination between the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Belgian Ministry of Defence. It was the latter, which had drafted the proposals, but without doing the necessary pre-consulting

---

[481] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.
[482] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.

at the diplomatic level with the other EU Member States. Moreover, the proposals proved to be a bridge too far for the ESDP process since they did not correspond to the mood of the state governments at the time. The results of the Belgian Presidency were, therefore, rather modest and the fact that the Belgian Presidency tried to champion its own agenda in a rather blunt way was ill received by the state governments. The main lesson learned from the Belgian Presidency was, above all, that there was never any point in trying to do anything against the will of the United Kingdom within the ESDP process if one wanted to succeed.[483]

Conclusions

The aim of this chapter has been two-fold. Firstly, it has tried to assess the evolution of the ESDP process between the start of the Austrian Presidency in July 1998 and the end of the Belgian Presidency in December 2001 in order to cover a lacuna of diplomatic history within the field of European integration. The intention has been to visualise some of the processes' characteristics and what the empirical content of this process has included. Secondly, the aim of the chapter has been to expose the critical negotiation issues for the ESDP process and the outcome of these negotiations.

There are several factors that could be referred to as important characteristics of the ESDP process between 1998 and 2001. However, at least, two such factors seem to have been of immense significance. Firstly, the ESDP process has been shaped by the very strong leadership that the United Kingdom and France provided for the process. As noted, it has been these two states that have been promoting the lion's share of the process and they have provided the necessary political leadership, practical expertise and military hardware to make the ESDP process materialise beyond the conceptual stage. The two countries held four bilateral summits between 1998 and 2001 in order to advance the ESDP process. The most significant of these meetings for the initiation of the process was, of course, the St Malo Summit in December 1998. But the two states also played an indispensable role in the implementation of the process by, for example, drafting the *Food for Thought Paper* and the *Toolbox Paper*. They also outlined the proposal to establish the Rapid Reaction Force and the modalities for the WEU's partial integration into the EU. These initiatives were, to varying degrees, done in close collaboration with the state governmentholding the EU Presidency, but ultimately it was most often France and

---

[483] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.

the United Kingdom that had the final say regarding the content and structure of the initiatives.[484] Their dominance of the process was almost of a hegemonic nature. Yet, while the countries have indeed provided the necessary leadership for the process, their preferences have differed substantially in the negotiations since they have represented the two opposite ends of the Europeanist versus Atlanticist views within the ESDP structure. Consequently, this set a norm within the process; namely, when these two countries were able to agree most of the others followed suit.[485] The United Kingdom and France have had more explicit and wide-ranging preferences in the ESDP process than the other state governments because they were aware that their stakes were higher and they had to pay more attention to details. The reasons for this being that they had invested the most political capital in seeing it come true and they were likely to act as lead-nations in any military operation that was undertaken within an ESDP framework. France and the United Kingdom have, therefore, had considerably more leverage and influence during the negotiations because their participation in the process was indispensable. While most other Member States had to prioritise and 'pick their battles' in the ESDP negotiations, France and the United Kingdom were able to intercede at any stage of the talks and, with a high degree of authority, demand a change to the process.[486] It should, in this context, be noted that a major difference between negotiations in NATO and the EU is that the Member States within the EU are simultaneously involved in negotiations in many different fields of integration. Thus, if a state government is not perceived as a helpful ally in advancing the common cause in security and defence co-operation, this can have negative implications for its overall standing in the integration process. Consequently, the coercive pressure that exists within the EU is, to a certain degree, greater than within NATO. This was a factor that greatly facilitated the possibility for the United Kingdom and France to take the lead in the process and they did not have any qualms about exercising coercive pressure on the state governments that were not acting co-operatively in regards to the ESDP process.

The leadership that the United Kingdom and France provided for the ESDP process also made it possible to advance the process very swiftly. However, it should, of course, be noted that the speed of the process has also depended on the commitment and competence of the various Presidencies in relation to the ESDP. Some have clearly been more helpful than others in advancing the process. The composition and establishment of the security bodies were indeed

---

[484] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.
[485] Jolyon Holworth, "European Integration and Defence: The Ultimate Challenge", p. 3.
[486] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

accomplished rather rapidly and they were first introduced in an interim form to give the process momentum. Also, the decision to make the ESDP operational by 2001 should be seen as an indication of the swiftness of the process. However, some issues proved more difficult and cumbersome than initially expected, such as the establishment of both permanent relations between the EU and NATO and inter-pillar relations. Yet beyond these details, it remains a fact that the development of the ESDP process has been fast by any international yardstick and stunningly swift by EU standards given the almost complete absence of security and defence co-operation within the EU for half a century. It should be noted that a reason for the swiftness of the process is also related to a second defining characteristic of the process; namely, its bottom-up approach.

The ESDP process has been moved forward by a bottom-up approach by way of the setting of numerical targets and then working towards those targets. This was instead of developing a top-down approach, which would have seen the state governments having to first consent to the establishment of an officially adopted strategic concept and an agreement of the exact aims and purposes of the crisis management capabilities. In essence, there was no common grand-strategic view of either the aims for or the future of this process officially agreed upon by the state governments. The reason for this is simply that the basic strategic outlook on key aspects, such as transatlantic relations, the security environment and the use of military force, are divisive issues among the state governments. As a result, the state governments did not broach aspects, such as the scope of the Petersberg Tasks, the range of the WEU illustrated profiles and the conceptual development of the civilian crisis management function, for negotiation. Thus, it was easier to agree on working towards capability targets, and then every state government could make its own interpretation of why the EU had developed the ESDP process and what the purposes of this process were. This was probably a wise choice to make at the time since it could assure that the momentum of the process would not be bogged down in endless negotiations on what could prove to be open-ended and academic questions regarding the ESDP process. The bottom-up approach will, however, constitute a challenge to the more overarching aspect of a unity of purpose for how the crisis management capabilities should be used. As Francois Heisbourg has pointed out, there are some inherent limitations to the concept of 'creative ambiguity'.[487]

---

[487] Francois Heisbourg, 'Europe's Strategic Ambitions: The Limits of Ambiguity', <u>Survival</u>, Vol. 42, No. 2, 2001.

Moving on to the second aim of the chapter, which has been to reveal the critical negotiation issues, it does seem possible, at a general level, to identify, at least, three different sorts of sources that generated shifting views within the negotiations of the ESDP process. Firstly, shifting views stemmed from the differing interpretations of what was functionally coherent and practically possible to achieve for the integration process at the time. For example, the Belgian Presidency's initiative to draft a White Paper for European Defence was rejected on the basis that it was perceived as practically impossible to achieve since the time was not ripe to take a new bold step within the ESDP process on that occasion. Another example is the Swedish proposal to include civilian crisis management and conflict prevention in the ESDP process. Some state governments rebuffed this proposal since it was perceived as functionally incoherent since some aspects of civilian crisis management already existed within the first pillar of the EU and these state governments feared that the development of a civilian crisis management function in the second pillar would only serve to duplicate the already existing functions. These forms of shifting views basically derived from differing assessments among the state governments and can be referred to as procedural factors. They should probably not be unbridgeable sources of tension between the Member States regarding the ESDP process.[488]

Secondly, shifting views within the ESDP process also derived from technical considerations based on legal or administrative constraints within the Member States. Germany was, for example, hesitant to approve of the number of police officers that were to be made available for the Feria Capability Targets, even though it had strong positive preferences for the development of a civilian crisis management capability that would entail policing. The reason why Germany was hesitant to give such approval was that it could not guarantee that it had secured access to a sufficient number of police officers for crisis management operations since the authority for policing in Germany, to a large degree, rests in the hands of the various regions (Länder). These forms of shifting views can be referred to as technocratic factors. It is also reasonable to assume that these factors should not constitute an insurmountable challenge to the ESDP process if domestic adjustments to the legal or administrative framework can be undertaken by the Member States.

---

[488] However, it should be noted that procedural factors have indeed been used as excuses to reject proposals that have run counter to the core preferences of the Member States with differing interpretations of the aims and purposes of the ESDP process.

Thirdly, yet beyond these procedural and technocratic factors, it is an inescapable fact that there did indeed exist fundamental differences among the opinions of the state governments on key defining aspects on the ESDP process. This was a product of the shifting views of the state governments on what the ESDP process was supposed to be all about. These shifting views, which can be referred to as core factors, generated hard negotiations on issues that might, at first sight, come across as petty details and stem from three fundamental and defining core-issues within the ESDP process. First and most importantly, there has existed within the process a division between the Atlanticist and the Europeanist camp.[489] The core of these shifting preferences was based upon what connection the EU should have with NATO and, in turn, also what role the United States would have in the European security structure. Some states, such as the Atlanticists, the Netherlands and Portugal (but also the non-aligned Sweden and Ireland albeit for different reasons), would initially have preferred to maintain the old system of ESDI within NATO and a clear separation between the WEU and EU. However, these countries were persuaded foremost by the United Kingdom with its strong Atlanticist credentials to support the option of an autonomous EU capability, predominately, but not exclusively, based on NATO's operational structure. Other countries, such as France and Belgium, would have opted for a completely independent EU capability with a separate operational planning structure from that of NATO. Taken to its extreme, the issue at stake here was whether the emphasis of the ESDP process should be on securing more independence for the EU from the United States in international security affairs and possibly even using this leverage to balance the role of the United States or whether it was about assuring that the EU would be a better- and, in turn, closer partner of the United States by strengthening its ability to solve its own security problems. It seems evident that the state governments had different priorities regarding this key-defining aspect of the ESDP.

Secondly, there have also existed diverging preferences between those states that promoted the military dimension and those that championed the civilian dimension of the ESDP. Occasionally, these preferences have clashed and the most eager promoters of the development of a civilian crisis management capability have certainly not always been the most stern supporters of the military dimension and vice versa.

---

[489] The transatlantic dimension can be taken to imply the scope and character of US involvement in European security. A concrete example of its involvement is the relationship between the EU and NATO and consequently the degree of the EU's autonomy in military crisis management. For this definition, see Hanna Ojanen, 'Sweden and Finland: What Difference Does It Make to be Non-Aligned?' in Nina Graeger, Henrik Larsen and Hanna Ojanen, The ESDP and the Nordic Countries: Four Variations of a Theme, p. 155.

A critical negotiation issue has been the scope of the development of the ESDP's military dimension. Some states, such as the non-aligned ones, wanted it to focus strictly on the Petersberg Tasks and preferably the lower ones, such as humanitarian missions and traditional peacekeeping operations. Other state governments had a considerably wider interpretation of the Petersberg Tasks and did not rule out that the EU would undertake coercive military action or high intensity warfare operations within the ESDP framework. Furthermore, after the events of 11 September 2001, some state governments wanted to expand the Petersberg Tasks to also entail certain anti-terrorist missions. Another critical negotiation issue regarding the scope of the military dimension of the ESDP process was the option of inserting Article V of the Modified Brussels Treaty into the Treaty of the European Union. This was something that the Europeanist camp strongly supported but it received a lukewarm reception from the Atlanticist camp. Moreover, the non-aligned state governments rejected the proposal outright partly on the basis of technocratic factors and domestic legal constraints, but also because of core factors, such as shifting views about the aims and purposes of the ESDP process.

Also the establishment and the scope of civilian crisis management was a critical negotiation issue. Some state governments foresaw no role for civilian crisis management and wanted this issue to be confined to the Commission's activities in the first pillar, while other state governments invested considerable energy and political capital into inserting civilian crisis management and conflict prevention into the second pillar. As noted, the shifting views, in part, stemmed from the procedural factors regarding the coherence of the pillar structure. However, it remains an indisputable fact that the establishment of a civilian crisis management function also touches upon core factors for some state governments. The countries that promoted the civilian dimension did this, in part, to shape the ESDP process in a way that was conducive for them, i.e., with emphasis on the less coercive dimension of this policy. And the states that opposed its establishment did this partly because they wanted to underline another dimension of the ESDP process.

The defining aspect of this issue of the balance between military and civilian means, in turn, raises the question of what kind of international security actor the EU state governments want to establish. Is it foremost a potent military actor that is willing and able to engage in even coercive military action in order to achieve its aims as a force of good or is it still basically a civilian power, which always puts premium on civilian means but does not exclude military means as a

very last option in the form of limited crisis management operations? This question, even though maybe an academic one, is still open for interpretation.

Thirdly, a division did also exist, albeit considerably smaller than the other two aspects, between the state governments that preferred some element of a federal structure for the ESDP and those state governments that demanded a strict intergovernmental framework. This had been more of a negotiation issue at the time of the implementation of the process rather than during the initiation of the ESDP. This was because the founding fathers of the ESDP process, the United Kingdom and France, clearly stated that they would not approve of any community model for security and defence co-operation within the EU. Rather, it has been based on issues, such as decisions, in some instances, being able to be taken by qualified majority voting, the use of reinforced co-operation, the strength and representation of security bodies within the ESDP framework, arrangements for common assets among the state governments and the degree of interdependence that the ESDP process would generate among the state governments. The heart of the matter is the shifting preferences regarding the degree of informal autonomy that the state governments have been willing to relinquish in order to establish the ESDP process. Some state governments have clearly been more careful to preserve their freedom of autonomous action than others within this process have. Rightly or wrongly, the intergovernmental versus federal preferences raise the question as to whether the ESDP process should be seen as a first attempt at creating some form of a common and integrated European Defence Community or the decision to resort to use military force always formally and informally will rest in the hands of the state governments.

Indicative Preferences on Key Defining Aspects within the ESDP Process

	Military	Civilian	Intergovernmental	Federal	Europeanist	Atlanticist
Belgium	P	R	R	P	P	R
Denmark	R	P	P	R	R	P
Germany	P	P	R	P	R	P
France	P	R	P	R	P	R
Ireland	R	P	P	R	I	I
Italy	P	P	R	P	I	I

Luxemb.	P	I	R	P	P	R
Netherlands	R	P	I	I	R	P
Austria	P	P	R	P	P	R
Portugal	I	I	I	I	R	P
Finland	R	P	I	I	R	P
Sweden	R	P	P	R	R	P
UK	P	P	P	R	R	P
Greece	P	I	R	P	P	R
Spain	P	I	R	P	P	R

- **P**ositive
- **I**ndifferent
- **R**eluctant

Preferences for the Scope of the Military Dimension

	Petersberg Tasks	Anti-terrorism	Article V
Belgium	X	X	X
Denmark			
Germany	X	X	X
France	X	X	X
Ireland	X		

Italy	X	X	X
Luxembourg	X	X	X
Netherlands	X		
Austria	X	X	
Portugal	X		
Finland	X	X	
Sweden	X		
UK	X		
Greece	X	X	X
Spain	X	X	X

Preferences for the Role of Civilian Crisis Management within the ESDP

	Second and First Pillar	Only First Pillar
Belgium		X
Denmark	X	
Germany	X	
France		X

Ireland	X	
Italy	X	
Luxembourg		X
Netherlands	X	
Austria	X	
Portugal	X	
Finland	X	
Sweden	X	
UK	X	
Greece		X
Spain	X	

Initial View of EU-NATO Relations by autumn of 1998

	ESDI within NATO	Autonoms EU option	Independent from NATO
Belgium			X
Denmark	X		
Germany		X	
France			X

Ireland	X		
Italy		X	
Luxembourg			X
Netherlands	X		
Austria		X	
Portugal	X		
Finland		X	
Sweden	X		
UK		X	
Greece			X
Spain		X	

Chapter Four

4. Preferences within the ESDP Process

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to assess the underlying reasons for the state governments becoming involved in the ESDP process. It attempts to identify both the essence of the converging factors that led to the initiation of the process and why the state governments often maintained diverging preferences on some of the key defining aspects for how this process was to be implemented. The study uses the Liberal Intergovernmental (LI) approach in its assessment, which entails analysing the factors that constituted the *sources* for the preferences of the key state governments as well as how the state governments went about *formulating* them. The chapter places a rather large emphasis on setting the historical context for the preference formation process by briefly presenting aspects, such as belief systems and historical points of reference since one of the key arguments of this study's final chapter is that the rational choice paradigm that LI is based upon does not sufficiently take these factors into account when LI is applied to the ESDP process.[490]

As noted in chapter three, it is possible to discern, at least, three core differences within the ESDP process, i.e., firstly between the Atlanticists and the Europeanists; secondly, between those countries that emphasised the military dimension and those states that stressed the civilian dimension and finally between those countries that supported a strict intergovernmental approach to the ESDP process and those that would have preferred to see some elements of a federal structure for the process. This chapter attempts to identify the underlying reasons for these shifting preferences within the ESDP process by placing special weight on analysing the preferences of what are referred to as the 'core-promoter countries' and 'core-sceptic countries' in the negotiation process. This is because that it is within the scope of the preferences of these countries that the outcome of the negotiations has been settled.[491] In order to trace the patterns of

---

[490] This study's definition of belief system is based on Kjell Goldmann's definition namely 'a system of empirical and normative ideas about reality'. For a further elaboration on the definition of historical points of reference see p. 235. Kjell Goldmann, <u>International Norms and War between States: Three Studies in International Politics</u>, (Stockholm: Swedish Studies in International Relations, 1971), p.11.

[491] It should be noted that most state governments, to various degrees, have had exceptional preferences that have departed from the mainstream opinion of the Member States. However it is, from a overarching perspective,

the preference formation processes and prove how they are interconnected to the predominant core preference, this chapter outlines the main positions of the selected state governments in reference to all the identified key defining aspects of the ESDP process. As will be noted the research conducted indicates a high degree of consistency between the state government's core preference and how it has developed its positions on other related ESDP issues.

Based on the review of the ESDP process in chapter three, it seems clear that the UK was a core-promoter of an Atlanticist structure of the ESDP and France was a core-promoter of the Europeanist structure. However, the two states had the common denominator that they both provided very strong leadership for the development of the military dimension of the ESDP process and especially France was very eager to elaborate and expand the role of this dimension of the process. Furthermore, the UK and France have strongly championed co-operation within the ESDP process along the lines of strict intergovernmentalism and especially the UK has been very careful to watch its sovereignty within this process. The federalist view of the ESDP has, at least, occasionally been advocated by Germany and the most vocal supporter for the ESDP's civilian dimension has been Sweden.

These four core-promoter countries have, to various degrees, been supported by other state governments within the EU, which have greatly shaped and influenced their preferences and positions. Thus, the analysis of the preferences of the core-promoter states does not, by any standard, give a complete picture of all the preferences within the ESDP process.[492] They do, however, cover some of the most relevant and 'extreme' ones and can, therefore, give an insight into a core-question for LI; namely, what have been the sources for the shifting preferences for security and defence co-operation within the EU. Because of both space and time constraints, it is also important to note that this section does not include any advanced or sophisticated foreign policy analysis of the selected state governments within the process. Rather it is an attempt to

---

possible to discern which countries have been pushing the various aspects of the ESDP process forward and which countries have tried to keep the various aspects of the process to a minimum.
[492] It is possible to claim that there were other state governments that had, at least, as strong preferences within the process as the above identified core promoters. Both the Netherlands and Portugal were occasionally even more careful to persevere an Atlanticist oriented structure of the ESDP process than the UK, and Belgium has been a champion of promoting a federal structure of the ESDP process. However, since these state governments have had a much smaller leverage and impact on the negotiations than the UK and Germany, it is more useful to assess the sources of the preferences of the latter state governments. Consequently, the study has, in this regard, done a trade-off between the strength of the preferences and their relevance.

briefly identify some of the main sources of references that seem to have had a bearing on the preference formation of the key countries vis-à-vis the ESDP process.[493]

Core Issues for ESDP	Promoter ↔ Sceptic
Atlanticism-Europeanism	The United Kingdom — France
Intergovt.-Federalism	The United Kingdom — Germany
Civilian-Military	Sweden — France

---

[493] Thus, the analytical framework for this chapter is based on a deduction derived from information from interviews together with primary and secondary sources rather than 'direct evidence of decision making' as Andrew Moravcsik claims that LI is based on. Consequently, the chapter is, for the most part unable to account for the exact deliberations conducted at the very highest political level of the preference formation process for the ESDP in the selected governments since access to the documentation of such deliberations have been almost impossible to obtain. Obviously it has also been difficult to gain access to the political leaders who made the deliberations since they are, with a few exceptions, still active politicians with very busy schedules. However, since the information and the hypotheses that it poses have been exposed to- and verified by civil servants and political advisors who have been interviewed for the purpose of this study the chapter is written from a reasonably good position of knowledge.

The Essence of the Preferences

One of the most interesting aspects of LI is indeed its hypotheses about the preference formation process since it maintains rather original assumptions regarding this process, which have deviated from much of the pre-existing literature in the field of European integration studies. LI claims that the underlying reason for the integration has been political-economic interests or issue specific interdependence and it is founded on a rationalist framework. The fundamental nature of this is based on the substantial, rather than instrumental rationality since all actors can be assumed to perform instrumentally in accordance with their preferences. According to this framework, states share the same fundamental preferences with regards to 'power and plenty' or economic well being and security. Security both entails protection against challenges to the sovereignty of a state and the ability to influence its environment in a conducive way.

LI has an ambitious approach regarding its intention to explain the preference formation of the EU state governments since it both attempts to identify the sources that constitute the preferences of the state governments and the process of how the state governments go about formulating them. Preferences can be defined as an ordered or weighted set of values placed on future outcomes of multilateral negotiations. The word 'value' is imperative in this context since it touches on the core of the desires of the state governments. Consequently, preferences constitute the fundamental reason underlying the positions of the countries.

Yet it is vital to note the distinction between preferences and positions. Positions often reflect a *stance* on a policy development that is intended to influence the policy development in a certain direction or in no direction at all in some instances. Positions in multilateral negotiations are undertaken to shape perceptions, influence events and are, therefore, made for external consumption. These positions are not always directed towards affecting the parties of the multilateral negotiations. Quite often the external consumption dimension is directed at the domestic audience where a state government can undertake a position that it knows will not affect the multilateral negotiations. However, it can claim that it tried to influence the negotiations in a direction that is desirable for the domestic audience.[494]

---

[494] In intergovernmental negotiations, where decisions are reached by consensus and all state governments have the formal right to exercise their right of veto, it is, of course, more difficult for state governments to claim that they

Positions can be used as means to a higher end, i.e., tactics to attain the preferences. Preferences, on the other hand, reflect the desired outcome of a policy development in a certain direction or the taste of a state government if one prefers. Preferences tend to remain stable over many years since they correspond to the basic values of the state governments, while positions can vary considerably since they can be adopted because of considerations for tactical manoeuvres in multilateral negotiations. It is also very important to observe that states can have similar positions on policy developments, but based on differing preferences.[495] This reflects the fact that the state governments know that they cannot obtain all their preferences in multilateral negotiations and, therefore, accept a development that moves in the direction of their preferred preferences. Given the previously noted ramification that each EU Presidency in its work is constantly constrained by limited time and manpower, it seems wise to follow Jean Monnet's advice: 'To succeed always chose the path of least resistance'.[496] After fifty years of handling the integration process, the state governments have become rather pragmatic and well aware of each other's positions and preferences. Thus, there is an understanding of the fact that it is counterproductive to waste time and energy on broaching negotiation issues where there exist insurmountably diverging preferences since such negotiations are unlikely to generate any results.

In regards to the process for the preference formation, LI contends that various interest groups within a country have different preferences, the state governments aggregate them and add their own preferences. Thus, the preferences of the state governments reflect those segments within the society, which influence the nation's policy-making apparatus. This is based on the assumption that the state governments have to give consideration to interest groups in order to assure that they can be re-elected. LI does recognise that within the field of security and defence policy co-operation, the state governments have more freedom of action since domestic interest groups have lesser preferences because the negotiations concern public goods.[497]

---

were out-manoeuvred. Thus, the previously noted dilemma of 'creative ambiguity', where the agreement reached is formulated in vague terms in order to make it possible for the state governments to undertake their own interpretation of the agreement, which is not necessarily in accordance with the other state governments, tend to be more common in these sensitive intergovernmental negotiations.

[495] Germany's preferences for some form of federal structure for the ESDP process and France's preferences for a Europeanist structure of the ESDP process are examples of this. These states were aware that they would not obtain their preferred structure in the short term, but had hopes that the development of the ESDP process over time would head in their preferred direction.

[496] In Andrew Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 18.

[497] Correspondence with Andrew Moravcsik, 12 July 2003.

The United Kingdom's Main Positions on the ESDP Process

The United Kingdom strongly promoted the development of a security and defence policy within the EU. Yet the British position was not unqualified and it had some important reservations concerning this process. Its key positions can be summarised in five points.

Firstly, the UK's most intensively expressed position on the development of the ESDP was that it would not, under any circumstances, approve of any measures that would undermine NATO's role in the European security structure.[498] The UK, therefore, strived to assure a procedure where it would be NATO, rather than the EU, that would be the first organisation that would be requested to conduct crisis management operations.[499] The British position in regards to NATO's standing was also that all operational planning structures of the EU's military crisis management capability would be as closely linked to NATO as possible. It, therefore, disapproved of any arrangement whereby the EU would duplicate assets and capabilities that already existed within NATO for operational planning. Thus, in essence, Atlanticism remained the UK's key consideration throughout the ESDP process.

Secondly, the UK emphasised the position that it supported the notion that the EU should play its full role in international security affairs and have access to the use of military force.[500] It refined this position by explaining that it encouraged the development of the ESDP process since it was seen as a means to assure that the EU could take a larger responsibility for the security problems in its own backyard.[501] However, in order to do so, the UK stressed that it was absolutely crucial that the EU Member States developed more military capabilities since there existed serious limitations upon their ability to conduct larger crisis management operations.[502]

---

[498] Speech by the Prime Minister Tony Blair on Foreign Affairs at Whitehall, 15 December 1998.
[499] Sir Michael Jay, British Ambassador to France, 'The European Security and Defence Policy and Transatlantic Relations', Lecture at the Cicero Foundation, Paris, 29 March 2000.
[500] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.
[501] See, for example, the St Malo Declaration: "The European Union needs to be in a position to play its full role on the international stage" and "To this end the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action backed up by credible military forces". <u>Franco-British Joint Declaration on European Defence</u>, 5 December 1998.
[502] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.

Thirdly, the UK insisted that all forms of defence co-operation within the EU would be done on an intergovernmental basis.[503] It was very keen to stress that it did not, in any way, see a role for the European Parliament or the Commission in this process.

Fourthly, the UK maintained a restrained position regarding the scope of the ESDP process since it wanted it to be solely focused on crisis management. It opposed the idea that the ESDP be reshaped to handle the threat from international terrorism after 11 September 2001.[504] It also rejected the idea that the ESDP would include provisions of reinforced co-operation on collective defence for the EU Member States that were also members of NATO.[505] It, furthermore, interpreted the higher end of the forms of operations that could be undertaken under the aegis of the ESDP as a separation of parties by force, rather than high intensity warfare operations.[506]

Finally, the UK supported and sometimes promoted the development of a civilian crisis management capability, whose structure it preferred to see as a based on an intergovernmental approach. It also particularly stressed the importance of improvements in the areas of civil administration and the rule of law, but was somewhat hesitant to expand the number of police officers that were to be made available for EU operations.[507] However, the British position on civilian crisis management was somewhat different to that of the core-promoter state governments within this process. The objective to maximise scope and size of the civilian crisis management capability was not a purpose in itself for the UK. Rather, the UK focused on functional aspects of civilian crisis management and assured maximum coherence in this sector, rather than its mere expansion.

---

[503]Franco-British Joint Declaration on European Defence, 12 December 1998.

[504] Oral witness given by Policy Director Simon Webb at the Ministry of Defence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 19 July 2001.

[505] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.

[506] Regarding the scope of the higher ends of the Petersberg Tasks, see statement by Policy Director Simon Webb at the Ministry of Defence: "We are not talking about operations of the size of Kosovo operations here". Oral witness given by Policy Director Simon Webb at the Ministry of Defence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 19 July 2001.

[507] Interview with representative from FCO, 19 July 2003.

The Sources of the United Kingdom's Preferences for the ESDP Process

The UK was a core-promoter of advancing an Atlanticist approach regarding the development of the ESDP process. Yet what makes the UK a unique case is that it is the only state government that drastically altered its preference towards the development of a security and defence policy within the EU between 1997 and 1998.[508] This changed preference later paved the way for the initiation of the ESDP process. This chapter, therefore, places greater emphasis on assessing the reasons for the main British preferences than the other identified core-promoter state governments of France, Germany and Sweden since it will be argued that this shift in preferences was of paramount significance to the whole process. The aim is both to identify the sources of the British preferences and the process of how the Blair government went about formulating them. In essence, the objective of this section is to outline why the UK has strong Atlanticist preferences and why it has changed its preferences regarding European defence from a negative to a positive outlook. The change in preferences between 1997 and 1999 is rather remarkable and typified in the following two citations from Prime Minister Tony Blair.

After the Amsterdam IGC Blair reported to the House of Commons that:

> 'Getting Europe's voice heard more clearly in the world will not be achieved through merging the European Union and the Western European Union or developing an unrealistic Common Defence Policy. We therefore resisted unacceptable proposals from others. Instead we argued for – and won- the explicit recognition, written into the treaty for the first time, that NATO is the foundation for our and other allies' common defence'.[509]

However by December 1999 Blair stated that:

> 'It would be a mistake if Britain opted out of the debate on European Defence Policy and left it to others. This debate we must shape and influence because our vital and strategic interests are affected by it. We also amend the decision

---

[508] During the Amsterdam negotiations the UK maintained the rather isolated position that it would not approve of any form of integration between the WEU and the EU. It was, in part, supported by some of the non-aligned countries together with the Netherlands and Portugal. However, these state governments did not shift their basic preferences for the ESDP process in the same way as the United Kingdom. Rather they bowed down in the face of pressure from the larger countries after they were assured that the UK was on board to develop the ESDP process.
[509] House of Commons, <u>Hansard</u>, 18 June 1997.

that Europe should now co-operate in defence where the vital objective is to help keep the peace'.[510]

The main point of this section on British preferences is that the change in preferences was not a shift away from Atlanticist preferences towards Europeanist preferences for European defence. Rather it was a change in the UK's preferences regarding the CFSP and, in turn, the EU's role as an actor in international security affairs. The UK's previous preferences during the Major government had, at most, reflected a half-hearted commitment and disinterest towards the CFSP in general and strong resistance to giving it any kind of military security dimension in particular. This preference was altered by the Blair government towards one that reflected a strong commitment to assure that the EU could play its full role in international security affairs and take more responsibility for security challenges in and around Europe. As Lord John Roper has pointed out, the news was that the Prime Minster Tony Blair realised that there was no contradiction between being a good Atlanticist and a good European.[511] Thus, Atlanticism remained a core preference of the United Kingdom regarding the ESDP process. The chapter, therefore, first outlines the main sources of British preferences for Atlanticism partly in a historical context in order to better reveal where the centre of the shift in British preferences concerning EU security and defence co-operation lay.

The United Kingdom's Relations with the United States

The previously noted position that the UK under no circumstances would accept any development that would undermine NATO's role in the European security structure reflected the fact that the UK has two closely linked factors that are at the heart of its foreign policy instincts and which are indispensable for its international standing. They also constitute the essence of the UK's Atlanticist preferences. These two factors are the special relationship it retains with the United States and its unreserved support for NATO's pre-eminent role in the European security structure.[512]

The special relationship has led the UK to have an exclusive rapport with the only remaining superpower and the UK, as opposed to France, has no qualms about admitting its dependence

---

[510] House of Commons, Hansard, 13 December 1999.
[511] John Roper, 'The Political Realities of European Defence Co-operation', Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 38, September 2000.
[512] Interviews with Lawrence Freedman, 23 May 2002 and John Roper, 22 September 2002.

and reliance on the US.[513] The relationship, has according to some scholars, also made the British belief system aware as a point of reference that it wanted to be as close as possible to the United States in international security affairs and the UK has tried to use the relationship to create a surrogate great power status by sponging off the US in order to offset other powers.[514] The special relationship's relevance in this context has been pointed out by John Baylis who has noted that Britain could only retain its great power role by relying on others who remained committed to a common cause.[515] Thus, if the UK wanted to continue to punch above its political and economic weight in international security affairs, it would need to be able to mobilise close and dependable allies.[516] The special relationship has also generated close bilateral co-operation on issues, such as intelligence sharing, technology transfers, military cooperation and nuclear collaboration, which have reinforced its vitality and relevance.[517]

The other factor for the United Kingdom, which is also a source of its Atlanticist preferences within the ESDP process, is its unreserved support for NATO's role in the European security structure. There seems to be, at least, two overarching reasons for this preference. Firstly, almost as an article of faith, every British post-war government has stressed the need to sustain the American interest in, and military commitment to Western European defence and security.[518] This was obviously indispensable given the limited conventional and nuclear capabilities that existed in Western Europe during the Cold War. As Stanley Hoffman has put it, the Europeans were addicted to American protection.[519] The best way to guarantee continued American interest in Europe was to have the United States strongly committed to NATO.[520] Thus, NATO was, in this context, a means to assure the higher end of close transatlantic relations. Secondly, to a large

---

[513] However, until the end of the 19th century Anglo-US relations were very strained and the embryo of the special relationship goes back to the very close bond that Prime Minster Winston Churchill was able to establish with President Franklin Roosevelt during the Second World War and the co-operation this generated despite the strong prevailing American isolationist tendencies in the early 1940s. Thus, the assumption that the common Anglo-Saxon bond *per automatic* would make these two states have a close and prosperous relationship seems to be an oversimplification.

