# The Path of the European Union Battlegroups

## A Historical Institutionalist Analysis of the Development of the EU Battlegroups since 1998

Caroline Schoofs

3856410

RMA Modern History (1500-2000)

Utrecht University

Supervisor: prof. dr. Jacco Pekelder

Second Reader: dr. Marloes Beers

Date: 21 February 2018

# Abstract

This thesis analyses the development of the EU Battlegroups, aiming to shed light on the question why the ambitious rhetoric of the EU deviates from reality considering the fact that these forces have not been deployed yet. Since the literature does not offer a proper theoretically informed explanation for this discrepancy, this thesis addresses the theoretical lacuna. After outlining the benefits and shortcomings of European integration and International Relations theory, this thesis argues that historical institutionalism has the best credits for analysing the EU decision-making process regarding the development of the Battlegroups. This approach highlights the importance of the historical institutional context in which rational actors make decisions, thus looks further than EU member states' intentions. This context proved instrumental for understanding why the outcome of the development process (e.g. the inactive Battlegroups) deviates from the ambitious rhetoric of the EU on the need to play a full role at the international stage.

This thesis invokes the metaphor of a tree to explain how the historical institutional context influenced EU decision-making regarding the Battlegroups. This thesis argues that the EU member states started to climb the tree in the late 1990s when a critical juncture took place. The decisions made in and influenced by the historical context subsequently could not be changed or reversed due to the institutional context. Only when a new critical juncture took place, after the successful Operation Artemis in 2003, the EU was able to climb on a new branch. This decision was again embedded within the historical context. The consequence of these past decisions, as well as of the decisions *not* made, was that there were political, military, and financial obstacles to the Battlegroups deployment. The institutional context again restricted the Union from transferring to another branch or to climb down to the trunk of the tree. In practice, this meant that the EU failed to change the concept of the Battlegroups and that abolishment of these forces was undesirable. Therefore, the EU member states continue to argue in favor of the concept, even though it has proven to be an inefficient outcome because deployment was difficult or even impossible.

# Contents

**Abbreviations** ..... **6**
**Introduction** ..... **9**
Academic debates ..... 11
History matters ..... 12
Sources ..... 15
Outline of the thesis ..... 16
**Chapter 1 – Theoretical framework** ..... **19**
1.1 European Integration Theory ..... 19
1.2 International Relations Theory ..... 23
1.3 Historical institutionalism ..... 28
1.4 Process-tracing ..... 32
**Chapter 2. The critical juncture of St. Malo** ..... **35**
2.1 Drawing together Europeanists and Atlanticists ..... 35
2.2 Defining new goals ..... 37
2.3 Outlining the institutional framework ..... 40
2.4 Establishing new institutions ..... 43
2.5 Committing capabilities ..... 45
2.6 Conclusions ..... 46
**Chapter 3. Limits to the European project** ..... **49**
3.1 Rules and norms ..... 49
3.2 Endogenous institutional pressure ..... 54
3.3 Exogenous institutional pressure ..... 55
3.4 Conclusions ..... 61
**Chapter 4. A new juncture** ..... **63**
4.1 Pressure for developing the CSDP ..... 63
4.2 Testcase for autonomous rapid military action ..... 70
4.3 Introducing the Battlegroups ..... 73
4.4 Revising the Headline Goal ..... 75
4.5 Copy-paste ..... 76
4.6 Conclusions ..... 79
**Chapter 5. Inefficient outcome** ..... **81**
5.1 Obstacles to deployment ..... 81
5.2 Battlegroups in action or inaction? ..... 83

5.3 Institutional change ..... 88
5.4 Attempts to change ..... 91
5.5 Small breakthrough ..... 95
5.6 Conclusions ..... 98
**Conclusion ..... 101**
**Bibliography ..... 107**
Primary sources ..... 107
News articles ..... 110
Secondary sources ..... 116

# Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| CFSP | Common Foreign and Security Policy |
| COREPER | Committee of Permanent Representatives |
| CSDP | Common Security and Defence Policy |
| CESDP | Common European Security and Defence Policy |
| DRC | Democratic Republic of Congo |
| ECSC | European Coal and Steel Community |
| EDC | European Defence Community |
| EEC | European Economic Community |
| ESDI | European Security and Defence Identity |
| ESDP | European Security and Defence Policy |
| ESS | European Security Strategy |
| EU | European Union |
| EUMC | EU Military Committee |
| EUMS | EU Military Staff |
| GAERC | General Affairs and External Relations Council |
| HR | High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy |
| IFOR | Implementation Force |
| KFOR | Kosovo Force |
| NAC | North Atlantic council |
| NATO | North Atlantic Treaty Organization |
| NATO IMS | NATO International Military Staff |
| NATO MC | NATO Military Committee |
| NRF | NATO Response Force |
| OAF | Operation Allied Force |
| PSC | Political and Security Committee |
| SFOR | Stabilization Force |
| SHAPE | Strategic Headquarters Allied Force Europe |
| SHIRBRIG | Standby High-Readiness Brigade |

| | |
|---|---|
| UK | United Kingdom |
| UN | United Nations |
| UN OCHA | UN Office of for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs |
| UNPROFOR | UN Protection Force |
| US | United States |
| WEU | Western European Union |
| WMD | Weapons of Mass Destruction |

# Introduction

We, the members of the European Council, are resolved that the European Union shall play its full role on the international stage. To that end, we intend to give the European Union the necessary means and capabilities to assume its responsibilities regarding a common European policy on security and defence.[1]

- Declaration of the European Council, Cologne, 3-4 June 1999.

In full compliance with international law, European security and defence must become better equipped to build peace, guarantee security and protect human lives, notably civilians. The EU must be able to respond rapidly, responsibly and decisively to crises, especially to help fight terrorism.[2]

- Global Strategy for the Union's Foreign and Security Policy, June 2016.

These quotes exemplify the rhetoric of European Union (EU) leaders since the late 1990s. It started when France and Britain made an agreement in St. Malo in 1998, which has become a milestone in European history. The two countries decided that the EU needed the capacity for autonomous military action to enable itself to play its full role on the international stage, an agreement that all EU member states soon endorsed. From this ambition, the concept of the Battlegroups emerged. Each Battlegroup consisted of 1,500 forces drawn from the EU member states. These Battlegroups were able to perform humanitarian and rescue missions, as well as peacekeeping and peacemaking tasks. Furthermore, the Battlegroups could be deployed rapidly, within five to ten days, and sustained for 30 days with a possible extension to 120 days. After its establishment in 2005, the Battlegroups reached full operational status in 2007. Since then, every six months there were two such Battlegroups on standby for military deployment in crisis situations.

However, the reality is in striking contrast with the ambitious rhetoric. While the wish to establish a rapid response capacity has become reality, the Battlegroups have not been deployed in the last ten years. Academics as well as EU leaders have therefore called upon the

[1] European Council in Cologne, 'Declaration of the European Council on strengthening the common European policy on security and defence', 3-4 June 1999, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 41-45, 41.
[2] 'Shared Vision, Common Action: a Stronger Europe', A Global Strategy for the Union's Foreign and Security Policy, June 2016, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *Strategy Matters. Key Documents 2015-2016* (Paris 2016), 57-119, 90.

EU to 'use them or lose them'.[3] Nevertheless, EU member states continue to argue for the relevance of rapid response, although the concept originated in the late 1990s. As the second quote above shows, rapid response was also considered relevant for the security threats of today's world, not least terrorism. Therefore, the EU has attempted to improve the concept to enable the deployment of the Battlegroups ever since the concept was launched. So far, this did not have concrete results.

The non-deployment of the Battlegroups was a symptom of a larger phenomenon. In the 1990s, the EU not only decided to develop a rapid reaction force but also a broader Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP). Within the CESDP, first shortened to European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) and finally changed into Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) in 2009, ambitious rhetoric similarly contrasted with the reality. Although the EU did conduct several military and civilian operations in the past, these mainly took place in crisis situations in which other organizations such as NATO had already cleared the air. In other cases, troops from other organizations accompanied the EU forces. In addition, the size of the military operations was in general fairly limited.[4] As Charles Grant, director of the Centre for European Reform, noted, the EU was irrelevant as a security actor in the largest humanitarian crises.[5] Therefore, the capability-expectations gap between what the EU promises to deliver and what it actually can deliver, remains to exist.[6]

To understand why the implementation of the security and defence policy diverged from the EU's ambitious rhetoric, resulting in the capability-expectations gap, this thesis will analyse how and why the EU developed the Battlegroups. It examines initial proposals for

---

[3] See Jolyon Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union* (Basingstoke 2014) 84; Kees Homan, 'EU-Battle groups. Use them or Lose them', *Armex* (2011) 4, 18-19; Frans Boogaard, 'Hennis: stuur Europese strijdkrachten het veld in', *Algemeen Dagblad,* 27 April 2017, https://www.ad.nl/politiek/hennis-stuur-europese-strijdkrachten-het-veld-in~a7fcce38/ (accessed 4 December 2017); Among others, former Swedish Foreign Minister Carl Bildt, has publicly warned that if a BG is not deployed soon, the concept as such will fade away, see Jan Joel Andersson, 'If not now, when?', The Nordic EU Battlegroup', *Brief Issue – European Union Institute for Security Studies* (2015) 11, 1-2, 1.

[4] Anand Menon, 'Empowering Paradise? The ESDP at Ten', *International Affairs* 85 (2009) 2, 227-246, 229; Panos Koutrakos, *European Security and Defence Policy* (Oxford 2013), 129-132.

[5] Charles Grant, *Is Europe doomed to fail as a power?* (London 2009), 7.

[6] Christopher Hill coined this term in 1993 to describe the gap between what the European Community was said to be capable of on the international stage and what it could actually deliver. Asle Toje argued that the concept of capability-expectations gap also holds for the European Union. Only since the EU has developed its capabilities since the late 1990s, it was not the lack of capabilities but the inability to create consensus that caused the gap between rhetoric and reality. See: Asle Toje, 'The Consensus-Expectations Gap: Explaining Europe's Ineffective Foreign Policy', *Security Dialogue* 39 (2008) 1, 121-141, 121-122.

developing a rapid response force since the late 1990s, the subsequent establishment of the current Battlegroup concept in 2003-2004 and the attempts to improve this concept up until the summer of 2017. In particular, this thesis will shed light on the question how the EU puts its ideas into practice. More importantly, the question is raised why the EU often did *not* implement other ideas, such as proposals for reforming the Battlegroups.

**Academic debates**

Until today, the academic literature does not offer any proper answer to the question why and how the Battlegroups developed. Academics have mainly limited themselves to factual descriptions of the emergence of the Battlegroups without asking critical questions, let alone applying a theoretical lens. Some of the works describe the factors that have contributed to the development of the Battlegroups, which will be discussed in chapter 2, such as the inability of the EU to jointly intervene in the Yugoslav wars of the late 1990s. But, these works barely explain the discrepancy between the EU's rhetoric and the non-deployment of the Battlegroups.[7]

Moreover, most academics have focused on normative questions and policy advice. Questions that are central in their works are: what is wrong with the current Battlegroup concept? And, can the concept be improved? The work of Gustav Lindstrom, who dedicated an extensive and often-quoted paper on the Battlegroups in 2007, exemplifies this approach. Lindstrom, current Director of the European Institute for Security Studies, started his paper by outlining the Battlegroups concept, elaborating on the composition, tasks and deployment time of these forces. Hereafter, Lindstrom indicated what challenges the Battlegroups would face in the near future. These included operational challenges such as the need to improve strategic airlift, as well as political-strategic ones. The airlift was required, simply because without it the EU would not have the means to bring its forces to the area of operation. Among the political-strategic challenges were the relations between the Battlegroups and similar forces such as the NATO Response Force.[8]

Another challenge was that of employability. As discussed into detail in chapter 5, several obstacles could obstruct the deployment of the Battlegroups. One was the inflexibility of the concept of the Battlegroups since these were designed after a specific military operation.

[7] See for example: Tommi Koivula, 'The Origins and First Years of the European Union Battlegroups', *Diskusion & Debatt* 1 (2010), 110-126; Mika Kerttunen, 'The EU Battlegroup – its Background and Concept', *Diskussion & Debatt* 1 (2010) 127-150, 138.
[8] Gustav Lindstrom, *Enter the EU Battlegroups*, Chaillot Paper 97 (Paris 2007) 62. This force will be further discussed in chapter 4.

In addition, countries had to commit forces to a Battlegroup beforehand which was problematic because at the time they committed the forces, these countries could not foresee where the forces would be deployed. In case a participating country had no interest in deploying the Battlegroup to a particular crisis situation, deployment was unlikely. At the same time, Lindstrom argued, participating in a Battlegroup also limited the ability of participating countries to deploy forces to other missions. Even without deployment of a Battlegroup, forces had to remain on standby. After indicating the challenges, Lindstrom made policy recommendations to face these challenges.[9]

Many academics have built upon Lindstrom's work. Often by doing case-studies of non-deployment, they expanded the list of challenges to the EU Battlegroup's deployment.[10] Although all these works are very insightful about the obstacles to Battlegroup deployment, they do not explain how these obstacles came into being nor do they explain why the EU member states were unable to remove the obstacles. In sum, what these works all have in common is that they analyse both the present and the future but forget about the past. This thesis will address this theoretical lacuna by assessing the insights of different theories and examining how these might improve our understanding of how and why the Battlegroups emerged and, more broadly, of how the EU makes decisions within the CSDP.

**History matters**

For the study of the EU Battlegroups, two sets of theories are relevant: theories of European integration and International Relations (IR) theory. This thesis will start by delving into these theories and analyses how these can contribute to the study of the CSDP in general and the emergence of the Battlegroups specifically. What these theories have in common is that they focus on sole causes that drive political decisions, such as the decision to establish a rapid

[9] Lindstrom, *Enter the EU Battlegroups,* 59-61.

[10] For examples of case-studies, see: Ludovica Marchi Balossi-Restelli, 'Fit for what? Towards explaining Battlegroup inaction?', *European Security* 20 (2011) 2, 155-184; Rik Coolsaet, Sven Biscop and Jo Coelmont, 'Mali: Another European Intervention without the EU?', *European Security Brief* 42 (2013) 1, 1-4; Giovanni Faleg, 'Castles in the Sand: Mali and the demise of the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy', *CEPS Commentary*, 18 January 2013, 1-3; Richard Gowan, 'From Rapid Reaction to Delayed Inaction? Congo, the UN and the EU', *International Peacekeeping*, 18 (2011) 5, 593-611; Richard Gowan, 'The EU and Libya: Missing in Action', *ECFR Commentary*, 31 May 2011; Anand Menon, 'European Defence Policy from Lisbon to Libya', *Survival* 53 (2011) 3, 75-90; Yf Reykers, 'No supply without demand: explaining the absence of the EU Battlegroups in Libya, Mali and the Central African Republic', *European Security* 25 (2016) 3, 346-365. For general discussions of the Battlegroups, see: Claudia Major and Christian Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', *Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik Research Paper* 8 (2011) 1-36; Laura Chappell, 'Deploying the EU Battlegroups: Mission Impossible?', *CFSP Forum* 7 (2009) 6, 7-12.

response force. Neofunctionalism underlines the role of spill over, whereas liberal intergovernmentalism considers political decisions the result of intergovernmental bargains over national interests. The neorealist school of International Relations mainly looks at changes in the international system. Finally, liberalism and constructivism respectively analyse the role of economic interests and ideas. Many of these insights are helpful for understanding why the EU in the late 1990s decided to launch the security and defence cooperation.

As we have already seen however, there is a gap between the EU's ambitions and the actual implementation. This implies that the factors, derived from above-mentioned theories, explaining the EU's ambitions cannot explain the subsequent non-deployment of this force. For example, if the EU wanted the develop a rapid response force because the member states came to believe in the idea that a rapid response force was necessary, then why did they consider deployment of this force not necessary? Also, if the EU aimed for developing an autonomous military force because it tried to balance the power of the United States (US), then why did the member states not make use of this force? To fill this gap, we must shift our focus from sole causes to the process in between these initial conditions and the outcome. As chapter 1 will further explain, historical institutionalism is a useful tool to understand such processes.

Historical institutionalism analyses factors that influence political behaviour and outcomes, specifically the role of the institutional context.[11] This context is provided by institutions, defined by Kathleen Thelen and Sven Steinmo as both formal and informal rules, procedures, norms and organizations.[12] Besides stressing the importance of institutions *at a specific moment in time,* historical institutionalism also underlines the influence of institutions *over time.* In other words, the approach assumes that past decisions, especially those made during so-called 'critical junctures', affect later ones. Chapter 1, after outlining the concept of critical junctures, explains how the decisions made during such junctures affect political behaviour and outcomes and can become path-dependent.[13] Path-dependency means that, as if

[11] Peter Hall and Rosemary Taylor, 'Political Science and Three New Institutionalisms', *Political Studies* 44 (1996), 936-957, 947-54; Mark A. Pollack, 'The New Institutionalisms and European Integration', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 125-143, 127.

[12] Kathleen Thelen and Sven Steinmo, 'Historical Institutionalism in comparative politics', in Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen and Frank Longstreth (eds.), *Structuring Politics. Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (Cambridge 1992), 1-32, 2.

[13] Giovanni Capoccia and R. Daniel Kelemen, 'The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism', *World Politics* 59 (2007) 3, 341-369, 341; Scott Page, 'Path Dependence', *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* (2006) 1, 87-115, 88; Pollack, 'The New

one is climbing a tree, the decision to climb a specific branch influences later decisions because it becomes more and more difficult to climb to a completely other branch or to climb down. It is more beneficial instead to climb further up on the same branch. In practice, this means that policymakers tend to continue the same policy line, even when the process generates unintended consequences.[14] This line of argument suggests that it is not only important to understand why a specific path was chosen, but also why other paths were not chosen and, more importantly, to what extent it was possible to change to different paths.

The notion of unintended consequences, in particular, contributes to our understanding of the Battlegroups since it can explain why the EU implemented its wish to have the capacity for autonomous and rapid military action and afterwards never made use of this capacity. Moreover, it can explain why the EU member states, without using the Battlegroups, continued to argue for these forces' importance. In addition, the approach of historical institutionalism allows for analysing the process in which the Battlegroups developed, instead of sole causes of this development or of the Battlegroups' non-deployment.

This thesis will test the historical institutionalist insights by answering the following research question:

> *To what extent are the establishment of the Battlegroups in 2004 and its subsequent development the result of path-dependent processes generated by the critical juncture of St. Malo in 1998?*

The French-British summit in St. Malo is chosen as the starting-point of this thesis since this summit launched the CSDP and the development of the Battlegroups. This thesis will trace the process that started in St. Malo and analyse to what extent this process was path-dependent.[15] Tracing the process, a methodology outlined in chapter 1, means to map the processes between the initial conditions and a particular outcome, aimed at identifying causal

---

Institutionalisms and European Integration', 127; James Conran and Kathleen Thelen, 'Institutional Change', in Orfeo Fioretos, Tulia Faletti and Adam Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford 2016) 1-25, 6.

[14] Menon, Anand, 'Power, Institutions and the CSDP: the Promise of Institutionalist Theory', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49 (2011) 1, 83-100, 86.

[15] According to Hall, 'seeing politics as a process that is structured across space and time is a perspective closely associated with historical institutionalism'. Peter Hall, 'Politics as a Process Structured in Space and Time', in Orfeo Fioretos, Tulia Faletti and Adam Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford 2016) 1-26, 1.

mechanisms.[16] This thesis thus aims to analyse the role of path-dependent processes as a causal mechanism to explain the development of the Battlegroups.

**Sources**

To understand the process of the Battlegroups' development, this thesis examined official documents such as European Council Conclusions, ministerial meetings, outcomes of bi- or trilateral summits, the Battlegroup Concept, and proposals for improving the EU's military capacities. Many of such documents were collected by the European Union Institute for Security Studies and published under the name 'Core Documents'. These collections were valuable and composed a large part of the corpus. It is important to note that these documents constitute a *selection* of sources relevant for the development of the CSDP. To have a complete image of the Battlegroups' development, these sources had to be complemented with additional documents, mainly from the European Council's archive and the websites of the European Parliament and NATO. With these documents I established a timeline of the decisions made by the EU and the reactions of important actors from within the EU or from organizations such as NATO.

Many documents, however, remain classified. For example, minutes of European Council meetings were not available to the public.[17] Therefore, the available documents were supplemented by news articles which provide more detailed information about the direct context of meetings: what preceded the meetings, what the participants of the meetings said about their intentions, how the discussions evolved, and how the outcomes were received by different institutions or persons. These documents gave insight into the context of the decisions. In addition, these sources shed light on the options available to the EU member states and on the directions not taken. Understanding what options EU member states had and why they did not choose specific options is, following the approach of historical institutionalism, just as important for understanding the directions taken because these reveal how much room for manoeuvre EU member states had within the historical institutionalist context.

[16] Pascal Vennesson, 'Case Studies and process tracing: theories and practices', in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences. A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge 2008), 223-239, 224, 232.
[17] Michael E. Smith, *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy. The institutionalization of cooperation* (Cambridge 2004) 13; Jean-Yves Haine, 'Introduction', in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003) 11-12, 12.

**Outline of the thesis**

This thesis starts with a detailed discussion of the theoretical framework. I will explain why theoretical explanations failed to account for the development of the Battlegroups, followed by a discussion of historical institutionalist' insights. I will outline how these insights will help us understand how the Battlegroups have developed since France and Britain decided that the EU needed to develop its capacity for autonomous military action, including a rapid reaction force. After this, the thesis will take a chronological approach, focusing on the sequencing of events and decisions within the evolving political, social and economic context.

The critical juncture of St. Malo is central to chapter 2. This chapter first outlines which forces contributed to the occurrence of the critical juncture. It then discusses the decisions made during this juncture. It aims to show how the historical institutional context, that enabled the juncture to occur, also influenced the direction that was taken during this juncture, leading to the establishment of a Headline Goal, military bodies, and initial capabilities.

Path-dependency is central to the next chapter. Chapter 3 analyses how the historical institutional context limited the room for manoeuvre of the EU member states until 2003. Informed by the approach of historical institutionalism, the historical institutional context is considered to not only comprise institutions like those of the EU itself and of NATO, but also includes formal and informal rules and norms. Credibility proved to be a relevant informal norm creating path-dependent processes. Most importantly, the range of options available to EU member states was limited because of the formal rule that decisions had to be taken unanimously

Chapter 4 analyses the period between 2003 and 2007, in which member states arrived at a new juncture. Although the main aim to develop the capacity for autonomous military action remained the same, the EU member states chose an alternative path by adjusting their military goals. The result was a revised Headline Goal which came to include the concept of the Battlegroups as we know it today. Following the structure of chapter 2, the fourth chapter analyses the causes that led to this juncture and how these influenced the decisions made during the juncture.

Chapter 5 focuses on the consequences of the decisions made during the new juncture. In other words, it analyses how the decisions made during the critical juncture generated path-dependent processes. During this period, in the years between 2007 and 2017, primarily the unanimity rule continued to restrict the EU's capacity to make decisions on both deployment

of the Battlegroups and reform of the concept. The chapter, finally, explains why the EU member states continued to argue for the Battlegroups' relevance, even though it remained questionable if they would ever see these forces in action.

The thesis ends with a conclusion in which the development of the Battlegroups since 1998 is explained by using the metaphor of a tree that is outlined in the next chapter. The concluding chapter discusses the merits of historical institutionalism for understanding the development of the Battlegroups, as well as the approach's shortcomings. Also the research method used is placed under scrutiny, outlining the benefits and pitfalls. Finally, the conclusion tables possibilities for further research, including research into the Battlegroups. The thesis also holds that the approach of historical institutionalism can help us understand wider political decision-making processes, both inside and outside the EU.

# Chapter 1 – Theoretical framework

As of today, theoretical accounts of how and why the Battlegroups emerged are still virtually non-existent. Initially, also the literature on the CSDP was more of 'journalistic quality', incorporating factual descriptions of the emergence of the CSDP but without scrutinizing these.[18] This changed around 2007, when more and more academics attempted to explain the emergence of the CSDP. Since the Battlegroups are part of this CSDP, explanations for the latter's establishment might also explain the former's. But, as British political scientist Jolyon Howorth concluded in 2014, these academics published books and articles 'in an attempt to shed theoretical light on CSDP', suggesting that not all were successful.[19] As will be shown in this chapter, the theories that were used to study the CSDP indeed derogate from the reality in one way or another.

## 1.1 European Integration Theory

Since the 1950s, there is an ongoing process of European integration. Ernst Haas, a leading neofunctionalist, once defined integration as a process 'whereby political actors in several, distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations and political activities toward a new center, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states'.[20] Neofunctionalism, first formulated in the 1950s and 1960s, explains this new endeavour by focusing on the role of societal and market patterns. These create incentives to establish supranational institutions in particular policy areas. Since different policy areas are functionally interdependent, successful integration in one area creates pressure to integrate in connected policy areas. Because of these pressures, it is in the interest of policymakers as rational actors to implement further integration. This is a process called 'spill over', the core of neofunctionalism's assumptions. In this view, European integration is believed to be the consequence of initial economic integration, which then created incentives for further integration. National politicians made the decisions to create supranational

[18] Christopher Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy* (Baden-Baden 2010) 39; Ben Tonra and Thomas Christiansen, 'The study of EU foreign policy: between international relations and European Studies', in Ben Tonra and Thomas Christiansen (eds.), *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy* (Manchester/New York 2004) 1-9, 3-4.
[19] Howorth, S*ecurity and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 192.
[20] Cited in Thomas Diez and Antje Wiener, 'Introducing the Mosaic of Integration Theory', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 1-24, 2.

institutions such as the European Commission. But, once these institutions were created, actors within these organizations pressured for more and deeper integration.[21]

The neofunctionalist reading of European integration was not satisfying all. American political scientist Andrew Moravcsik, who published major works on liberal intergovernmentalism, argued that there is no gradual progression towards further integration like the concept of spill over suggested. Instead, Moravcsik added: 'Integration has only intermittently spilled over into related sectors and policies and, at least until recently, the autonomous influence of supranational officials has increased slowly and unevenly, if at all'.[22] The lack of gradual integration indicates that the causes for integration had to be found elsewhere.