[514] See Bartlett, The Special Relationship.

[515] See John Baylis, Anglo-American Defence Relations 1939-1984 (London: Macmillan, 1984).

[516] The concrete value of the special relationship for the United Kingdom has been subject to intense debate. However, given the polices of the Blair government it seems as if the key representatives of this government firmly believ that the relationship is indeed 'special' and it will, therefore, be careful to guard it so that it remains that way, i.e,. not permitting any developments within the ESDP process to undermine NATO or in turn undermine the United States' role in the European security structure.

[517] See, for example, Michael Clark, 'Defence and Security in Britain's External Relations' in Lawrence Freedman and Michael Clark (eds.), Britain in the World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[518] Paul Cornish, Britain and the WEU, p. 58.

[519] Stanley Hoffman, 'Europe's Identity Crisis Revisited', Daedalus, 123, No. 2, 1994, p. 10.

[520] See Michael Clark, 'American Reactions to Shift in European Policy: The Changing Context', in John Roper (ed.), The Future of British Defence Policy, Joint Studies in Public Policy (Hants: Grower Publishing, 1985), p. 80.

extent, the establishment of the Alliance was a result of British diplomatic efforts and neither the Labour party nor the Conservative Party has ever questioned British membership of NATO. It is also noteworthy that it was the Labour party that, despite its occasional attempts for European activism, was in government at the time when the UK joined the organisation as one of the founding members. The North Atlantic Council's consultative mechanism and the joint planning also come, to a large extent, from the British Governments' procedural and defence planning in the Imperial Defence Committee.[521] Furthermore Britain's advocacy of the transatlantic relationship and the primacy of NATO have left Britain in a very privileged position within NATO, where it retains far more influence than its actual political and military power.[522] Thus, there is a strong historical attachment to NATO within the British political system and, as an influential member, the UK has enjoyed the Alliance being a powerful platform for its own international standing.[523]

The Reluctant European

Given the two previously mentioned factors, it is natural that the UK's view of European integration, especially in security and defence affairs, has been shaped with a high degree of reluctance since this could challenge its Atlanticist preferences. Hence, there is, in part, a British reluctance to any major shift from the prevailing European security structure where NATO is the pre-eminent military actor.[524] It is this preference for solely relying on NATO and obstructing security and defence co-operation within the EU that changed under the Blair government. However, in order to understand the sources that have led to this change in preferences, it is first necessary to assess the sources of the UK's previously negative view of security and defence co-operation within a European (rather than a Euroatlantic) framework.

The UK's experiences with the European continent have certainly not always been rosy and it seems to have shaped its traditional European diplomacy in, at least, three ways. Firstly, according to some scholars, it has to a certain extent, led the UK to believe in the importance of

---

[521] Franklyn Arthur Johnson, <u>Defence by Committee</u> (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), p. 364.
[522] Interviews with Lawrence Freedman, 23 May 2002 and representative from NATO's International Staff, 6 November 2001.
[523] See, for example, Jacquelyn K. Davis and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, 'Britain and the Atlantic Alliance, Implications for U.S. Policy', <u>Special Report: British Security Policy and the Atlantic Alliance: Prospects for the 1990's</u> (Washington, D.C.: International Defence Publishers, 1987).
[524] See F.S. Northedge, 'Britain as a Second-Rank Power', <u>International Affairs</u>, Vol. 46, No. 1, 1970 and F.S. Northedge, <u>The Decent from Power</u> (London: Allen & Unwin, 1974).

balancing rather than engaging with continental Europe.[525] Especially French aspirations for trying to subsume a leading role within the EU in order to undermine Washington's role in the European security structure was met with discontent by London. The EU itself has occasionally been depicted as a great continental power aspiring to threaten the hegemony.[526] Traditional British policy has, therefore, been one of balancing the great powers of the continent against each other in order to assure that no single power would be powerful enough to threaten the UK's sovereignty and influence.[527] Secondly, there has also been a widely held view in the UK that foreign and security affairs ought to be beyond the authority of the inverted commerce driven EU.[528] An expansion of the EU's role in this sphere was, at best, interpreted to be a bridge too far for the integration process and, at worst, evidence of the EU aspirations for acquiring state-hood.[529] The EU as an international actor has also been held in low esteem in the United Kingdom for its undistinguished past.[530] Thirdly, a defining feature of the UK's EU policy has been a deep distaste for any ideas that suggest relinquishing sovereignty, particularly regarding Britain's Armed Forces, over to Brussels or some other faceless unaccountable concoction. Obviously, as an aspiring great power, the UK wants to assure that it can retain the freedom of autonomous military action outside the EU framework.[531] In the British belief system, sovereignty and defence therefore tends to be linked and are aims in themselves. Hence, the UK has not seen it desirable that the use of military power should come under any kind of supranational structure, as some federally oriented countries have desired.[532] In fact, scepticism of the European integration process has increased as it has expanded to also include provisions for defence and security co-operation.[533] In most political quarters of the British political system,

---

[525] See Heuser, Nuclear Mentalities, p. 41.

[526] Anthony Forster, Euro Scepticism in Contemporary British Politics (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 23.

[527] Heuser, Nuclear Mentalities, p. 33.

[528] Cornish, 'Britain and the WEU', p. 69.

[529] Len Scott, 'British Perspectives on the Future of European Security' in Colin McInnes, Security & Strategy in the New Europe (London: Routledge, 1992).

[530] Stephen George, An Awkward Partner –Britain in the European Community, (Third Edition), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 279.

[531] Furthermore, a second reason for the opposition against any federally structured defence co-operation is that the UK has experienced an extreme continuity in its institutions, which have developed incrementally towards democracy. Unlike several other EU state governments, it has not experienced such malaise as violent revolutions, dictatorships, militarism, fascism or communism. Neither does it have a history of using military force for what later have been perceived as illegitimate or wrongly motivated political objectives. It has, therefore, retained great confidence in its judgement of how and when to resort to the use of military force and it has intrinsically been seen as a means of assuring the survival of its sovereignty and independence. Indeed, it is in this context interesting to note that Prime Minister Tony Blair was the first British Prime Minister ever to have ordered the use of military force five times during his first four years in office. See John Kampfner, Blair's Wars, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003).

[532] They have less self-confidence in their ability to exercise military power it could be added.

[533] Anthony Forster and William Wallace, 'NATO's Real Purpose', Survival, Vol. 4, No. 43, 2002.

these areas have been seen as the last line of defence for national sovereignty.[534] Hence, therefore, the UK has demanded that all forms of defence co-operation within the EU be conducted on a strict intergovernmental basis.[535] In the UK, the federalist argument for closer defence integration in order to avoid so-called re-nationalisation of defence does not enjoy much resonance. Only the state governments have, according to the British way of thinking, the legal and moral authority to send soldiers into harm's way.[536]

New Thinking on European Defence

The change in the British preference for the establishment of a European security and defence policy started to emerge in 1998. During the spring and summer the Blair government seriously considered altering its position on European defence from the one during the Amsterdam IGC.[537] There were both push and pull factors that generated a shift in British preferences towards the ESDP and the UK's analysis of the role of the institutions in the European security structure was focused on the demands that these institutions would have to fulfil rather than on federalist ideology.

The UK's changing preferences originated in a certain dissatisfaction with the current European security structure, which was generated partly because of the situation in the external security environment and partly because of the ambitions of the new Blair government to play a more influential role within the European integration process.[538] The sources of the changing British preferences on European defence were multi-causal, but it is, at least, possible to identify the combination of four primary causes that were decisive.

Firstly, the British experiences from the Balkans indicated that the current European security structure was failing to adequately correspond to the primary security problem at the time;

---

[534] Laurence Martin and John Garnett, British Foreign Policy, Royal Institute of International Affairs (London: Cassell Imprint, 1998), p. 84.
[535] Michael Franklin with Marc Wilke, Britain's Future in Europe (London: Printer Publishers, 1990).
[536] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 22 September 2002.
[537] The first indication of this shift came in July 1998 with the publication of the United Kingdom's *Strategic Defence Review*, which, for the first time, referred to the 'vital role' of the EU's foreign and security policy in the European security structure. However, this notion should probably be associated more with the concept that the United Kingdom was committed to enhancing the role of the EU in international security affairs in general rather than a blue print for the development of the ESDP.
[538] Interview with John Roper, 22 September 2002.

namely, complex intrastate conflicts.[539] The EU's persistent inability to prevent the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Serbian security forces from engaging in systematic human rights abuses in Kosovo had showed the shortfalls of an organisation that lacked the ability to back up its diplomacy with military credibility.[540] Particularly, the experiences from holding the EU Presidency in the spring of 1998 were very formative for the British perception in this regard.[541] One of the cornerstones of Blair's foreign policy was that diplomacy without the ability to resort to the use of force was almost meaningless when negotiating with tyrants, warlords, and dictators.[542] It could, of course, be argued that the EU had this ability before the development of the ESDP since all military resources are state-owned and the EU could have asked NATO or the WEU to undertake the Petersberg Tasks through the framework of the Combined Joint Task Force.[543] However, this view misses the point that there was no institutional framework within the EU to take defence decisions since the security bodies could not provide the state governments with the political-strategic guidance.[544] Furthermore, and arguably more importantly, the dominant perception of the EU among the state governments prior to the ESDP process was that it was a civilian power. To incorporate defence issues within this framework would have made the state governments rather uncomfortable.[545]

Secondly, it was also becoming increasingly clear to the UK that the US would not play the same role in the post-Cold War European security environment as it had previously done. There was an awareness that even though a political-military consensus across the Atlantic was still extremely important, the post-Cold War environment lacked much of the conviction and urgency

---

[539] Interview with Lawrence Freedman, 15 May 2002.

[540] Interview with Charles Grant, 15 September 2002.

[541] See Cardiff European Council, <u>Declaration on Kosovo</u>, Cardiff, 15 June 1998.

[542] Hence, the later reference in the St Malo declaration to the importance attributed to the EU's ability to have access to a credible military force. Yet, it should, of course, be noted that the focus of being able to combine diplomacy with the use of military force is an aspect that *per se* is not associated with the Petersberg Tasks. However, for the sake of corresponding with the Treaty of the European Union and for the ability to achieve an agreement among all the state governments the European Council Summit in Cologne made reference to the Petersberg Tasks when it elaborated on the development of the ESDP. See Franco-British Summit, <u>Joint Declaration on European Defence</u>, 4 December 1998.

[543] This arrangement was, however, from an institutional perspective, described as a "nightmare" since it was so complicated and required the approval of many different actors and institutions. Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

[544] Furthermore, the argument that the EU would be better off by only focusing on civilian matters failed to take into account that the EU was an active part in the diplomatic game during the Kosovo crisis. This generated expectations that the EU also would be able to bring a solution to a problem that necessitated a military response. If through the CFSP the EU was involved in the process of artificial restrictions upon its ability to assess and act in military matters, serious limitations to its effectiveness were generated. Thus, to a certain extent, it is possible to claim the establishment of the CFSP created a political spill-over that, in part, led to a change in the British preferences towards security and defence co-operation within the EU.

[545] Thus, the ESDP process can be seen as a measure of making state governments comfortable and confident in order to deal with military issues even within the EU framework and use this as an additional tool for the CFSP.

of the Cold War era. Consequently, the United States would not always be willing to engage in crisis management operations every time a violent conflict erupted on the European continent. Even if it could be persuaded to do so, it would do it on its own terms. Because of the geopolitical realities, its stakes and interests were lesser than most European state governments in such crises.[546] The experiences from Bosnia, which saw the US very hesitant in becoming militarily engaged, were very formative for the British view. When the US finally became militarily involved, it preferred to do so by air power, which led to a situation where predominately British and French troops were caught on the ground while the United States provided close air support.[547] Such an arrangement does, of course, deviate from a fundamental principle of coalition warfare; namely, the importance of shared risk taking among the participating countries. Later the experiences from the Kosovo operation increased the awareness of the drifting apart between the United States and Europe in military operational terms and showed that the dependency on the US had some drawbacks to it. Of the 1,850 targets selected during the Kosovo operation, Washington selected all but one.[548] Even though the US was the master of facilitating low-casualty, rapid result operations, on which today's media and public opinion put a premium, the experiences from the Balkans indicated that, in some circumstances, it might be attractive to, at least, in theory have an autonomous European option for such operations in the distant future; otherwise such operations would only be conducted on US terms.[549] The UK always avoided publicly expressing these views since it still desired a strong American commitment to the European security structure, which intercedes with its tradition of always avoiding expressing doubts about or criticism of the United States in public.[550] It should also be noted that, for the UK, decreasing the dependency on US military power was a very distant and remote goal and, in almost all instances, it wanted to work with the United States in such operations.[551]

Furthermore, the British Government strictly interpreted the role of the ESDP as *only* being restricted to the Petersberg Tasks. It excluded any immediate ambitions of including high intensity warfare operations or future aspirations for collective defence missions within the ESDP framework. This principle did not reflect any British doubts regarding the use of military

---

[546] Interview with representative from FCO, 21 September 2002.

[547] Sir Michael Quinlan, 'European Defence Co-operation', <u>RUSI Journal</u>, April, 2001.

[548] Ronan Fanning, 'Defence and Security', in Paul Gillespie (ed.), <u>Blair's Britain England's Europe – A View from Ireland</u> (Dublin: The Institute of European Affairs, 2000).

[549] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

[550] For a detailed account of this feature of British diplomacy, see, for example, Peter Riddell, <u>Hug Them Close – Blair, Clinton, Bush and the Special Relationship</u> (London: Politico's, 2003).

[551] Interview with British researcher, 23 September 2004.

force. On the contrary, British thinking greatly acknowledged the proportionate and just use of military force as tools for crisis management in order to achieve national and collective interests.[552] Instead, its limited interpretation of the ESDP's role was a reflection of institutional considerations and realistic assessments of the lack of military capabilities among the EU Member States. By ensuring that the EU would only undertake more limited operations, it reserved more demanding operations for NATO and thereby preserved its exclusive role in the European security structure. It also assured that the demand for establishing a duplicate command structure would be considerably less urgent. Furthermore, it should in this context also be noted that, unlike some Europeanist inclined countries, the UK also supported the development of a civilian crisis management capability within the EU. The UK's preferences for a civilian crisis management capability were based on the assumption that it provided an added value to the ESDP, which also reinforced the notion that the ESDP was qualitatively different from NATO. Thus, it would not mean that NATO's functions would be duplicated. Instead, it should be seen as a complement to NATO in the European security structure. In contrast to the development of the military crisis management capability, there existed strong bipartisan support among both the Labour and Conservative Party that the EU should develop a civilian crisis management capability. This was often done in close co-ordination with Sweden, partly as a reward for Sweden supporting the UK in reference to strong institutional links between NATO and the EU.[553]

Thirdly, it was the overall military impotency of the Europeans to conduct larger military operations, which convinced the Blair government that a new approach was necessary to assure that Europe developed more and better military capabilities.[554] According to some sources, Tony Blair had been shocked when his advisors had informed him what limited military resources were available within Europe if the Europeans had decided to pursue a military operation against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia without US assistance.[555] The UK was also frustrated that NATO's defence planning structure and the initiatives taken within the Alliance to assure that more European capabilities would be developed were not delivering a satisfying result in this

---

[552] An indication of this is that Prime Minister Tony Blair was the first British Prime Minster every to order the use of the British Armed Forces five times in different forms of high intensity operations during his first four years in office. See John Kampfner, <u>Blair's Wars</u> (London: Simon & Schuster, 2003).
[553] Interview with representative from FCO, 19 July 2003.
[554] Antonio Missiroli, 'CFSP, Defence and Flexibility', <u>Chaillot Papers</u>, No. 38, Institute for Security Studies Western European Union, 2000, p. 24.
[555] Interview with Charles Grant, 15 September 2002.

regard.[556] It was argued that 'branding' could play a role in order to convince some of the continental state governments to invest in defence reforms and new military capabilities. The assumption was made that these state governments could obtain more domestic support for increased defence expenditures if they were made on behalf of the EU rather than NATO.[557] Furthermore, the fact that France was not completely committed to NATO undermined the possibility of retaining all European defence co-operation within the Alliance. This was eloquently and pragmatically put into words by former Permanent Under Secretary of State for Defence Michael Quinlan:'I do not welcome that or applaud it indeed I am mined rather to deplore it but it is an inescapable political fact. France has major assets of defence budget, defence industry, increasing relevant and effective armed forces and the self-confidence and tough-mindedness to use them robustly. Thus any form of a more able European defence capability would demand a whole-hearted commitment from France and this was only possible in the EU framework'.[558]

Fourthly, the UK had previously excluded itself from the EMU and the Schengen system. 'New Labour' was, therefore, concerned that the UK was becoming increasingly marginalised within the European integration process.[559] Since the party and especially its leader wanted to show that it 'belonged to the heart of Europe' and that it represented positive engagement and leadership within Europe, the Blair government needed a policy area in which it could play a leading role.[560] This view should also be seen against the background that since Tony Blair had taken

---

[556] The goals set by the Defence Capability Initiative (DCI), which were first introduced at NATO's Washington Summit in 1999, had only reached about 50 percent of their targets by 2002. According to Julian Lindley-French, the European perception of the initiative was that it was too closely linked to the US force structures and its drive towards high intensity warfare operations. Lack of political leadership in this field was also given as one of the main reasons why this initiative was not delivering. According to former Policy Director Simon Webb at the British Ministry of Defence, it was assumed that the various EU Presidencies could curb this problem within the EU since the Presidencies would invest political capital into making progress in this field. See Julian Lindley-French, 'Memorandum on the Recent Developments in the Common European Security and Defence Policy', written evidence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 16 June 2001 and The RT Hon Geoffrey Hoon and Simon Webb, Oral witness Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 3 October 2001.

[557] Interview with Anthony Forster, 22 November 2003.

[558] Quinlan, 'European Defence Co-operation'.

[559] The EMU, in itself, also constituted a factor for the development of the ESDP, which should not be underestimated. The fact that the economic integration, at the time, had proceeded to a previously unforeseen degree created demands for deeper political integration. Furthermore, the model for the EMU being inherently non-federal in its structure indicated that this framework, even though not in line with the federal vision of Europe, was a model for advancing the integration process at large. Interview with British researcher, 22 July 2003.

[560] It should be noted that when John Major succeeded Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister in 1990, one of the principal objectives was to establish a better working relationship with the rest of the Member States of the EU and improve the UK's standing in the integration process. However, the UK was by 1997 just as marginalized because of the difficulties experienced during the Maastricht negotiations, the British withdrawal from the ERM mechanism and the imposed export ban on British beef, which led to the Major government threatening to block all Community

over the leadership of the Labour Party from John Smith he had gone out of his way to stress his pro-European credentials, claiming that Britain would never be isolated under his premiership. He, therefore, insisted that the UK would take part in a constructive engagement with the other Member States and it would, together with France and Germany, lead the integration process.[561] He, furthermore, stated a bold aim that 'over the next few years Britain should resolve once and for all, its ambivalence toward Europe'. He also pointed out in very unfamiliar British terms that the European Union was 'one of the outstanding political achievements of the twentieth century and a project that has succeeded brilliantly'.[562]

Thus, the sources for playing a leading role within the European integration process derived from the fact that the Blair government had a far more favourable outlook on the European integration process than the previous Major government. This was not based on any federalist ideology, but an awareness that the European integration process was a necessary and useful instrument to handle the often trans-national challenges that were confronting almost all European state governments at the end of the twentieth century. Furthermore, within the new Labour government, there was an awareness that the UK's importance and relevance in international affairs would be considerably greater if it had leverage within the European integration process.[563] Tony Blair, for example, stated, 'America wants Britain to be a strong ally in a strong Europe. The stronger we are in Europe the stronger our American relationship'.[564] The Blair government did, therefore, indeed also have a strong commitment to the development of a coherent and effective CFSP since this was seen as essential in order to assure that Europe was able to reduce the US burden in European security affairs.[565] This was also vital not in order to reduce transatlantic co-operation, but actually to preserve it since Europe's inability to deal with crises in its vicinity was causing considerable animosity in Washington.[566] The choice was made to try to play a leading role within the defence and security spheres of the EU, where it was a

---

business until this issue was resolved. Tony Blair had, therefore, devoted considerable efforts to criticising the Major government for its inability to have any impact on the European integration process.

[561] David Gowland and Arthur Turner (eds.) <u>Britain and European Integration 1945-1998</u>, p. 209.

[562] Tony Blair, Speech at Lord Mayor's Banquet, 22 November 1999.

[563] Because of disinterest and Europhobia the Conservative Government had marginalised its influence on the European integration process during the early half of the 1990's. At the same time, it looked as though Bonn and Washington were forging a new special relationship and increasingly taking the lead in setting the European security agenda. This had also marginalised the UK's influence on the United States since Britain could not as it was called 'deliver Europe'. See Christopher Coker, 'The Special Relationship in the 1990s', <u>International Affairs</u>, Vol. 68, No. 3, July 1993, p. 410

[564] Tony Blair, Committed to Europe, Reforming Europe, speech at Gent, 23 February 2000.

[565] Richard Hatfield, 'The Consequences of St Malo', Institute de Francais des Relations Internationale, Paris, 28 April 2000.

[566] For a provocative, but still somewhat indicative view of the mood in the United States at the time, see Edward Lutwak, 'The Americans Can't Believe how Useless the Europeans Are', <u>Los Angeles Times</u>, 12 September 1998.

credible Atlanticist partner and it had the most formidable defence forces in Europe at its disposal.[567]

The United Kingdom and the Implementation of the ESDP Process

Apart from the underlying reasons for the UK's changing preferences towards the ESDP, it is also necessary to assess how the United Kingdom went about formulating these preferences. It seems as if the role of individual decision-makers was central to the development of the United Kingdom's preferences towards the ESDP. This should also been seen against the background that Tony Blair's influence over policy, which, according to some experts, has been greater than that of any previous government.[568] Within the British system the Cabinet Office initially played, to a certain extent, the central role in the process at the expense of the influence of the Ministry of Defence and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.[569] The Cabinet Office issued a memorandum to all Permanent Under Secretaries in the government departments requesting areas, where the government could advance a European agenda.[570] By remaining so closely involved in the process, Tony Blair, described as the most pro-European Prime Minister since Britain joined the EEC in 1973, invested his personal credibility in the process, which was a great gamble. Blair also exposed himself to criticism by altering the government's policy from the one adopted at the Amsterdam negotiations. However, Blair thereby provided the necessary political impetus for the ESDP process and he also surrounded himself with several pro-European policy advisors in the Cabinet, which seems to have worked in tandem with his vision of the process.[571]

---

[567] The modernisation of the Labour Party into "New Labour" also meant that the party retained a more positive view of defence matters. Their defence policies at previous general elections had been disastrous for the party. The Labour Party manifesto in 1983 was, for example, described by Gerald Kaufman as the 'longest suicide note in history'. The Blair government, therefore, did not announce any reductions in defence expenditures after it took office in 1997. This increased its credibility within this policy area. See Denis Healy, The Time of My Life (London: Michael Joseph, 1998), p. 218. Also for a detailed account, see Bruce George, 'The British Labour Party and Defence', The Washington Papers, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1991, pp. 53-57.

[568] Peter Hennessy, 'The Blair Style of Government: An Historical Perspective and an Interim Audit', Government and Opposition, No. 1, Vol. 33, 1997, pp. 3-20.

[569] See Richard Whiteman, 'Amsterdam's Unfinished Business - The Blair Government's Initiative and the Future of the Western European Union', Occasional Paper, No. 7, Institute for Security Studies Western European Union, 1999, p. 7.

[570] Interview with representative from FCO, 21 September 2002.

[571] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 23 November 2001.

Yet among many academics and defence analysts there was a hesitation to develop a defence and security policy within the EU since they feared that it could risk the status of NATO and the accomplishments achieved within this framework for defence co-operation.[572] In its dialogue with leading academics on this issue, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office was often advised not to pursue this line of policy when it asked where Britain could play a leading role in Europe.[573] However, Ambassador Robert Cooper suggested in June 1998 in a classified report that Britain take a lead in assuring the development of a common security and defence policy by merging the WEU and the EU and creating a fourth pillar for collective defence that applied to those state governments that would like to participate in it.[574] It was later suggested by Charles Grant at the Centre for European Reform that the EU would take over the WEU's political functions and NATO its military functions.[575] Such a decision would, according to Grant, streamline the decision making process by reallocating its components where they presumably belonged.[576] Thus, in essence, the key question was whether it was possible to scrap all together the WEU, which was the middleman, and transfer its powers to the EU and still preserve Atlanticism and NATO's important standing.

To make these ideas operational Policy Director Richard Hatfield at the Ministry of Defence at an early stage set up a team of policy analysts who outlined the basic principles for what would become the foundation for the Franco-British declaration on European defence at St Malo a few months later.[577] It should be noted that, at this stage, the Ministry of Defence particularly championed this policy, while the Foreign and Commonwealth Office partly expressed a modest degree of uncertainty about it.[578] The reason for this situation was not necessarily any major shifting political visions on the European security structure between the ministries. Rather it came down to the fact that some of the key policy makers for the ESDP were located within the Ministry of Defence at the time.[579] In the UK, the military establishment as such was ambiguous towards the new British position and has always traditionally maintained strong Atlanticist preferences.

---

[572] Interview with Lawrence Freedman, 15 May 2002.
[573] Interview with Anthony Forster, 22 November 2003.
[574] Interview with Charles Grant, 22 September 2002.
[575] Charles Grant, 'Can Britain Lead in Europe?', Centre for European Reform, London, 1998.
[576] Antonio Missiroli, 'CFSP, Defence and Flexibility', p. 24.
[577] Interview with British researcher, 22 November 2003.
[578] Interview with representative from the British Ministry of Defence, 21 September 2002.
[579] Interview with John Roper, 22 September 2002.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the new British preference for security and defence co-operation within the EU did not imply that the UK was deserting its Atlanticist preferences within the European security structure. Rather it should be seen as a shift in preferences regarding the UK's ambition to play a leading role in the European integration process and a tactical shift in Britain's desire to generate more military capabilities within Europe and assure a more coherent organisation of the European security structure. As Richard Hatfield points out, the Blair government had as strong a commitment to NATO as the Major government, but in the beginning it was not ready to make a blind leap into the unknown in this area.[580] Thus, the UK's Atlanticist preferences and the positive implications associated with it, such as the special relationship and its unique standing in NATO, still remained at the core of British foreign policy thinking. The aim of the ESDP was to assure a better European contribution to NATO and thereby support the Atlanticist cause. However, it also reflected a larger commitment to an effective CFSP, both because the Blair government wanted to have a more influential role in the European integration process and because advancing the CFSP was a goal in itself for the Labour government given Blair's belief in the basic soundness of European integration. It goes without saying that if the Blair government wanted to have a more influential role in the process, it would also need to ensure the CFSP would work more effectively; otherwise the failure of the process would heap guilt and shame upon the United Kingdom. Yet it is indeed important to note that there did not exist a long-term grand strategic plan behind this initiative.[581] Rather it fulfilled, at the time, a number of political aims of the new government; it included some 'dos and don'ts' and it was assumed that conflicting ambitions with other state governments wanting to influence the European defence initiative in a Europeanist direction could be dealt with as the problems arose.[582]

---

[580] Richard Hatfield, 'The Consequences of St Malo', Institute de Francais des Relations Internationale, Paris, 28 April 2000.
[581] Interview with representative from the FCO, 21 September 2002.
[582] This seems to reflect a tradition within British diplomacy that emphasises a willingness to accept compromise and gloss over irresolvable differences. Ideologies can be set aside in order to reach agreements. Interview with John Roper, 22 September 2002.

France's Main Positions on the ESDP Process

Like the UK, France had similar positions regarding the development of the ESDP on a range of issues since the two had worked exceptionally close within this process, but its core-preference was fundamentally different. It is, therefore, somewhat more difficult to assess the relevance of the French positions on the development of the ESDP since the correlation between its positions and its preferences, on some accounts, diverge. The reason for this being that on some occasions France exercised restraint in its declaratory policy in order to assure that the UK continued to be committed to the process.[583] France, therefore, seems to have engaged in a policy of 'forward linkage' where it knew that some of its core-preferences only could be achieved by later developments of the process. The most important French positions on the ESDP process can be summarised in six points.

Firstly, France maintained the position throughout the ESDP negotiations that the EU should strive for the highest degree of autonomy vis-à-vis NATO and preferably create independent operational planning capabilities separate from the structure that existed within NATO. According to former Defence Minster Alain Richard, depending on the existing means in NATO, the EU's freedom of decision making would end up being hindered.[584] It also held a minimalist position on the frequency of consultations and the scope of the agenda undertaken jointly by the EU and NATO. This was the most intensely expressed position of France and it was at the heart of its European preferences. France claimed that it was imperative that the EU had the access to an *autonomous* military force in order to give the CFSP leverage. This was a matter of power and influence for Europe. Jacques Chirac has, for example, stated that the European Union should 'endow itself with all the instruments of true power'.[585]

Secondly, France held a maximalist position on the scope of the operations that could be undertaken within the ESDP framework. France supported the Spanish initiative after 11

---

[583] See, for example, Defence Minister Alain Richard's speech at the Wehrkunde in 2001, where he stated that 'European Defence would not be an alternative to the Atlantic Alliance and the EU would be confined to conducting no more or no less than the Petersberg Missions'. However, at a speech to the WEU Assembly in 2000, Richard stated that 'There can be no European defence without collective defence as a long-term goal'. See European Defence Speech by M. Alain Richard, Minister of Defence to the "Wehrkunde", Munich, 3 February 2001.

[584] Speech by M. Alain Richard, Minister of Defence to the "Wehrkunde", Munich, 3 February 2001

[585] Jacques Chirac, Discours devant l'assembly general de l'association du traité atlantique, Strasbourg, 19 October 1999.

September to expand the Petersberg Tasks to include anti-terrorist operations.[586] It would have, furthermore, liked to see Article V of the Modified Brussels Treaty transferred to the Treaty of the European Union.[587] At the higher end of what kind of operations could be interpreted as being included in the Petersberg Tasks, France claimed that even high intensity warfare operations, such as Operation *Desert Storm* could, in principle, fall under the aegis of the ESDP.[588]

Thirdly, France, like the UK, wanted to keep security and defence co-operation strictly in the hands of the state governments and did not see any role for the Community institutions in this context.[589]

Fifthly, France was rather critical of the development of a civilian crisis management capability and its initial position was that it wanted this function to be kept outside the scope of the ESDP process.[590]

Finally, France strongly emphasised the importance that the development of the ESDP would create a genuinely European defence industry.[591]

---

[586] Michael Clark (ed.), <u>Achieving the Helsinki Headline Goals</u>, Discussion Paper, Centre for Defence Studies, November, 2001, p. 10.
[587] See speech by Alain Richard at the WEU assembly.
[588] Clark (ed.), <u>Achieving the Helsinki Headline Goals</u>, p. 10.
[589] <u>Franco-British Joint Declaration on European Defence</u>, 5 December 1998.
[590] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[591] Closing speech by Alain Richard, Minister of Defence, at the symposium of the "Association Diplomatie et Défence", Paris, 18 April 2001.

The Sources of France's Preferences for the ESDP process

France's core preference has been to assure a Eurocentric structure for security and defence co-operation within the EU. The sources of its Europeanist preferences have been shaped both by institutional and historical factors and, to a large extent, its Europeanist preferences reflect two closely related ambitions of its diplomacy; namely (and taken to its extreme), its strive for a multipolar international system attained predominantly as a means to balance America's influence and leverage globally in general and particularly in Europe and the creation of a Puissance l'Europe, whereby France would assume the leadership position.[592] As will be noted, there have been some ebbs and flows in the intensity of France's Europeanist preferences, but, as Nicole Gnesotto has pointed out, over a longer historical perspective there has been 'an extraordinary permanence of the French ambition'.[593] Thus, in order to identify France's underlying preferences it is particularly important to set the historical context within which these preferences have been formulated.

The Awkward Ally

Some say that France is known for treating its enemies well and its allies poorly.[594] Moreover, it has been a difficult partner especially within NATO, but also, at times, within the European integration process, even though it has played an indispensable role as a committed European for advancing and enhancing this process. This feature of French diplomacy derives, in part, from two overarching tendencies in the manner that it has conducted its foreign policy which are of significance in order to understand how it has gone about developing its preferences within the ESDP process. Firstly, in its policy making process, France is greatly inclined to seek guidance from its own historical points of reference for present day situations. The problem with this approach is these historical points of reference sometimes sharply diverge from those of the other allies within the Euro-Atlantic community.[595] As Shaun Gergory has eloquently put it:

---

[592] Interview with French researcher, 6 June 2002.

[593] Nicole Gnesotto, La puissance et l'Europe (Paris: Presses de Science Po, 1998).

[594] France has indeed often maintained a Hobbesian view of its allies. General de Gaulle is, for example, quoted as saying: "Never forget that our allies are also our adversaries". See Heuser, Nuclear Mentalities, p. 127.
Heuser, Nuclear Mentalities, p. 126.

[595] Michael Brenner, Guillaume Parmentier, Reconcilable Differences: U.S.-French Relations in the New Era (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2002), p. 8.

> 'No other former great power has been so faithful to its attitudes of the past, no other so successful in transporting seemingly out-dated images of power in the political discourse of the late twentieth century'.[596]

Secondly, as Charles Cogan has pointed out does the French negotiation style appear to be based on a 'Cartesian logic', whereby hardheaded commitments to principles rather than pragmatic approaches to problem solving seem to have primacy.[597] This amalgamation has indeed caused friction between France and other EU Member States within the ESDP process since its reasons and the sources of its preference have, in many ways, been perplexing and sometimes provocative and especially Nordic countries have had a difficult time reconciling this with their thinking.[598] It has also generated a widespread perception that France has a hidden agenda for the finality of this process.[599] In order to understand why France at times undertakes such a rather obstinate approach to the conduct of its foreign policy, especially in reference to its Europeanist preferences, it is necessary to briefly reflect on France's belief systems regarding how it perceives itself and its history in order to set the context for its preferences.

France claims to be the 'oldest European nation' and assumes that by virtue of its history that it is bound to be a great power.[600] Yet France's poor performance during the Second World War was deeply troubling for its identity and self-perception.[601] As Stanley Hoffman has noted, 'France became obsessed with independence because she lost it in 1940'.[602] Even though there was a great appreciation for America's participation in the liberation of France, its interpretation of the role that the United States played during and after the Second World War is shaped by ambiguous feelings and occasionally a sense of aversion.[603]

---

[596] Shaun Gergory, <u>French Defence Policy in the Twentieth Century</u> (Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000), p. 7.
[597] Some claim that this is a reflection of the first factor, where French 'rationalism', in reality, is an interest clothed in reason. Charles Cogan, <u>French Negotiation Behaviour: Dealing with La Grande Nation</u> (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute for Peace Press, 2003).
[598] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.
[599] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 6 June 2002.
[600] According to Beatrice Heuser it sees itself as having a special mission to civilise the world given its rich history of political philosophy, literature, architecture and culture and, therefore, by these virtues has a right to preserve its great power status, which assures that it can exercise its rightful mission. Heuser, <u>Nuclear Mentalities</u>, p. 99.
[601] This factor is sometimes referred to as 'the Complex of 1940'. In a longer historical perspective, it should also be noted that between 1789 and 1944 France was invaded five times and this has made France draw the conclusion that at the moment of truth a state does not have any friends. This has partly contributed to France's realist-oriented foreign policy. See Gergory, <u>French Defence Policy in the Twentieth Century</u>, p. 10.
[602] In Cogan, <u>The Third Option</u>, p. 11.
[603] This resentment was accentuated by the American occupation of France in 1944. The decision to establish an Allied Government in Occupied Territories in France was especially ill received.

In the years immediately after World War Two, France worked closely together with the UK to assure the establishment of the North Atlantic Alliance. However, France grew increasingly disappointed with the fact that Britain and the United States continued to work so closely in tandem in NATO especially in reference to collaboration on nuclear issues and felt that it undermined France's own standing and influence within the Alliance.[604] Thus, General Charles de Gaulle drew the conclusion that is was impossible to change the Alliance from within and, in 1966, France withdrew from NATO's integrated command structure without consulting anyone, informing the other allies by letter that they had to remove their infrastructure from France.[605] The French withdrawal from NATO's integrated command structure, of course, accentuated France's Europeanist preferences since, in comparative terms, it had more to gain from defence co-operation outside the NATO framework as its role within the North Atlantic Alliance was even weaker after 1966.

France's Relations with the United States and Puissance l'Europe

The focus of France's Europeanist preferences more than anything else mirrors its discontent at the role that the United States plays in European security affairs. Yet France and the United States have not always had a troubled relationship. The two countries have never been at war with each other and France was the first country to support US independence. American democracy is also based on several political ideas that have their origins in France.[606] Yet,

---

[604] It should also be noted that the start of the development of a French nuclear weapons programme in 1954 was indeed a reflection of France's Europeanist preferences. Nuclear deterrence was seen as necessary in order to assure that a similar humiliating defeat, like in the Second World War, would not happen again and it would reduce France's dependency on its allies. The French nuclear capability was also intended to work as the great equaliser for France vis-à-vis the other Great Powers. Pascal Boniface, <u>Vive la bombe</u>, Edition No. 1, Paris, 1992.

[605] There were also important external factors that altered France's initial view of its role within NATO. The risk of war between East and West was assumed to have decreased with the death of Joseph Stalin in 1953. The experiences from the Suez crisis in 1956 did, according to the French interpretation, reinforce the assumption that the United Kingdom and the United States could not be trusted and France should, therefore, avoid becoming to deeply integrated into NATO as a consequence. Furthermore, the outcome of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 strengthened the French belief that the nuclear stalemate had reduced the risk of conventional war in Europe. It seems here that the necessity, in part, was dictating the ideology for France. When the risk of war was perceived as high, as in the years immediately after World War Two, France was a strong supporter of NATO, but as the risk of war decreased, France became more concerned with its ambitions to balance the role of the United States in the European security structure. See Sten Rynning, <u>Changing Military Doctrine: Presidents and Military Power in Fifth Republic France, 1958-2000</u> (New York: Praeger, 2002).

[606] France and the United States, furthermore, have the common feature that they, to a certain extent, sees themselves as the chosen people destined to claim universal leadership. However, this commonality also causes

according to Guillaume Parmentier is the French mistrust of the United States a combination of historic legacy and perceived excess of latter-day American power. The word 'suvivisme' (followership) well embodied this French criticism and suspicion of US aims and methods and, to a large extent, factors, such as identity, culture and political style, are equally major problems in US-French relations.[607]

As a strong believer in the balance of power systems, France looked to Europe as a means to balance the role of the United States in the Europe security structure.[608] De Gaulle, therefore, had a grand design for the future of France at the centre of a Europe that would challenge the military, political, cultural and economic dominance of the two super-powers by way of a *troisieme superpuissance*, embodied in the expression *puissance l'Europe*. Under these auspices, France looked to Europe to do what France could no longer do for itself. France welcomed the end of the Cold War as a return to normality and saw it as an opportunity to shift the focus of European security planning and organisation back to Europe. In this spirit, former Defence Minister Roland Dumas in 1991 grandiosely stated 'a common defence of Europe by Europe for Europe', echoing the dream and desire of General de Gaulle.[609] In the run-up to the Maastricht negotiations, France, together with Germany, took the initiative to propose the establishment of a political union.[610] The French ambition for this endeavour was evident as President Francois Mitterrand pointed out that 'A political union will ineluctably, in terms of foreign policy, lead to the creation of a proper European defence capability'.[611] It was, therefore, not surprising that the subsequent discussions at Maastricht on a common defence policy within this political union were almost exclusively centred on the concept of 'collective defence' and considerations about the possibility that the United States might withdraw its troops and, in turn, its security commitment to Europe.[612] In essence, there was a continuity in the key regulatory task for France, even after the end of the Cold War, to capture and hold on to the European integration process as a means of advancing its great power ambitions. As Mitterrand said in the mid-1990s,

---

problems since universalism is, of course, not easily shared. The dependency on the United States during and after the Second World War also offended French national pride and sense of nationhood and self-reliance based on the realist assumptions that lie at the heart of French foreign policy thinking.

[607] Brenner & Parmentier, Reconcilable Differences, p. 3.

[608] Michel R. Gueldry, France and European Integration -Toward a Transnational Polity? (London: Praeger, 2001).

[609] For Roland Dumas statement see: 29 October 1991, Press Conference, Politique Etranger de la France, Textes et Documents, September-October 1991, p. 161.

[610] The acronym CFSP was coined in 1990 in a joint Franco-German letter to the Irish Presidency of the EC.

[611] Closing speech by President Francois Mitterrand at Ecole de Guerre Forum, 'The State of European Security at the Dawn of the 21st Century', 11 April 1991.

[612] However, later the gradual transition from the focus on territorial defence to crisis management within the concept of European defence was greatly accentuated after the WEU's Council Summit in Petersberg, Germany, in 1992, where the concept 'Petersberg Tasks' was coined.

'Never separate the grandeur of France from the building of Europe. This is our new dimension.'[613]

France's Rapprochement with NATO

There was a deviation from the traditional Gaullist legacy in French policy after Jacques Chirac entered the Elysée in May 1995, which is important to be aware of in order to understand the factors that led to the development of the ESDP process a few years later. This was despite the fact that Chirac was the leader of the 'Gaullist Party' (Rassemblement du Peuple Français; RPF).[614] In essence, this was the start of an all-time decline in France's Europeanist preferences for the European security structure and an indication of a new French pragmatism, even though the Europeanist preferences had no way completely disappeared.[615] He had, for example, in 1993 stated in very non-Gaullist terms that:

> 'If France wants to play a determining role in the creation of a European defence identity, it must take into account the state of mind of its partners and reconsider to a large degree the form of its relations with NATO. It is clear that relying on existing European institutions such as the WEU only take place from the inside not against the United States but in agreement with it.'[616]

The two years that followed were exceedingly important for the European security structure and, to a certain degree, the outcome of France's rapprochement with NATO, which, in the end, resulted in failure and paved the way for the establishment of the St Malo agreement in 1998.[617]

Yet it is important to note that apart from Chirac's personal views, which were less Gaullist and more pragmatic towards NATO, the French rapprochement with NATO also derived from, at least, three structural factors, which corresponded rather well with France's Europeanist preferences. Firstly, less emphasis on nuclear deterrence in the post-Cold War security

---

[613] 30 May 1994, Press Conference, Politique Etranger de la France, Textes et Documents, May-June 1994, p. 132.

[614] This development did not come as a complete surprise given the fact that Chirac had in his youth spent some of his formative years in America and was known for having a more favourable view of the US than most French political leaders. See transcript of Interview with President Jacques Chirac, The New York Times, Elysée Palace, 8 September 2002.

[615] Interview with French researcher, 6 June 2002.

[616] Address by Jacques Chirac at the reception in honour of reserve officers in Paris, 8 February 1993.

[617] Charles Cogan goes as far as to claim that a complete reintegration of France into NATO would have made the ESDP process unnecessary altogether. However, given the frailty of some aspects of the ESDI process and the expanding role of the CFSP process, it seems as if it was a matter of when, not if, the EU should be involved in military matters in a more autonomous fashion.

environment made France less sensitive to the importance of French independence from NATO.[618] The ambition to preserve the independence of the *force de frappe* was, of course, a key consideration for why France withdrew from the integrated command structure in NATO in 1966.

Secondly, another factor that shaped the Chirac government's increasingly more positive perception of NATO was based on the assumption that as the United States reduces its troop presence in Europe, its influence in NATO will also decrease.[619] The French Government, therefore, considered for a while establishing a European defence pillar in NATO, instead of opting for an autonomous alternative and in return expected NATO to produce a modification of the SACEUR system. The possibility of establishing such a pillar had emerged with the creation of the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) in 1994 and the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) that was in the making by 1995-1996.[620] Such an option could, from an EU perspective, imply that the ESDI was the operationalisation of the CFSP and the CJTF was the tactical instrumentalisation of the ESDI.

Thirdly, both Operation *Desert Storm* in 1991 and Operation *Deliberate Force* in 1995 had painfully highlighted France's increasing strategic isolation and its difficulties with operating militarily with its allies.[621] It was clear that being outside NATO's integrated command caused serious weaknesses to France's ability to engage in coalition warfare operations.[622] Thus, in essence, while France had not given up on its Europeanist preferences, (preferences are indeed 'sticky' as pointed out in the introduction to this chapter), it was evident by the mid-1990s that they had forced France to pay a rather high opportunity cost.[623] The less Gaullist Chirac government was, therefore, willing to consider influencing the European security structure from within NATO, even though it demanded some principal concessions.[624]

---

[618] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[619] Cogan, The Third Option, p. 76.
[620] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[621] Cogan, The Third Option, p. 63.
[622] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Defence, 3 June 2002.
[623] Regarding this issue Anand Menon claims that, while independence from NATO served France well during the Cold War since it assured more autonomy and a sense of exceptionalism and grandeur, it has had negative implications for France in the post-Cold War era as it became more isolated. Anand Menon, France, NATO and the Limits of Independence 1981-1997 - The Politics of Ambivalence (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000).
[624] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 3 June 2002.

Given the new impetus for a French engagement with NATO, France announced, on 5 December 1995, that it was returning to NATO's Military Committee. Chirac also revealed in a speech on 1 February 1996 that France was willing to consider rejoining the integrated command structure as along as 'the European identity can assert itself fully therein'.[625] However, the attempt to reach an agreement between the United States and France over the conditions of the latter's re-entry into the integrated command structure ended in failure and relations between Jacques Chirac and President Bill Clinton deteriorated. The reason for this failure was the French insistence on assuring that a European was made head of NATO's Southern Command. Washington claimed that it had already accommodated France through the establishment of the ESDI and rejected the French proposal despite Chirac's personal request to Clinton. Yet the Pentagon was working on reaching a compromise, which would have seen a European commander become responsible for CJTF operations at the Southern Command. However, this initiative floundered because Chirac called for early parliamentary elections in France in May 1997 and, in the subsequent elections, the Gaullists lost their control over the National Assembly and France went back to a Cohabitation arrangement. The new Socialist government led by Prime Minster Lionel Jospin and Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine had systematically criticised Chirac's efforts to reintegrate France into NATO's command structure. After the establishment of the Cohabitation arrangement, it was simply politically impossible for Chirac to approach NATO again on this issue. [626]

France once again increased its anti-American rhetoric after failing to reach an agreement on the reintegration of France into NATO and even went so far as to try to gang up with other like-minded, but not necessarily democratic states, regarding the establishment of a multipolar system. In May 1997, France, for example, signed a joint communiqué with China 'to engage in reinforced co-operation to foster the march toward multipolarity and oppose any attempt at domination in world affairs'.[627] In 1998, Hubert Védrine in a speech referred to the United States as a 'hyperpuissance' with excess power instruments that needed to be balanced by other great powers in the international system.[628] Yet despite these subsequent yearnings for multipolarity

---

[625] 'France and NATO', President Jacques Chirac on Radio France Inter, 1 February 1996.
[626] Interview with French researcher, 6 June 2002.
[627] Joint communiqué issued by President Jacques Chirac and President Jiang Zemin, Bejing, May 14 1997.
[628] However, Védrine, who was taken by surprise by the animosity that the term 'hyperpuissance' caused, later tried to modify his position somewhat. See, for example, Védrine's following statement: 'you are far more than a superpower because you have all the attributes of conventional power plus those of a "soft" power. That's what I've meant when I've talked about hyperpuissance; it's neither a criticism nor an attack but a statement of fact. NEW WORLD CHALLENGES: THE FRENCH VISION, Speech by Hubert Védrine, Minister of Foreign Affairs, at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, March 28 2001.

and anti-Americanism, France's attempt at a rapprochement with NATO was of significance to the ESDP process. Firstly, despite the good intent behind the French initiative, the outcome of the rapprochement led to a dead-end, where there would be no chance of France re-entering the integrated command structure for several years.[629] This fact severely undermined the ESDI's effectiveness as a credible option for the ESDP process since France would have felt considerably more comfortable using the ESDI if it had been fully integrated into NATO.[630] Needless to say, this was a key dilemma since France would have had a very significant role in any European-led crisis management operation given its military resources and experiences from expeditionary warfare and peace support operations. In brief, new thinking and fresh ideas were necessary to enhance the state of affairs in the European security structure. Secondly, and arguably more importantly, the attempts by the Chirac governments for a rapprochement with NATO had indicated that, at least, President Chirac had a reasonably pragmatic approach to the European security structure and that the anti-American segments within the French political system were predominately among the Socialists, rather than the Gaullists.[631] In essence, the rapprochement with NATO indicated to the UK that, at least, President Chirac seemed to be by British standards 'engageable' regarding a deal on European defence.[632]

France and the St Malo Summit

When the United Kingdom in 1998 indicated that it was willing to shift its position on European security and defence co-operation within the EU, this, in France, caused great interest.[633] There was indeed also a consensus across the board in French politics about the desirability of France working with the UK to develop the ESDP process even though there were some fears that it was an attempt by the United Kingdom to draw France closer into NATO and the Americans further into the EU.[634] In regards to the French preference formation process, there are no indications that the French Government consulted or took into consideration the preferences of various interest groups within France before it reached an agreement with the UK on European defence

---

[629] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 3 June 2002.

[630] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 3 June 2002.

[631] The significance of this derived from the fact that it is the Presidency that controls aspects such as foreign and defence policy within the French political system.

[632] Interview with representative from the FCO, 12 September 2002.

[633] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 3 June 2002.

[634] Anne Deighton, 'European Union Policy' in Anthony Seldon, <u>The Blair Effect - The Blair Government 1997-2001</u> (London: Little, Brown and Company, 2001), p. 321.

at St Malo.[635] After some compromises on issues, such as references to NATO and the use of the word 'autonomous' rather than 'independent', the two parties were able to agree on a common declaration on European defence that was presented on 5 December 1998.

The ability to reach this agreement between the Atlanticist-oriented United Kingdom and the Europeanist-oriented France was greatly helped by their common experiences from Bosnia and later at the Rambouillet negotiations since it made them draw similar conclusions that a new impetus was needed for the European security structure.[636] It was also spurred by an awareness of an unsustainable dependency on the United States in European security affairs given the hesitance of Washington to become militarily involved on the ground both in Bosnia and Kosovo.[637] The Kosovo campaign, furthermore, reopened the issue of NATO's integrated command structure and political oversight of military operations. Especially France was very sensitive to the fact that the US Joint Chiefs of Staff at times overran SACEUR himself, which created a sense that the operation was run by Washington rather than by SHAPE. As Alain Richard has noted, 'The Kosovo experience has reminded us that each nation weights on the whole in portions to its own military contribution.[638]

France and the Implementation of the ESDP Process

Yet even though France proved to be willing to reach a compromise with the UK on the development of the ESDP, there should be no doubt about the long-term French Europeanist preferences for the European security structure. Indeed, it was also of great concern to the UK that France did not, to a larger extent, refrain from expressing its Europeanist preferences publicly after the St Malo agreement.[639]

The Europeanist preferences can be traced back to France's position during the implementation process of the ESDP. For example, the maximalist French interpretation of the role that the ESDP could play, in part, reflected the French preferences within the European security

---

[635] It should be noted that throughout the process between 1999 and 2001 the Quai d'Orsay maintained a considerably stronger emphasis on the importance of the ESDP being developed in an Europeanist direction than the Ministry of Defence. Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 3 June 2002.
[636] Quinlan, 'European Defence Co-operation'.
[637] Brenner and Parmentier, Reconcilable Differences, p. 64.
[638] Remarks by Minister of Defence Alain Richard, 'Défence européene et souveraineté, Paris, October 20, 2000.
[639] Interview with British researcher, 23 September 2004.

structure.[640] The notion that the Petersberg Tasks could include requiring combat operations and in the future preferably also counter-terrorist measures indicated that France wanted to see a growing dimension to defence co-operation within the EU.[641] This was, in part, based on the French desire for the EU to incrementally take over much of the role that NATO retained in the European security structure. Thus, France's preferred option was to have as much defence co-operation as possible outside the Alliance.[642] France, therefore, wanted an independent structure for the ESDP and Article V in the Modified Brussels Treaty included in the Treaty of the European Union as a form of reinforced co-operation within the second pillar. It should in this context be noted that the use of reinforced integration has for a long time been a French method to assure that it belongs to the core of Europe and, therefore, can exert more influence than the Member States that remain outside this framework. Hence, for example, France proposed reinforced co-operation as a means to advance the ESDP process during its EU Presidency in 2000.

France's strong emphasis on an intergovernmental approach to defence co-operation within the EU reflected a conceptual heritage from the Gaullist era, which always stressed the importance of French sovereignty and a union of strong nation-states. Furthermore, France maintains an active role in international affairs, including a high readiness for military engagement, which makes it want to ensure a high degree of freedom of action in the field of security and defence co-operation. Like the UK, France, therefore, strongly opposes any idea of handing its sovereignty over its armed forces to the EU.[643]

As previously noted, France was hesitant about the development of a civilian crisis management capability within the ESDP framework. France tried to stop the establishment of a civilian dimension to crisis management all together during the negotiations at the Cologne Summit. It was later also reluctant to the establishment of capability goals within the civilian sphere.[644] It resisted the Swedish initiative to establish a Petersberg committee and it strongly opposed the reference to third parties within the conflict prevention programme.[645] It also insisted on keeping

---

[640] Bernard de Bressy, 'Défense ou intervention: le paradox européen', <u>Défense national</u>, avril 2000, pp. 5-11.
[641] Yet France was more careful than the United Kingdom to stress that peace enforcement operations required a mandate from the UN Security Council. This can be traced back to France's protection of the UN system as a means to prevent the United States from taking unilateral military action.
[642] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.
[643] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 3 June 2002.
[644] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.
[645] France made the strongest possible objection to any cooperation between the EU and NATO in reference to the conflict prevention program. It should, however, be noted that France did not express any hesitation about EU-

CIVCOM weak, both in terms of resources and staff.[646] There were, at least, two reasons for France's disinclination to develop a civilian crisis management function. The first reason derived from process considerations. Even though France did not, in principle, oppose the development of a civilian crisis management capability, it was reluctant to approve of it since its establishment would divert time and political energy away from the development of the ESDP's military dimension. Furthermore, France stated that it thought that this function already existed within the Community pillar of the EU.[647]

Secondly, France opposed the development of a civilian crisis management capability since it did not want this aspect to be a defining feature of the ESDP process.[648] France had an interest in focusing on the ESDP's military dimension given the fact that it wanted the ESDP to expand at the cost of NATO's role in the European security structure. Thus, France saw the ESDP process as primarily a military project and viewed the development of a civilian crisis management capability as a distraction from this goal. The heart of this issue was really about what sort of actor the EU would be in international security affairs. Some state governments, like the core-promoters of the civilian dimension, wanted it to have a somewhat similar profile to the UN, i.e., focusing on peacekeeping and peace building measures. Others like France wanted the EU to be a potent military actor that would give the CFSP the leverage and influence that it lacked. It should also be noted that France for many years has expressed frustration over the inclination, especially in Sweden, to adhere to a naïve, normative and value driven foreign policy.[649] This policy seems to clash with the dominant features of French foreign policy, which tend to focus more on the relevance of rationalism and great power politics than on normative or altruistic aspects of foreign policy.[650]

France's emphasis on the importance of the ESDP also generating more European defence industry co-operation derived from the French desire to give its industries the means to be a

---

OSCE co-operation or EU-UN co-operation within this field. The French position was clearly based on its preference to keep EU-NATO interaction at a minimum.
[646] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 June 2004.
[647] Hence, also the Deputy Secretary General of the Council Pierre de Boissieu (French) was very critical of the development of a civilian crisis management capability within the second pillar since it undermined the coherence of the pillar structure. Interview with representative from the Irish Ministry of Defence, 28 May 2004.
[648] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.
[649] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.
[650] Hubert Védrine defended this feature of French foreign policy in an eloquent (and very French) manner by alluding to Max Weber who has pointed out that there is a distinction between an ethics of conviction and an ethics of responsibility. According to Védrine, an authentic ethics of responsibility itself constitutes a powerful conviction. Védrine with Moisi, France in an Age of Globalization.

credible competitor vis-à-vis the powerful American defence industry.[651] France, which maintains a large defence industrial base (of which it is very protective), has for political reasons not had the same success as the UK in preserving access to technology transfers from the United States. Increasing co-operation between European countries would also, according to France, significantly reduce procurement costs, enhance prospects for advanced research and development and contribute to a greater homogeneity within the EU's forces

Conclusions

To surmise why France has been the core-promoter of a Europeanist structure of the ESDP, it seems clear that this is a combination of its own historical points of reference and influence considerations. The defining difference between the UK and Germany, on the one hand, and France, on the other, is that the first two have a very positive view of the role that the United States played during the Cold War and, to a certain degree, continues to play in the European security structure. They therefore see themselves as partners of the United States. France, which has a more sceptical view of the American role during and after the Cold War, is continuously measuring itself against the United States. It sees the United States as a rival to its own great power ambitions given France's previously noted self-proclaimed role of representing a universal cause that is somewhat different from that of the United States. It is this French strive for spreading its universal cause and restoring its independence and place among the great powers that makes France undertake the sometimes unpopular task of challenging the US role in the European security structure. Consequently, France has always had a worse relationship with- and less influence on Washington than the United Kingdom and, to a lesser degree, Germany. Thus, France has had the most to gain in comparative terms from less co-operation across the Atlantic and a greater degree of independence for the EU. This also has institutional implications that are self-reinforcing since being outside the integrated military command structure means that France also enjoys a less prominent role within NATO and, therefore, has more to gain from European security co-operation outside this framework.[652] A reintegration of France into this system would probably lessen its Europeanist preferences since it would reduce France's self-perceived isolation within the NATO structure. However, it would be naïve to assume that it

---

[651] Closing speech by Alain Richard, Minister of Defence at the symposium of the "Association Diplomatie et Défence", Paris, 18 April 2001.
[652] Interview with representative from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 3 June 2002.

would end its Europeanist ambitions. The forms of its interaction with NATO are predominately a consequence of, not the cause of its Europeanist preferences. France can probably never entirely fulfil a self-satisfying degree of great power status as long as it is operating in what is predominately a US-led framework.

In some regards, France has been its own worst enemy regarding its endeavour to establish an autonomous European defence structure since its constant hankering for multipolarity and the Puissance l'Europe has diluted a reasonable argument that it is under some circumstances healthy for the EU to have a large degree of autonomy and freedom of decision-making regarding security and defence issues. Consequently, France, as noted in chapter three, has repeatedly been isolated in its demands for a minimum of interaction between the EU and NATO within the ESDP framework.[653] The other state governments have often been careful not to side with France in its demands for an autonomous structure for the ESDP process since they feared they then also would sign up to France's hidden agenda of undermining the role of NATO and, in turn, the US role in the European security structure. The basic point here is that France's questioning of EU-NATO relations and its strive for multipolarity has questioned the whole concept of the Euro-Atlantic community and France thereby, to a large extent, puts limits on what this community can and cannot do. Given the challenges from the external security environment, most European state governments feel more comfortable retaining the option of working with the Americans and the military might that it represents in order to handle these challenges, rather than trying to balance the United States.

Germany's Main Positions on the ESDP process

Germany was, in many regards, the middleman during the ESDP negotiations and tried to act as an honest broker between the shifting preferences of France and the UK.[654] Yet its own core-preference within the ESDP process to establish some form of collective structure for the ESDP process that surpassed traditional second pillar intergovernmentalism did not correspond well with neither the UK's or France's preferences for strict intergovernmental co-operation within this field. Since the participation and engagement of London and Paris was indispensable for the process, Germany avoided fervently championing this issue during the negotiations. Rather it was seen as a long-term objective for Germany. Thus, between 1999-2001, the issue of a

---

[653] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.
[654] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

supranational structure for the ESDP process was not a critical negotiation issue, except for some peripheral matters that concerned the implementation of the policy. However, given the tendency within the integration process of continuously deepening it, rather than re-nationalising it, it is still worthwhile to assess the underlying reasons for Germany's farfetched, but still rather strong desire for a European security and defence policy beyond the intergovernmental model. Germany's main position in reference to the ESDP process can be summarised in three main points.

Firstly, as opposed to the UK and France, Germany stated that it would have preferred a more federally oriented structure for the ESDP, where decisions also with defence implications would under some circumstances be reached with qualified majority voting rather than by consensus. It would also have favoured a stronger mandate for the security bodies, the High Representative and possibly also the European Parliament within the ESDP process and it was positive to the proposal to open up the second pillar to reinforced integration.[655] However, Germany has, as many times before in its European diplomacy, been pragmatic regarding its positions within the ESDP process.[656] It should, for example, be noted that it with some reluctance accepted the Irish proposal for an inclusion of a paragraph in the Treaty of the European Union that stated that the creation of the ESDP process did not imply the creation of a European army.[657]

Secondly, Germany supported the UK's Atlanticist position on EU-NATO relations throughout the ESDP negotiations between 1999-2001.[658] Yet unlike Britain, Germany would, just like France, have preferred to see Article V of the Modified Brussels Treaty included in the Treaty of the European Union since the objective of establishing a common defence for the EU was an important federal goal for Germany.[659] It did, however, retain a restricted interpretation of the scope of the Petersberg Tasks and the German Government rejected all aspects within the ESDP process that seemed to be associated with war fighting.[660] Yet it supported, together with France,

---

[655] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[656] W.R. Smyser, How Germans Negotiate - Logical Goals Practical Solutions (New York: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2003).
[657] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.
[658] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.
[659] This reinforces the thesis of this chapter that the core preference is omnipotent and other preferences tend to be analogue with or subjected to this core preference.
[660] It should be noted that Germany rejected the first original version of the Petersberg Tasks in 1992, which stated "tasks of combat forces in crisis management and armed conflicts". Instead, it was paraphrased into "tasks of combat forces in crisis management including peacemaking". For Germany, the original version seemed too war-like. See Willem van Eekelen, Debating European Security 1948-1998, SDU-CEPS, Brussels, 1998, p. 127.

the Spanish initiative after the events of 11 September 2001 to integrate the fight against terrorism into the ESDP.[661]

Finally, Germany strongly supported the development of both a civilian crisis management capability and a conflict prevention programme but wanted it predominately, but not exclusively, to be based in the EU's Community pillar. It also wanted to include all aspects of disarmament, from 'nuclear to light weapons', in the ESDP process in general and particularly in the civilian crisis management capability and conflict prevention programme.[662] This was also something that was not well received in London and Paris.[663]

Regarding the scope of Germany's interpretation of the Petersberg Tasks, see Clark (ed.), <u>Achieving the Helsinki Headline Goals</u>, p. 11.

[661] Policy statement delivered by Federal Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in the German Bundestag on the forthcoming European Council in Laeken on 14/15 December 2001, Berlin, 12 December 2001.

[662] Comprehensive Concept of the Federal Government on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building, Auswärtiges Amt, December 2002.

[663] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.

The Sources of Germany's Preferences for the ESDP Process

Germany did not have to alternate its preferences for European defence when the issue emerged during the autumn of 1998 partly since it saw the development of the ESDP as a first step towards its core preferences for some form of supranational structure covering defence and security issues in Europe. The aim of establishing some form of supranational structure for European defence has been a long-standing German dream ever since the failure of the European Defence Community.[664] However, these aspirations grew after the end of the Cold War and especially Chancellor Helmut Kohl was very eager to see some form of supranational control over the armed forces within Europe in order to assure that a re-nationalisation of defence and security did not come about again in Europe.[665] Kohl also linked this issue with the reunification of Germany, which, according to him, made it all the more urgent that such an arrangement was established.[666]

These ideas also seem to have appealed to the Schröder government. In 2001, Chancellor Gerhard Schröder informed the Bundestag in response to a declaration of operational readiness for the EU's military and civilian crisis management capabilities that:

> 'Due to national sensitivities, the plans for a European Defence Community came to nothing. Today, after more than 40 years of European integration we have after all come a long way'.[667]

Along the same lines of adherence to the power of federalism the Chancellor in January 1999 also stated that:

> 'I am convinced that our standing in the world regarding foreign trade and finance policies will sooner or later force a Common Foreign and Security Policy worthy of its name. National sovereignty in foreign and security policy will soon prove itself to be a product of imagination.'[668]

---

[664] Germany has occasionally also been supported by the Commission in this endeavour. In 1992, Jacques Delors, for example, stated: 'I cannot prevent myself from thinking that if, one day, the European Community has a very strong political union then why not transfer the nuclear weapons to this political authority?', Le Monde, 12 January 1992. After the end of the WEU Council Summit in Bremen on 10 May 1999, Romano Prodi, thinking along the same lines, stated that the next logical step for European security and defence co-operation would be to set up a European army. Atlantic News, No. 3107, 12 May 1999.

[665] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

[666] Jopp, 'Germany and the Western European Union', p. 39.

[667] Policy Statement delivered by Federal Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in the German Bundestag on the forthcoming European Council in Laeken on 14/15 December 2001.

[668] Speech by Chancellor Gerard Schröder at the conference 'New Foundations for European Integration', Brussels, 19 January 1999.