Moravcsik agreed with neofunctionalists that states are rational actors pursuing the national interests.[23] However, he did not consider these national interests to be the result of economic pressures. As a *liberal* intergovernmentalist, Moravcsik applied 'a liberal theory of state preference', this in contrast to the intergovernmentalist perspective that is based on realist premises.[24] The latter, represented by Austrian political scientist Stanley Hoffmann, views state preferences as exogenously given geopolitical interests.[25] Moravcsik, instead, assumed that state preferences emerge from the domestic context. More importantly, liberal intergovernmentalists believe that states bargain over these interests. These intergovernmental bargains result in integration when the interests of the participants converge. This, in Moravcsik's eyes, explains the specific character of European integration.[26] Several countries negotiated over the possibilities of integration and, if all agreed, decisions were made to integrate. Because decisions were made occasionally, the process of integration was not as gradual as neofunctionalism suggests.

Neofunctionalism and liberal intergovernmentalism do agree on one point. The theories share the idea that integration is limited to the field of economic trade ('low politics')

---

[21] Arne Niemann and Philippe C. Schmitter, 'Neofunctionalism', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 44-66, 45-50; Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 201.
[22] Andrew Moravcsik, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: a Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31 (1993) 4, 473-524, 476.
[23] Andrew Moravcsik and Frank Schimmelfennig, 'Liberal Intergovernmentalism', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 67-90, 68-73; Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 200.
[24] Moravcsik, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community', 480.
[25] Diez and Wiener, 'Introducing the Mosaic of Integration Theory', 9.
[26] Moravcsik, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community', 480.

and is highly unlikely in the field of security and defence ('high politics').[27] For liberal intergovernmentalism, integration occurs after a convergence of interests. When states will gain more than they will lose, they will decide to integrate. However, cooperation in the field of security and defence is considered to only weaken the state.[28] Defence is assumed to be of a zero-sum nature; there will always be losers.[29] At the same time, these losses cannot be compensated for with less sensitive economic gains.[30] In other words, while cooperation in the field of security and defence might by economically beneficial because the EU member states can share in several costs, this gain will not weigh up to the loss of decision-making authority in this field. A complicating factor is the diversion of national preferences in the field of high politics, limiting the possibility of preference convergence, and therefore of integration.[31]

After the proposal for a European Defence Community (EDC) failed in the 1950s, an event that will be discussed in the next chapter, Hoffmann concluded that European integration would never attain the same in high politics as it did in low politics.[32] Finnish political scientist Hanna Ojanen argued that, when looking at the reality of the 1960s, 'the unfeasibility of a defence community was so blatantly evident that even the (neo)functionalists agreed that integration had its limits'.[33] Neofunctionalists consider integration limited to low politics because high politics do not have a similar day-to-day impact on people's lives than economic affairs have. As a result, there will be less pressure for integration in high politics, limiting the spill over potential.[34]

The French-British commitment to strengthen the EU's military capabilities made in 1998, followed by the CSDP, thus surprised the academic community.[35] Most scholars believed that, because the theories of neofunctionalism and liberal intergovernmentalism

---

[27] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 19; Frédéric Mérand, *European Defence Policy: Beyond the Nation State* (Oxford 2008)*,* 18; Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 200-201.
[28] Mérand, *European Defence Policy,* 12; Hanna Ojanen, 'The EU and NATO: Two Competing Models for a Common Defence Policy', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44 (2006) 1, 57-76, 59.
[29] Ojanen, 'The EU and NATO', 59.
[30] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 64.
[31] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 200.
[32] Mérand, *European Defence Policy,* 17.
[33] Ojanen, 'EU and NATO', 59.
[34] Ben Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration* (New York 2000) 62; Ojanen, 'EU and NATO', 60.
[35] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 19; Chris Bickerton, Bastien Irondelle and Anand Menon, 'Security Co-operation beyond the Nation-State: The EU's Common Security and Defence Police', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49 (2011) 1, 1-21, 8.

failed to predict the emergence of security and defence cooperation, these theories cannot explain this new phenomenon.[36] Ojanen, in contrast, argued that these theories were still relevant for studying the CSDP. 'Theories would not be theories, if they were unable eventually to cope also with problematic and challenging new evidence', Ojanen believed.[37] In other words, by adapting the theories to the new reality and by letting go of the high-low politics distinction, the theories could be revived. The CSDP was thus considered either a result of spill over or of converging state preferences.[38] Indeed, integration within the EU might have created pressure for cooperation in security affairs. Also, member states play an important role in the CSDP since these actors decide on the actual policies. But, when taking a closer look at these theories, one discovers more discrepancies than similarities between the theories' assumptions and empirical reality.[39]

For one, neofunctionalism predicts increasing supranationalism, a phenomenon that characterizes much of the cooperation within the EU, but not the security and defence cooperation. Article 42 of the Treaty of the European Union provides that the European Council ultimately decides, unanimously, on issues relating to the CSDP, including the deployment of the Battlegroups.[40] The continuing importance of the member states instead of supranational institutions thus contradicts neofunctionalist premises. Also, neofunctionalism has little to say on the source of spill over to the policy field of security and defence. The theory holds that supranational entrepreneurs or institutions push for further integration. The European Commission is often considered such an institution. Since the Commission had decision-making authority in certain policy fields, it could exert pressure for further integration. But, because the Commission lacked such authority in the field of security and defence, its pressure for integration was limited. An alternative approach is to consider the WEU as the source of spill over. However, according to political scientist Christopher Reynolds, WEU elites did not necessarily push for the CSDP's development, not least since they might lose from such a development. Simply said, they could lose their job when the CSDP would take over tasks from the WEU. This suggests that not supranational entrepreneurs, but other factors led to the establishment of the CSDP.[41]

---

[36] Mérand, *European Defence Policy,* 18; one exception is: Robert Dover, 'The Prime Minister and the Core Executive: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Reading of UK Defence Policy Formulation 1997-2000', *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 7 (2005) 4, 508-525.
[37] Ojanen, 'The EU and NATO', 61.
[38] Ibidem.
[39] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 20.
[40] Ibidem 24 and 30.
[41] Ibidem*,* 61-62.

Liberal intergovernmentalism equally has its difficulties in explaining both the CSDP and the Battlegroups. The theory assumes that major decisions are made at the multilateral level after a process of collective bargaining. The first steps towards security and defence cooperation, however, were made at the French-British bilateral conference in St. Malo in 1998, not on a multilateral level. Also, the next chapter will show that other important decisions were made during French-British conferences in Le Touquet in February and in London in November 2003. The European Council subsequently endorsed these decisions and copied large parts of the French-British declarations for use in the Council's own conclusions and declarations. Moreover, there was only little bargaining involved. Instead, after Britain and France reached agreements, other member states soon embraced these agreements without asking anything specific in return.[42]

Finally, both theories have difficulties explaining the development of the CSDP and the Battlegroups, specifically the reluctance of member states to implement an ambitious security and defence policy as is obvious from the fact that the Battlegroups have not been deployed yet. If the establishment of both the CSDP and specifically the Battlegroups were the result of either converging national interests or spill over, why did their development remain so limited? Political scientist Frédéric Mérand concluded that 'the two founding fathers of EU studies had very little to say about security and defence cooperation'.[43]

### 1.2 International Relations Theory

Since the theories of European integration failed to explain the emergence and development of the CSDP, scholars have turned to International Relations (IR) theory for alternative explanations.[44] Within IR theory, the neorealist school offered the main explanation. Neorealism, developed by the prominent American political scientist Kenneth Waltz in the 1960s-1970s, considers the state to be a unitary actor pursuing exogenously given national interests. In the anarchical international system, all states seek security for themselves.[45] Following from this is the assumption that integration in security and defence is unlikely because only states are actors that can engage in security and defence. The EU is not and can

[42] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 21; See also Mérand, *European Defence Policy,* 18-19.
[43] Mérand, *European Defence Policy,* 17.
[44] Ibidem*,* 19.
[45] Stephanie C. Hoffmann, 'CSDP: Approaching Transgovernmentalism?', in Xymena Kurowska and Fabian Breuer (eds.), *Explaining the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy. Theory in Action* (Basingstoke 2012), 41-62, 41.

never be such an actor.[46] As a result, not only the CSDP, but the EU as a whole is a 'hard case for realism'.[47]

Nevertheless, several neorealist scholars plundered their toolbox to explain why states did cooperate in the field of security and defence. Their approaches all share the neorealist emphasis on the international system in structuring political behaviour. Therefore, they search for explanations mainly in the systemic change that preceded the establishment of the CSDP. When the Cold War ended, the distribution of power altered. The international system changed from a bipolar into a unipolar order, leaving the US to be the only superpower since the 1990s. This US dominance, in the view of American political scientist Seth Jones, created incentives for EU member states to cooperate in the field of security and defence to increase their power. 'To be clear', Jones argued, 'European states are not pursuing balance-of-power politics'.[48] In other words, the EU's efforts were not inspired by a concern for a threat coming from the US. The EU rather aimed to have the means to compete with the US in the defence industry and at the same time aimed to decrease its reliance on the US. As noted earlier, the EU learnt from its experiences in Bosnia and Kosovo that depending on the US as a security provider was problematic since America did not have stakes in Europe's neighbourhood.[49]

In line with Jones' view, fellow American political scientist Barry Posen acknowledged that one could not speak of traditional balancing behaviour. But, the EU's 'search for autonomy may not in the first instance be directed against the United States, it nevertheless is motivated by the great power of the United States', Posen explained.[50] Posen and Jones thus assumed that the new power distribution, combined with the drifting apart of the two sides of the Atlantic, explained why the EU opted for the CSDP. The EU Battlegroups, Jones added, were established because the transatlantic relations became even more strained in the run up to the Iraq war.[51]

At first sight, the ideas of Jones and Posen seem to be very sound. The EU indeed wanted to build the capabilities to be able to act autonomously from the US. However, the intentions and decisions of EU member states diverge from what the balancing-argument

[46] Howorth, *Security and Defence Cooperation in the European Union,* 193.
[47] Lorenzo Cladi and Andrea Locatelli, 'Bandwagoning, not balancing: why Europe confounds realism', *Contemporary Security Policy* 33 (2012) 2, 264-288, 266.
[48] Seth G. Jones, 'The Rise of a European Defense', *Political Science Quarterly* 121 (2006) 2, 241-267, 255.
[49] Jones, 'The Rise of a European Defense', 246-248.
[50] Barry R. Posen, 'European Union Security and Defense Policy: Response to Unipolarity?', *Security Studies* 15 (2006) 2, 149-186, 50-51.
[51] Jones, 'The Rise of European Defense', 266.

predicts. If the EU's endeavour was truly inspired by resentment towards American primacy, we would expect the EU to try to match the American military capabilities that made the latter power superior. Moreover, we would expect a far more ambitious EU policy and less reliance on the US.[52] Why, then, did the EU never deploy the Battlegroups? Also, why did the EU continue to rely on NATO for mutual defence instead of establishing a mutual defence clause for the EU?[53] Similarly, why did the EU continue with the Berlin Plus negotiations between the WEU and NATO for guaranteed access to NATO assets? Finally, why did the EU develop strong ties with NATO? Especially the United Kingdom (UK) remained very much concerned with having a good relationship with the US throughout the process of development of the CSDP. This contradicted the idea that the UK, together with the other EU member states, tried to compete with the US or decrease their reliance on this superpower.

Italian political scientists Lorenzo Cladi and Andrea Locatelli therefore asked whether 'realists can pick up from their toolbox an alternative conceptualization for the European military ambition'.[54] Bandwagoning, in their view, is a 'useful answer' that the realist school offered. As the concept puts forth, the weaker power (the EU) decided to side with the stronger party (the US) for security as well as for particular gains. In neorealist tradition, this view considers systemic change to have resulted in the EU's lack of autonomy and weak bargaining position vis-à-vis the US. In this context, the EU did not develop the CSDP to be able to compete with the US, as Jones and Posen suggested, but to complement the US. The EU would gain from such strategy because, by making itself useful to the US, the US would be willing to assist the EU if necessary. 'It may appear that the best way to avoid being abandoned by the United States is once again to prove yourself useful (this, incidentally, also provides some degree of autonomy)', Cladi and Locatelli concluded.[55] To make itself useful, it is not necessary for the EU to match the US capabilities, what might explain the EU's limited ambition, as well as its continuing reliance on the US.