The same year saw the German Government on another occasion also point out, albeit slightly more cautiously, but still based on the same vision that 'Areas like defence where soldiers are sent to risk their lives, will remain for a long time in the intergovernmental domain. But we want Europe to become more and more of a global actor, foreign policy should also go beyond intergovernmentalism.'[669]

Germany's Experiences From the Past

To understand the sources of Germany's core preference for some form of supranational structure for the ESDP process it is necessary to review its historical points of reference and its belief system. According to Elmer Plischke is no other country in Europe so haunted by its past and nothing is more important in German thinking on issues of war and peace than breaking with this past.[670] Pacifism, democracy and respect for human rights have, therefore, emerged as powerful values in German foreign policy.[671] This also had legal ramifications; the Basic Law committed Germany to norms, such as European unity, international peace and the protection of human rights. Thus, Germany's diplomacy is, to a very large extent, shaped by its institutional arrangements and by an understanding of the kind of identity that its post-war elites have sought to project in Europe.[672]

Germany's Relations with the United States

At the centre of German thinking on war and peace are also its relations with Washington. West Germany saw itself as the first line of defence against aggression from the East and it was very much shaped by the fact that the East German population was repressed by a dictatorship. The defining difference regarding the Federal Republic can only be attributed to the US role in the

---

[669] Cogan, The Third Option, p.144.
[670] Elmer Plischke, 'West German Foreign and Defence Policy', Orbis, 12/4, 1969, pp. 110-114.
[671] Furthermore, losing two world wars and finding that the sacrifices had been in vain has made Germany even more reluctant to the use of military force. Hence, for example, the willingness among West Germans to defend their country in the event of aggression was consistently the lowest in Western Europe throughout the Cold War years. Thus, the use of military force has under no circumstances been glorified since the fall of the Nazi government. At most, it has been portrayed as a necessary evil during extreme circumstances. The past has also led many Germans to establish an absolute (anti-) approach to war wherein the distinction between just and unjust wars was eroded and all wars were seen as irrational and wrong. See Eurobarometer, No. 24, December 1985.
[672] Simon Bulmer, Charlie Jeffery and William E. Paterson, Germany's European Diplomacy - Shaping the Regional Milieu (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 5.

European security structure: American security guarantees for Western Europe were seen as particularly indispensable for West Germany given its geostrategic position. Thus, when faced with the choice between the Gaullist vision of Europe and the American vision, Germany always preferred the second because of the military might that the United States could provide for Germany's protection.[673] However, there was also an emotional twist to this preference based on Germany's enormous gratitude to the United States. Germany's support for NATO was as strong as the UK's, especially among the policy makers in the Federal Government.[674] For example, the initiative by the Green Party in 1986 for West Germany to withdraw from NATO never enjoyed much support among the wider public.[675] It should as well be noted that Germany's economic miracle was also, in part, thanks to foreign assistance from the United States, which came in the shape of the Marshall Plan in the early years after World War Two. Given the close relations between the two countries, some have even claimed that the German-American alliance was 'the second Constitutional Law of the Federal Republic'.[676]

Germany and the European Integration Process

Not surprisingly, given its past, nationalism is also dreaded in Germany and the country has, therefore, searched for another distinctiveness and found that it could embrace a European identity instead. Germany has always been at the heart of the European integration process since the source of its initiation was based on a desire to firmly embed Germany within this process once and for all. The historical lesson for Germany is that it has benefited enormously from both economic and political integration, while its unilateral endeavours, especially those undertaken by the Third Reich, ended in complete disaster.[677] A cornerstone of German diplomacy has, therefore, been to not act alone in international affairs. It is here that the key to Germany's preferences for a collective structure for defence and security co-operation lies.[678] Sovereignty in Germany is not understood in a traditional fashion but as participation in and influence on a greater European superstate.[679] Consequently, Germany has a considerably more favourable attitude towards a more federal and supranational approach to security and defence integration

---

[673] Interview with German researcher, 23 September 2004.
[674] Interview with German researcher, 23 September 2004.
[675] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.
[676] Statement by Walter Leiser Kiep in Heuser, <u>Nuclear Mentalities</u>, p. 217
[677] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.
[678] Heuser, <u>Nuclear Mentalities</u>, p. 187.
[679] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.

within the EU than France or the UK since it neither has the informal legitimacy, self-confidence or necessary military hardware to conduct any larger military endeavours unilaterally. As Johannes Bohnen has accurately, but contra-intuitively pointed out, pressure for European integration often serves to increase Germany's autonomy in the field of security and defence. It has increased Germany's room for manoeuvre and enhanced its influence over its partners.[680] However, the desire for some form of federal structure for defence co-operation was also based on a pro-European ideology (which thrived on a moral high ground as a peace promoting ideology) and a great faith in the usefulness of the community model both as a mean to assure stability and effective results.[681]

The end of the Cold War and the unification of Germany brought a fundamental transformation to its foreign policy environment and there was a great deal of uncertainty about what would become of the German Question.[682] In theory, Germany was now free to assume the role of a normal European great power.[683] Yet instead of freeing itself from its obligations to the international institutions and its self-imposed policy of constraints in regard to security and defence issues, Germany made further progress within the European integration process. Helmut Kohl seized the opportunity to reinforce supranational integration through a process of deepening by proposing, together with France, the establishment of the monetary union. This was despite Germany's hesitance to abandon the stability that the Deutschmark represented and he also suggested the establishment of a political union at the Maastricht IGC. Together with France, Germany also announced, in October 1991, plans for the establishment of a purely European force with the Franco-German brigade as its nucleus. This initiative would constitute the embryo of what would become Eurocorps and was a comprise made by Francois Mitterand in the light of Helmut Kohl's desire for some form of supranational structure for the armed forces in Europe. At the same time, France saw it as an instrumental creation to counter-balance the establishment of the Allied Rapid Reaction Corps launched within the NATO framework in 1991.

---

[680] Johannes Bohnen, 'Germany', in Jolyon Howorth and Anand Menon (eds.), <u>The European Union and National Defence Policy</u> (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 49.
[681] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.
[682] Timothy Garton Ash, <u>In Europe's Name: Germany and the Divided Continent</u> (London: Vintage, 1994), p. 380.
[683] Some, for example, thought that Germany would acquire nuclear weapons and seek to balance its rivals in a new multipolar and considerably more unstable Europe. See John Mearsheimer, 'Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the End of the Cold War', <u>International Security</u>, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1990, p. 6.

Incremental Steps Towards a Normalisation of the Use of Armed Forces

To understand Germany's preferences for the ESDP process, it is also necessary to assess its experiences from the post-Cold War security environment and its initial self-imposed constraints upon participating in international peace support operations. Until 1990, the Federal Republic had not deployed forces abroad at all since the Basic Law prohibited any participation of German forces outside the NATO context.[684] However, after a constitutional ruling, German soldiers were sent to Somalia in 1994.[685] In 1995, Germany reluctantly accepted to participate in the NATO-led extraction force for UNPROFOR and then it participated in Operation *Deliberate Force* to end the Bosnian-Serb aggression on the outskirts of Sarajevo in 1995. Germany later participated in IFOR, SFOR and some what crossed the Rubicon by participating in Operation *Allied Force* in 1999, even though this operation lacked a UN mandate.[686] Yet it should be noted that both the Social Democrats and the Greens were bitterly divided over the issue of Germany participating in Operation *Allied Force*.[687]

The experiences from the Balkans did, in a fundamental way, shape Germany's perceptions of the European security structure on at least two accounts.[688] Firstly, it increased its knowledge and understanding of the very complex security environment that it had to handle in intrastate conflicts like the ones in the Balkans. In these operations, where there was no peace to be kept, it was necessary for the intervening forces to be able to act resolutely and not shy away from using decisive military force when it was perceived as necessary.[689] This fact made it easier for the German political leadership to explain to its people that military force in peace support

---

[684] Helmut Kohl stated in 1993 that there were places in Europe where it was out of the question for Germany to send military forces since the indigenous population had experiences from the Second World War. This made the prominent German strategist Josef Joffe note if this policy was accepted, the only place in Europe, where German troops could be deployed, was Sweden. In Johannes Bohnen, 'Germany', p. 54.

[685] In 1994, the German Constitutional Court established three criteria for German participation: it had to be conducted within the framework of a collective security organisation; its intentions should be to uphold peace and international security and it had to be approved of by the *Bundestag.*

[686] Participation in the latter operation was based on the need to maintain solidarity with NATO, a moral obligation to prevent the ethnic cleansing and fears that not standing up to the challenges in the Balkans might weaken the European security institutions, which were the centrepiece of Germany's foreign policy. Germany was more dependent on functioning institutions in Europe than the other major European states. See, for example, Hanns W. Maull, 'Germany and the Use of Force: Still a 'Civilian Power'?', Survival, Vol. 42, No. 2, 2000.

[687] The German Federal Government was also at the brink of a collapse in November 2001 when Chancellor Schröder linked a vote of confidence to his government with the vote on the deployment of German forces to Afghanistan. Though the vote past with a narrow margin especially the Green Party was very divided on their views of German participation in the operation in Afghanistan.

[688] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.

[689] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.

operations was sometimes necessary to use in order to establish a better peace.[690] It also increased the awareness of the inherent limitations imposed on the EU as long as it lacked a military dimension in international security affairs.

Secondly, Germany, just like the United Kingdom and France, realised during the 1990s that the current European security structure was not corresponding properly to the challenges of the ones in the Balkans, both in regards to the diplomatic process within the EU and the military impotency of the EU state governments.[691] It showed that fresh ideas and a new impetus were necessary. As Gerard Schröder noted, 'However, the regrettable fact remains there are still deficits in the Common Foreign and Security Policy, but here the answer can only be more not less Europe'.[692] Yet Germany was keener on advancing the diplomatic process through the CFSP than developing more military capabilities for crisis management operations since deeper political integration, rather than more military hardware, has been at heart of the European ideology that has shaped Germany for the past five decades.[693] Thus, it should be observed that Germany's shift in security policy has so far been more political than military, and more symbolic than real, and the necessary transformation of the *Bundeswehr* still has a very long way to go.[694] Yet the incremental steps that Germany has taken towards normalising the use of its armed forces since the end of the Cold War has indeed played an important role for its integration into the ESDP process, both conceptionally and operationally.

Germany and the Implementation of the ESDP Process

However, despite Germany's gradual normalisation the old culture of restraint is still prevalent and it remains very sensitive to the use of military force according to Hanns W. Maull.[695] This feature of German thinking on war and peace has also been reflected in the way that it has developed its preferences for the ESDP process. Germany took a very positive attitude towards

---

[690] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[691] See, for example, Schörder's following statement: 'It was, above all, the experiences of the wars in Bosnia and Kosovo that led us to adopt in Cologne during the German Presidency a plan for the development of an autonomous European Security and Defence Policy.' Policy Statement delivered by Federal Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in the German Bundestag on the forthcoming European Council in Laeken on 14/15 December 2001.
[692] Policy Statement delivered by Federal Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in the German Bundestag on the forthcoming European Council in Laeken on 14/15 December 2001.
[693] Bulmer, Jeffery and Paterson, Germany's European Diplomacy, p. 31.
[694] For an analysis of the development of *The Bundesweh* see Mary Elise Sarotte, 'German Military Reform and European Security', Adelphi Paper, No. 340, (London: The International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2001).
[695] Maull, 'Germany and the Use of Force: Still a 'Civilian Power'?'.

the fact that the UK and France finally were able to agree on the development of security and defence co-operation within the EU at St Malo and this spawned an intense policy-making process within Germany. This was due to the significance of the agreement and because it fell to the German Presidency to advance the process. Yet just as in the case of France and the UK, there were no interest groups that seemed to have had a decisive impact on the process of Germany's preference formulation.[696] Neither did bureaucratic in-fighting, which, to a large degree, was the case in France, bother the ministries in Germany.[697]

Germany's culture of restraint can, for example, be traced back to its large emphasis on non-military forms of crisis management and conflict prevention measures. Germany's preference for civilian crisis management and conflict prevention was based on especially pro-active support from the Green Party. Joschka Fischer intervened personally to assure that the development of a civilian crisis management capability received all the possible support that it could obtain from Germany.[698] However, even the Social Democrats strongly supported the development of a civilian crisis management capability within the EU.[699] The development of civilian crisis management capabilities reinforced the EU's traditional international identity as a civilian, rather than a military power that tended to prefer to handle crises with non-military means and where the use of force only would be the last of many options.[700] Even though the experiences from the Kosovo crisis had indicated the inherent limits of the EU's identity as a civilian power, there were many German political leaders and scholars that had ambiguous feelings about the EU's

---

[696] With the exception of some promotional literature and the arrangement of a few conferences and symposiums, it is difficult to identify any major influence that the German defence industry had upon the process of its government's preference formation regarding the ESDP process. Neither does it appear that public interest groups, such as the peace movement, had any strong views or influences on the government. Jurgen Hartmann, 'Organized Interests and Foreign Policy', in Wolf-Dieter Eberwein and Karl Kaiser (eds.), Germany's New Foreign Policy (New York: Palgrave, 1998), p. 273.

[697] There were no great arguments between the ministries within the German system predominately since there was a clear division of labour; namely, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had the decision-making authority for security policy issues, but had to consult the Ministry of Defence. Regarding defence issues, the roles were reversed. The only brief tension within the German system remained between especially the Policy Planning Unit at the Ministry of Defence and the European Integration Unit at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which had opposing views regarding how the security bodies within the EU institutions should be structured in order to be compatible with the Treaty of the European Union. However, tensions were generally very low. Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

[698] There was indeed some apprehension within the Green party about what was sometimes referred to as the militarisation of the EU. In order to accommodate these worries the government was very eager to stress that the ESDP's development was an expansion of the EU's toolbox to promote peace and stability where military means 'were not excluded' Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

[699] ESDP: A Key Project for European Unification, Auswärtiges Amt, March 2003.

[700] See, for example, Chancellor Gerhard Schröder's statement at the 37th Munich Conference on Security Policy: 'The European Union will not just make available military reaction forces, but will attach particular significance to civilian crisis management. Military measures will be nothing other than a last resort'.

'militarisation'.[701] The emphasis on civilian crisis management, therefore, greatly appealed to them. However, Germany's position on civilian crisis management was also a reflection of the fact that it had considerably more influence in this area than within the military sphere given its limited military resources for crisis management operations.

Sensitivity at the use of force was also reflected in the German interpretation of the scope of the Petersberg Tasks. Germany included all aspects of crisis management, but not high intensity warfare operations and crisis management operations that could lead to collective defence missions.[702] Gerard Schröder was always very careful to stress that the development of the ESDP was not going to lead the EU to engage in an 'Angriffskrieg' and the military option will always be the last resort when everything else has failed.[703] Joschka Fischer has also been very eager to stress that 'the EU does not do war'. The use of military force will, according to Fischer, always be severely constrained and used with the utmost caution when conducted within the EU framework.[704]

The previously noted positive view of the role of the United States and NATO also shaped Germany's preferences within the ESDP process.[705] During the ESDP negotiations Germany was therefore keen to support an Atlanticist structure of the ESDP process since it wanted to preserve NATO's role and, in turn, that of the US in the European security structure.[706] This position seems to reflect considerations beyond those of just merely a national interest and largely echoes Germany's historical points of reference. Yet on one subject it had shifting preferences from those of the United States within the ESDP process. Germany would have preferred to have the collective defence provisions of the Modified Brussels Treaty included in the Treaty of the European Union. For example, Joschka Fischer in a bold speech on the future of Europe stated that:

---

[701] See, for example, the declaration by German Minister of State Otto Zopel at the General Affairs Council on 24 January, which appreciated the non-aligned countries' emphasis on civilian crisis management by proclaiming that the 'The EU is a civilian power and must remain so.' Atlantic News, No. 3172, 26 January 2000.
[702] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[703] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[704] The Guardian, 23 May 2003.
[705] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.
[706] Statement by Karsten Voigt, Co-ordinator for Germany-American Co-operation at the German Foreign Ministry, 'German Perspective on the ESDP and NATO', 24 January 2001.

'For how long can it be justified that countries inextricably linked by monetary union and by economic and political realities do not also face up together to external threats and together maintain their security?'[707]

Yet this was more a reflection of an ideological commitment to the European integration process than a challenge to the primacy of NATO in the area of collective defence. Germany has also often stressed that it would prefer see a greater degree of overlapping membership between the EU and NATO, which would render any concerns for the development of a collective defence provision within the Treaty of the European Union. However, it should be noted that there seems to have existed between 1999-2001, at least, two somewhat different strands within the Germany policy-making system during the ESDP process.[708] Firstly, the strand represented by Joschka Fischer that gave top priority to the European ideological dimension of this process and, therefore, was somewhat more inclined to compromise on the Atlanticist dimension of the ESDP. This strand also had a more positive view of potential supranational arrangements for the ESDP process. For example, Joschka Fischer had in an interview with the Guardian stated that 'Transforming the European Union into a single State with one army, one constitution and one foreign policy is the critical challenge of the time'.[709] Secondly, there existed a strand represented by the influential member of the Bundestag Karsten Voigt, who, at all times, put a premium on not becoming engaged in any form of defence co-operation within the ESDP that could upset Washington.[710]

Conclusions

There is also an awareness in Germany that the ESDP process will not be structured along the lines of the European Defence Community for a very long time, if ever. However this fact does not eliminate the German desire for future developments in this regard. Germany's federalist preference, even within security and defence co-operation, seems to be a hybrid between European ideology and power and influence considerations. The unification of Europe is something that is more favourably looked upon in Germany than in just about any other

---

[707] Fisher, among other things, proposed the establishment of a president elected by universal suffrage. 'From Confederation to Federation – Thoughts on the Finality of European Integration', Speech by Joschka Fischer at the Humboldt University in Berlin, 12 May 2000.
[708] Interview with German researcher, 23 September 2004.
[709] The Guardian, 26 November 1998.
[710] Some also claim that especially during the German Presidency Germany was somewhat more eager than the UK to establish close links between EU and NATO. Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.

European country and it has given Germany an unprecedented era of peace and prosperity.[711] Abandoning the last line of defence for the state governments by approving of a community model for the defence and security co-operation would be a symbolic achievement for the integration process, which Germany would welcome. It would also assure that a re-nationalisation of security and defence in Europe would, once and for all, become impossible. Within such a supranational structure, Germany would have comparatively more influence and leverage than it has in today's strictly intergovernmental structure for the ESDP given the fact that France and the UK have superior defence forces and also the willingness to use them outside the EU framework. Given its past Germany does not retain the same option and, therefore, always is inclined to act collectively in military matters.

---

[711] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 March 2004.

Sweden's Main Positions on the ESDP Process

Sweden was, in many aspects, a reluctant partner within the ESDP process, which was, at least, initially in Sweden met with a great deal of ambiguity. Sweden has, therefore, maintained rather defensive positions in regards to the development of security and defence co-operation within the EU. However, it has devoted considerable time and energy to widening the scope of the ESDP process to entail aspects of civilian crisis management and conflict prevention measures. Sweden's main positions in reference to the ESDP process can be summarised in four points.

Firstly, Sweden strongly emphasised the need to establish a civilian crisis management function within the ESDP framework that would be treated on an equal footing with the military crisis management function.[712] It, furthermore, stressed the importance of conflict prevention being an integrated part of the ESDP process. These positions were at the heart of its preferences within the ESDP process and generally had a strong resonance in Swedish foreign policy thinking.

Secondly, Sweden supported an Atlanticist approach towards the EU-NATO arrangement, where there would be a very high degree of co-operation and transparency between the two organisations. In addition, Sweden constantly repeated the position that it was absolutely vital for the non-aligned countries to be able to participate on an equal footing with the NATO Member States within the ESDP process.[713]

Thirdly, while Sweden accepted the development of a military crisis management capability within the EU (not least interpreted by the Swedish Government as a measure that would be instrumental for the EU to support UN peacekeeping efforts), it did take a minimalist interpretation of the scope of the Petersberg Tasks. It excluded within this framework military coercion and offensive action in general.[714] It also rejected the idea that anti-terrorist co-operation should be included within the ESDP framework after the events in the United States on 11 September 2001. Sweden also declared that it could not accept Article V of the Modified Brussels Treaty being included in the Treaty of the European Union, either as applicable for all

---

[712] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 May 2003.
[713] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.
[714] Hanna Ojanen, 'Sweden & Finland: What Difference Does it Make to Be Non-Aligned?' in Nina Graeger, Henrik Larson and Hanna Ojanen, <u>The ESDP and the Nordic Countries – Four Variations on a Theme</u> (Helsinki: The Finish Institute of International Affairs), p. 165.

EU Member States or as a form of reinforced co-operation for the NATO allies, since this would not be compatible with Sweden's policy of military non-alignment.[715]

Finally, Sweden supported the Franco-British position that the ESDP process should be structured on a strict intergovernmental basis. It was particularly sensitive to proposals that issues with defence implications could, in some circumstances, be settled by using qualified majority voting.[716]

---

[715] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.
[716] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.

The Sources of Sweden's Preferences for the ESDP Process

What makes Sweden an interesting case within the ESDP context is that its 'negative preferences' vis-à-vis security and defence co-operation within the EU had not changed when the issue emerged as a consequence of the St Malo agreement in 1998. It was not entirely convinced of either the desirability or the necessity of this development. However, above all, did it fear that the "slippery slope" dynamics of the development of the ESDP process might force Sweden to abandon its policy of military non-alignment. Its acceptance of the process was, therefore, foremost a result of the intense pressure exercised by some of the other state governments within the EU, which made Sweden reluctantly accept the establishment of the process primarily to guard its overall standing and grand strategic interests within the integration process.[717]

Once it was an unavoidable fact, Sweden's main priority within the ESDP process was to assure that the process only would focus on military crisis management and not include any collective defence obligations. It was indeed a common expression that Sweden would receive the 'Maginot medal' for defensive behaviour within the ESDP process since it acted very distrustfully as soon as a new issue emerged within this framework, which possibly indicated an expansion of the ESDP process.[718] This was not a very glorious epithet to hold and it created a notion that Sweden would continuously be on 'the wrong side of history' because of domestic hang-ups. Sweden's other main priority was to devote considerable time and energy in order to establish a civilian dimension of crisis management within the ESDP process.[719] This was seen as a measure to shape the ESDP process in a conducive way for Swedish foreign policy thinking.[720]

There are several examples that indicate Sweden's activism and commitment to the establishment of a civilian crisis management function. Sweden spent considerable effort in order to receive recognition for the establishment of civilian crisis management at the Cologne

---

[717] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.

[718] Interview with representative from the Commission, 22 June 2004.

[719] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.

[720] Sweden often worked in close collaboration with Finland for this cause. However, as Hanna Ojanen points out, Finnish and Swedish policy vis-à-vis the ESDP was rather different as far as style and format were concerned. Finland was largely perceived as being a pragmatic and loyal EU member. Sweden, on the other hand, tended to make more normative statements, underlining its regional role and tended to act as a 'big state' within the EU, even though the resources at its disposal, in terms of population, defence, human capital, GDP, suggested otherwise. Sweden has also indicated that its non-alignment has been a reflection of identity, rather than geographic proximity to Russia, whereas, in Finland, the contrary has been the case. Ojanen, 'Sweden and Finland', p. 164.

Summit in 1999. It was the initiator of what later would become CIVCOM; it proactively worked towards the establishment of capability goals within the civilian sphere; it developed an exercise policy for civilian crisis management and was the architect of the EU Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts.

Sweden's Historical Points of Reference

When assessing the sources of Sweden's preferences within the ESDP process, it is necessary to recognise the fact that it is a newcomer to the European integration process. Moreover, it has had rather different historical points of reference compared to the other identified core-promoters: the United Kingdom, France and Germany, which have shaped the priorities of Sweden's foreign policy in a decisive way. Sweden has not been in a war since 1814 and it was a spectator rather than a participant during the World Wars. It has avoided becoming embroiled in the World Wars by vigorous diplomacy, sometimes shaped by a policy of strict adherence to neutrality, at other times by a policy of appeasement. Given the economic advantages of not being exposed to the destructiveness brought about by the World Wars, it was able to achieve within Europe an unparalleled era of peace and prosperity.[721] Thus, the conventional wisdom in Sweden has been that the policy of neutrality has served its interests very well. This reiterated the somewhat prevailing insular tendencies within Sweden and generated a view that 'alenegang' rather than engagement with the European continent was to be preferred.[722]

Non-alignment in its domestically interpreted version has later also been seen as a retreat and disapproval of Great Power politics and as a position of moral high ground.[723] Sweden engaged in what was referred to as an 'active foreign policy' during the Cold War era. Non-alignment was, in this context, seen as a measure for assuring that Sweden could maintain a high and independent international profile. Through active participation in intergovernmental organisations, such as the UN and the Council of Europe, combined with expressions of strong solidarity with states in the third world, it was assumed that Sweden could obtain unprecedented

---

[721] Between 1870-1970 Sweden, together with Japan, had the strongest economic development in the world. During this era Sweden went from being one of Europe's poorest countries to the most prosperous by 1970. It was also able to create a rather unique and very comprehensive welfare society that for better or worse was characterised as extreme both by foreigners and Swedes. Carl Bildt, Uppdrag Europa (Mission Europe) (Stockholm: Nordstedts Förlag, 2003), p. 68.

[722] See Ann-Sofie Nilsson, Den moraliska stormakten (The Moral Great Power) (Stockholm: Timbro, 1991).

[723] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

international prestige and influence.[724] Sweden was, therefore, very eager to participate in initiatives to promote issues, such as nuclear disarmament and poverty reduction programmes, in order to verify its commitment to a 'morally driven' foreign policy. In essence, maintaining an autonomous foreign policy through non-alignment has traditionally played an important role in terms of Sweden's self-perceived international identity.[725]

Sweden and the European Integration Process

Sweden's approach to the European integration process does, in large parts, resemble that of the UK's. The necessity of their membership in this process was motivated on economic, rather than political grounds. Both countries also, to a certain degree, felt that they had to relinquish some aspects of their previous identities (that of a previous great empire in the case of the UK and that of a 'moral great power' for Sweden), which were sources of national pride and nostalgia in order to embrace a new identity within a European context. Both countries have also been careful to watch their sovereignty within the process and voiced opposition to federal tendencies within the EU.[726] Furthermore, it should be noted that the populations in both countries have been among the most EU sceptic in the whole of Europe.

Before Sweden joined the EU in 1995 there was an intensive domestic debate whether or not non-alignment could be preserved even after the accession.[727] It should be noted that there were also some concerns within the EU institutions that Sweden's non-alignment might hinder the

---

[724] Ann-Sofie Dahl (nee Nilsson) has referred to Sweden as a 'moral great power'. Ann-Sofie Nilsson, <u>Den moraliska stormakten</u>.

[725] Yet it should be noted that its commitment to 'international solidarity' was considerably more focused on the humanitarian situation in North-South relations than in East-West relations. It took a rather unique position in the Western world by often sternly criticising both blocs during the Cold War, opting, to paraphrase a commonly used expression, for some form of a 'third way' for its foreign policy. Yet, underneath this altruistically declared foreign policy, there was an element that was much more shaped by geopolitical realties. Sweden maintained throughout the Cold War close collaboration with NATO allies on issues, such as intelligence sharing and even pre-war arrangements, in order to enhance its security in case a threat to its territorial integrity became imminent. In some circles, Sweden was even referred to as 'the seventeenth member of NATO' throughout the Cold War. Thus, it seems as if there were some moral double standards ingrained in Sweden's 'morally driven' foreign policy during the Cold War era. For an analysis of Swedish foreign policy during this era, see Ingemar Dörfer, <u>Nollpunkten: Sverige i det andra kalla kriget</u> (Ground Zero: Sweden in the Second Cold War), (Stockholm: Timbro, 1992).

[726] Karl Magnus Johansson 'Introduktion', in Karl Magnus Johansson, <u>Sverige i EU</u> (Sweden in the EU) (Stockholm: SNS Förlag, 2002), p. 10.

[727] The coherence of this debate was not helped by the somewhat wobbly position of the Social Democratic Government in 1990. As late as in May 1990 Prime Minster Ingvar Carlsson stated that it was out of consideration for the credibility of the policy of neutrality that Sweden refrained from applying for membership in the European Community. Yet five months later the same government announced that it wanted Sweden to join the same organisation as part of a five-point economic crisis management package presented by Minister for Finance Allan Larsson.

development of security and defence co-operation within the EU.[728] Thus, in 1994, Sweden had during the negotiations for EU membership agreed not to hamper the development of an EU defence identity and was even forced to sign an agreement stating that it would not do so.[729] The Swedish public was not made aware of this, but it had a large impact on Sweden's preference formation when it decided a few years later that it would not hinder or opt out of the development of the ESDP.[730]

Sweden's security policy changed after it joined the EU to that of a policy of military non-alignment in peacetime with the *possibility* of being able to be neutral in the event of a conflict breaking out in its neighbouring areas. The interpretation of this policy was that Sweden would be willing to participate in all military operations that were not associated with collective defence operations.[731] Thus, in essence, after joining the EU in 1995, non-alignment was not so much focused on war avoidance as it was on avoiding adherence to military alliances and supranational decision-making procedures (hence Sweden's previously noted keen support for strict intergovernmentalism within the ESDP framework). Yet in the rather infected domestic debate about whether Swedish non-alignment could be preserved with its EU membership, some of the political parties invested considerable political capital in assuring that it would be possible to do so. Thus, when the issue of security and defence co-operation within the EU remerged with the St Malo agreement, this raised concerns among these political parties. They feared that the "slippery slope" dynamics of the ESDP process might generate co-operation also in the area of collective defence, which would herald the death knell for Swedish non-alignment.

Incremental Steps Towards Co-operation with NATO

The end of the Cold War led to something of an identity crisis for Swedish foreign and security policy. After all, whom should Sweden be neutral towards after the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the end of East-West confrontation? Sweden, therefore, took several measures during the early and mid-1990s to be better integrated into the Euro-Atlantic Community. This factor, in

---

[728] See, for example, Commission Opinion on Swedish Membership Application 1994: 'The question is whether the Swedish policy of neutrality – even reduced as it is to the core of military non-alignment and credible, independent defence- might stand in the way of a full acceptance of the Union's external policies'.

[729] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

[730] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

[731] See 'Sweden's policy of non-participation in military alliances remains unchanged' – Press release, The Swedish Parliament, 7 May 1999.

hindsight, seems to have played an important role for Sweden's acceptance of the development of the ESDP process since it proved that it was possible to co-operate within a collective framework in the areas of security and defence without having common defence arrangements.[732] Furthermore, official co-operation with NATO was no longer hindered by concerns over how this would effect the international perception of Sweden's non-alignment. Between 1992-1995 Sweden participated in UNPROFOR in the Balkans and this greatly shaped its knowledge and understanding of international peace support operations beyond the traditional UN peacekeeping concept that it had participated in during the Cold War. It also created an awareness in Sweden that the UN model was not well prepared to handle the types of complex intrastate emergencies like those in the Balkans and that other organisations, often with a more robust approach to peace support operations, i.e., NATO, were better equipped to undertake such operations.[733]

In 1994, Sweden joined the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme and was a very active participant within this framework.[734] Through the Planning and Review Process (PARP) it also devoted considerable efforts so as to assure that its armed forces were compatible with NATO standards in order to be better prepared to participate in NATO-led crisis management operations. It did not participate in Operation *Deliberate Force* in 1995, not least because all forms of participation with Swedish fighter aircraft within a NATO framework were still a particularly sensitive issue because of the connotation that this might bring with an 'Angriffskrieg'.[735] However, Sweden did participate in the subsequent stabilisation operations IFOR and SFOR, which was the first time ever that Swedish soldiers had operated under NATO command. These incremental steps, which can be referred to as a form of salami tactics, greatly reduced Sweden's 'beruring angst' for co-operation with NATO and reinforced the notion that it was possible to engage in crisis management co-operation with defence organisations, such as NATO and the WEU, without being drawn into a military alliance.[736] It also shaped Sweden's

---

[732] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

[733] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

[734] Sweden's activism within the PfP programme was, in part, used as a compensatory measure to indicate Sweden's willingness to be considered as a serious and committed partner in crisis management operations, even though it remained non-aligned. This has sometimes been referred to as the 'Avis-principle' of Swedish security policy based on the Avis car-rental slogan 'We are only second biggest – We try harder!'

[735] It would take until 1997 before the government announced that it had no objections to Swedish fighter aircraft participating within a NATO framework. Ann-Sofie Dahl, Svenskarna och NATO (The Swedes and NATO) (Stockholm: Timbro AB, 1999), p. 126.

[736] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.

Atlanticist preferences within the ESDP process since Sweden's activism within NATO's programmes required that it had favourable arrangements for co-operation with the alliance.

Sweden and the Implementation of the ESDP Process

Yet despite these steps towards a 'desensitisation' of Sweden's interaction with NATO and the declining relevance of non-alignment as a delimiting factor for defence co-operation, Sweden was not enthusiastic about the St Malo agreement.[737] Sweden had devoted considerable efforts during the Amsterdam negotiations to assure that a merger between the WEU and the EU would not take place and there was feverish activity, especially at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, to tackle the St Malo agreement.[738] Sweden had, as previously noted in chapter three, also tried to stop the informal Defence Ministers' Summit in Vienna during the Austrian Presidency yet without receiving any considerable sympathy for this proposal from the other state governments. Sweden was primarily very luck-warm to the St Malo agreement because it could interfere with Sweden's non-alignment, but there were also some concerns that it might negatively affect transatlantic relations.[739] After consulting its usually likeminded allies within the EU, i.e., the other non-aligned state governments, it drew the conclusion that it probably was impossible to stop the initiative and its best option would be to try to influence it the best it could from the inside by promoting the development of a civilian crisis management capacity within the ESDP.[740] Civilian crisis management was, as previously noted, not a new activity within the EU. However, by associating it with the ESDP process, this dimension was moved up the Union's political agenda and was thereby able to also shape the perception of the ESDP process.[741] This made civilian crisis management become a much more prioritised subject within the EU systems

---

[737] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.