However, also the bandwagoning argument does not entirely match reality. As German political scientist Benjamin Pohl argued, this line of reasoning suggests that the EU's efforts in designing the CSDP were aimed at pleasing the US. As will be shown in the

[52] Cladi and Locatelli, 'Bandwagoning, not balancing', 275 and 281; Benjamin Pohl, 'Neither bandwagoning nor balancing: Explaining Europe's security policy', *Contemporary Security Policy* 34 (2013) 2, 353-373, 356.
[53] Article 17 of the Amsterdam Treaty of 1995 reads: 'the policy of the Union … shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence of certain Member States … which see their common defence realised in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation'.
[54] Cladi and Locatelli, 'Bandwagoning, not balancing', 281.
[55] Ibidem, 281-282.

subsequent chapters, the EU was indeed preoccupied with having a good relationship with the US. But this did not mean that all EU proposals and policies were appreciated by the US, such as the proposal to establish an independent military headquarters. Also, in several instances, EU member states openly opposed the US, as during the Iraq war. On other occasions, the same member states did support the US. Pohl referred to the French position during the Kosovo war that was 'generally in line with the positions of Washington and London: independence for Kosovo in exchange for guaranteed minority rights and temporary (EU) supervision'.[56] However, the French motivation was not to please the US. It rather reflected a 'shared predicament'. Moreover, whereas the UK's intentions seemed to confirm the bandwagoning argument, the British hesitancy regarding the development of the CSDP does not. If the UK wanted to make the EU useful to the US, why then did it want to limit the EU's efforts?[57]

So, as political scientist Maxime Larivé argued, neorealism's contribution to the study of the CSDP 'is considerable, but with some limits'.[58] Neoliberalism provides an alternative explanation, but with even greater limits. Neoliberalism focuses on trade and economics as factors causing interdependence between states. As a result, cooperation as well as the absence of war are considered beneficial by those states.[59] The preference for peace results in a decreased relevance of military capabilities.[60] As American political scientists Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye wrote, one of the characteristics of 'complex interdependence' is the 'irrelevance of military force'.[61] If we apply this argument to the CSDP, it begs the question how then we can explain the build-up of military forces like the Battlegroups. Moreover, economically, the EU member states had little to gain from an ambitious defence project outside of NATO.[62] Although economic interests might be one of the rationales for defence cooperation, these interests alone cannot explain the emergence of the CSDP, including the Battlegroups.[63]

---

[56] Pohl, 'Neither bandwagoning nor balancing, 361.
[57] Ibidem, 361-363.
[58] Maxime Larivé, *Debating European Security and Defense Policy. Understanding the complexity* (Farnham 2014) 11.
[59] Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdepence* (Boston/Columbus/Indianapolis 2012) 8; Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 200.
[60] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 72.
[61] Keohane and Nye, *Power and Interdepence,* xxiii.
[62] Mérand, *European Defence Policy,* 21.
[63] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy, 23;* Mérand, *European Defence Policy,* 22.

Constructivists, finally, take a wholly different approach. Whereas neorealists and neoliberals assume that state preferences are fixed, constructivists consider these preferences to be socially constructed. Ideas, norms, discourses, and identities shape these interests and therefore also political outcomes. A large part of the constructivist work on the CSDP focused on the divergence of national preferences and the possibility of the emergence of a European strategic culture. [64] A strategic culture, in the words of Laura Chappell, British political scientist, constitutes 'the beliefs, attitudes and norms towards the use of force, held by a security community which has had a 'unique historical experience''.[65] This includes ideas on when, where and by whom force should be used. British political scientist Julian Lindley-French, from a rather sceptical perspective, argued that the strategic concepts the EU developed over time reflected more divergences than similarities between the national strategic cultures. This would not change until the CSDP became '"common" in fact', like it was in name.[66] Others argued that the gap between the national strategic cultures was already narrowing, but that a common strategic culture yet had to emerge.[67] If authors believed that a European strategic culture was emerging, it was but a result of the CSDP, not the other way around. Consequently, these accounts cannot explain the emergence of the CSDP.

While the strategic culture debate focused more on the consequences of security and defence cooperation, only few constructivists have been occupied with the question why and how this cooperation emerged, among them German political scientists Christoph Meyer and Eva Strickmann.[68] They analysed the CSDP as the result of not only material but also ideational forces, thereby combining realism and constructivism. With this approach, they intended to overcome constructivism's inability to explain how and when ideas change.[69] Meyer and Strickmann argued that changes in the systemic, political, social or economic context gave more weight to particular ideas.[70] Policy-makers then followed a 'logic of

[64] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 210.
[65] Chappell, 'Differing member state approaches', 419.
[66] Julian Lindley-French, 'The Revolution in Security Affairs: Hard and Soft Security Dynamics in the 21st Century', *European Security* 13 (2004) 1-2, 1-15, 5.
[67] François Heisbourg, 'Europe's Strategic Ambitions: The Limits of Ambiguity', *Survival* 42 (2000) 2, 5-15, 6; Paul Cornish and Geoffrey Edwards, 'The Strategic culture of the European Union: a progress report', *International Affairs* 81 (2005) 4, 801-820, 802.
[68] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 23.
[69] Frédéric Mérand argued that constructivism has difficulties explaining change, see Mérand, *European Defence Policy beyond the nation state*, 24; Christoph O. Meyer and Eva Strickmann, 'Solidifying Constructivism: How Material and Ideational Factors Interact in European Defence', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49 (2011) 1, 61-81, 65
[70] Meyer and Strickmann, 'Solidifying Constructivism', 77.

appropriateness', which means that their actions had to be compatible with the dominant ideas.[71]

This approach is very insightful because it can explain, for example, how the military incapability of the EU during the crisis in the Yugoslavia gave birth to a new awareness on the need to develop this military capability. It was considered appropriate to be able to intervene in ethnic conflicts like that in Bosnia and Herzegovina.[72] The establishment of the CSDP including the Battlegroups therefore was equally an appropriate action. But one big question remains. If the establishment of both the CSDP and the Battlegroups was the result of a 'logic of appropriateness', then why did EU member states not push their efforts further? In other words, why was the establishment of the Battlegroups appropriate while the deployment of these forces apparently was not? Meyer and Strickmann's account thus cannot explain the discrepancy between the EU discourse and the actual policy implementation.

### 1.3 Historical institutionalism

Since the theories of European integration and International Relations are at odds with the empirical reality, Jolyon Howorth concluded that 'we must look elsewhere than pure theory'. Howorth, together with British professor of European Politics Anand Menon, suggested institutionalism as an alternative approach suitable to the study of the CSDP.[73] Institutionalism does not represent one single approach but comprises three different approaches: rational choice, historical and sociological institutionalism. These approaches share an emphasis on the institutional context as shaping political behaviour and outcomes. The difference between these approaches is in emphasis. Rational choice institutionalism emphasizes the role of the actors' intentions in creating institutions, therefore takes upon a more functionalist approach. Sociological institutionalism highlights the way institutions, which they define more broadly including in cultural terms, influence political behaviour. This approach also assumes that these institutions influenced preferences, which are taken as given by rational-choice institutionalists.[74]

---

[71] Mérand, *European Defence Policy beyond the nation state*, 22; Thomas Risse, 'Social Constructivism and European Integration', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 144-162, 148; Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 209.
[72] Meyer and Strickmann, 'Solidifying Constructivism', 73.
[73] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 205; Menon, 'Power, Institutions and the CSDP', 83-84.
[74] Hall and Taylor, 'Political Science and Three New Institutionalisms', 943-948; Pollack, 'The New Institutionalisms and European Integration', 127.

This thesis will take the third approach, historical institutionalism, as the theoretical framework. This approach distinguishes itself from the others mainly by emphasizing the *historical* institutional context, or the effects of institutions over time. Not only the current institutional context, but also institutional changes made in the past are considered to play a role in shaping political behaviour and outcomes.[75]Applying the approach enables us to shift the attention from a focus on single causes (albeit spill over, bargaining, balancing or bandwagoning, economic interests, or ideas) to the process of decision-making within a historical and institutional context that shapes political behaviour and outcomes. This approach, as James Mahoney stated, can be particularly useful for the study of outcomes that cannot be explained by theories, such as the (non-deployment of) Battlegroups.[76] To explain how this approach can help us understand how the Battlegroups emerged and developed, I will outline the key arguments of historical institutionalism.

Historical institutionalism was coined as a term and developed as an approach for the study of politics in the 1992 publication *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Perspective* by American political scientists Sven Steinmo and Kathleen Thelen, and sociologist Frank Longstreth. These academics examined the role of institutions, defined as formal or informal rules, procedures, and organizations, in shaping political behaviour and outcomes.[77] They considered institutions relevant because these determine both who participates in decision-making and what are the rules of the game in which they participate.[78] Following the sociological approach, institutions are believed to affect preferences of actors. As a result, actors tend to rely on routines or familiar patterns of behaviour that contribute to the endurance of the same institutions. But, in line with the rational choice approach, historical institutionalism also asserts that actors are rational. As Sven Steinmo explained: 'human beings are both norm-abiding rule followers *and* self-interested rational actors'.[79] Historical institutionalism thus posits itself between the two other institutionalisms.

At the same time, historical institutionalists often use the proverb 'history matters'. Steinmo identified three ways in which history is relevant for the study of politics. Firstly,

---

[75] Hall and Taylor, 'Political Science and Three New Institutionalisms', 938; Pollack, 'The New Institutionalisms and European Integration', 127.
[76] James Mahoney, 'Path Dependence in Historical Sociology', *Theory and Society* 29 (2000) 4, 507-548, 508.
[77] Thelen and Steinmo, 'Historical Institutionalism in comparative politics', 2.
[78] Sven Steinmo, 'Historical Institutionalism', in: Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences. A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge 2008), 118-138, 118 and 124.
[79] Steinmo, 'Historical Institutionalism', 126.

political events occur in a historical context.[80] When policymakers intend to create new institutions, they do this in the context of already existing institutions. In Reynolds' words, there is no 'tabula rasa'. Instead, new institutions must fit in the existing institutional context.[81] In addition, Peter Hall explained, history does not simply provide contextual features of a political event. Instead, politics can be seen as a 'process structured across space and time'.[82] Secondly, actors draw lessons from the past. They learn from both past failures and successes. Thirdly, expectations are moulded by the past. Without analysing this past, one overlooks how past decisions, lessons learned, and expectations influence the behaviour of political actors. This interconnectedness between events and decisions led Steinmo to conclude that history is 'not a chain of independent events'.[83]

Historical institutionalism further holds that decisions made in the past can become path-dependent. Path-dependency, a concept originally derived from economics, was defined by American political scientist Margaret Levi in 1997 as follows:

> Path dependence has to mean, if it is to mean anything, that once a country or region has started down a track, the costs of reversal are very high. There will be other choice points, but the entrenchments of certain institutional arrangements obstruct an easy reversal of the initial choice. Perhaps the better metaphor is a tree, rather than a path. From the same trunk, there are many different branches and smaller branches. Although it is possible to turn around or to clamber from one to the other […] the branch on which a climber begins is the one she tends to follow.[84]

The metaphor that Levi applied, that of a tree, shows that the end of a path is not already determined at its beginning. The initial conditions, including the context of and the decisions made at the critical juncture, do affect but do not determine the outcome.[85] Instead, as American political scientists Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier explained, the consequences of specific choices do not immediately 'crystallize […] but rather is shaped through a series of intervening steps'.[86] As a result, historical

[80] Steinmo, 'Historical Institutionalism', 127-128.
[81] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 90.
[82] Hall, 'Politics as a Process Structured in Space and Time', 1 and 5.
[83] Steinmo, 'Historical Institutionalism', 127-128.
[84] Cited in Paul Pierson, 'Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics', *The American Political Science Review* 94 (2000) 2, 251-267, 252.
[85] Mahoney, 'Path Dependence in Historical Sociology', 511.
[86] Ruth B. Collier and David Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena. Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement and Regime Dynamics in Latin America* (Notre Dame 2002) 31.

institutionalism cannot predict political outcomes. Nonetheless it is a useful approach to understand in hindsight how these political outcomes came about.

Actors tend to follow the branch on which they started to climber because of several mechanisms. Policy alternatives that were available earlier might have closed off in the process of institutional development. At the same time, when people invest in a particular project, they create resistance to change. Moreover, politicians often put in place arrangements that make institutional change difficult, such as the requirement of a unanimous vote.[87] In addition, it is often beneficial for policymakers to stay on the same policy track.[88] Changing the institutions, on the contrary, is undesirable because it becomes more difficult and more expensive than continuing the same path. In addition, institutional change brings with it uncertainty about possible outcomes.[89] Institutional change is thus unlikely, making institutions 'sticky'.[90]

Historical institutionalism further argues that these path-dependent processes possibly generate unintended consequences or inefficiencies. In the long run, the chosen path might have less benefits than an alternative path would have had.[91] Moreover, institutions can persist even after they are no longer efficient.[92] As a result, existing institutions do not necessarily embody the (long-term) interests of its creators.[93] This implies that if one wants to understand a political outcome, one needs to look further than the initial conditions such as the member states' preferences. Instead one needs to include an analysis of how the institutions as well as the larger historical context structures politics over time.