[738] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.

[739] The fact that the agreement between the UK and France was called <u>The Joint Declaration on European Defence</u> was especially troublesome for Sweden since the term 'defence', in Swedish, has traditionally referred to the protection of a country's territorial integrity. Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

[740] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

[741] Especially the non-aligned state governments were concerned that the EU would develop into a military alliance similar to that of NATO. By developing civilian crisis management functions the ESDP could, instead, develop in a direction that in reference to crisis management resembled parts of the UN system rather than NATO, which was considerably less controversial for the non-aligned state governments. The fact that the EU did develop these resources also made it possible for the EU to provide the UN with them, which, in itself, could strengthen the UN's ability to handle and manage crises. This was well received among some of the state governments that were strong supporters of the UN system.

since the issue of its advancement was on the agenda of every EU Presidency between 1999-2001.

In regards to the preference formation process Sweden seems to be the only one of the four identified core-promoter countries that has taken public interest groups into account when developing its preferences for the ESDP process. There existed various domestic interest groups, such as the Peace and Arbitration Society and the Swedish Church, which expressed their desire for Sweden to proactively promote the development of a civilian crisis management capability and conflict prevention programme.[742] The government arranged conferences with these groups and they had the opportunity to voice their opinions to policy makers at the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs. These interest groups did not exert pressure on the government, but there did exist 'expectations' that Sweden would pursue this aspect within its EU diplomacy.[743] It should be noted that the Social Democratic Government has often had a large degree of sympathy for the causes that these groups represented.[744]

Yet the sources of Sweden's strong preference for civilian crisis management and conflict prevention were multifaceted and cannot be explained by just one single factor. Sweden was indeed the most *vocal* promoter of civilian crisis management and it initially championed this issue almost to the point that it became contra-productive since it caused animosity and frustration among several of the other state governments, which wanted to focus time and energy on first developing the military dimension of the ESDP process. Some state governments, especially in the beginning of the process, perceived Sweden as pursuing this agenda in order to cover up the challenges associated with the compatibility between the development of a military crisis management capability and military non-alignment.[745] The latter being a policy that especially some of Continental Europe's state governments have little respect or understanding for.[746]

The primary reason for the degree of *intensity* in Sweden's activism within this field, especially during 1999, can be traced back to the domestic political situation in Sweden at the time.[747] The Left Party (formerly known as the Communist Party) and the Green Party supported the ruling

---

[742] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 May 2003.
[743] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 15 May 2003.
[744] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.
[745] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 June 2004.
[746] Ojanen, 'Sweden and Finland', p. 155.
[747] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.

Social Democratic minority government. These parties both cherish pacifism and EU scepticism and, therefore, rejected any form of defence policy co-operation within the EU, especially since they perceived it as a menace to non-alignment. The full or partial integration of the WEU into the EU was, therefore, an especially tainted domestic political issue in Sweden.[748] The parties used the opportunity to scrutinise the government at the Committee on EU Affairs in the Swedish Parliament and sternly criticised the government's position regarding the ESDP at large. The Green Party even threatened to end its support for the minority government if it did not veto the development of the ESDP at the European Council Summit in Cologne.[749] Such a development would most likely have forced the Social Democratic minority government to resign and call for new elections. The situation was also accentuated by the fact the development of the ESDP process interceded with the European Parliament elections in June 1999, which made the issue more exposed and politicised.[750]

By focusing on the civilian aspects rather than the military aspects of the ESDP, the government was within the domestic political scene able to direct attention away from the military features and a government crisis was avoided. For the Left Party and the Green Party, the development of a civilian crisis management capability within the EU was considered to be an acceptable alternative to the development of the military crisis management. Thus, the domestic situation in Sweden was a defining factor for the *degree* of activism that Sweden undertook in the field of civilian crisis management during 1999. It should also be noted that the Social Democratic Party itself was very divided in its views of the development of the ESDP process. This ambiguity that existed within the Social Democratic Party regarding the ESDP was a factor that was almost of equivalent importance for the Swedish Government's very reluctant approval of the ESDP process at the Cologne Summit in 1999.[751]

Yet Sweden's activism within the area of civilian crisis management and conflict prevention would have taken place even if the Social Democratic minority government's political situation were not dependent on it. The Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs had published documents already in 1997 that indicated that Sweden would work towards establishing conflict prevention

---

[748] Schyman kräver svenskt veto (Schyman Demands Swedish Veto), <u>Dagens Nyheter</u>, 3 June 1999.
[749] See Miljöpartiet hotar hoppa av samarbetet (The Green Party Threatens to End Co-operation), <u>Expressen</u>, 4 June 1999. Schyman kräver svenskt veto (Schyman Demands Swedish Veto), <u>Dagens Nyheter</u>, 3 June 1999.
[750] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.
[751] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

as a norm within the CFSP structure.[752] It is important to note that Sweden's preference for civilian crisis management was based on its long tradition of working with conflict prevention and civilian crisis management as alternative methods to using military force, which has been promoted by the great aversion to the latter in Swedish foreign policy thinking.[753] Especially the concept of 'conflict prevention' has for many years been an important component of Sweden's declaratory foreign policy.[754] One of the central elements of Swedish policy has also been that the EU has to be able to support the UN's role in the international system.[755] Consequently, in order to assure that both organisations were fully interoperable, it was important that the EU also developed a similar programme for conflict prevention as the UN. Furthermore, Sweden's activism in civilian crisis management also allowed it to take a lead within an area of the ESDP process and assure that it could exercise influence within the process.[756] Sweden was provided with a just reason d'être to do so since the state building efforts in the Balkans had indicated that there were indeed serious limits to the ability of the EU Member States to provide the resources for the efforts in areas of, for example, civil administration and rule of law. Sweden's activism, capability and knowledge within this sector also assured that it was able to place several Swedish civil servants in high ranking positions in the Council Secretariat's units, which dealt with issues regarding various aspects of civilian crisis management.[757]

The key Swedish consideration during the development of the ESDP process beyond those of promoting civilian crisis management and assuring that there were no collective defence arrangements within the Union was that it was able to participate on an equal footing with the NATO allies within the process. For all the non-aligned states, creating an A team and a B team was the nightmare scenario.[758] It could be expected that Sweden would adhere to a Europeanist

---

[752] At that stage, the Social Democratic minority government was not supported by the Green Party, one of the main antagonists, which was against the development of a military crisis management capability within the EU. <u>Preventing Violent Conflicts –A Swedish Action Plan</u>, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Ds 24, 1997.

[753] Surveys indicate that in Sweden there is, from a European comparative perspective, a very high aversion to violence and, as anthropologist Åke Daun puts it, 'The Swedish society has for many generations been a peaceful society both domestically and in reference to peaceful relations with its neighbours. This has shaped a certain mentality in Sweden, which makes it reluctant to use military force'. Daun, <u>Svensk mentalitet</u>, p. 114.

[754] <u>Preventing Violent Conflicts- A Swedish Action Plan</u>, The Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Printing Works of the Government Offices, Stockholm, 1999, p. 17.

[755] This characteristic of Swedish foreign policy partly goes back to Sweden's activities within the non-aligned movement and disarmament movement during the 1970s and 1980s.

[756] Some analysts have even stated that the development of civilian crisis management allowed Sweden, which is outside the Euro zone, to exert influence within the ESDP as a way of compensating for the fact that it is not at the core of Europe. This Swedish position would thereby be rather similar to the British in this regard. Daniel Keohane, ´Realigning Neutrality? Irish Defence Policy and the EU', <u>Occasional Paper</u>, No. 24, WEU Institute for Security Studies, March 2001, p. 18.

[757] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.

[758] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.

preference for the European security structure given its preference for civilian crisis management and its official disinterest in joining NATO. Yet it chose to adhere to the Atlanticist camp given its active involvement in NATO, not least through the PfP programme. It was, of course, of paramount importance that it had good relations with NATO if it wanted to continue its activism within the PfP programme. Furthermore, given the sensitivity of how compatible the development of a military dimension was with non-alignment, Sweden's position was that it wanted all military co-operation to be conducted within NATO since it did not want the EU to have a 'military dimension'. More importantly, Sweden, for obvious geopolitical reasons, has also strongly supported the US military presence particularly in Northern Europe as a counterweight, which would assure that no single country would acquire too much influence in the region.[759] Thus, the continued vitality of NATO was an important factor that shaped its positioning in the EU-NATO dichotomy.

It should also be noted that Sweden has indeed interpreted the Petersberg Tasks more strictly than other EU states and it has been keen to stress that elements of military coercion have not been included as part of the Petersberg Tasks. The higher end of these tasks has been interpreted as peacekeeping operations with a chapter seven mandate.[760] This position, in large part, reflects its fear of developments towards collective defence within the EU. However, it also reflected its thinking on issues of war and peace and the prevailing aversion to the use of military force. Especially some elements within the with in ruling Social Democratic party has had a strong ambivalence towards the militarisation of the EU and the Government was therefore keen to have a minimalist interpretation of the use of military force within the ESDP framework.[761]

Conclusions

Sweden has in many regards been an awkward partner within the ESDP process and it has experienced some difficulties to come to terms with this new dimension of the European integration process. Yet it has tried to add its own flavour to the process by promoting civilian crisis management and conflict prevention. As noted, the reasons for Sweden's preferences for civilian crisis management have been multifaceted and, therefore, cannot be explained by one

---

[759] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.
[760] Ojanen, 'Sweden and Finland', p. 165.
[761] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 26 August 2004.

single factor. The domestic political situation did indeed shape the sense of urgency for the Swedish Government to promote civilian crisis management and conflict prevention within the ESDP process since it was almost a prerequisite in order to maintain continued support for the Social Democratic Party within the Swedish Parliament. However, more importantly, Sweden's aversion to the use of military force, its historical points of reference and its self-perception during the Cold War have also shaped a positive preference for civilian crisis management and conflict prevention. Sweden's legacy and tradition of working with especially conflict prevention measures have made it eager to export this dimension to the EU level. Furthermore, Sweden has, to a large degree, perceived it as its roll to promote these aspects within the ESDP process and it has allowed it to have more influence and leverage within a particular sphere of the process.

Conclusions: Preferences within the ESDP Process

This chapter has attempted to distinguish the factors that have led the state governments to an agreement on the initiation of the ESDP process and why the state governments have had rather shifting preferences for how the process should be implemented. The analysis of the positions and preferences of the four core-promoter state governments obviously indicates they are very different on some key defining aspects, such as how the EU should interact with the only superpower in a unipolar system, how to relate to the European integration process and how to strike the right balance between military and civilian means in order to enhance the Union's ability to contribute to peace and stability.

These shifting views are predominately based on core factors that derive from power and influence considerations as well as from different historical points of reference and values among the state governments, which have made them develop different preferences with regards to the defining aspects of the ESDP process. Thus, it is impossible to assess preferences for security and defence co-operation within the EU from a 'clean sheet of paper' since due recognition also has to be given to the histories of the state governments and how they view the world in order to understand their preferences within the ESDP process.

It seems clear that the focal point for the establishment of a military dimension within the EU was the change in the British preferences regarding European defence. The UK alone had the necessary transatlantic credentials and diplomatic leverage to assure that the other Atlanticists and the reluctant non-aligned countries could follow suit. There were, as previously noted, several factors that shaped the new British view on European defence. However, the main factor for the British modification was, above all, the perception of the external security environment in combination with a stronger commitment to the European integration process by the Blair government.[762]

---

[762] It is interesting to note that the initiation of the ESDP process in this context rather well corresponds with the theoretical framework of Foreign Policy Change that has been created by Dr Jakob Gustavsson. According to Gustavsson's theoretical framework, the change in preferences in foreign policy requires three factors. Firstly, fundamental structural changes, which, in the ESDP context, would be the end of the Cold War and the uncertainty surrounding what role the United States would play in the European security affairs in general and particularly the main security challenge at the time, i.e., in complex intrastate conflicts in Europe's vicinity. Secondly, Gustavsson identifies strategic political leadership as a vital component for a change in preferences. Here Prime Minister Tony Blair's willingness to be at 'the heart of Europe' and provide a leadership role for Britain within the integration process of security and defence co-operation corresponds rather well to Gustavsson's hypothesis. Thirdly,

The Europeans through the CFSP framework were clearly not up to the task of handling the ferocious war in the Balkans. Yet the Americans had repeatedly stated their disinterest in becoming involved into these intrastate conflicts and their frustration over the Europeans inability.[763] Thus the American reluctance to become involved in the conflicts in the Balkans, for perfectly sound reasons from an American perspective, made it more pressing for the Europeans to get their act together in international security affairs. Prime Minister Tony Blair seems to have noted this at a relatively early stage of his premiership.[764]

However, there were two critical intra-EU structural challenges in order to do so. The institutional decision-making inertia typified by the inability to combine the CFSP with a credible threat of the use of military force and, just as importantly, the lack of military capabilities among the state governments to conduct larger crisis management operations were restrictive factors for the EU to be able to better master its external security environment. There seems to be have been an awareness of these problems, at least, among the major European powers.[765]

Furthermore, the impotence of the CFSP to make a decisive difference to peace and security in the Balkans undermined the EU's reputation as an international actor and, in turn, possibly even its citizens' faith in the relevance and sustainability of European co-operation.[766] In essence, the experiences from the Balkans indicated that the CFSP was the 'sick man' of the European integration process.[767] The previous arrangement of the European security structure, with the WEU as the middleman between the EU and NATO, was clearly an ineffective solution and was

---

Gustavsson defines the presence of a perceived crisis situation as the third and final component for a change in foreign policy preferences. The EU's inability to successfully handle the crisis in Kosovo and it having to absorb as a result, the uncontrolled flow of refugees typified this crisis mode more than anything else. Jakob Gustavsson <u>The Politics of Foreign Policy Change: Explaining the Swedish Reorientation on EC Membership</u> (Department of Political Science, Lund, 1998).

[763] It is important to note that the concept of European defence has been modified during the 1990s as a *consequence* of the changes in the security environment. At the Maastricht negotiations, which were held immediately after the end of the Cold War, the notion of European defence was still very much focused on territorial defence. This was based on the fear that Washington might be inclined to withdraw its troop presence and, in turn, its commitment to NATO. Since Russia's future development was uncertain, it was seen as necessary that the concept of territorial defence was retained. With the experiences from the Balkan wars and, not least, the introduction of the Petersberg Tasks in 1992, the concept changed. This new notion was considerably more acceptable to the Atlanticist oriented countries and the non-aligned nations since the focus of it was on crisis management rather than on collective defence.

[764] Interview with John Roper, 22 September 2002.

[765] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.

[766] Interview with Werner Fasslabend, 8 December 2003.

[767] Arguably together with the Common Agricultural Policy some would claim.

not corresponding to the main challenges in the security environment in a satisfactory way. It caused an awareness that the current state of affairs regarding the European security structure was unsustainable.

Beyond institutions was the lack of sufficient military capabilities a critical problem for the ESDP process and it would, in some instances, be a 'show-stopper' for the EU if it would aim to conduct especially more comprehensive high-intensity crisis management operations. However the underlying problem is not that of capabilities since these are, of course, only symptoms of how the EU state governments view security and the degree of responsibility that they are ready to take for the security environment in and around Europe. The ESDP process was a useful road map, at least, on the first part of an inevitable journey of fostering the ability for the Europeans to take a larger responsibility for their own security, which is really the underlying structural problem the ESDP process hopefully can curb.

Conceptually, the essence of the development of the ESDP was, therefore, an organisational and institutional response to a perceived structural problem, i.e., the inability of the European state governments to assume a larger responsibility for assuring peace and stability in and around Europe. The issue at stake was whether the EU would remain outside the field of military security affairs or whether the EU's role in international affairs had now matured so much that it was unsound to constrain its influence in this sphere. Yet it is not an indisputable fact that the ESDP model was the best way to achieve this since another option would have been to strengthen NATO's European pillar and keep the EU out of the defence business. This would have institutionally and administratively been a much easier task to undertake since it would have saved considerable time and political energy and it would not have endangered the vital transatlantic relations. However, given the very slim progress of this approach within NATO, especially regarding capability developments, during the mid- and late 1990s, it did seem as if a new approach was necessary. Furthermore, preventing the EU from developing resources in this field was a sub-optimal solution to the EU's effectiveness within the sphere of the CFSP and based predominately on a defensive position of not, in any way, endangering NATO's role, which is, first and foremost, an issue concerning the role the US would play in the European security structure. However, cultivating security institutions only makes sense if they adequately respond to the security challenges that the Member States are facing. Thus, it seemed clear that the old structure was not producing a satisfying result. Hence, the external security environment is imperative to understand in order to grasp the essence of the ESDP's development since, in the

words of Nicole Gnesotto, it required 'a United Kingdom that is more European, a France that was less anti-American, and a Germany that was more sensitive to the very notion of national responsibility, and an evolving view in all the neutral EU Member States of the Union's role in the World'.[768] Thus, as Gérard Araud points out, the ESDP is not a victory for a Gaullist view of the European security structure as much as it is a necessary rapprochement between the positions of the main European allies.[769]

Yet, the ESDP process has so far only modestly increased the military capabilities among the Member States and has somewhat marginally shaped the procurement plans for an increase in Europe. It has, however, visualised the shortcomings of the EU state governments' armed forces and caused an increased awareness of the military gaps that the EU state governments have. The achievements are not by any standard breathtaking and the approach has been sub-optimal given its previously noted bottom-down approach. However, the ESDP has implemented some self-generating catalysts, such as the new security bodies and the EU Institute for Security Studies, which can further stimulate European thinking on defence and security issues. It has, in essence, created a new centre of gravity that can advance this process further.[770] The new bodies and institutions have also been incorporated into the EU's daily policy process and, therefore, repaired some previous inabilities to think or obtain information within the sphere of defence and security.

However, the ESDP process has been very much focused on preparing for the 'last war' rather than for future conflicts. It has been the experiences from the Balkans that have defined much of the structure of the EU's military and civilian crisis management capabilities. Such a structure might have served well the demands that were at the top of the security agenda in the post-Cold War Europe. However, it is much less certain if the structure is also equally pertinent to a post-11 September security environment, in which aspects of both homeland security, civil protection against weapons of mass destruction and terrorism and an ability to engage in high intensity

---

[768] See Nicole Gnesotto, 'European Defence Beyond 2000', <u>Newsletter</u>, No. 28, Institute for Security Studies: Western European Union, January 2000.

[769] Gérard Araud et. al 'Les institutions de l'Europe de la défese', <u>Defense national</u>, december 2000, p. 116-127.

[770] Ultimately, it is the perception and the values of the political leadership in the capital cities that is most important. However, the socialisation process that takes place at the Permanent Representative level is very important since this level sometimes is successful in persuading the political level that it has to make concessions in order to advance the common cause, even though it might contradict the political perception or the prevailing national values. If the political level does not engage in a process to educate or spread the awareness of the raison d'être of the common cause, this sooner or later will create domestic political problems. At the same time, there is an awareness of this problem at the political level of the state governments and they will exercise constraint for the common cause if this creates a problem among the state governments.

coalition warfare operations together with the US in the fight against international terrorism stand out as important new features of the security environment.[771] The bottom line is that the ESDP reflects a number of compromises by the EU state governments and it is the lowest common dominator, upon which the governments could agree at the time. For all its faults and weaknesses, it is also important to remember that the ESDP is still in its embryo and the state governments that are not pleased with what it is now often seem to take comfort in what they hope it will one day become.

---

[771] However, the role of the ESDP regarding the fight against terrorism was indeed expanded during the Spanish Presidency that started in January 2002. Furthermore, the EU constitution that the state governments finally approved of in May 2004 further elaborated on the role of the ESDP process regarding the efforts against international terrorism. It should also be noted that the Petersberg Tasks have been expanded in the constitution.

Chapter Five

5. Conclusions - Testing the Liberal Intergovernmental Approach on the ESDP Process

> 'Europe seems to be a model of non-military power, influential but disinclined to use force. But behind every law is a policeman and behind every constitution is an army ready to protect it. And behind the peaceful development in Europe stands NATO and American military power.' [772]

Introduction

This final chapter tests the relevance of the liberal intergovernmental approach to the ESDP process on two different levels of analysis. Firstly, it broadly outlines some of LI's key micro-level hypotheses and then tests whether they can accurately explain the preference formation, the negotiation process and the institutional arrangements for the development of the ESDP. Secondly, the chapter in the final section traces some important contextual factors at a more philosophical level regarding historical points of reference, values and norms that have decisively shaped the ESDP process, which LI seems unable to account for. This is because these factors run contrary to the core concepts, upon which LI is based at its macro-level; namely, its Realist inspired notions of 'rationality' and 'unitary actor behaviour'.[773]

For the sake of consistency and in order to connect the theoretical and empirical perspectives, should it be pointed out that Andrew Moravcsik, coming from a normative empirical perspective, has claimed that the development of the ESDP is an unwise decision since it diverts efforts and resources away from the EU's international role as a civilian power. He has also expressed

---

[772] Citation from Robert Cooper currently Director General for External and Politico-Military Affairs at the Council of the European Union. Robert Cooper, The Breaking of Nations (London: Atlantic Books, 2003), p. 161.

[773] In this chapter, the use of the concepts 'historical points of reference', 'norms' and 'values' is frequently intertwined and rather loose. Historical points of reference refer to early or formative experiences of a state that have shaped the perception of its citizens and its political leaders. Norms are referred to as a shaping context of expectations and informal principles that can enable or constrain a state government's behaviour. Values refer to a set of prevailing political ideals. What is important to note is that these concepts should be seen to contrast with the ahistorical, apolitical and non-cultural rationalist framework, upon which LI is based. For a more in-depth discussion of the concepts 'historical points of reference', 'norms' and 'values', see Alastair Ian Johnston, 'Thinking about Strategic Culture, International Security, No. 4, Vol. 19, 1995 and Ken Booth, Strategy and Ethnocentrism (New York: Praeger Publisher, 1979).

doubts about both the feasibility and desirability of establishing the European Rapid Reaction Force since the EU state governments would not be willing to invest in the necessary military resources to establish the force. Moreover, it would be an instrument in search of a mission since the Europeans would not be able or dare to intervene outside the European continent without US military support. Moravcsik has, therefore, referred to the ERRF as a 'feel good force' developed by the EU Member States for self-indulgence and symbolism rather than as a result of a serious commitment by them to make a decisive difference to improving the security environment in Europe's vicinity.[774] Thus, while having taken these views into account, the chapter now move on to test the empirical relevance of Moravcsik's theoretical framework to the development of the ESDP process.

---

[774] See 'Should the European Union Be Able to Do Everything That NATO Can', Debate between Fraser Cameron and Andrew Moravcsik, <u>NATO Review</u>, autumn 2003.

I. What Explains the Preferences of the State Governments?

Regarding the manner of how the state governments formulate their preferences, LI claims that:

1) **The key actors in the process are the state governments, which aggregate preferences domestically, and act according to them.**[775]

LI is state-centric insofar that it presupposes that it is the state governments rather than the Commission or the European Parliament that are the important actors in the negotiation process. LI makes the assumptions the state governments aggregate the preferences of various domestic interest groups together with their own preferences and act in accordance with them. The domestic factor of LI is typified by the fact that Moravcsik claims that the preferences for developing the ESDP have predominately been derived from economic special interest groups and the that state governments are pleading on behalf of the defence industry.[776] However, LI recognises that pressure from interest groups is smaller in security and defence negotiations since these negotiations concern 'public goods' and the domestic commercial interests are, therefore, smaller than within the confines of economic integration.

Comment:

LI is correct to assume that the ESDP process has been state-centric. The roles of the Commission and the European Parliament have by EU standards been very small within this process. The Commission has kept a low profile partially because it lacks competence within the military sphere of integration and partially because it knows that it would be counterproductive to mark its territory in the process since this most likely would generate sharp criticism from the state governments.[777] It should however be noted that the Commission's role within the two other spheres of the ESDP process, i.e., civilian crisis management and conflict prevention, has been significantly different from the one it had within the field of military crisis management. This is because it was a recognised player within these spheres and its degree of influence and

---

[775] Moravcsik & Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', p. 61.
[776] Correspondence with Andrew Moravcsik, 23 July 2003.
[777] Interview with representative from the Commission, 22 June 2004.

leverage has, therefore, been greater within these fields.[778] It was, for example, as noted in chapter three, granted the role of drafting a proposal for the conflict prevention programme and its role in regard to civilian crisis management in general and particularly civil protection was of importance to the process.[779] The Commission, in addition, assumes that its role within the second pillar will expand over time because of the advantages that the community methods have as far as financing and the ability to reach decisions are concerned.[780] It should also be noted that other non-state actors, such as the Council Secretariat and, to a lesser extent, the Policy Unit, occasionally played influential roles within the process when it came to drafting proposals and giving advice. This was particularly the case during the Presidencies held by some of the smaller Member States, such as Portugal, Finland and Sweden, and these bodies have occasionally tried to guard their influence in the process through this advantage.[781] It could also be expected that the role of the bodies in the second pillar, such as the Military Staff and the Policy Unit, will be more influential in the future since one of the ideas behind the ESDP process was to create a new focal point within the second pillar that could generate ideas and proposals in order to advance the process further. Yet that remains to be seen. Viewed from an overarching perspective it is clear that neither the Commission, the Council Secretariat nor the Policy Unit have played a *decisive* role in the initiation or the outcome of the ESDP process.

As pointed out in chapter three, the European Parliament, unlike the Commission, tried to expand its role within the process in a more vocal manner. However, these efforts resulted in little besides some rhetorical commitments from the state governments to keep the Parliament informed about the development of the ESDP process. Some states, such as Belgium and Germany, would have preferred to grant the Commission and the Parliament a larger role within the process, at least in a long-term perspective. However, this was rejected, first and foremost, by France and the UK, which were the champions of the strict intergovernmental approach to the ESDP process.[782] Thus, in essence, the state governments have almost entirely dominated the ESDP process, which by this virtue has been of a state-centric nature.

---

[778] As noted in the introductory chapter of this study, the ESDP process consists of three parts; namely, military crisis management, civilian crisis management and conflict prevention. However, as pointed out, the political significance and relevance of the last two are smaller than the military dimension.
[779] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.
[780] Interview with representative from the Commission, 22 June 2004.
[781] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.
[782] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.

However, the second assumption that the state governments aggregate the domestically based preferences from various interest groups and add their own preferences to the process has little bearing on the empirical realties. It has been almost exclusively the representatives at the political levels of the cabinet offices, foreign ministries and defence ministries that have formulated the preferences of the state governments within the ESDP process.[783] Generally the main preferences have been shaped by the cabinets and the foreign ministries have normally had more influence than the defence ministries.[784] The informal (and obviously formal) primacy of the cabinet office was particularly noticeable in the UK since the initiative to develop what would later become the ESDP process derived from a request from 10 Downing Street. It, therefore, is only natural that this actor directed and monitored the process very carefully.

The foreign ministries have often had a self-perceived role as gatekeepers of the interpretation of the policies of cabinets and have, therefore, tended to be more faithful to the core factor principles than the more pragmatic and operationally focused defence ministries. As noted in chapter four, this seems to have been particularly apparent in the cases of France and Sweden and the former was bothered by considerable bureaucratic infighting between especially the Quai d'Orsay and the French military establishment.[785] In Germany and the UK the situations have been rather different since the ministries seem to have worked rather well in tandem. In the UK, the Ministry of Defence had by comparative European standards rather a large influence on the process.

Naturally, the policy shaping entities have, to a certain degree, taken into consideration the views from other interest groups, such as the defence industries and public interest groups. Still, the impact they have had on the policy making process seems to have been rather marginal and there are few indications that these groups engaged in intensive lobbying activities in order to make their voices heard during the process. The possible exception to this might be Sweden since it made more effort than France, Germany and the UK to take into account the views of public interest groups when it developed its preferences for civilian crisis management and conflict prevention.

---

[783] It is important to note that the political level of the different entities often reflects somewhat different preferences and perceptions than at the bureaucratic level of these entities. The political level normally gives more consideration to prevailing state values and public sentiments, which quite often contrast with the aims and goals of the integration process while the bureaucratic level, in relative terms, is more focused on coherence and functional considerations.
[784] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.
[785] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.

In conclusion, the way that the Member States went about formulating their preferences within the ESDP process does not seem to accurately correspond to LI's assumptions. There are few indications that the state governments would aggregate the preferences of other domestically based actors and then add their own preferences. The only marginally relevant interest groups in the ESDP negotiations were parts of the European defence industry and, to a lesser degree, some segments of what could be referred to as peace movements. However, neither of these groups had a decisive impact on the preference formations of the state governments regarding the establishment or implementation of the ESDP process.

Concerning the sources that the state governments used to formulate their preferences, LI claims that

2) **The state governments formulate their preferences based on political-economic imperatives or occasionally on issue specific interdependence and these preferences are stable over time.**[786]

According to LI, the state governments formulate their preferences based on economic gains and losses or occasionally on issue specific matters where the interdependence between the state governments shapes the possibility to reach an agreement. In defence and security issues, both factors are relevant. LI is, furthermore, founded on rational choice theory where the concept of 'rationality' is based on *substantial* rather than instrumental rationality (since no one would, of course, question that all actors can be assumed to act instrumentally in accordance with their preferences.) According to the LI concept of 'substantial rationality', states share the same fundamental preferences in 'power and plenty' or economic well being as well as security and factors, such as federalist ambitions, historical points of reference or norms and values, are either irrelevant or of marginal importance to the state governments' preferences.[787] Security both entails protection against challenges to the sovereignty of a state and the ability to influence its environment in a conducive way. The economic imperatives in relation to the ESDP process are, according to LI, the demands to generate political measures that would accommodate defence industry's interests. However, issue specific political-military interdependence on foreign and defence policy issues, such as a collective interest in managing the challenges to state or international security, can also be central to the preference formation since these are 'public

---

[786] Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 4.
[787] Ibid.

goods' and the gains and losses in economic terms are less obvious.[788] The central theme of LI is that the dynamics for the integration process can predominately be traced to the interests of the state governments, which most often derives from domestic factors and integration proceeds as a result of the converging interest of the Member States.

Comment:

The substance of the preference formation is the most important aspect of the dynamics of the European integration process because it identifies the reasons for why the state governments engage in this process in the first place and why and how the process advances. However, as will be further elaborated upon in the final section of this chapter, it is in this regard that LI also exposes some of its most apparent weakness in relation to the ESDP. Within the field of economic integration, it is reasonably easy to identify the dynamics as national economic implications (or political-economic imperatives as LI calls it) where the well being of the state governments' economic development seems to be the most vital factor for determining the preferences.[789] It is also within this economic sphere that LI has first been developed and it certainly has some merits in explaining and predicting this area of European integration.[790] However, it is much less well suited to explain preferences for security and defence co-operation. Within the field of security and defence integration, the 'rational' reasons for engaging in the integration process are considerably more indistinguishable. Here the issues at stake cannot be quantified or enumerated and they seem, to a much greater degree, to be governed by factors, such as previous security policy agreements, historical points of reference and values.

LI's micro-level hypotheses are clearly vague regarding the causes of security and defence co-operation. They both advance the arguments that it has been economic factors and issue-specific interdependence that have generated this co-operation. The common denominator between these

---

[788] Moravcsik & Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', p. 61.

[789] There seems to be a rather large consensus among economists on the idea that the economic integration process within the EU has largely favoured the economic performance of the Member States since it has removed trade barriers and increased trade and competition among them.

[790] One of the LI's key arguments is that European integration from 1955 to 1991 (or from Messina to Maastricht as Moravcsik puts it) was predominately focused on various aspects of economic integration and it preceded because of political-economic interests rather than adherence to federalism or security considerations, even though the latter two factors marginally mattered. Given the rather exhaustive empirical material that Moravcsik presents in his book *the Choice for Europe* for this argument, it seems to be a relevant point in reference for explaining the economic integration process for agreements, such as the Rome Treaty and the European Single Act. However, it is probably less well equipped to explain the basic ideas behind the initiation of the European integration process through the establishment of the Coal and Steel Community since they were more driven by security imperatives. See Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 4.

two arguments is the notion of 'unitary actor behaviour', which assumes that state governments strive for 'power and plenty'. Regarding the first argument concerning economic factors, it is true that the reform of the defence industry has been one factor that has provided impetus to the ESDP process.[791] The reform of the European defence industry was a factor that was taken into consideration during the initiation of the ESDP process and it also played a part during its implementation. This was, as noted in chapter three, especially apparent when the state governments agreed to use the WEU's illustrated profiles and the scenarios, upon which the capability goals of the Headline Goal are based. This was because some of the scenarios were adjusted to fit some of the state governments' procurement plans. Some scholars also claim that the continued success of the defence industrial base indeed *should* be a main engine behind the development of the ESDP.[792] Major players, such as the UK, France and Italy have protected their defence industry base and have, according to these analysts, as a result failed to create a pan-European defence industrial base to rival the domination of the American defence industrial complex. The progressive unification of the European defence industrial base would, according to some estimates, generate cost saving measures of 10-12 percent on defence equipment.[793] Yet there have been so far no real signs of European defence industry collaboration being a *main engine* behind the advancement of the ESDP.[794] In addition, after five years of the ESDP process, the issue of reforming the defence industry has only recently started to move forward substantially and this aspect has often been referred to as the undeveloped or missing link within the ESDP process. Furthermore, as noted in chapter three, the initiative from the French Presidency to establish the possibility of reinforced co-operation for defence industrial collaboration was defeated during the IGC, which indicates that defence industrial aspects were not a top-priority during the ESDP process. Thus, when Moravcsik claims that the preferences for developing the ESDP have predominately derived from economic special interests pleading on behalf of the defence industry, this seems to be based on the wrong premises.[795] In sum, political-economic interest has not been a main engine behind the ESDP process.