Whereas paths have ends, these also require a beginning. According to the approach of historical institutionalism, institutional change occurs only after so-called

---

[87] Pollack, 'The New Institutionalisms and European Integration', 127; see also Page, 'Path Dependence', 88.
[88] Menon, 'Power, Institutions and the CSDP', 87; Mahoney, 'Path Dependence in Historical Sociology', 508.
[89] Pollack, 'The New Institutionalisms and European Integration', 127.
[90] Capoccia and Kelemen, 'The Study of Critical Junctures', 341; Pollack, 'The New Institutionalisms and European Integration', 127.
[91] Pierson, 'Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics', 253.
[92] Paul Pierson, 'The Path to European Integration. A Historical Institutionalist Analysis', *Comparative Political Studies* 29 (1996) 2, 123-163, 131; Menon, 'Power, Institutions and the CSDP', 86; see also Hall and Taylor, 'Political Science and Three New Institutionalisms', 942; Orfeo Fioretos, Tulia G. Falleti, and Adam Sheingate, 'Historical Institutionalism in Political Science', in Orfeo Fioretos, Tulia Faletti and Adam Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford 2016) 1-32, 10.
[93] Pierson, 'The Path to European Integration', 131.

'critical junctures'. These critical junctures punctuate periods of continuity. The long periods of institutional stability are then interrupted by relatively short episodes in which rapid innovation takes place. Often, these periods of change are associated with an exogenous shock, for example a revolution or war.[94] Furthermore, the junctures are considered critical since the decisions made during these moments affect later decisions. At such moments, history moves onto new paths.[95]

### 1.4 Process-tracing

But how can we analyse whether the development of the Battlegroups was the result of path-dependent processes generated at the critical juncture of St. Malo? Noting Hall's definition of politics as structured across space and time, political events or outcomes need first be placed within their (institutional) context. This means that we must analyse the rules of the game and who participates in it. Political events also need to be placed in time. By analysing the sequence of events, we can trace political events back to historical events which are themselves historically contingent.[96] A historical institutionalist analysis of a political outcome thus needs to take into account the institutional context (e.g. the rules of the game and who participates in it), the decisions made at the critical juncture and the subsequent historical, political and social context in which decisions are being made.

The focus on sequencing and the unfolding of processes over time, is closely linked to the methodology of process-tracing.[97] Process-tracing deals with the identification of causal mechanisms which connect independent and dependent variables.[98] American political scientist Jeffrey Checkel, in providing the basics of process-tracing, explained the method as follows:

> process tracing means to trace the operation of the causal mechanism(s) at work in a given situation. One carefully maps the process, exploring the extent to which it coincides with prior, theoretically derived expectations about the workings of the mechanism. The data for process tracing is overwhelmingly qualitative in nature, and

[94] Conran and Thelen, 'Institutional Change', 6.
[95] Hall and Taylor, 'Political Science and Three New Institutionalisms', 942; see also Collier and Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena,* 29.
[96] Mahoney, 'Path Dependence in Historical Sociology', 507.
[97] Capoccia and Kelemen, 'The Study of Critical Junctures', 355.
[98] Vennesson, 'Case Studies and process tracing: theories and practices', 232.

> may include historical memoirs, expert surveys, interviews, press accounts, and documents.[99]

The focus on the *process* is relevant to each historical institutionalist approach since it specifies the sequence of events and analyses how these are interconnected. This way, we will be able to understand how the process developed over time from the initial conditions to the political outcome.

[99] Jeffrey Checkel, 'Process Tracing', in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash (eds.), *Qualitative Methods in International Relations. A Pluralist Guide* (Basingstoke/New York 2008), 114-130, 116.

# Chapter 2. The critical juncture of St. Malo

The encounter that took place in St. Malo in 1998 proved to be a historic moment. British Prime Minister Tony Blair aligned with French President Jacques Chirac, deciding that the EU needed the capacity for autonomous military action. This decision contrasted with the UK's traditional Atlantic-oriented policy, primarily because of the emphasis on autonomy. Why did the UK change its traditional policy? And, what were the consequences of this decision? This chapter seeks to answer both questions.

## 2.1 Drawing together Europeanists and Atlanticists

The launch of the CSDP was a wholly new endeavour for the EU member states. While European leaders slowly expanded cooperation in economic affairs since the 1950s, political affairs and the policy field of security and defence remained largely untouched by this process of European integration. This does not mean, however, that attempts to expand integration to the latter policy field were not made at all. Nor was the agreement made in 1998 between France and the UK the first proposal for security and defence cooperation. Instead, throughout the years, European leaders made several proposals for such cooperation, thereby preparing the ground for actual security and defence cooperation to take off.

The first such proposal came from French Prime Minister René Pleven and was therefore often referred to as the 'Pleven Plan'. Pleven suggested the establishment of a European army, as part of a European Defence Community (EDC). On 27 May 1952, the members of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), a precursor of the EU, signed a treaty establishing this EDC. It never came to the ratification of this treaty because the French National Assembly voted against it in 1954. Ten years later, the 'Fouchet Plans', proposed by one of Pleven's successors, calling for a 'Union of States' and the establishment of a common defence policy, failed as well.

Other initiatives had more success. In 1947, France and Britain signed the Treaty of Dunkirk on mutual defence. In 1984, member states of the Western European Union (WEU), established in 1954 to strengthen peace and security, re-activated this Union. By signing the Rome Declaration, they declared to 'make better use of the W.E.U. framework to increase cooperation between the member states in the field of security policy and to encourage

consensus'.[100] Because of these initiatives, the idea that the EU needed military capabilities slowly consolidated.[101] The ground had become fertile.

The need for European military capabilities only increased in the 1990s. Although the fear of a nuclear war vanished with the end of the Cold War, Europe was confronted with new conflicts, some of them very close to home. War erupted in Yugoslavia in 1991. Both the EU and its precursor, the European Communities, proved to be incapable of action, mainly due to political divisions.[102] Drawing from the early experience with the crisis in the Balkans, member states of the WEU declared in 1992 to develop a European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within NATO.[103] The intention was to enable WEU access to NATO assets, meaning that the WEU could use NATO's communication units and headquarters. The formal arrangements, however, were not finalized. It would take another decade to finalize these so-called 'Berlin Plus' negotiations.[104]

The development of ESDI did not have immediate effects on the operational capability of the WEU. Besides a WEU maritime operation (Operation Sharp Guard), Europe continued to be absent as a security actor in Yugoslavia. To make things worse, the US was not interested in fighting that war. In an attempt to contain the situation in the Balkans, the Netherlands sent a battalion to Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR). UNPROFOR, active in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina since 1992, managed to establish a truce but was unable to prevent the massacres in Srebrenica in 1995. US involvement in NATO airstrikes eventually proved to be crucial because only with this air support the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina ended.[105] The inability of the EU to establish a military operation in the Balkans, combined with its reliance on the US, created an increasing awareness that the EU needed to develop its own military capacity, separate from NATO.

In October 1994, France already made a case for developing European military capabilities to overcome reliance on NATO assets, but France stumbled upon British

---

[100] WEU Foreign and Defence Ministers, Rome Declaration, 27 October 1984, https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2003/7/11/c44c134c-aca3-45d1-9e0b-04d4d9974ddf/publishable_en.pdf (accessed 7 November 2017) 1-4, 4.
[101] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 159.
[102] Jean-Yves Haine, 'An historical perspective', in Nicole Gnesotto (ed.), *EU Security and Defence Policy. The first five years (1999-2004)* (Paris 2004) 35-54, 39.
[103] Julian Lindley-French, *A Chronology of European Security and Defence 1945-2006* (Oxford 2007), 196, 203 and 207.
[104] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 6. Eventually, in December 2002, NATO arranged assured EU access to NATO assets and capabilities.
[105] Ibidem*,* 5-6.

opposition. For years, Britain had vetoed proposals for security and defence cooperation outside the NATO framework. Just after his election as Prime Minister of the UK in May 1997, Tony Blair followed the traditional policy. As one of his first political acts, Blair vetoed the merging of the EU and the WEU, including the introduction of the Petersberg tasks to the EU as called for by the Treaty of Amsterdam signed in October 1997. The WEU had defined these tasks in Petersberg, near Bonn, Germany, in June 1992 as new military tasks the WEU was supposed to be able to execute. These included humanitarian and rescue missions, peacekeeping and peacemaking.[106] But as long as the UK continued to resist, these innovations would not be implemented.

Soon thereafter, Prime Minister Blair took a decision that altered the course of European security and defence significantly. Blair met French President Jacques Chirac on 3-4 December 1998 in St. Malo and agreed to develop a European capacity for autonomous military action. The emphasis on Europe and autonomy diverged from the British traditional standpoint. In other words, the UK had made a 'U-turn'.[107] What had changed in those months that can explain this U-turn was that the UK had assumed the rotating Presidency of the European Council in the first half of 1998. During the Presidency, the crisis in the Balkans was still ongoing with a new war erupting in Kosovo. Blair experienced first-hand that the EU was not able to assemble a large force and had to rely on US combat planes and other assets. While the emergence of the idea of European security and defence cooperation thus already prepared the ground, the British experiences with European incapacity and American disinterest regarding the Kosovo War eventually constituted the trigger.[108]

### 2.2 Defining new goals

What did the UK specifically agree to? The two-pages long St. Malo agreement specified the general goal that the EU had to be able to play its full role on the international stage. This meant first, the implementation of the Treaty of Amsterdam. This included the fostering of closer relations with the WEU and the introduction of the Petersberg tasks into the EU, meaning that the EU had to conduct humanitarian and rescue missions as well as peacekeeping and peacemaking operations. To achieve the implementation of the Amsterdam

[106] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 5-7. See also Catherine Gegout, 'The French and British change in position in the CESDP: A security community and historical-institutionalist perspective', *Politique Européene* 4 (2002) 8, 62-87, 69.
[107] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 18.
[108] Gegout, 'The French and British change in position in the CESDP', 71; Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 152-153.

Treaty, the declaration read, the European Council had to 'decide on the progressive framing of a common defense policy'.[109] The declaration continued by stating that 'the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises'.[110] Simply said, Blair and Chirac argued for the development of a security and defence policy, including actual military means, to make the EU capable of conducting military operations.

Only one week after Chirac and Blair signed the St. Malo agreement, the European Council endorsed it. During the meeting in Vienna on 11-12 December 1998, the Council welcomed the new impetus that was given to the debate on European security and defence cooperation. While agreeing to the idea of developing the capacity for autonomous military action within the Union, the Council did not specify yet what the new military force was supposed to look like. It was the task of Germany, holding the Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the first half of 1999, to further the debate.[111] During the Council meeting in Cologne on 3-4 June, the member states had still not figured out what direction to take.

In the second half of 1999, thoughts were exchanged on the specific design of the future European force. Again, the main initiative was taken during a French-British summit. In London, on 25 November, Blair and Chirac proposed the development of rapidly deployable and militarily self-sufficient combat forces up to corps level, 'with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, combat support and other combat service support (up to 50,000-60,000 men) and appropriate naval and air combat elements', capable of undertaking crisis management tasks. In addition, the French-British declaration stated that member states should be able to provide smaller rapid response elements, available and deployable at high readiness.[112] Deployment had to take place within 60 days and needed

[109] British-French summit in Saint-Malo, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence', 3-4 December 1998, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 8-9, 8.
[110] British-French summit in Saint-Malo, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence', 3-4 December 1998, 8.
[111] European Council in Vienna, 'Presidency Conclusions (extracts)', 11-12 December 1998, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 13.
[112] Anglo-French Summit in London, 'Joint declaration on European defence', 25 November 1999, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 77-79, 77.

to be sustainable for at least a year. Furthermore, the EU had to strengthen the European strategic airlift capabilities substantially.[113]

The European Council endorsed this proposal during the summit in Helsinki on 10 and 11 December 1999. The Presidency conclusions to this summit, in fact, reproduced the exact French-British proposal, complemented with a timeframe. By 2003, the conclusions read, member states must be able 'to deploy within 60 days and sustain for at least 1 year military forces of up to 50,000-60,000 persons capable of the full range of Petersberg tasks'.[114] The Council also copied the French-British proposal for developing smaller rapid response elements at very high readiness.[115] These objectives became known as the Helsinki Headline Goal. Although the first steps were made by France and the UK in St. Malo (December 1998) and London (November 1999) and by the European Council in Cologne (June 1999), it was in Helsinki in December 1999 where, in the words of political scientist and historian Niklas Granholm, 'the first embryo of the Battlegroup Concept emerged'.[116]

The force that the Headline Goal envisioned, was relatively large. But why did France and Britain choose the specific format of a corps-sized force? As political scientist Frédéric Mérand noted, the numbers 'did not come out of nowhere'.[117] Not surprisingly, inspiration was drawn from experiences in the Balkans. Only the exact source of inspiration remains a matter of discussion with some academics pointing at the specific experiences with the crisis in Kosovo, whereas others highlighted experiences in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Jolyon Howorth, for instance, argued: 'What EU military planners had in mind was the ability to carry out a Kosovo-type operation with minimal reliance on US inputs', involving a substantial number of ground troops.[118] In Kosovo, the EU was unable to act militarily and had to rely on the US. Initially, the US was reluctant to commit forces and therefore relied mainly on air power. From March until June 1999, NATO launched air strikes

---

[113] Anglo-French Summit in London, 'Joint declaration on European defence', 25 November 1999, 77-78.
[114] European Council in Helsinki, 'Presidency Conclusions Part II: Common European Policy on Security and Defence', 10-11 December 1999, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 82.
[115] European Council in Helsinki, 'Presidency Conclusions, Annex IV: Presidency reports on 'Strengthening the common European policy in security and defence' and on 'Non-military crisis management of the European Union'', 10-11 December 1999, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 83-91, 86.
[116] Niklas Granholm, 'EU-Battlegroups: Some new capabilities, actually', *The RUSI Journal* 151 (2006) 6, 62-66, 62.
[117] Mérand, *European Defence Policy beyond the nation state*, 122.
[118] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 80.

on Kosovo as part of Operation Allied Force (OAF). However, air power alone was not enough, and more troops were required.[119] Therefore, NATO launched the operation Kosovo Force (KFOR) on 11 June 1999, initially consisting of around 50,000 troops, that ended the Serbian offensive in Kosovo.[120]

Alistair Sheperd added that the EU not only used KFOR, but also SFOR, as a template after which it modelled its own force.[121] SFOR (Stabilization Force) was the NATO-led peacekeeping force, active in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1996 until 2004. This force consisted initially of around 32,000 troops. An official interviewed by Christopher Reynolds, in turn, highlighted the role of the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) in shaping the EU's military goal. IFOR had preceded SFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina between December 1995 and December 1996. IFOR had enforced the peace that SFOR thereafter had to keep.[122] Not a coincidence, IFOR consisted of approximately 60,000 troops. So, whereas one might disagree on the question if either KFOR, SFOR, IFOR, or a combination of these was the exact source of inspiration, these operations had in common that the forces were relatively large and that these were able to make a difference.

### 2.3 Outlining the institutional framework

The St. Malo declaration did not only define new goals but also outlined the institutional framework, using the existing institutional framework of the EU as a basis. The choice for the EU as the institutional framework, was mainly the result of disappointment with the WEU. In the words of Howorth, the WEU proved to be 'too weak politically, too insignificant militarily and too unwieldly institutionally to be able to carry out the major responsibilities which were being thrust upon it'.[123] Also, the specific choice for intergovernmental decision-making was based on past proposals for defence cooperation within the EU. From the failure of the supranational European Defence Community, France and the UK drew the lesson that decision-making had to be intergovernmental. The failure of the Fouchet plans, proposing not only an intergovernmental defence policy but also reform of the EEC to increase

[119] Ivo H. Daalder and Michael O'Hanlon, 'Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo', *Foreign Policy* (1999); Timothy Garden, 'The lesson of Kosovo is: more troops, not air power', *The Independent,* 22 July 1999, http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/the-lesson-of-kosovo-is-more-troops-not-air-power-1108029.html (accessed 15 November 2017).
[120] Alistair J.K. Sheperd, ''A Milestone in the history of the EU': Kosovo and the EU's international role', *International Affairs* 85 (2009) 3, 513-530, 513.
[121] Sheperd, ''A Milestone in the history of the EU'', 517.
[122] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy*, 180.
[123] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 6.

intergovernmentalism in economic affairs, learned that the existing structures had to be maintained. Therefore, the new defence policy was accommodated within the existing Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) which constituted the second, intergovernmental, pillar of the EU, next to the supranational pillar of the European Communities and the intergovernmental pillar of police and judicial cooperation.[124] What the EU member states could not foresee was that this choice would have an important impact on decision-making within the CSDP, limiting the room for manoeuvre of the member states.

In line with the existing provisions in the CFSP, set out in the Maastricht Treaty, the declaration specifically noted that the European Council had to take decisions unanimously.[125] In practice, the main negotiations took place during the meetings of foreign ministers. These meetings initially took place under the name of General Affairs Council (GAC). In June 2002, the European council decided to change the name in the General Affairs and External Relations Council (GAERC). This body held two sessions, one on General Affairs and one on External Relations. Then, in 2009, the latter body was renamed as the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC).[126] Ministers of defence could participate in the meetings of foreign ministers.[127] The Council of the European Union, sometimes referred to as the Council of Ministers, was the umbrella-term for the council 'configurations' such as the FAC and the GAC.[128]

Other EU institutions, such as the European Parliament and the European Commission, were not assigned any role or function in the St. Malo Declaration. But since the CSDP had to be developed within the CFSP, the role of the Parliament and the Commission in the latter was extended to the former. As documented in the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, Parliament debated on the priorities and implementation of the CSDP. The Parliament had to be informed about developments in this policy field. Based on this information, Parliament could ask the Council questions and make recommendations. But, it remained up to the member states to

[124] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy*, 117.
[125] British-French summit in Saint-Malo, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence', 3-4 December 1998, 8.
[126] Giovanni Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', in Giovanni Grevi, Damien Helly and Daniel Keohane (eds.), *European Security and Defence Policy. The First 10 Years (1999-2009)* (Paris 2009) 19-68, 25; Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 36-37.
[127] British-French summit in Saint-Malo, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence', 3-4 December 1998, 8.
[128] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', 26.

decide whether to act upon these recommendations. Parliament, together with the Council, also formed the budgetary authority.[129]

The Commission, in turn, had the right of initiative in the CFSP, therefore also in the CSDP. Article J(8) of the Maastricht Treaty stated that the Commission 'may refer to the Council any question relating to the common foreign and security policy and may submit proposals to the Council'[130] In practice, however, the Commission never formally exercised this right. Moreover, the Commission exerted direct influence by managing the CSDP budget.[131] In contrast to other policy fields such as economic cooperation, where the European Commission could decide on policies and institutional development, its authority within the CSDP was very limited.[132]

Other institutional actors included the Presidency, preceding Council sessions, and the High Representative for the Common and Security Policy (HR-CFSP). The Presidency was held by a member state, which established the working agenda and had the ability to set the priorities of the EU. Moreover, the Presidency represented the EU in CFSP matters. The post of the High Representative, in turn, was held by one appointed official. The post did not exist yet when France and Britain signed the St. Malo declaration, but its establishment was part of the Amsterdam Treaty. The post was created on 1 May 1999 when the Treaty came into force. During the European Council meeting in Cologne in June, then NATO Secretary-General and former Spanish foreign minister Javier Solana was appointed as the first HR.[133] Solana, starting the job in October, functioned as the external face of the EU. Other tasks included policy proposals and policy implementation.[134]

Finally, the relevant institutional context was not exclusively European. Most European states were not only member of the EU, but also of NATO. Therefore, France and the UK specified in the St. Malo agreement that the collective defence commitments to which the EU member states had subscribed, had to be maintained. The principle of collective

[129] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', 51.
[130] Council of the European Communities, 'Treaty on European Union', Maastricht, 7 February 1992, Title V, Article J.8, https://europa.eu/european-union/sites/europaeu/files/docs/body/treaty_on_european_union_en.pdf (accessed 16 November 2017) 128.
[131] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', 46-47.
[132] Smith, *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy,* 97.
[133] Gisela Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet and Carolin Rüger (eds.), *The High Representative for the EU Foreign and Security Policy – Review and Prospects* (Baden-Baden 2011) 22.
[134] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 38-39; Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', 35.

defence, enshrined in Article 5 of the Washington Treaty of 1949, constituted the cornerstone of the Atlantic Alliance. France and the UK thus confirmed the importance of this principle and indicated that the new initiative would not interfere with it. But the two went further. NATO, the foundation for collective defence, also had to contribute from the European initiative. The declaration read that the European defence policy would 'contribute to the vitality of a modernized Atlantic Alliance'. [135] Moreover, the EU would only take decisions and act militarily 'where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged'.[136] Furthermore, France and Britain pledged that the EU would prevent unnecessary duplication and decided that the EU needed to have recourse to military means within NATO's European pillar or outside the NATO framework.[137]

### 2.4 Establishing new institutions

Next to setting the Headline Goal, the European Council in Helsinki introduced three new political and military bodies that were to be established the next year. A Political and Security Committee (PSC), composed of national representatives of senior/ambassadorial level, had to deal with all aspects of the CSDP, including exercising the political control and strategic direction of military operations. A Military Committee (MC) was composed of the Chiefs of Defence, represented by military representatives. The MC had to give military advice and recommendations to the PSC and provide military direction for the, also to be established, Military Staff (MS). The MS had to provide military expertise and support to the CSDP and perform early warning, situation assessment and strategic planning for Petersberg tasks.[138] These new institutions were first established as interim bodies on 14-15 February 2000.[139] It would take until the end of the year, when the European Council convened in Nice, for these institutions to become permanent. Although these institutions were established before the EU even thought about establishing Battlegroups, these institutions and the accompanying planning procedures would be used in the case of future Battlegroups deployment.[140]

---

[135] British-French summit in Saint-Malo, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence', 3-4 December 1998, 8.
[136] Ibidem, 9.
[137] Ibidem.
[138] European Council in Helsinki, 'Presidency Conclusions, Annex IV: Presidency reports on 'Strengthening the common European policy in security and defence' and on 'Non-military crisis management of the European Union'', 10-11 December 1999, 86.
[139] General Affairs Council in Brussels, 'Extract from communiqué: Strengthening of ESDP', 14-15 February 2000, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 93.
[140] Kerttunen, 'The EU Battlegroup – its Background and Concept', 138.

The new institutions were not designed from scratch. On the contrary, these bodies were modelled after NATO's military bodies, specifically the North Atlantic Council (NAC), the NATO Military Committee (MC) and the NATO International Military Staff (IMS).[141] As Stephanie Hoffmann argued: 'While ESDP could have assumed many forms, its creators used NATO as a template'.[142] Christopher Reynolds, building upon the work of DiMaggio and Powell, identified four reasons for this institutional 'isomorphism'. Firstly, politicians often use credible and legitimate institutions as a template, and NATO had proven to be such institution. Secondly, policy-makers tend to use already existing institutions, institutions they were familiar with and that had proven to be effective.[143] As historical institutionalism argues, institutional change brings with it a high level of uncertainty about the possible consequences.[144] By re-creating existing institutions, one can overcome such uncertainty. A British official emphasized this rationale and argued that, although NATO's institutional design was not necessarily the most optimal choice: 'It is not an accident that the EU structures were set up as mirror of NATO. The key European players did not know anything else'.[145]

Thirdly, institutions are inter-locked and because of the relation of interdependence, institutions tend to adapt.[146] As the EU emphasized the importance of its relationship with NATO, adapting the EU's institutions to those of NATO was considered beneficial for the cooperation and complementarity with NATO. Following this line of argument, Blair argued just before his meeting with Chirac in November 1999, that any European military committee would complement the NATO military committee.[147] Also, while the decision to appoint former NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana as HR was believed to assure the US of the CSDP's compatibility with NATO, as discussed earlier, it also is a way to ensure this compatibility itself. Solana would bring with him much inside knowledge of NATO, enabling

[141] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 175-178; Stephanie C. Hoffmann, 'Overlapping institutions in the realm of international security: The case of NATO and ESDP', *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (2009) 1, 45-52, 48-49; Steven Blockmans, 'The Influence of NATO on the Development of the EU's common Security and Defence Policy', in Ramses A. Wessel and Steven Blockmans (eds.), *Between Autonomy and Dependence. The EU Legal Order under the Influence of International Organisations* (The Hague 2013) 243-268, 250.
[142] Hoffmann, ''Overlapping institutions in the realm of international security', 48-49.
[143] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 181-187.
[144] Pollack, 'The New Institutionalisms and European Integration', 127.
[145] Cited in Hoffmann, ''Overlapping institutions in the realm of international security', 49.
[146] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 181-187.
[147] 'Franco-British talks to further plans on EU military capability', *Agence France Presse,* 24 November 1999 (via LexisNexis).

the CSDP to adapt to NATO.[148] Fourthly, it is a rational decision to use existing institutional structures since it reduces transaction costs. New institutions do not have to be negotiated over when these already were accepted. EU member states had accepted the military bodies, only in a different forum.[149]

The EU military bodies, however, were no exact copies of NATO's. Obviously, the EU institutional structure was of equal importance for the design of these bodies. This can be illustrated by the example of the meeting schedules of the PSC. The PSC met more often than the NAC. An explanation for why the PSC met on a weekly basis, was that COREPER II also met every week, the day after PSC-meetings. COREPER II was the Committee of Permanent Representatives of member states which prepared the meetings of defence and foreign affairs ministers. More importantly, COREPER II was hierarchically superior to the PSC. As Reynolds argued, 'there is therefore a clear logic to the PSC meeting beforehand, so that its decisions can be approved by its hierarchical superiors'.[150] The EU thus drew inspiration from existing military bodies within NATO and adapted them to the institutional structure of the EU.