The second argument that LI presents is that security and defence co-operation can derive from issue-specific interdependence. This would, in principle, indicate that LI would accept the idea

---

[791] However, there are few indications that this factor was a result of the intensive lobbying activities of the defence industry as assumed by LI.

[792] See, for example, Stefano Silverstri, 'Atlantic and European Defence after Kosovo', The International Spectator, 1999, p. 20.

[793] Keith Hartley, 'Evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee on the European Union', 2 March 2000.

[794] See for example John Roper, 'European Defence, Two Cheers for Tony Blair'.

[795] Correspondence with Andrew Moravcsik, 12 July 2003.

that the external security environment made the EU Member States aware that they had a common interest in co-operating in order to solve universal problems. This comes across as a considerably more plausible explanation for the development of the ESDP process than political-economic imperatives. Thus, in order to grasp the sources of the preferences for the ESDP process, it is necessary to assess why the state governments agreed on developing it. LI puts forward the argument that preferences are stable over time. This seems to be in line with the analysis of the four state governments assessed in chapter four, which has indicated a high degree of consistency over time in the preferences of the state governments. However, the most important aspect is the causes that generated the shift in the UK's preferences for security and defence co-operation within the EU (the answer to the first hypothesis on the negotiation process will elaborate further on the significance of this shift). Here, the most significant factor for the changes in preferences seems to be the perception of the external security environment (in essence as noted in chapter four based on a tri-partisan explanation based on the intrastate conflicts in the Balkans, American reluctance and European incapacity) in combination with the Blair government's desire to be 'at the heart of Europe'.

It seems as if LI is able to account for part of the story insofar as it could be interpreted as if issue-specific interdependence, to a certain degree, could explain the preferences caused by the security environment, albeit probably somewhat over-focusing on a pure interest based explanation and underestimating the humanitarian and altruistic motives that underpinned the ESDP process. It would be 'over smart', to assume, as LI does, that the only reasons for the Europeans developing a better ability to hinder intrastate conflicts like the ones in the Balkans derived from considerations to stem the flow of refugees into the EU and stop disturbances of trade and commerce. Clearly the European leaders, from a humanitarian perspective, were bothered by these conflicts and, therefore, wanted to develop tools to hinder them. However, it is more doubtful if LI can explain the second factor, which, as noted in chapter four, was a product of Tony Blair's personal outlook on and commitment to the European integration process. This was, in part, undoubtedly based on power considerations, such as increasing the UK's influence in Washington by being able to 'deliver Europe' *but* also Blair's belief in the basic soundness of the integration process.[796] In sum, the Conservative Party and its leader John Major had not indicated any willingness to change its position on European defence during the Amsterdam negotiations. However, the Blair government changed its position on the question of European

---

[796] As noted in chapter four, Tony Blair has been described as the most pro-European Prime Minister since Edward Heath.

defence after a year in office and the development of the ESDP process was greatly helped by Prime Minister Tony Blair's positive outlook on European co-operation. It seems doubtful if the ESDP process would have materialised without the personal leadership provided by Tony Blair on this issue. This was, in part, based not only on a reassessment of the UK's interests concerning European defence, but also on a reflection of a positive attitude towards the European integration process. Thus, while LI could convincingly explain the ESDP process as issue-specific interdependence generated by the external environment.[797] However, seeing as LI claims that values, outlooks and norms cannot decisively shape the integration process, it would have to contradict its core assumption of rationality if it was to accept the idea that Blair's commitment to the integration process played an important role in the ESDP process.

II. What Explains the Bargaining Process?

Andrew Moravcsik claims that the European integration process reflects a new form of power politics developed peacefully within the institutions through the exploitation and manipulation of asymmetric interdependence.[798] It presents four principal hypotheses concerning the nature of the bargaining process. On the issue of when agreements can be reached within the bargaining process, LI claims that:

1) **It is the major state governments that dominate the direction and pace of the integration process and integration takes place when the three large state governments France, the United Kingdom and Germany have converging preferences.[799]**

According to Andrew Moravcsik, it is only the UK, France and, to a lesser extent, Germany that are relevant in the field of security and defence since they are the major players. All other states are more or less irrelevant.[800] However, they need to mobilise support for their positions since the negotiations are intergovernmental and other state governments will veto a proposal that they do not approve of. Larger states will have more intense preferences than smaller states within the ESDP process since, according to the Liberal Intergovernmental approach, the large states are more likely to carry a greater burden when the EU conducts crisis management operations.

---

[797] However, as noted in chapter four was for example Germany's and France's preferences for the development of security and defence cooperation within the EU not *only* motivated by the external security environment and issue-specific interdependence but also shaped by factors such as pro-European ideology and leadership ambitions.
[798] Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 5.
[799] Anthony Forster, 'Britain and the Negotiation of the Maastricht Treaty: A Critique of Liberal Intergovernmentalism', Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 36, No. 3, September 1998, p. 349.
[800] Correspondence with Andrew Moravcsik, 23 July 2003.

Comment:

LI is correct to assume that France and the UK have played an indispensable role in this context and it was the official convergence of these states' positions at the St Malo Summit that opened the way for the ESDP process.[801] More precisely it was the alteration of the UK's preferences alone that led to the initiation of the process despite the fact that some of the other Atlanticists and the non-aligned countries, in particular Ireland and Sweden, were very reluctant to approve of the ESDP process. Thus, Britain has had a very effective ability to persuade other state governments to approve of the process. Consequently, there can be no doubt about the fact that the UK and France have had the most influence and leverage within the process. As pointed out in the conclusions of chapter three, these two state governments also had the power to intercede at any stage of the negotiation process and demand an alteration, while the other state governments clearly had to 'pick their battle' during the ESDP process. Furthermore, as noted in the conclusions of chapter three, there existed an assumption during the negotiation process that, where the United Kingdom and France could agree, most others would follow.

LI is clearly also correct in assuming that the UK and France have had more wide-ranging preferences than the other state governments. As noted in chapter three, they had to pay more attention to detail since, as lead-nations, they most likely would have to carry the main burden on the battlefields. However, as the interviews conducted with British and French diplomats have indicated, they also focused more on the details because they had invested the most political capital in seeing the process evolve beyond the conceptual stage and France and the UK would either swim or sink together within this process. While LI certainly would recognise the importance of the attention to detail because of functional considerations, it would pay less attention to aspects, such as the return on the political capital invested. This is because LI's rationalist core assumptions do not support the claims that standing, prestige and reputation within the integration process can decisively affect the preference formations of the state governments or their bargaining behaviour. Thus, LI seems to be somewhat narrowly focused in

---

[801] It is doubtful if it would be correct to claim that France and the UK had converging preferences within the ESDP process, as LI would put it, since these two countries, in a longer-term perspective, had different preferences about the aims, purposes and finality of the ESDP process. This study, therefore, refers to sufficiently converging positions rather than converging preferences. However, this might be more of an academic point and it remains a fact that the Anglo-French co-operation was indispensable for the development of the ESDP process.

its interpretation of the factors that made the UK and France have more wide-ranging preferences than the other state governments.

LI also somewhat underestimates the impact that smaller states occasionally can have on the direction of the integration process within the field of security and defence. Even though the initiation of the ESDP process was a result of the sufficiently converging positions of the UK and France, the content of the ESDP was indeed partly influenced by smaller states in a significant way. The plan to develop a civilian crisis management capability for the EU was initiated by a number of smaller Member States, such as Sweden and Finland, and the decision to develop this aspect was taken partly against the preference of a large state like France. The civilian crisis management capability has by this initiative become a separable, but not separate part of the ESDP process and thereby has shaped the content of this process into a more multidimensional approach to crisis management. This is not insignificant for the EU's international profile and its role as a complement to rather than a substitute for NATO, even though it has been the military dimension that has become the defining aspect of the ESDP process. Another plausible interpretation of the expansion of a civilian crisis management function is that the development of this function was a way to accommodate the concern of some of the smaller states about the 'militarisation' of the EU. However, as pointed out in hypothesis three, this also runs counter to LI's hypotheses since it takes a very sceptical attitude towards the possibility of issue-linkage and claims that all negotiations in principle are issue-specific, which leaves very little room to link the negotiations within and between different policy fields.[802]

Regarding the significant characteristics of the bargaining environment, LI asserts that:

2) **Since the negotiations take place in a non-coercive environment the state governments will only approve of agreements that will make them better off relative to their next best alternative in the absence of an agreement.** [803]

---

[802] To a certain degree, this argument depends on what view one takes regarding the relevance of the development of civilian crisis management and conflict prevention. If one takes the position that this dimension is of, at the most, marginal significance to the ESDP process, the point can be made that the approval by the major state governments of the development of these functions was an insignificant symbolic and institutional concession by the larger states, most notably France, to the smaller states. The argument can be made that this was in accordance with the LI assumption that issue linkage under some circumstances can be made to such factors. However, since this study attributes somewhat larger relevance to the significance of civilian crisis management and conflict prevention to the ESDP process, it does not share this interpretation.
[803] Moravcsik & Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', p. 61.

It is, as noted, the major powers that dominate the integration process but they need to engage in coalition building with the other state governments in order to assure agreements. Thus, LI makes the assumption that the negotiations take place in a non-coercive environment since the state governments have the power to veto proposals that they do not approve of and will do so if the agreement does not leave them better off. LI would, therefore, presuppose that the development of the ESDP in principle would have accommodated the preferences of all the state governments.[804] As a result, the state governments act in a unified, rational, manipulative and calculated manner in order to pursue their preferences within the bargaining process without taking into account the preferences of the other state governments.

Comment:

LI is correct in believing that the state governments will pursue their preferences within the negotiation process and it would be very naïve to assume that they will not guard their interests within this process very carefully. This is part of their job prescription and it is, of course, a reason why they are represented within the negotiation process so that the various positions of the state governments can be reconciled so that a common position can be adopted. In essence, the pursuit of the state governments' preferences is at the very heart of the European integration process. Yet, that being said, LI, which is greatly inspired by game theory and classical bargaining theory, seems to be too deterministic in its hypotheses about the characteristics of the negotiations for the ESDP process. Moreover, its assumptions about *how* the state governments go about pursuing their preferences need modification. It is necessary to identify some institutional ramifications that shape the negotiations within the European integration process and set it apart from other forms of non-institutionalised negotiations and, therefore, make EU negotiations less suitable to be assessed through the perspective of traditional bargaining theory.

Firstly, a factor that sets the negotiations within the EU apart from many other international negotiations is the continuity that exists within the integration process. It would most likely be to the detriment of the state governments to engage in a 'hit and run' format when negotiating with the other state governments since that most likely would haunt them in the future. In a one-off negotiation, it is possible, as LI suggests, to pursue rationally calculated preferences by engaging, for example, in deceitful or manipulative behaviour and disregarding the preferences

---

[804] Correspondence with Andrew Moravcsik, 12 July 2003.

of other state governments since the negotiation parties will probably not encounter each other in the future. However, when the negotiations take place on a continuous basis, the demands for negotiating reasonably and constructively become much more pertinent. Those who do not play by these rules often face unpleasant repercussions.[805] For example, as noted in chapter three, France's behaviour during its Presidency, where it tried to use the power vested in the Presidency to promote its own Europeanist preferences in a very indiscreet manner, resulted in the country suffering somewhat of a backfire. This was because it made it more difficult for France to engage in coalition building in order to insert top-ranking French officials within the security bodies.[806]

Secondly, the worst solution at many times is the absence of an agreement. The awareness of this fact modifies the negotiation characteristics of the state governments. Negotiations within the EU are, therefore, often win-win solutions since the failure to reach an agreement also has serious drawbacks for the state governments. As highlighted in chapter three, this factor seems, for example, to have shaped the ESDP negotiations during the Nice Council Summit. As the realisation grew during the Summit that the Member States might fail to reach an accord on reinforced co-operation because of different views on whether this concept also should be applicable to defence and security co-operation, the French Presidency backed down from its initial proposals in order to accommodate the concerns the UK and Sweden above all. This was done in order to secure an agreement, even though it contradicted France's own preferences for reinforced co-operation. Thus, the LI's assumption that the state governments pursue their preferences without regards to other governments needs some modification since there is a common interest in securing agreements.

Thirdly, and closely related, in regards to the right to veto, LI claims that the state governments will not refrain from using this option if they do not approve of an agreement. However, even if the ESDP process is strictly intergovernmental and all states at all times have the option to use the right to veto, it is a fact that most often the state governments refrained from using the right to veto if they were outnumbered.[807] The right to veto is just not an option in many cases. It is too high a political cost to use this instrument against proposals supported by a clear majority of the Member States. Sweden would, for example, have initially preferred to veto the

---

[805] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.
[806] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[807] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.

establishment of the ESDP and the development of this policy almost created a domestic political crisis, which threatened the very survival of the Swedish minority government. Yet it did not use its right to veto to stop the ESDP process and it also refrained from vetoing the first-ever informal defence ministers' meeting within the EU because it was unable to find any substantial support for this among the other state governments. It was noted by a Swedish diplomat 'that is something that you just don't do [use the veto based on rather poorly defined reasons] as a small and new member of the EU'.[808] Such a decision would, furthermore, have undermined Sweden's standing and interests within the rest of the integration process.[809] What this clearly indicates is that there exists informal codes of conducts and norms within the negotiation process, which the state governments abide by in order to assure the viability of the integration process, which is in the interest of all EU Member States.[810] This runs counter to the very core of the Realist inspired notion of rationality that LI is based on, which assumes that norms and informal codes of conduct are of little or no significance to the European co-operation.

Thus, unlike LI's hypothesis, the negotiations do not take place in a non-coercive environment since there are norms, expectations and informal codes of conduct within the process. Coercion based on *peer pressure* (rather than explicit threats) is a fact of life in EU negotiations and, as noted above, it decisively affects the negotiation behaviour of the state governments. This is not to say that this pressure applies equally to all the state governments since some of them clearly have had more leverage than others within the process. The state governments that are the most committed and bring the most resources to the negotiation table seem to have more leeway within the process. Nevertheless, it can be seen as somewhat of a survival mechanism in order to safeguard the viability of the integration process. This is applicable when a state government, because of poorly defined domestic political reasons, tries to hinder the development of what is commonly assumed to be a collective interest within the Union, e.g., the development of an effective and coherent common security and defence policy. The implication of this pressure is that state governments continuously have to consider their overall standing in the integration process if they have an interest in achieving things within this framework since there are

---

[808] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2003.
[809] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Defence, 22 June 2004.
[810] Thus, what this comes down to is that the EU remains based on a grouping of likeminded liberal democracies that have agreed to pool sovereignty in order to reach common solutions to universal problems. What is unique about the EU is its political maturity and the fact that the Member States are willing to abide by informal rules in order to make the Union function.

important informal rules and norms that govern the process, which LI is unable to take account of.

On the outcome of the negotiations, LI claims that:

3) **The state governments that will gain the most from an agreement will offer the most significant side-payments. Thus asymmetrical interdependence decides the outcome of the negotiations and there is little room for linkage within or between policy fields.[811]**

The bargaining process is almost always issue-specific with cross-issue linkage restricted to balancing out benefits among governments and it tends to concern institutional issues.[812] The governments that have the most to gain from an agreement will be the most inclined to give concessions during the negotiations in order to preserve an agreement. The outcome of the negotiations will be governed by the asymmetrical intensity of the preferences rather than their collective input. Issue linkage is rare and on the few occasions when it takes place, it is symbolic rather than substantial.[813] Within the field of security and defence co-operation, the state governments have a large degree of flexibility since there are no domestic interest groups that have strong preferences.

Comment:

LI is largely correct in assuming that the actors that stood to gain the most from an agreement have made the biggest concessions within the ESDP process.[814] France had different preferences for relations between EU and NATO than those eventually agreed to. However, it could live with this agreement since the establishment of the ESDP process was seen as the first important step towards its Europeanist preferences. Germany also had different preferences in the intergovernmentalism versus federalism dichotomy than what was agreed to. However, it also saw the ESDP process as a first step towards its federalist preference. It seems as if the French

---

[811] Moravcsik, <u>The Choice for Europe</u>, p. 14.
[812] <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 8.
[813] <u>Ibid.</u>, p.12.
[814] However, this is not to say that the state governments that had the most to gain were the only ones who made major concessions. Some of the state governments that were reluctant about the ESDP process also made considerable concessions in order to assure the establishment of the ESDP process and thereby exposed themselves to domestic criticism.

and German Governments engaged in a policy of forward-linkage by compromising on their preferences based on assumptions that history eventually would be on their side, even though the two states, in part, had rather sharply diverging preferences on these two accounts. Nevertheless, they both shared a desire for inserting Article V of the Modified Brussels Treaty into the European Union but refrained from fervently championing this issue since, at that stage, it was perceived as being counterproductive to the ESDP process.[815] In essence, there was an awareness that 'the best could be the evil of good' at the initial stage of the ESDP process but this, in no way, removed the longer-term aim harboured by France and Germany to establish some form of collective defence provision for the Union. The UK usually had the final say in the process since it decided the very limits to the process and by that virtue most often could ensure that its will prevailed in the process.[816] This seems to correspond well with the statement by a Belgian diplomat in chapter three that 'there is never any point in trying to do anything against the will of the United Kingdom if one wants to accomplish something'.[817]

It is difficult to verify if LI is correct to assume that that issue-linkage within and between policy fields was rare during the ESDP negotiations. However, the interviews conducted indicate that there was an awareness that the way the state governments acted and bargained had implications for their over-all standing within the integration process. Moreover, this seems to have modified their behaviour and made them more reluctant to use the formal right vested in the veto. Furthermore, there were coalitions within the ESDP process that indicated the existence of, at least, intra-policy issue-linkage. The UK's support for the Swedish efforts to establish a civilian crisis management function was, in part, a reward for Sweden's support for the UK's promotion of an Atlanticist structure of the ESDP process.[818] Yet it is more difficult to find support for inter-policy issue-linkage, even if some of the interviews conducted with persons who have been active in policy-making circles for the ESDP process have indicated that there were examples of such. This is a field of European integration that would benefit from further empirical research.

LI rightly concludes that the state governments, at least during exceptional circumstances, were willing to accept the domestic constraints of other state governments after the latter had made credible commitments to these factors. The resistance of the non-aligned countries to any kind of reinforced co-operation regarding collective defence is an indicative example of this. The

---

[815] Interview with representative from the German Ministry of Defence, 19 August 2004.
[816] Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.
[817] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.
[818] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 22 July 2003.

compromise to not mention NATO in reference to the changes made to Articles 17 and 25 of the Treaty of the European Union in order to accommodate the Irish Government's concerns that this might complicate its referendum on the Nice Treaty is also a clear example of a vital asymmetrical interest.[819] This, in part, also underpins the LI hypothesis that it is the intensity of the preferences rather than their collective input that determines the outcome of the negotiations.

However, the above-mentioned examples indicate that LI seems to overestimate the degree of flexibility and underestimates some of the constraints upon the state governments when negotiating in the field of security and defence. Unlike the assumptions of LI, the room for manoeuvre was constrained by the influence of previous policy decisions on defence and security issues. This was at the core of the Atlanticist-Europeanist dichotomy. Formal commitments to NATO, the WEU or non-alignment has decisively shaped the preference formation and negotiation behaviour of the state governments. Thus, the reoccurring problem with LI's rationalist approach is that it loses sight of the historic context within which the negotiations took place.

Furthermore, while domestic interest groups did not have a decisive role in this process, parliamentary opposition was an important factor in affecting how the state governments acted in the bargaining process. Moreover, it did indeed limit their degree of flexibility in these negotiations and it made the process considerably more politicised and less rational than what LI would presuppose. Unlike LI's assumption that the state governments are guided by the principle of substantial rationality, where it is the tangible costs and benefits that are the focus of the state governments' preferences, it seems as if the negotiations often centred on symbolic issues that the state governments pursued in order to accommodate domestic political concerns. The Irish demand to insert an explicit sentence that the initiation of the ESDP did not imply the creation of a European army is such an example. Sweden's continuous emphasis on promoting civilian crisis management and conflict prevention in the Presidency Conclusions and Presidency Reports also, in part, reflected domestic political concerns, as did the UK's insistence on inserting sentences in the same documents, which would ensure that the ESDP process would not in anyway undermine NATO's role in the European security structure.

---

[819] Yet, it should, of course, be noted that the state governments also had a self-interest in assuring that the Nice Treaty would survive the referendum in Ireland; otherwise it would not come into force (even if the ESDP provisions did not depend on the ratification process).

This is not to say that these initiatives contradicted these states' preferences, but it did shape the intensity and format of how the state governments promoted their preferences. In addition, one of the main considerations of the non-aligned state governments during the ESDP negotiations was to assure that they could maintain their non-alignment. Of course, this was, first and foremost, an issue of symbolism and abstraction. It would be absurd to think that the a member of an integrated union that has a common foreign and security policy and an emerging defence policy would decided to declare itself neutral in the event of an outside power attacking a Member State of the EU.[820] In essence, the policy of non-alignment should be treated for what it is, a heritage from the past with very limited conceptual compatibility with the founding values of the European integration process and it is based on domestic political considerations. Yet this security arrangement was a factor that severely restricted the flexibility of the non-aligned states within the area of defence and security negotiations and it showed the shortcomings of applying a rationalist framework to an irrational and anachronistic security arrangement.

---

[820] The possible exception being Austria where the policy of neutrality is anchored in the Austrian constitution and the Austrian Government could thereby claim that it was technocratic factors rather than ideological reasons that prevented it from approving the collective defence provisions within the EU.

III. What Explains the Choice of Institutions?

Regarding the choice of the institutional framework, LI claims that:

1) **The need for credible commitments explains the choice of institutions and the state governments with extreme views tend to be the most critical of supranational structures.[821]**

According to LI, it is the need to safeguard commitments that explains the institutional choices. If there are joint gains, future uncertainty and a large risk of rejecting the agreement, the state governments will be inclined to support a supranational structure for the decision-making process. The state governments with favourable unilateral alternatives and sharply diverging views tend to be the most critical of supranational structures since they fear the loss of sovereignty more than other state governments.

Comment:

The first issue concerning when the state governments would be ready to support supranational structures within the ESDP process can be answered in two different ways. The short and easy answer would be that there did not exist any formal transfer of sovereignty to *supranational* structures within the ESDP process since the UK and France clearly stated already in the St Malo declaration that they did not see any roles for the Commission, the European Court of Justice and the European Parliament within this process. Thus, the ESDP process was advanced along the lines of strict intergovernmentalism. The reason for this approach derives from the simple fact that it is only the state governments that have the political and moral authority to send troops into harm's way and can be held democratically accountable for such decisions. Thus, this selected structure for the ESDP process has more to do with the sensitivity associated with the application of military force than the absence of fear of failing to take decisions or the lack of joint gains, as LI would assume. Issues concerning the application of military force touch upon the very sovereignty of the state governments and in this regard they will make sure to protect their unchallenged primacy very carefully within the foreseeable future.

---

[821] See Moravcsik & Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', p. 60.

Yet, as noted in chapter three, there were some issues that emerged during the implementation of the ESDP process that affected the informal sovereignty of the state governments within this process. One such issue was the establishment of a permanent Chairman of the EU Military Committee. Some state governments, most notably some of the non-aligned countries, would have preferred to see the Chairmanship rotate with the EU Presidency in order to assure that the state governments at all times could control and influence the Chairmanship.[822] However, as highlighted in chapter three, the state governments, in the end, agreed on a permanent Chairman in order to assure the continuity and effectiveness of the work conducted by the Committee. Yet it seems difficulty to find a reasonable degree of consistency for a hypothesis when the state governments are willing to pool sovereignty given the fact that the state governments, on the contrary, could not, as also noted in chapter three, agree on appointing the High Representative as the permanent Chairman of the Political and Security Committee but rather retained the Chairmanship within the power vested in the rotating EU Presidency because of sovereignty considerations. Another issue that also could have affected the sovereignty of the state governments was whether issues with defence implications could, in some circumstances (though not regarding troop deployment), be taken by qualified majority voting. Some of the federally oriented state governments, such as Belgium and Germany, had some sympathy for this proposal in order to assure the effectiveness of the EU's decision-making mechanism.[823] However, the state governments could not agree on such an arrangement because of the implications it might have for their sovereignty within the ESDP process.[824]

Also the issue of civilian crisis management raised some questions regarding sovereignty. One reason why some of the state governments, such as Sweden and Finland, insisted on establishing civilian crisis management within the second pillar was, in part, based on the view that it could only be the state governments that could decide when, for example, police officers could be sent into a crisis area because of the dangers such missions might entail.[825] Other state governments, for example Belgium, had a more favourable outlook on the role of the Commission regarding civilian crisis management. Belgium, therefore, during its EU Presidency worked on transferring some facets of civilian crisis management, in particular aspects of civil protection, from the second pillar to the first pillar. This was done because of both an ideological commitment to

---

[822] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.
[823] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.
[824] Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.
[825] Interview with representative from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 April 2003.

federalism and a reflection of the great belief in the effectiveness of the community model.[826] In sum, there has been no formal transfer of sovereignty by the Member States to supranational structures within the ESDP. The informal sovereignty that was abandoned by the state governments has not been very substantial and when it has taken place it has reflected functional considerations and efforts undertaken to assure that the security bodies were functioning well.

LI also claims that state governments with extreme views tend to be the most critical of supranational decision-making. To a certain extent, this notion of LI depends on what the concept of 'extreme views' entails. Belgium's preferences for the future establishment of some form of European army make it rather extreme by some accounts. Yet it was very positive to the notion of supranational structures within the ESDP process. However, if the non-aligned states, such as Sweden and Ireland, are seen as having extreme views then it is largely correct to assume that they avoided supranational decision-making structures, partly because they feared they could be outmanoeuvred within such frameworks. Also the UK and France have been critical of supranational structures but this has predominately been based on their preferences to have unilateral options for the application of military force. However, as noted in chapter four, it has also been shaped by some historical points of reference. Thus, LI seems to be largely correct to assume that the state governments with strong unilateral alternatives and/or critical views of the development of the ESDP process have been the ones that have most carefully guarded their sovereignty within the process.

---

[826] Interview with representative from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 5 September 2004.

Conclusions Regarding LI's Micro-Level Hypotheses

Even though this study does not aim at providing a comparative perspective on different competing European integration theories ability to explain and predict the ESDP process beyond the introduction given in chapter two, it is still worth while to briefly acknowledge some of LI's methodological advantages over other European integration theories that increases its relevance in relations to the ESDP process. Firstly, as opposed to most other European integration theories, it provides testable micro-level hypotheses where it is possible to verify or reject its claims about the integration process. This has proven useful not just because of the predictions that LI entails but because it provides an analytical framework for the integration process that seems largely coherent and it fosters the users of this analytical framework to pose relevant and pertinent questions in regards to which aspects of the integration process that provides the relevant dynamics. This is an important step forward to advance theoretical perspectives on the ESDP process and it has exposed some of the shortcomings of when for example classical international relation theories are applied to the process.

Secondly, LI does not fall into the trap of trying to explain the integration process by just naming one single factor since it, in part, provides different hypotheses for economic and political integration even thought they both derive from rationalist assumptions.[827] In essence, it is not mono-causal like many other single-minded theories on European integration and it at least partly recognises the different forms of dynamics that exists within different areas of integration.

Thirdly, its two-level analysis, which takes domestic as well as system-based factors into consideration, is also a great leap forward compared with many other European integration theories. It does not rule out that the security environment has provided an important impetus for the ESDP process as Neofunctionalism, for example, would do. LI also provides an important understanding of the inherit limitations upon some of the supranational decision-makers, such as the Commission and the European Parliament. This is especially pertinent within an area like

---

[827] However, as is noted in the final section of this chapter, the study criticises the hypotheses especially in regards to the preference formation both on the grounds that they are very general and therefore difficult both to prove wrong or right and the core assumption of substantial rationality which disregards important aspects such as norms and historical points of references as sources for the preference formation for the ESDP process.

security and defence co-operation, which has been conducted along the lines of strict intergovernmentalism.

Thus LI's micro-level hypotheses certainly provide some important insights into explaining the ESDP process and with some exceptions LI has been able to identify the right actors within the process, i.e., the state governments. Moreover, given its focus on the major powers within the integration process, it was also accurate in singling out the UK and France as the most important ones within the ESDP process, even though it somewhat underestimates the relevance of smaller states. Yet, this being said, LI fails to explain the integration process within the ESDP process on several important accounts; this is a problem for a theoretical framework with predictive ambitions.

In regards to the preference formation process, it has been noted that LI is incorrect to assume that that state governments aggregated the preferences of domestic interests groups and added their own. This is because the policy-making machinery seems to have developed its own preferences with little concern for other domestic based interest groups. Secondly, its hypothesis that the dynamics for the ESDP process was driven by politicians trying to accommodate the interests of the defence industry has been proven wrong. Furthermore, even if the issue-specific interdependence hypothesis of LI can in part provides some important insight into how the security environment has provided impetus to the ESDP process, it underestimates the importance of individual decisions-makers and their outlook on the European integration process. It can, therefore, not provide an accurate picture of all the factors that caused the changes in the UK's preferences for security and defence co-operation within the EU.

Regarding the bargaining process, it provides an important insight into the outcome of the process by claiming that it is the intensity of the preferences, rather than their collective input that matters. Furthermore, it seems correct to assume that the state governments that had the most to gain from an agreement were the ones that were willing to make the biggest concessions and the state governments with the most extreme views were the most reluctant to pool sovereignty within the process. Yet it is largely incorrect about the hypotheses of the characteristics of the negotiations and it greatly underestimates how norms and informal codes of conduct have shaped the negotiations for the ESDP process. LI's micro-level hypothesis in this regard assumes that the ESDP process, in principle, had to accommodate the preferences of all 15 Member States, otherwise it would have been vetoed. As noted, this was not the case. There

were some state governments that would have preferred to veto the development of the ESDP, at least at an early stage, but they refrained from doing so because of concerns for how this might affect their standing and influence within the integration process. In essence, the negotiations did not take place in a non-coercive environment. If they had, the ESDP process would most likely not have seen the light of the day; at least not by 1999. Because of its ahistorical approach, it also overestimates the degree of flexibility that the state governments have when negotiating within the area of security and defence. Previous policy commitments remained at the core of these negotiations, which LI is unable to account for. Thus, in sum, LI almost maintains a theological approach to the integration process, focusing on rational calculations at the expense of non-rational explanation. This makes LI overlook the political dimension of the integration process since perceptions, standing and ideas matter. Politics is of course more than just rational calculations since it is, to a large degree, a product of ideology, belief systems and symbolism.

The Explanatory Limits of the Core Concepts Unitary Actor Behaviour and Rational Choice

As previously noted, LI is based on a domestically centred form of Realism that puts the focus on substantial gains and losses and assumes that state governments universally make rational choices founded upon the pursuit of the previously noted notion of 'power and plenty'.[828] Consequently, LI disregards the idea that less tangible aspects, such as historical points of reference, norms and values, can decisively affect the preferences of the state governments. This rationalist approach has merits with regards to the notion of 'plenty' in explaining preferences in and the outcomes of, for example, EU internal market negotiations where it is key aspects, such as marginal rates of return and commercial advantages more than political values and norms, that are at the heart of the negotiations. LI was indeed, as noted, originally developed to explain the economic aspects of the European integration process. Yet it does not apply equally well to the area of security and defence. The 'power' side of LI would imply that it would be substantial gains based on rationally calculated national interests that would be the principal motivator for the preference formation within the ESDP process and that values, norms and historical points of reference did not decisively shape the preferences for- or the outcome of the process. This might have been true if the negotiations for the ESDP process started from 'a clean sheet of paper'. However, the EU Member States have considerable historical baggage in the field of defence and security, which cannot be disregarded when assessing their roles within this area of European integration.

Thus, this final section of the study takes issue with LI's core assumptions of rationality and unitary actor behaviour. It is also argued that some aspects of the ESDP process have indeed been shaped by and can, in part, be explained based on some features among the EU state governments that reflect *elements* of a European strategic culture founded on norms and values, which put great emphasis on avoiding the use of military force and prefer to solve conflicts with non-coercive instruments.[829] The limited and constrained application of military force shaped by

---

[828] As noted, Moravcsik claims that the European integration process reflects a new form of power politics developed peacefully within the institutions through the exploitation and manipulation of asymmetric interdependence. Moravcsik, The Choice for Europe, p. 5.

[829] The concept 'strategic culture' can be defined as specific aspects that guide the application of force based on common political values. These specific aspects refer to functional connotations of situational assessment, approaches to problem-solving and strategic objectives. See Sten Rynning, 'A European Strategic Culture? The ESDP and 21st Century Geopolitics, ECPR workshop No. 12, Edinburgh, 2 April 2003.

way of the Petersberg Tasks often in the context of post-conflict reconstruction, peace-building, an emphasis on civilian crisis management, such as policing, and a focus on conflict prevention and development aid underpins this 'soft' and constrained approach to using military force that seems prevalent among the EU Member States. This study does *not*, however, argue that there exists a single all-encompassing strategic culture among all the EU state governments and their citizens.[830] One of the problems with the ESDP process is that the EU Member States share many of the same values, which, for example, are spelled out in Article Two of the Treaty of the European Union, such as human dignity, fundamental rights, democracy, rule of law, tolerance and respect for international law. Yet they do, on various points, differ on how to obtain or maintain these values in an international context since they quite often diverge on situational assessments, approaches to problem-solving and policy-making and strategic objectives.[831] Thus, there seems to be several subcultures within the EU, which makes it unsuitable to claim that the EU has a single strategic culture.

However, to varying degrees, there seems, at least from an international comparative perspective, to be elements of a common strategic culture among the state governments represented in the reluctance to use military force and the desire to find different tools other than military statecraft to handle pressing security issues. Furthermore, given this sensitivity that varies among the Member States, but is, on average, higher than within some other international actors, it is likely that the Member States will be guided by the 'just war' criteria when they do resort to the use of force.[832] Maybe somewhat over-categorical, but still with important insights,

---

[830] It should, of course, be noted that the EU is a heterogeneous entity in this regards as in many others. Francois Heisbourg has stated that the EU state governments have rather shifting strategic visions. In order to structure this division, Heisbourg divides the state governments into extroverts and introverts where the extroverts, France and the UK, have been a part of almost all peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations of significance in the last decade. On the other hand, the four non-aligned states together with Germany, or the introverts as Heisbourg calls them, practically rule out participating in peace enforcement operations per definition according to Heisbourg. However, Heisbourg concludes that the focal point is moving towards greater, not lesser acceptance of the use of military force. This could maybe, in part, explain why Germany was willing to participate in Operation *Enduring Freedom* in Afghanistan in 2001 and Sweden was prepared to participate in Operation *Artemis* in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2003. Robert Cooper also notes this distinction between different EU state governments and rightfully claims that in Germany, Greece, Italy and Greece the military power for obvious historical reasons has little legitimacy. See Francois Heisbourg, 'Europe's Strategic Ambitions: The Limits of Ambiguity', p .6 and Cooper, The Breaking of Nations, p. 159.
[831] This dilemma was highlighted in chapter three of this study; namely, the main fault-lines in the ESDP process have been the Europeanist versus Atlanticist preferences, which are really are about what role NATO and, in turn, the United States should have in the European security structure. There is the dichotomy between federalism and intergovernmentalism which, in part, reflects the differing views on the merits of the European integration model in the area of security and defence and the shifting views of the balance between military and civilian crisis management tools. This partly reflects the different assessments on how to best obtain peace and stability.
[832] There does not yet exist a strategic concept for when and how the EU should conduct military operations. However, the few statements on the issue of intervention and crisis management operations made by the leaders of

Christopher Coker notes that 'the EU will only be able to fight just wars.'[833] Furthermore, some argue that the cautious EU approach vis-à-vis the use of force and its preferences for non-coercive instruments contrasts to the American attitude, which, unlike the EU, tends to focus more on military power then on soft power.[834] Such comparisons sometimes become grossly exaggerated. Nevertheless, there seems to be some grain of truth in them that cannot be disregarded.

Concepts, such as 'strategic culture' and 'just war theory' based on, for example, historical points of reference, norms and values, go against the very core beliefs of the Realist/Rationalist inspired worldview that LI is founded upon. As Colin Gray puts it, 'strategic culture is the world of mind, feeling and habit of behaviour'.[835] LI assumes that all state governments act rationally and on unitary grounds when they formulate their preferences for security alternatives, such as, for example, how to develop a common policy for security and defence co-operation within the EU. This study argues that such an approach gives an incomplete picture of the factors that have shaped the ESDP process. While national interest based power considerations have indeed been very important factors for how the state governments have formulated their preferences for the ESDP process, they have to be seen within a larger context. Beliefs, norms and values have had a vital impact on the outlooks of the state governments on issues of war and peace and just as

---

the EU state governments seem to echo many of the principles of just war theory. Prime Minster Tony Blair has, for instance, in his classic speech **'Doctrine of the International Community'** at the Economic Club in Chicago on 24 April 1999 stated some criteria that have to be fulfilled in order to conduct a military crisis management operation. Firstly, a humanitarian emergency has to be at hand. Secondly, all diplomatic options have to be exhausted. Thirdly, the outcome of the operation will have to be successful. Fourthly, the intervening parties have to be prepared to undertake a long-term commitment. Fifthly, there has to be some resonance with the state's interest to undertake such operations. The notion of national interest does, at least, intuitively run counter to just war theory. However, the Blair government has suggested that reactions to humanitarian suffering could be related to national interests since it contradicts the aim of establishing an international community based on the rule of law, which can be an aim in itself for the Blair government. Prime Minister Tony Blair's speech: Doctrine of the International Community at the Economic Club, Chicago - 24 April 1999.

[833] Christopher Coker, 'The United States and its Global Vision: Europe-US Alliance Post Iraq War', in Terhi Souminen and Eero Kytömaa (eds.), The United States and the World, Occasional Papers, No. 4, Atlantic Council of Finland, 2004.

[834] The example that is given to support this argument is the different emphasis on military expenditures contra development assistance that is prevalent across the Atlantic. See, for example, Michael O'Hanlon, 'The American Way of War: Lessons for Europe', in Steve Everts et al. (eds.), A European Way of War, Centre for European Reform, 2004. It is somewhat unfortunate but unavoidable that assessments of the EU's development as an actor in international security affairs is going to be viewed in comparative and contrasting perspectives to the US role. Yet the reason for this is simple. The world is basically unipolar with a few subpoles and there is no other international actor in contemporary world affairs that could serve as a focal point of reference for the EU in this regard.

[835] Realism has always contrasted with the concepts of 'strategic culture' and 'just war theory' since the latter two are not focused on the functional imperative of the distribution of the power structure, but on normative aspects of the conduct of international security affairs. It should, however, be noted that more recent realists have acknowledged that cultural factors can influence how states view and apply military force. Colin Gray, for example, has pointed out that 'All strategic behaviour is affected by human beings who cannot help but being cultural agents.' See Colin Grey, Modern Strategy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 59.

However, since it is a central argument of this section of the chapter, that the state governments' outlook on the use of military force has been one important factor that have shaped the development of the ESDP process, the study in appendix one gives some guidance to plausible explanations for this sensitivity that seems to be prevalent in Europe. The contention that is associated with the use of military force varies among the general public within the EU, but the median figures of these surveys clearly indicate, for example, a considerably higher degree of sensitivity to the use of military force among the EU citizens than among, for example, Americans.[838] It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that this will also, to some extent, reflect the views that are represented at the political level of the various policy-making bodies of the EU state governments.[839] This element of European 'exceptionalism' should, of course, not be exaggerated since the use of military force for good reasons is a controversial issue in just about any culture or civilisation. Furthermore, in recent years, some EU state governments have indeed on a few occasions not shied away from applying decisive military force during what could be described as higher end military crisis management operations.[840] Yet the factors that create differences even on the periphery of the views on issues of war and peace between different entities can provide important insights into how they will position themselves vis-à-vis future security challenges. More importantly for the argument of this section of the chapter, and unlike the LI's core assumptions, it has also shaped the emphasis on the preferences for different crisis management tools to meet such challenges among the Member States. Hence that the Member States with citizens that seemed generally to be the most reluctant to the application of military force, such as Sweden, Ireland, Germany and Finland, have been the most eager to promote civilian crisis management and conflict prevention measures within the ESDP framework.[841] These states preferences derive in large parts from norms and values based on a high aversion

---

Paper 58, The Royal United Service Institute, 2003, Cooper, <u>The Breaking of Nations</u>, and Robert Kagan, 'Power and Weakness', <u>Policy Review</u>, No. 121, 2003. Regarding the survey on the different views of the use of military force among the EU citizens, see Philipe Manigart, <u>Public Opinion and European Defence</u>, Royal Military Academy, Belgium, 2001. For the survey of the views across the Atlantic, see 'Transatlantic Trends 2003', A project of the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Compagnia di San Paolo, 2003.

[838] See 'Transatlantic Trends 2003'.

[839] There are two reasons for this assumption. Firstly, since political leaders are drawn from the general population, they, at least, are likely, in part, to reflect the 'mood of the nation'. Secondly, political leaders depend on popular support in order to become re-elected and, therefore, can, at least, be expected to promote, to some extent, the prevailing values of the general population. This assumption has in part also been confirmed by the interviews conducted for this study.

[840] In 1995, France and the UK used artillery to subdue the Bosnian Serbs in Bosnia during Operation *Deliberate Force*. In 1999, 11 EU state governments participated in Operation *Allied Force* and, in 2001, several EU state governments were very keen to contribute forces to Operation *Enduring Freedom* in Afghanistan. However, it should be noted that some EU Member States preferred just to contribute forces to ISAF in Afghanistan because of the sensitivity of engaging in direct combat action.

[841] See Manigart, <u>Public Opinion and European Defence</u>.

against the use of military force and desire to find alternative forms of statecraft to handle violent conflicts. In essence, it seems as if there are other important factors other than merely the concept of 'substantial rationality' that have shaped the preferences for civilian crisis management and conflict prevention among these states. This study, therefore, argues that the relative reluctance to use military force that exists among the EU state governments and the values and norms this view represents have been *one* factor that has shaped the development of the ESDP process towards an emphasis on both a more limited form of military crisis management combined with civilian crisis management and conflict prevention. LI cannot account for this factor since it contradicts its core concepts of 'rational choice' based on the primacy of 'power and plenty' and 'unitary actor behaviour'.

Conclusions

This study has in chapter three made the point that it is possible to identify, at least, three fault-lines within the ESDP process. Firstly, the shifting views between the Atlanticist and the Europeanist preferences, secondly the dichotomy between intergovernmentalism and federalism and finally the diverging views on the balance between military and civilian crisis management tools. The unitary actor behaviour approach assumes that state governments formulated their preferences on national interest based power considerations in reference to these fault-lines and that these preferences can be separated from the prevailing values, norms and historic outlooks of the Member States. There are some arguments that support this line of thinking. One reason for the UK's Atlanticist preference was, of course, the fact that its special relationship with the US gives it considerable leverage and influence in international affairs and it will always be careful to nurture its foreign policy's power base. France's Europeanist preferences have, to a large degree, derived from the fact that it would have considerably more influence in a European security structure that was based on an independent European structure than a Euro-Atlantic framework. Germany's adherence to federalism can partly be explained by the reality that it has more leverage in a collective European structure for security and defence co-operation given its non-existent option of acting unilaterally in military affairs. Sweden's preferences for civilian crisis management can partially be explained by way of the considerably greater weight that Sweden had in this area of the ESDP process than within the military aspect.[842] Thus, as the

---

[842] Institutional leadership and the influence that this generated certainly played a role in the ESDP process. However, the state governments could support one or several of the aspects of the ESDP process without

unitary actor behaviour approach would point out, national interest based power considerations are very important factors in explaining how states develop preferences. Yet, as this final section has pointed out, the power and influence factor, although a very important one, is only part of the story. It would give an incomplete picture of the process by focusing only on this aspect as a source for the preference formation process among the state governments and consequently would disregard that values and norms also are decisively reflected in the preference.[843] It would be 'over-rational' to assume, for example, that Germany's preferences for federalism and Sweden's preferences for civilian crisis management only derived from power considerations and, at the most, marginally were affected by their political values and norms and historical points of reference. An understanding of how historical outlooks and beliefs have shaped the norms and values in these states regarding the use of military force is needed in order to appreciate their preferences for federalism and civilian crisis management.

Thus, the aim of this final section of the chapter on the unitary actor approach's limited ability to explain the preference formation for some aspects of the ESDP process has not been to claim that LI is completely wrong and that preferences for a somewhat limited form of military crisis management together with civilian crisis management and conflict prevention capability only are reflections of an element of a European strategic culture that places great emphasis on war avoidance. Instead, the aim has been to clarify that LI is based on some core concepts, which predominately, but not exclusively, emanate from Realism and they are too categorical and unnuanced to provide a coherent and adequate picture of the context within which the ESDP negotiations took place. Thereby, LI misses some vital factors that have a decisive impact on how the EU state governments formulate their preferences and negotiate in issues of security and crisis management. Consequently, this study argues that some elements of a European strategic

---

undertaking the role of institutional leadership within these aspects but they could never undertake the role of institutional leadership unless they thought that this aspect of the ESDP process was sound. Thus, the underlying preference seemed to be based more on the state's prevailing values and priorities than considerations of institutional leadership *per se*. Sweden saw its role, at all times, as protecting and supporting the civilian dimension of crisis management, but it did this because it thought that it was sound to move the process in this direction. The UK wanted a leading role within the European integration process, partially because it was concerned that it was becoming marginalised since it was not part of the EMU. It saw security and defence co-operation as such an area, but it would never have undertaken this leadership if it had not thought that it would have been sound to develop this aspect of European integration, especially since it can be assumed that the leverage and influence that it obtains is predominately focused on the area where it has a leadership role.

[843] The argument can certainly be made, for example, that national interest based power considerations were more important than historical points of references and values for the preference formation. Yet this is in part only a hypothetical argument since the only thing that can be deducted with a reasonably high degree of certainty from this study is that it was a combination of the two factors that influenced the preference formation among the Member States during the ESDP negotiations between 1998 and 2001. Thus both factors are indispensable to understand the underlying dynamics for the ESDP process.

culture, which reflects the collective input of all the EU state governments, have been a factor that has decisively shaped the balance between military and civilian crisis management capabilities and a conflict prevention capability within the ESDP, which LI, however, is unable to account for. In sum, it is impossible to understand how the state governments have developed their preferences for the development of crisis management tools without giving due reference to how they seem to view the use of these instruments.

It seems like this debate about a European strategic culture based on specific values and norms, is still only in its infancy. It is, however, accentuated with the coming of maturity of the EU as an international actor also in security affairs and the implementation of the EU Security Strategy. The issue of intervention and crisis management and under what conditions this should be undertaken has to be debated within the EU as the ESDP process gradually takes shape. Thus, the reluctant, but also fragmented view of the use of military force that exists in the EU makes it a challenge to create a unity of purpose for when and how the EU's military crisis management capabilities should especially be used. Yet this is also arguably one of the most important intellectual contributions of the ESDP process in itself. The relative autonomy of the EU vis-à-vis the United States that is typified by the ESDP process forces the EU state governments both to think long and hard about what role the EU should have in international security affairs and what the realities of statecraft are for a regional or global power. Too often some Member States within the EU have only defined themselves as being against the values, policies and measurers of the United States without providing credible options for how to handle the endless stream of difficult and pressing issues in international security affairs.

* * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Interviews

Interview with Werner Fasslabend, Former Minster of Defence, Austria, 8 December 2003.

Interview with representative from Belgium's Permanent Representative to the European Union, 5 September 2004.

Interview with representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Belgium, 5 September 2004.

Two interviews with representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, 20 February 2004.

Interview with representative from France's Permanent Representation to the European Union, 3 June 2002.

Interview with representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France 4 June 2002.

Interview with French Researcher, 4 June 2002.

Interview with representative from the Ministry of Defence, Germany, 19 August 2004.

Interview with representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Germany, 15 March 2004.

Interview with German Researcher, 21 September 2002.

Interview with representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Holland 21 November 2001.

Interview with Irish Researcher, 27 May 2004.

Two interviews with representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Portugal, 29 July 2004.

Two interviews with representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden, 26 August 2004.

Interview with representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden, 15 May 2003.

Interview with representative from Sweden's Permanent Representation to the European Union, 22 June 2004.

Interview with representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden, 23 April 2003.

Two interviews with representatives from the Ministry of Defence, Sweden, 19 August 2003.

Interview with US researcher, 5 May 2002.

Interview with representative from the, Department of Defense, USA, 5 May 2002.

Interview with two representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey, 8 October 2002.

Interview with Professor Lawrence Freedman, Department of War Studies, King's College London, 23 May 2003.

Interview with Professor Anthony Forster, Special Advisor to the House of Lord's Select Committee on European Security and Defence, 22 November 2003.

Interview with Charles Grant, Director, Centre for European Reform, London, 20 September 2002.

Interview with Lord John Roper, Former Director, WEU Institute for Security Studies, 22 September 2002.

Interview with representative from FCO, United Kingdom, 21 September 2002.

Two interviews with representatives from Ministry of Defence, United Kingdom 22 September 2002.

Interview with British Researcher, 19 august 2003.

Interview with representative from the Policy Unit of the European Union, 22 June 2004.

Interview with representative from the European Commission, 22 June 2004.

Interview with representative from the Council Secretariat, 23 June 2004.

Two interviews with representatives from the EU Military Staff, 17 February 2004.

Interview with representative from the EU Military Staff, 2 June 2002.

Two interviews with representative from the International Secretariat, NATO HQ, 6 November 2001.

Official Documents

A SECURE EUROPE IN A BETTER WORLD - presented by Javier Solana, EUHR for CFSP - European Council, Thessaloniki, 20 June 2003

Bibliography

Anglo-French Summit London, 25 November 1999, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence'

British-Italian Summit, <u>Joint Declaration Launching European Defence Capability Initiative</u>, 19-20 July 1999

Cardiff European Council, <u>Declaration on Kosovo</u>, Cardiff, 15 June 1998

Declaration at the Capabilities Commitment Conference Brussels, 20-21 November 2000

Declaration of the European Council on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence, European Council Summit, Cologne 3-4 June 1999

Elaboration of the Head Line Goal 'Food for Thought'. Annex to the document Meeting of European Union Defence Ministers, Sintra, 28 February 2000

<u>Europe's Security and Defence Policy Confronted with International Terrorism - Reply to the Annual Report of the Council</u>, Report to the Assembly of the Western European Union, 3 December 2001

European Council, Cologne, 3-4 June 1999, Presidency Conclusions

European Council, Göteborg, 15-16 June 2001, Presidency Conclusions

European Council, Helsinki, 10-11 December 1999, Presidency Conclusions

European Council, Laeken, 14-15 December 2001, Presidency Conclusions, Annex II

European Council, Nice, 7-9 December 2000, Presidency Conclusions

European Council, Santa Maria da Feria, 19-20 June 2000, Presidency Conclusions

European Council, Vienna, 11-12 December 1998, Presidency Conclusions

Extraordinary European Council Meeting, Brussels, 21 September 2001

Final Communiqué, Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held in Reykjavik on 14 May 2002

Franco-British statement on European Defence, Cahors, 21 February 2001

Franco-British Summit, <u>Joint Declaration on European Defence</u>, 4 December 1998

German Presidency Paper on Strengthening European Security and Defence Policy, Bonn, 24 February 1999

German-Dutch Memorandum of Understanding on Mutual Cooperation to Reinforce European Air Transport Capacity, Brussels, 14 May 2001

Bibliography

Implementation of the Common European Security and Defence Policy and WEU's Future Role, - reply to the annual report of the Council, Assembly of the Western European Union, the Interim European Security and Defence Assembly, 6 December 2000

Improving the Coherence and Effectiveness of the European Union, Action in the Field of Conflict Prevention. Report to the Nice European Council by Secretary General/High Representative and the Commission, Nice, 8 December 2000

Informal Meeting of EU Foreign Ministers in Eltville, 13-14 March 1999, German Proposal.

Informal Meeting of the EU Defence Ministers, Ecouen, 22 September 2000, Conclusions

North Atlantic Council, Washington Summit Communiqué, 1999

Plan of Action: European Policy to Combat Terrorism, 21 September 2001

Police Capabilities Commitment Conference, Brussels, 19 November 2001

Resolution on the Establishment of a Common European Security and Defence Policy Rapporteur: Catherine Lalumère, European Parliament, 30 November 2000

Statement of Priorities for the Finnish Presidency, 26 June 1999

The Alliance's Strategic Concept approved at the North Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C., on 23 and 24 April 1999

The Belgian Presidency of the European Union, 1 July-31 December 2001, Priorities Note European Security and Defence Policy

The IGC and the Security and Defence Dimension – Towards an Enhanced EU Role in Crisis Management, Memorandum, 25 April 1996, Finland, Sweden

Time for Defence Draft Plan for Action Proposed by the Assembly of the WEU, 15 March 1999

WEU Council of Ministers, Audit of Assets and Capabilities for European Crisis Management Operations, Luxembourg, 23 November 1999

Work Programme of the Belgian Presidency, Prime Minster Guy Verhofstadt, Address to the European Parliament, 4 July 2001

Oral Witness

Iain Duncan Smith, Shadow Secretary of State for Defence, oral statement to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 26 April 2001

Ian Davis, BASIC, oral evidence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 5 December 2002

Bibliography

Julian Lindley-French, 'Memorandum on the Recent Developments in the Common European Security and Defence Policy', written evidence to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 16 June 2001

Klaus Nauman, oral witness to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 13 December 2001

Professor Michael Clarke, oral witness to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 19 July 2001

The Rt. Hon. Geoffrey Hoon, oral witness to the Select Committee on the European Union, House of Lords, 3 October 2001

Speeches

Closing speech by Alain Richard, Minister of Defence, at the symposium of the "Association Diplomatie et Défence", Paris, 18 April 2001

Closing speech by President Francois Mitterrand at Ecole de Guerre Forum, 'The State of European Security at the Dawn of the 21st Century', 11 April 1991

Discours Prononce par Monsieur Jacques Chirac, President de la Republique Francaise, devant le Parlement européen, 4 July 2000

Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine, Statement on the Intentions of the French Presidency to the General Affairs Council, 12 July 2000

Foreign Minister Jaime Gamma Statement on the Portuguese Work Programme at the General Affairs Council, 24 January 2000

'From Confederation to Federation – Thoughts on the Finality of European Integration', Speech by Joschka Fischer at the Humboldt University in Berlin, 12 May 2000

Intervention by Dr Javier Solana, High Representative for the CFSP, COPSi/NAC first joint meeting, Brussels, 19 September 2000

Jacques Chirac, Discours devant l'assembly general de l'association du traité atlantique, Strasbourg, 19 October 1999

Minster for Foreign Affairs Anna Lindh, "Conflict Prevention and Civilian Crisis Management – Statement in the European Parliament", 14 March 2001

NEW WORLD CHALLENGES: THE FRENCH VISION, Speech by Hubert Védrine, Minister of Foreign Affairs, at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, 28 March 2001

Bibliography

Notre Europe, Discours Prononce par Monsieur Jacques Chirac, President de la Republique Francaise, Devant Le Bundesdag Allemand, 27 June 2000

Opening Statement by Foreign Minster Tarja Halonen, President of the Council at an open debate on the General Affairs Council, 19 July 1999, Brussels

Pertti Torstila, 'Finland's Successful Presidency', Speech at the Hungarian Atlantic Council, 22 March 2000

Policy statement delivered by Federal Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in the German Bundestag on the forthcoming European Council in Laeken on 14/15 December 2001, Berlin, 12 December 2001

Prime Minister Tony Blair's speech: Doctrine of the International Community at the Economic Club, Chicago - 24 April 1999

Prime Minister Tony Blair, Speech at Lord Mayor's Banquet, 22 November 1999

Prime Minister Tony Blair, Committed to Europe, Reforming Europe, speech in Gent, 23 February 2000

Remarks by Minister of Defence Alain Richard, 'Défence européene et souveraineté, Paris, 20 October, 2000

Richard Hatfield, 'The Consequences of St Malo', Institute de Francais des Relations Internationale, Paris, 28 April 2000

Sir Michael Jay, British Ambassador to France, 'The European Security and Defence Policy and Transatlantic Relations', Lecture at the Cicero Foundation, Paris, 29 March 2000

Speech by Chancellor Gerard Schröder at the conference 'New Foundations for European Integration', Brussels, 19 January 1999

Statement by Karsten Voigt, Co-ordinator for Germany-American Co-operation at the German Foreign Ministry, 'German Perspective on the ESDP and NATO', 24 January 2001

Speech by M. Alain Richard, Minister of Defence to the "Wehrkunde", Munich, 3 February 2001

Speech by the Prime Minister Tony Blair on Foreign Affairs at Whitehall, 15 December 1998

US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbot 'America's Stake in a Strong Europe', RIIA, London, 7 October 1999

US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 15 December 1999

Miscellaneous

Comprehensive Concept of the Federal Government on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building, Auswärtiges Amt, December 2002

ESDP: A Key Project for European Unification, Auswärtiges Amt, March 2003

Preventing Violent Conflicts –A Swedish Action Plan, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Ds 24, 1997

Sweden's policy of non-participation in military alliances remains unchanged' – Press release, The Swedish Parliament, 7 May 1999

'Transatlantic Trends 2003', A project of the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Compagnia di San Paolo, 2003

Secondary Sources

Adréani, Gilles, Bertram, Christoph and Grant, Charles, 'Europe's Military Revolution', Centre for European Reform, 1998

Araud, Gérard, et al., 'Les institutions de l'Europe de la défense', Defense national, december 2000

Ash, Timothy Garton, In Europe's Name: Germany and the Divided Continent (London: Vintage, 1994)

Bailes, Alyson, 'European Defence and the Changing Politics of the European Union: Hanging Together or Hanging Separately?', Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 39, No. 3, 2001

Bartlett, C. J., The Special Relationship – A Political History of Anglo-American Relations since 1945 (London: Longman, 1992)

Baylis, John, Anglo-American Defence Relations 1939-1984 (London: Macmillan, 1984)

Bohnen, Johannes, 'Germany', in Jolyon Howorth and Anand Menon (eds.), The European Union and National Defence Policy (London: Routledge, 1997)

Brenner, Michael, Parmentier, Guillaume, Reconcilable Differences: U.S.-French Relations in the New Era (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2002)

Bildt, Carl, Uppdrag Europa (Stockholm: Nordstedts Förlag, 2003)

Bjurner, Anders, 'Vision and Achievements of the Swedish Presidency in Developing a Civilian Crisis Management Capability', Conference Report, Stockholm 20 April 2001

Boniface, Pascal, Vive la bombe, Edition No. 1, Paris, 1992

Bibliography

Booth, Ken, <u>Strategy and Ethnocentrism</u> (New York: Praeger Publisher, 1979)

Bulmer, Simon, Jeffery, Charlie and Paterson, William E., <u>Germany's European Diplomacy - Shaping the Regional Milieu</u> (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)

Borawski, John and Young, Thomas-Durell, <u>NATO After 2000: The Future of the Euro-Atlantic Alliance</u> (Westport: Praeger Publisher, 2001)

Brauner, Wolfgang, 'Evaluation of the German Presidency', <u>Dossier</u>, Deutsche-Aussenpolitik, 2000

Chrysochou, Dimitris N., <u>Theorizing European Integration</u> (London: Sage Publications, 2001)

Clark, Michael, 'Defence and Security in Britain's External Relations' in Lawrence Freedman and Michael Clark (eds.), <u>Britain in the World</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)

_____ 'American Reactions to Shift in European Policy: The Changing Context', in John Roper (ed.), <u>The Future of British Defence Policy</u>, Joint Studies in Public Policy (Hants: Grower Publishing, 1985)

_____ (ed.), <u>Achieving the Helsinki Headline Goals</u>, Discussion Paper, Centre for Defence Studies, November, 2001

Coker, Christopher, 'The Special Relationship in the 1990s', <u>International Affairs</u>, Vol. 68, No. 3, July 1993

_____, 'Empires in Conflicts', <u>Whitehall Paper 58</u>, The Royal United Service Institute, 2003

_____, 'The United States and its Global Vision: Europe-US Alliance Post Iraq War', in Terhi Souminen and Eero Kytömaa (eds.), <u>The United States and the World</u>, Occasional Papers, No. 4, Atlantic Council of Finland, 2004

Cogan, Charles, <u>The Third Option –The Emancipation of European Defense 1989-2000</u> (Westport: Praeger, 2001)

_____, <u>French Negotiation Behaviour: Dealing with La Grande Nation</u> (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute for Peace Press, 2003)

Cooper, Robert, <u>The Breaking of Nations</u> (London: Atlantic Books, 2003)

Dahl (nee Nilsson), Ann-Sofie, <u>Den moraliska stormakten</u> (Stockholm: Timbro, 1991)

_____, Ann-Sofie, <u>Svenskarna och NATO</u> (Stockholm: Timbro AB, 1999)

Daun, Åke, <u>Europeisk identitet</u> (Kristianstad: Kristianstads Boktryckeri AB, 1992)

Deutsch, Karl, et al., <u>Political Community and the North Atlantic Area</u> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957)

Bibliography

Davis, Jacquelyn K. and Pfaltzgraff, Robert L., 'Britain and the Atlantic Alliance, Implications for U.S. Policy', <u>Special Report: British Security Policy and the Atlantic Alliance: Prospects for the 1990s</u> (Washington, D.C.: International Defence Publishers, 1987)

Dwan, Renate, 'Themes to Be Dealt with and Challenges to Be Met', <u>Conference Report</u>, Stockholm 20 April 2001

de Bressy, Bernard, 'Défense ou intervention: le paradox européen', <u>Défense national</u>, avril 2000

Deighton, Anne (ed.), <u>Western European Union 1954-1997 Defence, Security and Integration</u> (Oxford: European Interdependent Research Unit, 1998)

_____, 'European Union Policy' in Anthony Seldon, <u>The Blair Effect - The Blair Government 1997-2001</u> (London: Little, Brown and Company, 2001)

Delpech, Térese, 'International Terrorism and Europe', <u>Chaillot Papers</u>, No. 56, European Union Institute for Security Studies, December 2002

Dover, Robert, 'British European Defence Policy 1997-2000: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Critique of Domestic Policy Formation' (Ph.D. dissertation: University of Bristol, 2004)

Duke, Simon, <u>The EU and Crisis Management</u> (Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration, 2002)

Dörfer, Ingemar, <u>Nollpunkten: Sverige i det andra kalla kriget</u> (Stockholm: Timbro, 1992)

Fanning, Ronan, 'Defence and Security', in Paul Gillespie (ed.), <u>Blair's Britain England's Europe – A View from Ireland</u> (Dublin: The Institute of European Affairs, 2000)

Ferreira-Pereira, Laura C., 'The Military Non-Aligned in the CFSP of the 1990s,' <u>European Integration Online Papers</u>, No. 3, Vol. 7, 2004

Forster, Anthony, 'The State of the Art: Mapping the Landscape of European Integration', <u>Journal of International Relations and Development</u>, 1997

_____, 'Britain and the Negotiation of the Maastricht Treaty: A Critique of Liberal Intergovernmentalism', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, Vol. 36, No. 3, September 1998

_____, <u>Euro Scepticism in Contemporary British Politics</u> (London: Routledge, 2002)

_____ and William Wallace, 'NATO's Real Purpose', <u>Survival</u>, Vol. 4, No. 43, 2002

Franklin, Michael with Wilke, Marc, <u>Britain's Future in Europe</u> (London: Printer Publishers, 1990)

Freedman, Lawrence, 'The Changing Nature of Military Conflict', <u>Survival</u>, Vol. 40, No. 4, 1999

_____, 'Can the EU Develop an Effective Military Doctrine?', in Steven Everts et al. (eds.), <u>A European Way of War</u>, Centre for European Reform, 2004

Bibliography

Friis, Lykke, 'Challenging a Theoretical Paradox: The Lacuna of Integration Policy Theory', <u>Global Society</u>, 1997

Gergory, Shaun, <u>French Defence Policy in the Twentieth Century</u> (Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000)

George, Bruce, 'The British Labour Party and Defence', <u>The Washington Papers</u>, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1991

George, Stephen, <u>An Awkward Partner – Britain in the European Community</u>, (Third Edition), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

Ginsberg, Roy, 'Narrowing the Capabilities-Expectation Gap', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, Vol. 37, No. 3, September 1999

Gnesotto, Nicole, <u>La puissance et l'Europe</u> (Paris: Presses de Science Po, 1998)

Goldmann, Kjell, <u>International Norms and War Between States: Three Studies in International Politics</u>, (Stockholm: Swedish Studies in International Relations, 1971)

Gordon, Philip H., 'Their Own Army? Making European Defense Work', <u>Foreign Affairs</u>, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2000

Gowland, David and Turner, Arthur (eds.) <u>Britain and European Integration 1945-1998</u> (Harlow: Longman, 1999)

Grey, Colin, <u>Modern Strategy</u> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

Gustavsson, Jakob, <u>The Politics of Foreign Policy Change: Explaining the Swedish Reorientation on EC Membership</u> (Department of Political Science, Lund, 1998)

Grant, Charles, 'Can Britain Lead in Europe?', <u>Centre for European Reform</u>, London, 1998

Gueldry, Michel R., <u>France and European Integration -Toward a Transnational Polity?</u> (London: Praeger, 2001)

Haas, Ernst B., <u>The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces 1950-57</u> (London: Stevens, 1958)

Hagman, Hans-Christian, "European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities", <u>Adelphi Papers</u>, No. 353, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2003

Hallergård, Carl, 'The Council's Efforts in Building a Coherent EU Civilian Crisis Management Capability', <u>Conference Report</u>, 20 April 2001, Stockholm

Manners, Ian, and Whitman, Richard, (eds.), <u>The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States</u> (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997

Bibliography

Hansen, Annika S., 'Civil-Military Cooperation: The Military, Paramilitary and Civilian Police in Executive Policing', in Renate Dawn (ed.), <u>Executive Policing: Enforcing the Law in Peace Operations</u>, Sipri Research Report No. 16, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)

Hartley, Keith, "Evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee on the European Union", Written Evidence, 2 March, 2000

Healy, Denis, <u>The Time of My Life</u> (London: Michael Joseph, 1998)

Hennessy, Peter, 'The Blair Style of Government: An Historical Perspective and an Interim Audit', Government and Opposition, No. 1, Vol. 33, 1997

Heisbourg, Francois, 'Europe's Strategic Ambitions: The Limits of Ambiguity', <u>Survival</u>, Vol. 42, No. 2, 2001

Heuser, Beatrice, <u>Nuclear Mentalities?</u> (London: Macmillan Press, 1998)

Hix, Simon, 'Approaches to the Study of the European Community and the Challenge to Comparative Politics', <u>West European Politics</u>, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1994

Hoffman, Stanley, 'The European Process at Atlantic Cross Purposes', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, 1991

_____, 'Europe's Identity Crisis Revisited', <u>Daedalus</u>, 123, No. 2, 1994

Holbrook, Richard, <u>To End a War</u> (New York: Random House, 1998)

Holworth, Jolyon, 'European Integration and Defence: The Ultimate Challenge?', <u>Chaillot Papers</u>, No. 43, Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, 2000

_____, 'The European Security Conundrum: Prospects for ESDP after September 11 2001', <u>Notre Europe Policy Paper</u>, No. 1, March 2002

Isaak, Alan C., <u>Scope and Methods of Political Science</u> (Pacific Grove: Dorsey Press, 1985)

Johansson, Karl Magnus, 'Introduktion', in Karl Magnus Johansson, <u>Sverige i EU</u> (Stockholm: SNS Förlag, 2002)

Johnson, Franklyn Arthur, <u>Defence by Committee</u> (London: Oxford University Press, 1960)

Jonson, Pål, <u>Användandet av marinstridskrafter vid militära krishanteringsinsatser</u> , FOI Rapport-0211-SE, 2001

Johnston, Alastair Ian, 'Thinking About Strategic Culture, <u>International Security</u>, Vol. 19, No. 4

Jörgensen, K.E, <u>Reflective Approaches to European Governance</u> (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999)

Kampfner, John, <u>Blair's Wars</u> (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003)

Bibliography

Kagan, Robert, 'Power and Weakness', <u>Policy Review</u>, No. 121, 2003

Kaiser, Karl, <u>Germany's New Foreign Policy</u> (New York: Palgrave, 1998)

Kegley, Charles W., (ed.), <u>Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and Neoliberal Challenges</u> (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995)

Keohane, Daniel, ´Realigning Neutrality? Irish Defence Policy and the EU', <u>Occasional Paper</u>, No. 24, Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, 2001

Kupchan, Charles, 'From European Union to Atlantic Union', in Jan Zielonka (ed.) <u>Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy</u> (London: Kluwer, 1998)

_____, 'In Defence of European Defence: An American Perspective', <u>Survival</u>, Vol. 41 No. 2, 2000

Lagendijk, Joost, 'Green Views on the European Security and Defence Policy', <u>EU-Buitenland</u>, 23 July 2004

Lenzi, Guido (ed.), <u>WEU at 50,</u> WEU Institute for Security Studies, 1998

Lutwak, Edward, 'The Americans Can't Believe how Useless the Europeans Are', <u>Los Angeles Times</u>, 12 September 1998

Manigart, Philipe, <u>Public Opinion and European Defence</u>, Royal Military Academy, Belgium, 2001

Martin, Laurence and Garnett, John, British Foreign Policy, Royal Institute of International Affairs (London: Cassell Imprint, 1998)

Maull, Hanns W., 'Germany and Japan', <u>Foreign Affairs</u>, Winter, 1990

_____, 'Germany and the Use of Force: Still a Civilian Power?', <u>Survival</u>, Vol. 42, No. 2, 2000

Menon, Anand, <u>France, NATO and the Limits of Independence 1981-1997 - The Politics of Ambivalence</u> (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000).