### 2.5 Committing capabilities

Besides the military bodies that would decide on and lead the foreseen autonomous military operations, the EU also needed to have actual soldiers and military equipment at its disposal. Late February 2000, the EU therefore established a timetable leading up to a Capabilities Commitments Conference to be convened by the end of 2000. At this conference, member states would indicate the forces and equipment they committed to the new EU force.[151] But first, the EU had to indicate the amount of forces and military equipment necessary to attain the objectives set in Helsinki. The preliminary force catalogue indicated that the objective of being able to deploy 60,000 men should be raised to 80,000.[152] In addition, the report read that between 300 and 350 fighter planes and 80 ships were deemed necessary.

---

[148] Blockmans, 'The Influence of NATO on the Development of the EU's common Security and Defence Policy', 250.
[149] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 181-187.
[150] Ibidem, 196.
[151] Meeting of European Defence Ministers in Sintra, 'The 'Food for Thought' paper on headline and capability goals, 28 February 2000', in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 102-107.
[152] Informal Meeting of EU Defence Ministers in Ecouen, 'Presidency Conclusions', 22 September 2000, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 143-146, 143-144.

On 20-21 November, the Capabilities Commitments Conference took place in which member states officially committed troops and assets. These commitments were set out in the final 'Force Catalogue', which transcended the draft version since 100,000 troops, 400 aircraft and 100 ships were pledged.[153] The Declaration that followed the conference stated that by 2003, 'the Union will be able to carry out the full range of Petersberg tasks, but that certain capabilities need to be improved both in quantitative and qualitative terms in order to maximise the capabilities available to the Union'.[154] The EU was thus not there yet, but going into the right direction.

HR Solana was optimistic. 'There is now a serious commitment to present a single political will to the rest of the world, a commitment to match Europe's economic power with political influence', Solana said in Berlin.[155] The EU was putting together a range of instruments to implement a 'true' CSDP.[156] Solana posed himself the question if the EU was 'willing to deliver a visible, coherent, and efficient foreign and security policy' and capable of doing so. Also, had the EU already delivered during 2000? 'I am confident', Solana responded, 'that, […], each of these questions can be answered positively'.[157]

### 2.6 Conclusions

The critical juncture of St. Malo took place because of several factors. While the idea that the EU needed to develop a military capacity prepared the ground, the lessons learned during the 1990s constituted the decisive factor. The ineffectiveness of the EU's military combined with American disinterest in Europe's neighbourhood reinforced the need for change. Even the UK, traditionally Atlantic-oriented, felt this need. The British change of mind made possible the St. Malo agreement and therefore also the subsequent development of the CSDP.

At this juncture, EU leaders had to decide on the new direction the EU would take. France and the UK took the lead, arguing that the EU had to develop a capacity for autonomous military action, including the necessary military means. This decision clearly

[153] Lindley-French, *A Chronology of European Security and Defence 1945-2006*, 269.
[154] Capabilities Commitments Conference in Brussels, 'Military Capabilities Commitment Declaration', 20-21 November 2000, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 158-163, 159.
[155] Speech by Dr Javier Solana, 'Where does the EU stand on CFSP?', Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik, Berlin, 14 November 2000, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 151-157, 152.
[156] Speech by Dr Javier Solana, 'Where does the EU stand on CFSP?', Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik, Berlin, 14 November 2000, 153.
[157] Speech by Dr Javier Solana, 'Where does the EU stand on CFSP?', Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik, Berlin, 14 November 2000, 156.

incorporated the lessons learned, aiming at enabling the EU to conduct military interventions like those in Kosovo and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The EU member states nothing but agreed. Next to the new goals, also the institutional framework and the military bodies were based upon the historical context. The proven ineffectiveness of the WEU, combined with past experiences with proposals for security and defence cooperation, resulted in the choice for accommodating the CSDP within the intergovernmental CFSP. This meant that decisions had to be taken unanimously by the member states and that other EU institutions had limited influence on the decision-making. Expectations based on experiences with NATO were instrumental in the development of the new military bodies. But at the same time, these bodies had to fit within the European institutional context.

In sum, this chapter has shown that the EU had taken a different direction at the juncture of St. Malo, based on the specific historical context, the lessons learned, as well as expectations based on historical experiences. NATO was no longer the sole forum for security and defence cooperation, with the EU taking matters into its own hands. In four years, the EU developed rapidly the new security and defence policy. Goals were set, institutions were built, and capabilities were committed. But soon, the decisions made at the juncture would prove to be critical, thereby limiting the room for manoeuvre of the EU's leaders.

# Chapter 3. Limits to the European project

The French-British St. Malo declaration of 1998 set the EU policymakers on a new path leading to the establishment of a Common Security and Defence Policy, including a rapid response force. Soon, it became clear that the choice for a specific path limited the room for manoeuvre of the EU member states, thus generated path-dependent processes. This chapter aims to analyse how the historical institutional context created path-dependency, roughly between 1998 until 2002.

## 3.1 Rules and norms

The road from St. Malo to Helsinki and after appeared relatively free from obstacles. The initiatives tabled by France and the UK were endorsed by the European Council and subsequently developed into the Helsinki Headline Goal. In addition, the Council established new military bodies and actual capabilities to achieve the new goal. Nevertheless, disagreements between the main drivers behind the CSDP soon reappeared, revealing that the agreement made between France and the UK was not the result of a change of national interests. Instead, both countries held on to their traditional policies. For the UK, a strong transatlantic relationship was key. France, in turn, aimed towards an independent and strong Europe.

Because decisions in the CSDP had to be taken unanimously, the agreement made in 1998 had become locked-in and became path-dependent. Since the interests of France and the UK concerning the role of NATO were diametrically opposed to each other, with one arguing for limiting NATO's role and the other favouring a strong role for NATO, both countries were unable to steer the new policy field towards a direction that was favourable to them. The only option was to continue the same path that France and the UK had started in December 1998. This meant that the new European military force was to be autonomous, but at the same time had to contribute to 'the vitality of a modernized Atlantic Alliance which is the foundation of the collective defence of its members', as determined in the St. Malo agreement.[158]

The UK already felt the restraining effects of the St. Malo agreement in the late 1990s. Albeit not publicly, the UK made efforts to persuade other EU member states to abandon the concept of 'autonomy'. The aim to establish the capacity for *autonomous* military action was

[158] British-French summit in Saint-Malo, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence', 3-4 December 1998, 8.

to be replaced by the objective to be able to engage in 'missions in which the US would not be involved'.[159] Catherine Gegout, British professor in International Relations, argued that the UK indeed has tried to 'renegotiate the St Malo agreement both at Helsinki and Nice'.[160] The British attempts to focus on NATO as the framework for security and defence cooperation were rather unsuccessful since the government was unable to convince other EU member states of the need for a greater role for NATO. As a result, the concept of autonomy continued to be used and was incorporated in the many EU declarations on the CSDP and the new military force.

The UK had also tried to ascribe NATO a 'right of first refusal'. The British Labour-led government believed that NATO first had to take a decision on whether to deploy military force or not. If NATO decided not to intervene, the EU could.[161] The US shared this opinion and believed that, since the CSDP was complementary to and not in competition with NATO, the latter should decide first.[162] Several EU member states, on the contrary, denied the existence of NATO's right of first refusal.[163] Although some believed that NATO should have such right, there was no declaration or agreement that explicitly stated that the EU could only deploy forces after NATO refused to do so. The UK based its assertion on the phrase that EU would only operate in situations where NATO as a whole was not engaged, a statement that featured in both the St. Malo agreement and subsequent declarations. But, since this phrase was rather vague, the UK had no leverage. Even British Conservative Party politician and shadow Secretary of State for Defence, Ian Duncan Smith, argued that the assertion that NATO had a right of first refusal was 'nonsense'.[164] The UK was thus not only limited by the decisions made, but also by those *not* made. Either way, the country was pushed back to the path chosen in St. Malo.

In contrast to the British government, the French initially did not feel much of the consequences of the St. Malo agreement since the EU-NATO relationship was not detailed

---

[159] Jolyon Howorth, 'Britain, France and the European Defence Initiative', *Survival* 42 (2000) 2, 33-55, 44.
[160] Gegout, 'The French and British change in position in the CESDP', 78.
[161] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 219-220.
[162] Michael Evans, 'U.S. tries to end EU's right to fight without NATO consent: In the lead-up to three key European meetings, U.S. officials express misgivings over military ambitions', *The Vancouver Sun,* 23 November 1999 (via LexisNexis).
[163] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 219-220.
[164] Hansard Volume (House of Commons Debates), Session 2000-01, volume 359, part 4, column 443-447, Mr. Iain Duncan Smith, 11 december 2000, https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200001/cmhansrd/vo001211/debtext/01211-31.htm#01211-31_spnew0 (accessed 14 November 2017).

out until the summer of 2000. In the St. Malo agreement, this relationship was defined in vague terms. For instance, the agreement stated that the EU would need recourse to 'European capabilities predesignated within NATO's European pillar'. In addition, the Union had to prevent 'unnecessary duplication'.[165] In Cologne in June 1999, the European Council further decided to develop 'effective mutual consultation, cooperation and transparency' between EU and NATO as well as to develop arrangements to ensure the possible involvement of non-EU European NATO members in EU-led operations.[166] In Helsinki, the European Council tasked the incoming Portuguese Presidency to work on proposals on principles for consultation with NATO and modalities for developing EU-NATO relations.[167]

The Portuguese efforts, discussed during the European Council meeting in the Santa Maria da Feira on 19-20 June 2000, resulted in the creation of four 'ad hoc working groups' between the EU and NATO on security issues, capabilities goals, modalities enabling EU access to NATO assets and capabilities, and the definition of permanent arrangements for EU-NATO consultation. If new issues were to arise, additional working groups could be considered. Also, the member states agreed on exchanges with non-EU NATO members.[168] According to Gegout, this proposal converged very much with the US position since it institutionalized US influence on the CSDP through the working groups. In contrast, the agreements diverged from the French desire for an independent CSDP. Nevertheless, France accepted NATO's involvement in the CSDP. If it would not do so, the country risked isolation since the other EU member states, particularly the UK, would not accept the French position. Also, French credibility was at stake because the country would hold the Presidency the next semester.[169] France, like the UK, thus had to conform to the agreements it had made in the past, a clear example of path-dependency.

During its Presidency, France attempted to push for a stronger and, more importantly, a more independent security and defence policy. Preceding the European Council meeting in

---

[165] British-French summit in Saint-Malo, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence', 3-4 December 1998, 9.
[166] European Council in Cologne, 'Declaration of the European Council on strengthening the common European policy on security and defence', 3-4 June 1999, 42 and 45.
[167] European Council in Helsinki, 'Presidency Conclusions, Annex IV: Presidency reports on 'Strengthening the common European policy in security and defence' and on 'Non-military crisis management of the European Union'', 10-11 December 1999, 89.
[168] European Council in Santa Maria da Feira, 'Presidency Conclusions, Annex I: Presidency Report on strengthening the CESDP', 19-20 June 2000, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 121-139, 124-125 and 132.
[169] Gegout, 'The French and British change in position in the CESDP', 74.

Nice, scheduled for 7-9 December 2000, France sought to include a new clause into the Nice Treaty, known as Clause J. This concerned 'enhanced cooperation' and would allow an inner core of states to press ahead towards a closer union without the other states. But, this deviated from the original agreements. The result was that, similar to the British experience, the room for manoeuvre of the French government was limited by decisions not made. The UK immediately made clear that the French could not just change course on its own. British Foreign Secretary Cook, not amused, stated: 'We were rather surprised when at a very late date there surfaced a text for quite a separate defence proposal within the EU. We have no idea what enhanced co-operation might lead us to'.[170] The British government was afraid that it would result in collective control over defence issues, including the rapid reaction force. Therefore, Cook urged that: 'We strongly believe that the best way forward is to deal with the reality of the project, and not setting out on a totally different path'.[171] Sweden and Ireland shared the British objections to this clause.[172] In the end, France did remove the clause. 'Enhanced co-operation' in certain areas was part of the agreement, but on British insistence, these areas did not include defence.[173]

While the dispute about Clause J had been settled, Chirac's words during the opening press conference of the European Council meeting again caused upheaval. Chirac stated that the development of the CSDP needed to be coordinated with NATO. But, he added, in matters of planning and operation, the rapid reaction force was to be *independent* from NATO's Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE), NATO's military headquarters in Brussels. Blair immediately voiced his disapproval by stating that these were particularly French, not European ideas. 'There is no proposal for a separate European military planning capability', Blair said. Moreover, the British prime minister was confident that during the meeting an agreement would be reached that 'Nato supports, Britain supports and that France can live with'. This would not include a proposal for an independent rapid reaction force.[174] Swedish defence minister Bjorn von Sydow, similarly, promised that they would find a

[170] Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, 'Cook demands removal of Nice defence clause', *The Daily Telegraph*, 5 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).
[171] Evans-Pritchard, 'Cook demands removal of Nice defence clause'.
[172] Ibidem.
[173] David Smith, ' The death of the European superstate', *Sunday Times,* 17 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).
[174] Philip Webster, Richard Beeston and Martin Fletcher, ' French trigger Nato furore', *The Times,* 8 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).