Menon, Anand and Hurell, Andrew, 'Politics Like No Other? Comparative Politics, International Relations and the Study of the EU,' <u>West European Politics</u>, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1996

Missiroli, Antonio, 'CFSP, Defence and Flexibility', <u>Chaillot Papers</u>, No. 38, Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, 2000

Mearsheimer, John, 'Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the End of the Cold War', <u>International Security</u>, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1990

_____, 'The False Promise of International Institutions', <u>International Security</u>, No. 4, Vol. 54, 1994

Bibliography

Medley, Richard, 'Europe's Next Big Idea', <u>Foreign Affairs</u>, Vol. 78, No. 5, 1999

Moravcsik, Andrew, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach,' <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, December 1993

_____, 'Taking Preferences Seriously: Liberalism and International Relations Theory', <u>International Organization</u>, Vol. 32 No. 3, 1997

_____, <u>The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht</u> (London: University College London Press 1998)

_____ and Kalypso, Nicolaidis, 'Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, March 1999

Moss, Bernard H., 'Round Table on Theory and Methodology in Moravcsik's *The Choice for Europe*', The 12th International Conference of Europeanists, and a biennial event organised by the Council for European Studies. www.europanet.org/conference 2000/abstracts/moss.htm

Myrdal, Sara (ed.), EU som civil krishanterare, (Stockholm: Utrikespolitiska Institutet, 2002)

Naumann, Klaus, 'Europe's Military Ambitions', <u>Centre for European Reform</u>, 20 June 2000.

Northedge, F.S., 'Britain as a Second-Rank Power', <u>International Affairs</u>, Vol. 1, No. 46, 1970

_____, <u>The Decent from Power</u> (London: Allen & Unwin, 1974)

O'Hanlon, Michael, 'The American Way of War: Lessons for Europe', in Steve Everts et al. (eds.), <u>A European Way of War</u>, Centre for European Reform, 2004

Ojanen, Hanna, 'Participation and Influences: Finland and Sweden Post-Amsterdam Developments of the CFSP', <u>Occasional Paper</u>, No. 11, Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, 2000

_____, 'Sweden & Finland: What Difference Does it Make to Be Non-Aligned?' in Nina Graeger, Henrik Larson and Hanna Ojanen (eds.), <u>The ESDP and the Nordic Countries – Four Variations on a Theme</u> (Helsinki: The Finish Institute of International Affairs, 2000)

_____, 'Hopes, Expectations and Worries – The Challenging Task of Heading the Development of the CFSP/ESDP in a Diversifying Union', in Hans Zettermark, Magnus Hägg and Caroline von Euler (eds.), <u>The Baltic Room: Extending the Northern Wing of the European House</u>, Strategic Yearbook 2001(Stockholm: Nordstedts Tryckeri, 2000)

Peterson, John, 'Decision Making in the European Union: Toward a Framework for Analysis', <u>Journal of European Public Policy</u>, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2000

Peterson, John and Sjursen, Helen (eds.), <u>A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of the CFSP</u> (London: Routledge, 1996)

Plischke, Elmer, 'West German Foreign and Defence Policy', <u>Orbis</u>, 12/4, 1969

Bibliography

Puchala, Donald, 'The Integration Theories and the Study of International Relations', in C.W. Kegley and E. Wittkopf (eds.), <u>The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives</u> (Random House, New York, 1984)

Quinlan, Sir Michael, 'European Defence Co-operation', <u>RUSI Journal</u>, April, 2001

Rees, Wyn, 'The Anglo-American Security Relationship', in Stuart Croft (ed.), <u>British Security Policy- The Thatcher Years and the End of the Cold War</u> (Worcester: Harper Collins Academic, 1991)

Richardson, Jeremy, 'Governments, Interest Groups and Policy Change', <u>Political Studies</u>, Vol. 48, No. 5, 2000

Riddell, Peter, <u>Hug Them Close –Blair, Clinton, Bush and the Special Relationship</u> (London: Politico's, 2003)

Roper, John, 'The Political Realities of European Defence Co-operation', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, Vol. 38, September 2000

Ross, George, <u>Jacques Delores and European Integration</u> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

Rynning, Sten, <u>Changing Military Doctrine: Presidents and Military Power in Fifth Republic France, 1958-2000</u> (New York: Praeger, 2002)

_____, 'A European Strategic Culture? The ESDP and 21st Century Geopolitics, ECPR workshop No. 12, Edinburgh, 2 April 2003

Rutten, Maartje, 'From Nice to Laeken European Defence: Core Documents', <u>Chaillot Papers</u>, No. 51, EU Institute for Security Studies, 2002

Sbragia, Alberta, (ed.), <u>Europolitics</u> (Washington, D.C.: Brooking's Institution, 1992)

Sandholtz, Wayne and Zysman, John, 'Recasting the European Bargain', <u>World Politics</u>, Vol. 42, No. 1, 1992

Santi, Rainer, <u>100 Years of Peace Making</u> (Zurich: International Peace Bureau 1991)

Sarotte, Mary Elise, 'German Military Reform and European Security', <u>Adelphi Paper</u>, No. 340, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2001

Scott, Len, 'British Perspectives on the Future of European Security', in Colin McInnes, <u>Security & Strategy in the New Europe</u> (London: Routledge, 1992)

Silverstri, Stefano, 'Atlantic and European Defence After Kosovo', <u>The International Spectator,</u> 1999

Smith, Michael J., 'Humanitarian Intervention: An Overview of Ethical Issue', <u>Ethics and International Affairs</u>, Vol. 12, 1999

Bibliography

Smyser, W.R., <u>How Germans Negotiate - Logical Goals Practical Solutions</u> (New York: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2003).

van Eekelen, Willem, <u>Debating European Security 1948-1998</u>, SDU-CEPS, Brussels, 1998

Védrine, Hubert with Moisi, Dominique, <u>France in an Age of Globalization</u> (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001)

Vos, Hendrik and Baillieul, Emilie, "The Belgian Presidency and the Post-Nice Process after Laeken", <u>ZEI Discussion Paper</u>, 2002

Wallace, William (ed.), <u>The Dynamics of European Integration</u> (London: Printer/RIIA, 1992)

Waltz, Kenneth N., <u>Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis</u> (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959)

Wedin, Lars, 'The European Security and Defence Policy from the Factory Floor', in Elisabeth Davidson, Arita Eriksson and Jan Hallenberg (eds.), <u>Europeanization of Security and Defence Policy</u>. Publication of a conference held at the Swedish National Defence College in Stockholm, 5 December 2001

Whiteman, Richard, 'Amsterdam's Unfinished Business - The Blair Government's Initiative and the Future of the Western European Union', <u>Occasional Paper</u>, No. 7, Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, 1999

Wincott, Daniel, 'Institutional Interaction and European Integration: Toward an Everyday Critique of Liberal Intergovernmentalism', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u>, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1999

Periodical Sources

Agence Europe,
Atlantic News
BBC
Dagens Nyheter
Die Welt
The Economist
Euronews
European Voice
Financial Times
The Guardian
Svenska Dagbladet
The Times
Washington Post

Appendix

Appendix 1. Sources of the Reluctance to Use Military Force

The reluctance to use military force is basically a very positive, sound and desirable aspect of a strategic culture. Yet this reluctance has at times taken rather extreme forms in Europe and some claim that it sometimes has left opponents to the use of military force in a position that by *implication* accepted the ambitions of terrorists, warlords and tyrants and contradicted reason, justice, proportionality and pragmatism.[844] The conceptual transformation of the use of military force from 'wars of necessity', which primarily focused on handling the existential threat that a possible invasion from the Warsaw Pact would have represented to the survival of a free Western Europe, to 'wars of choice' typified by the military crisis management operations that followed after the end of the Cold War have not been a non-controversial issue in Europe. This is despite the fact that these 'wars of choices' often have been undertaken on humanitarian grounds rather than just merely to pursue state interests.[845] There have, to differing degrees, been upheavals and public outcries in the streets of many European capitals, which have involved different political circles and sections of the general public at the time of the four main military operations, in which European forces have participated since the end of the Cold War, i.e., Operation *Desert Storm* in 1991, Operation *Allied Force* in 1999, Operation *Enduring Freedom* in 2001 and Operation *Iraqi Freedom* in 2003.

Some of these political expressions are considerably more vocal, frequent and arguably influential within the EU than in most other places in the world and they have traditionally occurred especially frequently among Green and left-wing political groups in Europe.[846] In many cases, it also has been these political elements that have most frequently opposed what they have perceived as the 'militarisation' of the EU as a result of the development of a military crisis management capability within this organisation. These groups often view the use of military

---

[844] According to Michael J. Smith, the very vivid opposition, both among some political circles and elements of the public within the EU state governments, to Operations *Desert Storm* in 1991 and *Allied Force* in 1999 can be seen through such a perspective. See Michael J. Smith, 'Humanitarian Intervention: An Overview of Ethical Issue', Ethics and International Affairs, Vol. 12, 1999.

[845] This is not to say that there was a consensus within Europe on *how* to deal politically and strategically with the threat that the Soviet Union constituted to Western Europe. Some advocated conciliation while others argued for a more offensive model. Yet it seems as if there was a general consensus on the point that there had to be some sort of military response if an invasion ever took place. The most extreme voices of some elements of the German peace movement that stated 'better red than dead' never had any resonance among the general public in Europe. Regarding the concepts 'wars of necessity' and 'wars of choice', see Lawrence Freedman, 'The Changing Nature of Military Conflict', Survival, Vol. 40, No. 4, 1999.

[846] These groups often have links with peace/alternative organisations, such as the Inter-Church Peace Council, the Council for Nuclear Disarmament, Euro-Communists and independent ecological and feminist groups. They have been particularly vocal in countries, such as Germany, Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom and Sweden.

force as something inherently evil and non-rational under almost any circumstances since it is perceived to breed injustice, hatred and animosity. Furthermore, some elements take an absolute position regarding pacifism, which means that they reject all purposes for the use of force regardless if it is for aggressive purposes or for self-defence.[847] They might be seen as rather extreme. Yet the fact that they constitute a significant part of the political landscape within the EU also on strategic issues reflects a political grouping that has serious doubts about the use of military force even in some forms of crisis management operations.[848]

There are, at least, five factors, for which LI is unable to account. They seem consciously or subconsciously to have, to different degrees, influenced values and norms in Europe in a *direction* towards a reluctant approach to the use of military force. This has, thereby, effected, in part, the shape and content of the ESDP process and, in turn, the balance and emphasis of its crisis management tools. These factors are a hybrid of alternative interpretations of Christian ethics, a Socialist inspired political culture, the conceptual heritage of nuclear pacifism and, most of all, the dreadful experiences from the World Wars in Europe combined with its aftermath, which witnessed a peaceful integration process in an internally non-aggressive environment. These defining features were to prevent the use of military force and future wars.[849] Again this study does not argue that these factors have been the sole or even principal sources for the structure and approach of the ESDP process and they have certainly not explicitly always been at the forefront of the minds of the policy makers within the EU state governments when they have been developing their preferences for the ESDP process. However, as noted by Collin Grey, strategic culture, or an element of a strategic culture in the case of the EU, is about the *habit* of mind. Moreover, these factors have collectively had a decisive impact on shaping European

---

[847] For an assessment of some of the basic features of pacifism, see Inis L. Claude, <u>Swords into Ploughshares</u> (New York: Random House, 1971).

[848] Green Parties, for example, constitute a significant part (larger than five percent) of the political landscape in countries like Austria, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Finland, Ireland, Germany, and Sweden. In the two latter countries, they also constitute either a part of the government (in Germany) or political support to the minority government (in Sweden) by the time the ESDP process was initiated. Almost all of the Green Parties, to varying degrees, adhere to pacifistic ideals. However, they have been spilt in their views on the necessity and desirability of the ESDP process. See Joost Lagendijk, 'Green Views on the European Security and Defence Policy', <u>EU-Buitenland</u>, 23 July 2004.

[849] To a certain degree, the issue of historic references and assessments can be separated through a specific pre-set political filter and can be seen as negative aspects insofar as each decision taken regarding war and peace should preferable be based on objective assessments rather than ethnocentric historical or political references, especially since each conflict has its own dynamics and circumstances. However, undesirable or not, since wars and conflicts always contain aspects of uncertainty and friction, historical points of reference are an intrinsic element in how states and people position themselves and come to terms with issues of war and peace. Thus, in essence, these aspects shape the strategic thinking of states. See, for example, phenomena, such as the Vietnam syndrome, the Somalia syndrome and how French strategic thinking has been shaped by the experiences of the Second World War etc.

thinking about issues of war and peace that have a bearing on how the EU citizens and their political leaders view the use of military force in contemporary Europe. If these factors were disregarded on the basis of rationalist or unitary actor behaviour assumptions, an important part of the explanation would be missed for why the EU has developed a somewhat constrained form of military statecraft by way of adopting merely a military crisis management capability and putting considerable emphasis on conflict prevention and civilian crisis.

Firstly, the issue of whether Christianity can be a source of inspiration for the general reluctance to use military force that seems to exist in Europe is, to a certain degree, ambiguous.[850] On the one hand, Christianity is considerably more practised in the United States than in the EU, even though the general reluctance to use military force is considerably more widespread within the latter. Thus, it is seems as if there is a correlation between Christianity and a general inclination towards non-military forms of conflict resolutions and it derives from certain interpretations of Christianity with reference to issues of war and peace.

David Martin has developed an influential typology that sees Christian thinking regarding war as having three distinctive strands: the crusade tradition, the just war tradition and the absolute pacifism tradition.[851] The last strand is often closely associated with the so-called alternative Christianity movement that is almost exclusively is found within Protestantism. It rejects all forms of armed conflicts regardless of the reason and it is based on the gospel, which it claims unequivocally condemns warfare.[852] Thus, the defining difference between this strand and the just war tradition is that the former does not ascribe to the Augustinian (Catholic) distinction between the use and abuse of military force. This strand has also politically been very vocal in various places in Europe at times when it has seemed as if some of the states were on the road to war or conflict.[853] Thus, the rather strong stand that some denominations of Christianity take in a

---

[850] This is also a factor that seems to vary from country to country. The Catholic Church in France has never played an influential role in this regard given the strong secular tradition in this country. Yet, in Germany, the Church has played a very influential role partly because there exists a certain degree of guilt within the Church that it had been too accommodating towards the Nazi governments and partly because the separation of religion and politics has not been very prominent. See Heuser, Nuclear Mentalities?, p. 191.

[851] According to its adherents, the crusade tradition was, of course, deemed to be 'just' *per se*. However, the wars that were conducted in the names of these traditions would not correspond well with *Jus ad Bellum* aspects, such as 'right intentions', 'probability of success', 'last resort' and *Jus in Bello* aspects, such as 'discrimination', 'proportionality' and 'minimum of force', which are the core concepts of just war theory.

[852] David Martin, 'Christian Ethics and Deterrence' in David Martin and Peter Mullen (eds.), Unholy Warfare: The Church and the Bomb (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited, 1983), p. 91.

[853] See, for example, the British Council of Churches' criticism of the Thatcher government's intention to retake the Falkland Islands from Argentina in 1982. This objection, in part, was based on a pacifistic interpretation of the gospel.

number of places within the EU on this issue seems to have affected, at least, some elements in Europe, which have shown a general reluctance to use military force.[854]

Secondly and more importantly, the disinclination to use military force also seems to have its origins in some parts of the Socialist movements in Europe and Marxist writings on war and capitalism.[855] It has been argued on the basis of the historical phenomena of the 19th and 20th centuries that peaceful tendencies and pacifistic movements are predominantly related to a political orientation that is best-labelled Democratic Socialist or Social Democracy and is also reflected in some Labour parties and trade unions.[856] The Socialist values should, according to these scholars, contrast to capitalist Social Darwinism, which emphasises competition and success at all costs - a value system that increases structural violence and subsequently behavioural violence, including state violence.

The reluctance to develop the so-called 'militarisation' of the EU also derives from the outlook that some Green and left-wing parties have on the role of the armed forces in society. This is because many of these parties claim to represent anti-militarism, which also has its origins in the Socialist tradition and particularly in the thinking of the anarchists and syndicalists regarding war and peace.[857] These ideologies despise the formal hierarchy that so profoundly shapes the armed forces and it is claimed that the working class should refuse 'to bear arms' since wars are fought to serve the interests of the political leadership and are driven by greed and nationalism. The armed forces are seen as the watchdog of the political leadership and it stands in the way of emancipating the working class from a class-based society. In essence, anti-militarist thinking basically sees the role of the armed forces as being part of the problem rather than part of the solution in order to create a more peaceful world.[858] People with sympathy for this line of

---

[854] Examples of Christian groups that have advocated pacifism on a religious basis are the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Inter-Church Peace Council.

[855] However, these positions of Socialism and pacifism were not undisputed. Leon Trotsky claimed that no Socialist could be pacifist since war and revolution was an inherit instrument to establish a Socialist world order. Neither did the Soviet Union's strategic behaviour indicate any higher degree of reluctance to use military force. Thus, the streak of distaste for using military force that Socialism has generated is a sectarian element of this ideology. See Leon Trotsky, 'Pacifism as the Servant of Imperialism', Communist International, English Edition, No. 5, 1917.

[856] Ernst L. Moerk, 'Socialism and Pacifism: Historical Relations, Value Homologies, and Implications of Recent Political Developments, or the Return of History', Peace and Conflict Journal of Peace Psychology, Vol. 3 No. 1, 1997.

[857] Examples of such anti-militarism groups are Nie wieder krieg and the Ohne mich-movment, which were founded in Germany in the early 1950s.

[858] See, for example, Kurt Tucholsky's dictum 'Soldiers are murderers' in Pazifismus '81', Der Spiegel, 15 June 1981.

thinking have, therefore, consequently had very ambiguous feelings about the EU abandoning its traditional civilian power identity in order to also develop a military dimension.

Given the impact that the Socialist and Social Democratic movements have had on the European political landscape during the last two centuries, it comes as no surprise that some of the writings on war and peace from these movements have had an impact on the European perception of the use of military force, especially among the Greens and left-wing groups in Europe. It should also be noted that the historic experiences of militarism and fascism in different forms created strong anti-war-movements in Europe and in the immediate years after the Second World War led to an increased support for Euro-Communism partly because this movement was seen to oppose their fascist counterparts.[859] The support of Socialist ideals in Europe, which are in sharp contrast to the political preferences concurrent in the United States, have, in part, increased the appeal of pacifism and anti-militarism as well as the general reluctance to use military force. This does not imply that these views are only applicable to the Socialist camp in Europe, but rather that some strands of Socialist thinking on war and peace have contributed to influence the debate on the use of military force. However, this being said Socialism and some denominations within Christianity have only mattered, to a degree, in influencing European thinking towards a reluctance to use military force. Moreover, they have had an asymmetric impact since they predominately, but not exclusively, have appealed to their followers. Most importantly, neither of these two factors prevented the outbreak of World War Two in Europe caused by the Nazi government in Germany.[860]

Thirdly, in the early 1950s, nuclear pacifism increasingly emerged as the nexus of the peace movement in most industrialised states (It should be noted that this development was greatly appreciated by the Soviet Union, which had no qualms about exploiting the nuclear pacifists for its own interests).[861] Given the indiscriminate nature of nuclear weapons and some of the contra-

---

[859] The relevance of pop culture in marketing and increasing the appeal of a modified version of this movement should not be underestimated especially during the height of the counterculture in the 1960s. Many of the political expressions of this movement still derived from the pacifist Marxist perception that government instruments, such as power, coercion and authority, are obstacles in the way of obtaining love, understanding and individual independence. Furthermore, all that stands between perpetual peace and understanding is, according to this movement, property, nationalism and patriotism. Bernice Martin, 'Religion, Culture and Anti-Nuclear Sentiments', in Martin & Mullen (eds.), Unholy Warfare: The Church and the Bomb, p. 116.

[860] It could actually be argued that anti-militarism and pacifism were part of the problem since these movements had somewhat contributed to the efforts made by Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain in Munich in 1938 and the arms reduction in Britain during the inter-war years.

[861] Examples of such organisations were Göttingen Appell, Council for Nuclear Disarmament and Kampf dem Atomtod. The World Peace Council and the so-called Stockholm Appeal, which wanted to outlaw nuclear weapons,

intuitive aspects of nuclear deterrence, as a means to assure peace and stability nuclear pacifism had a wider appeal than traditional pacifism and anti-militarism, which were predominately motivated by Socialist thinking on war and peace and some strands of Christian ethics.[862] Thus, it is not surprising that entering the nuclear age was, in part, shaped by controversies, pacifistic outcries and political polarisation in Europe.[863] Accordingly, when war became associated with nuclear annihilation, this created a sense that all wars were immoral and wrong even among wider circles than just absolute pacifists and antimilitarists.[864] This notion that reflects rather confused thinking has, to a certain extent, survived the end of bipolarity and the nuclear age within some quarters and has within Europe created a general disinclination to use force.

Another consequence of the nuclear pacifism movements that has also, to a certain extent, a bearing on the view of using military force was that it gave the guardian of nuclear deterrence, i.e., NATO, an image problem within some countries. Especially some of the non-aligned state governments in the EU, such as Sweden and Ireland, have expressed considerable sympathy for the causes of the nuclear pacifism movements since they had the political leeway of doing so seeing as they were not officially under the nuclear umbrella of NATO's extended deterrence. These governments, therefore, often expressed stern criticism of the concept of 'nuclear deterrence' and regularly portrayed NATO in negative terms.[865] Given the fact that the non-aligned states never had to be committed allies in fighting the Cold War and were de facto free riders thanks to the security NATO provided Western Europe during the Cold War, it should,

---

were, for example, strongly supported by the Soviet Union. According to the Soviet Union's 'own estimates', a flabbergasting 700 million people, predominately within the Soviet empire, signed the Stockholm appeal. Rainer Santi, 100 Years of Peace Making, (Zurich: International Peace Bureau, 1991).

[862] As noted, just war theory is based on the notions of discrimination and minimum use of force, which are difficult ideals to follow in the event that nuclear deterrence failed. However, given the fact that the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact posed an existential threat to the survival of a free Western Europe, the political leaders were left with no option, but to rely on nuclear deterrence. In reference to the dilemma that this posed to Christian ethics, Chancellor Adenauer, in 1957, eloquently stated that the question revolved around whether Western Europe should remain Christian or become Communist. In Heuser, Nuclear Mentalities?, p. 191.

[863] Some of the elements of the peace movement in Germany did, for example, refer to the decision taken by NATO to deploy nuclear weapons on German territory as the preparation for a 'global Auschwitz'. Ibid., p.181.

[864] See, for example, the statement by German Defence Minster and later Secretary General of NATO Manfred Wörner in 1983 that 'every modern war is a crime'. Ibid., p.185.

[865] As non-alignment, or neutrality as it was referred to then, acquired more of an ideological content during the latter stages of the nuclear age, the policy itself was transformed from expediency to ideology, i.e., neutrality became filed with moral overtones and came to be seen as a goal in itself, rather than being a means to an end. To be neutral was to be aloof from the battle and reject the immoral intrigues of the superpowers and their preoccupation with nuclear deterrence, working instead for what was good and what was right. This belief system offered certain attractions in terms of self-perception, and soon became part of the national identity of these countries. Robert Dalsjö eloquently refers to this dimension of Swedish non-alignment and the often-prevalent self-perception that came with it as follows: 'to be Swedish was to be neutral; to be neutral was to be good, thus it was good to be Swedish'. See Robert Dalsjö, 'Security in Northern Europe after Prague and Copenhagen - A Swedish Perspective', Lecture at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, 3 March 2003.

based on the very nuclear deterrence that the non-aligned countries rejected, be, of course, noted that they were able to devote much time and effort to developing well intended, but rather idealistic alternative non-violent approaches to conflict resolution. The norms that these states developed, both in relation to the view of nuclear deterrence and NATO and the reluctance to use military force and the preference for non-violent approaches to conflict resolution, have arguably made it somewhat more difficult for them to accept the idea that it was necessary for the EU to develop a military dimension to handle crises in its vicinity.

Fourthly, the dreadful experiences of the World Wars in Europe that left over 60 million Europeans dead have most generally, but also most decisively, shaped the reluctance to use force among the wider public, irrespective of their religious affiliation or political preferences in Europe. After the initial somewhat positive sentiments towards the First World War, it was soon realised that the war, especially on the Western front, had degenerated into a humanitarian disaster without proportions. It is, therefore, indicative that the first real peace movements in Europe started to emerge after the war.[866] The Second World War displayed the ultimate failure of peaceful interstate relations in Europe. It led to a divided and ruined continent morally bankrupted by collaboration, militarism and murder.[867] It is impossible to understand European thinking regarding war and peace and the development of the EU's management tools for such issues without referring to these wars. Given the track record of the use of military force in Europe over the last century, it is not surprising that it is a contentious issue and that a cautious approach, which, to a large extent, focuses on prevention and management, has been developed.

The World Wars served as the catalyst for the European integration process, which ultimately was a quest for constructing a Europe, where war within the Community was politically unthinkable and technically impossible. Thus, the entire European integration process has been defined as a means to prevent the use of military force and war.[868] Therefore, as some scholars point out, this reluctance to use military force is in the EU deeply ingrained in the general public. These scholars claim that the EU, in its search for peace and stability, has within its security community developed a form of European 'exceptionalism' whereby the interaction between the state governments is based on principles of rule of law and negotiations rather than power

---

[866] However, local peace movements started to emerge already by the end of the Napoleonic wars, such as the London Peace Society in 1815. Moreover, several pacifistic institutions were founded in the 1890s, including the International Peace Bureau and the Inter-Parliamentarian Union.
[867] Cooper, The Breaking of Nations, p. 164.
[868] Coker, 'Empires in Conflicts', p.33.

politics and a show of force.[869] Consequently, after a century, in which the European state system has spawned conflicts of catastrophic proportions, it is not surprising that the state governments had decided to operate within a legal framework and a system, within which conflicts are settled peacefully. The integration process typifies this. This system has brought great and international unforeseen benefits to the EU. However, as Robert Cooper notes, this system has also brought some illusions as were apparent during the conflicts in the Balkans, when some EU state governments thought that peace and justice could be achieved by 'just asking people to be reasonable'.[870] Yet, as Cooper points out, it was, in the end, the use of military force that enabled peace and relative stability to be established in the Balkans.

This leads to the fifth factor that has created a reluctance to use military force within the EU. The system of mediation, arbitration and focusing on non-military solutions is self-perpetuating for the reluctance to use force since it strengthens the notion that war is avoidable or even unnecessary since there are other forms of conflict resolution instruments that can be used for handling conflicts. Christopher Coker states that this tendency to prefer diplomatic rather than coercive instruments is not only the result of the political expressions from the Greens and left-wing groups, but also a post-modern feature of contemporary Europe.[871] From a normative standpoint, this is undoubtedly positive since such an approach can save enormous humanitarian and economic costs if it is successfully applied. Yet there seems to be a grain of truth in Robert Kagan's controversial article *Power and Weakness*, in which he claims that Europe is blinded by the assumption of the applicability and universalism of its own post-modern system.[872] This system of arbitration, mediation and co-operation might work well within the Euro-Atlantic community, but they are hardly the right instruments to deal with tyrants, warlords and dictators. Robert Cooper takes this argument further by claiming that, as the EU expands its external relations, it has to overcome the inhibitions to use force. Moreover, it has to develop double standards for the instruments that it employs internally and the instruments it uses when engaging with tyrants and dictators, where more coercive and subversive methods are needed when interacting with the latter.[873]

---

[869] Ibid.; and Cooper, The Breaking of Nations.
[870] Cooper, The Breaking of Nations, p. 160.
[871] Coker, 'Empires in Conflict', p. 42.
[872] However, the author of this study does not share Kagan's main thesis that the view on the use of force is foremost decided by the distribution of power. This study argues that it is predominately the historical experiences rather than the relative absence of military power that has affected European thinking regarding the use of force. Kagan, 'Power and Weakness'.
[873] Furthermore, Cooper claims somewhat controversially that the EU has to engage in a new form of 'imperialism' in order to spread good governance in the form of human rights, market economy and democracy to weak states.

This would make them more stabile and their populations less susceptible to the appeal of international terrorism. Yet, Cooper does not assert that the EU state governments should abandon their desire to solve problems with negotiations and legal means since multilateralism and negotiations are the centrepiece of the existence of the EU. The objective should be to work towards a world increasingly ruled by law rather than by force. However, this should not be an excuse for not engaging in tough-mined policies when required to deal with serious threats that, in the long run, might pose a threat to the EU and its values. Cooper, <u>The Breaking of Nations</u>.