'formula all can accept'.[175] HR Solana, in turn, played down the dispute by arguing that it was a mere question of language, a question of semantics.[176] Nevertheless, Chirac's words were a gift to the British opposition and raised concerns within the US.

When the meeting in Nice came to an end, the member states presented their conclusions. Following up on earlier decisions, the new political and military bodies were formally established and became permanent. Also, the institutional links between the EU and NATO were further expanded. Member states decided that regular contacts would be established between PSC and NAC, ministries, military committees and possibly between subsidiary groups such as Politico-Military Group and NATO's Policy Coordination Group. Meetings between the PSC and NAC and ministerial meetings should be held at least once during each Presidency.[177] The treaty did, however, omit several paragraphs on the EU's role in crisis management, including links with NATO.[178] The burden of the efforts to further develop these links were simply laid with NATO.[179] Also, the EU agreed that for operations with recourse to NATO assets and capabilities, operational planning would be carried out by NATO's planning bodies. For autonomous EU operations, instead, operational planning 'will be carried out within one of the European strategic level headquarters'. In operations of the latter kind, candidate countries and non-EU European allies could send liaison officers to the Military Staff to exchange information on the operational planning and envisaged contributions.[180]

The conclusions on the operational planning for autonomous EU-led operations clearly limited NATO's influence in such operations but did not necessarily equal Chirac's suggestion for *independent* operational planning, affirming that France equally suffered from path-dependency as the UK. Only when NATO's assets were not used, the EU would conduct autonomous operational planning. The conclusions were thus very much in line with earlier

[175] Peter Starck, ' Belgium and Sweden pledge pragmatism on rapid reaction force', *The Irish Times,* 12 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).
[176] Ian Black, ' Nice summit: Chirac gives way in row with Blair on Nato: Security Differences on defence remain despite a show of unity', *The Guardian*, 9 December 2000, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2000/dec/09/eu.defence (accessed 16 November 2017).
[177] European Council in Nice, 'Presidency Conclusions, Annex VI: Presidency report on the ESDP', 7-9 December 2000, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 168-208, 204.
[178] Black, ' Nice summit: Chirac gives way in row with Blair on Nato'.
[179] Robert E. Hunter, *The European Security and Defense Policy: Nato's Companion – or Competitor?* (Santa Monica 2002)*,* 111.
[180] European Council in Nice, 'Presidency Conclusions, Annex VI: Presidency report on the ESDP', 7-9 December 2000, 202.

agreements. Also, the specific arrangements were completely new. In Cologne in June 1999, the EU member states decided that for EU-led operations without recourse to NATO assets, 'the EU could use national or multinational European means pre-identified by Member States'. More specifically, this required either 'the use of national command structures providing multinational representation in headquarters or drawing on existing command structures within multinational forces'.[181] On 28 February 2000, the EU defence ministers meeting in Sintra similarly agreed that for 'planning and command requirements would draw on existing national and multinational HQs available to the EU'. The headquarters used for such operations would be based on the multi-nationalisation of national headquarters.[182] Here, EU member states already hinted at the possible autonomous operational planning, an idea that was followed-up in Nice.

### 3.2 Endogenous institutional pressure

The EU heads of state and government had to limit themselves to what they had agreed upon in the past. They could not choose any direction they wanted because they engaged in a highly institutionalized context. Not only rules and norms, but also actual institutions made up this context. Within the endogenous institutional context, European Parliament was the most vocal on the new developments in the CSDP. Parliament expressed support for some initiatives and rejected others. At times, Parliament also came up with additional proposals.

One such proposal came after the EU had decided to establish interim military bodies. Parliament considered an additional institution to be necessary. In its resolution on CSDP of 15 June 2000, Parliament proposed to establish a 'European interparliamentary body on security and defence'.[183] This pressure had little effect since the EU leaders continued their course without increasing Parliament's role in the CSDP. Later that year, Parliament expressed its dissatisfaction on the lack of control by Parliament and insisted 'on the need for

[181] European Council in Cologne, 'Presidency report on strengthening of the CESDP', 3-4 June 1999, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 42-45, 44.
[182] Meeting of European Defence Ministers in Sintra, 'Military Bodies in the European Union (the 'Toolbox Paper')', in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 94-101, 99.
[183] European Parliament, 'Security and Defence with a view to the Feira European Council', resolution, 15 June 2000, http://www.bits.de/CESD-PA/23-e-f.html (accessed 10 October 2017).

parliamentary scrutiny and democratic accountability of CESDP, involving national parliaments vis-à-vis the governments of the Member States'.[184]

Parliament welcomed other developments in the CSDP, including the establishment of the Headline Goal and the new military bodies, but kept the pressure on the EU member states high. Firstly, Parliament stated in its resolution in November that 'the Union, both collectively and its Member States individually, will have to devote greater financial resources across the entire range of these policy options in order for CESDP to be both credible'. Secondly, Parliament believed that also a 'firm political commitment on the part of all Member States' was required to attain the ambitious Helsinki Headline Goal. Finally, Parliament underlined the need to step up the efforts regarding developing capabilities since there were still gaps in terms of both institutions and equipment that needed to be stopped if the EU was to have a credible conflict-prevention and crisis-management capability by 2003.[185]

The fact that the European Council did not endorse, let alone implement the proposal to increase parliamentary control in the CSDP, reveals the limits to the power of the Parliament in the CSDP. Clearly, the Parliament was not involved in actual decision-making. But as Vojtech Horsák wrote, 'this does not prevent the Parliament from voicing its opinions in various forms'.[186] It was up to the member states, convening in the European Council, to decide whether to act upon the Parliament's opinion. Parliament thus only could exert limited indirect influence by keeping the pressure high.

### 3.3 Exogenous institutional pressure

More successful in influencing EU leaders was the US. Whereas the European Parliament aimed at increasing parliamentary control, the US was primarily concerned about the consequences of the European initiative for NATO. The US used to support, at least rhetorically, the development of an ESDI. After all, this ESDI was developed within NATO and therefore, did not form any kind of threat to the Alliance. At the same time, NATO

[184] European Parliament, 'A common European security and defence policy after Cologne and Helsinki', resolution, 30 November 2000, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+20001130+ITEMS+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN#sdocta10 (accessed 16 November 2017).
[185] European Parliament, 'A common European security and defence policy after Cologne and Helsinki', resolution, 30 November 2000, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+20001130+ITEMS+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN#sdocta10 (accessed 16 November 2017).
[186] Vojtech Horsák, 'The European Parliament and the Common Security and Defence Policy: Does the Parliament care?', *Focus* (2011) 2, 1-4, 1.

proved prepared to negotiate permanent WEU access to NATO assets. The new French-British initiative was of a different kind, primarily because it promoted a *European* security and defence policy and the capacity for *autonomous* military action. In addition, the fact that the UK, the staunchest ally of the US, supported the initiative, gave rise to insecurity in the US about the future of the Alliance.[187] It was feared that the European initiative would weaken NATO. Therefore, the US continuously interfered with European affairs by voicing its opinion on new initiatives, to avoid the doomsday scenario. Both the Clinton and later Bush administration emphasized that the US supported the development of the CSDP, but that this support was subject to specific conditions. These conditions were set out by US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, a few days after the French-British summit in St. Malo. As such, her article in the *Financial Times* of 7 December was the first formulation of the American 'yes, but…' reaction towards the emerging CSDP.[188]

Albright, concerned about the news, had already discussed the French-British initiative with British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook on 4 December 1998.[189] Apparently this discussion did not satisfy Albright, pushing her to create public pressure by publishing her standpoint in an article. Albright started on a positive note, writing that she welcomed the call of the British Prime Minister Tony Blair to develop European military capabilities.[190] All the European efforts, however, had to be aimed at improving the effectiveness of the Alliance. To achieve this, any institutional change had to be consistent with what Albright called the 'basic principles that have served the Atlantic partnership well for 50 years'.[191]

To this end, the EU had to avoid the so-called 'Three D's'. The first D was for decoupling. Albright meant that European decision-making had to take place within NATO. Duplication was the second issue. Defence resources, Albright argued, were too scarce to conduct force planning, operate command structures, and make procurement decisions twice. Therefore, these procedures had to take place within NATO and not within the EU. Finally, Albright stated that the EU should avoid discrimination against NATO members who were

[187] Peter van Ham, 'Europe's Common Defense Policy: Implications for the Trans-Atlantic Relationship', *Security Dialogue* 31 (2000) 2, 215-228, 220-1.
[188] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union*111.
[189] Carole Landry, 'US gives cautious welcome to Franco-British defense pact', *Agence France Presse,* 4 December 1998 (via LexisNexis).
[190] Madeleine Albright, 'The right balance will secure NATO's future', *Financial Times,* 7 December 1998, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents*, Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 10-12, 10.
[191] Albright, 'The right balance will secure NATO's future', 11.

not EU members.[192] The US government thus clearly positioned the new European security and defence policy within the institutional context by stressing the importance of NATO and indicating the limits of the European initiative. Albright, having discussed the issue with Cook, also met with French President Jacques Chirac to make sure her message was understood. Chirac assured her that any European initiative would be complementary to NATO.[193]

US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott expressed even greater concern during a speech held in London on 7 October 1999. Talbott made clear that his country supported the work done regarding the ESDI. But he was concerned, much more than Secretary of State Albright, about recent developments within the EU. The St. Malo Declaration and the Cologne European Council conclusions 'could be read to imply that Europe's default position would be to act outside the Alliance whenever possible, rather than through the alliance'. Talbott, misinterpreting the EU's initiatives as aimed at reforming the ESDI, worried that this ESDI would eventually grow 'away from NATO, since that would lead to an ESDI that initially duplicates NATO but that could eventually compete with NATO'.[194]

The EU had assured the US repeatedly that the new initiative would not hinder NATO. Starting with the St. Malo declaration, thus before Albright's warning, NATO was designated as the foundation for collective defence of the member states. The EU would prevent unnecessary duplication, Albright's second condition. In addition, NATO was said to contribute from the European security and defence cooperation. Although the Council did not make it explicit, the appointment of Solana as HR was considered to send the US the message that also NATO's interests would be served.[195] Apparently, these assurances were not enough to satisfy the US. Therefore, in 1999 and 2000, officials from both the EU and its member states repeatedly tried to convince the US of the benefits of the CSDP for NATO.[196]

The British politician George Robertson, appointed as NATO Secretary-General on 14 October 1999, tried to dispel the American concerns as expressed by Albright and Talbott. He did so by introducing the 'three I's' to replace Albright's 'three D's' as three principles on

---

[192] Albright, 'The right balance will secure NATO's future', 11.
[193] 'Albright told that NATO and Europe's defence are complementary', *Agence France Presse,* 10 December 1998 (via LexisNexis).
[194] Speech by Strobe Talbott, 'America's Stake in a Strong Europe', London, 7 October 1999, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 54-59, 55-56.
[195] Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet and Rüger, *The High Representative for the EU Foreign and Security Policy,* 22; Hunter, *The European Security and Defense Policy,* 67.
[196] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 114.

which European security and defence cooperation should be based: 'improvement in European defence capabilities; inclusiveness and transparency for all Allies; and the indivisibility of Trans-Atlantic security, based on our shared values'.[197] Robertson added that European security and defence cooperation could be beneficial to the Alliance, and even necessary, because 'the burden of dealing with European security crises should not fall disproportionally on the shoulders of the US'. Such a division of labour, as was evident in the Kosovo crisis, was politically unsustainable in the long term. Therefore, Robertson argued for 'a more balanced Alliance, with a stronger European input'.[198] Robertson ended with the assurance that a stronger Europe did not mean 'less US', rather a stronger NATO. In sum, 'Strengthening Europe's role in security is about re-balancing the transatlantic relationship in line with European and American interests'.[199]

Especially British officials made great efforts to emphasize that the CSDP was compatible to NATO. The UK traditionally was a very 'Atlanticist' state, emphasizing a good relationship with the US and a strong commitment to NATO. Therefore, this country took the American concerns about the European initiatives seriously. But the British government did not only feel pressure from its Atlantic partner. Pressure also came from within the country. The opposition Conservatives accused the government of being dragged into anti-American policy.[200] Eurosceptics within the UK blamed Blair for selling the British forces to the EU, only to show that he was a good European, thus questioning his motives. Conservative Ian Duncan Smith said that in the CSDP, 'we have a process that appears to be driven by political dreams of deeper integration in Europe, regardless of the consequence. There can be no other explanation for a process which puts at risk a hugely successful military alliance'.[201] Criticism also came from other circles. Former Armed Forces Minister Nicholas Soames and former

[197] Speech by Lord Robertson, Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Amsterdam, 15 November 1999, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001), 60-65, 63.
[198] Speech by Lord Robertson, Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Amsterdam, 15 November 1999, 62.
[199] Ibidem, 63.
[200] Kevin McElderry, 'British, French leaders discuss European defence at summit', *Agence France Presse*, 25 November 1999 (via LexisNexis).
[201] Andy McSmith, 'Tories will scrap plans to set up EU army', *The Telegraph,* 12 June 2000, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1342311/Tories-will-scrap-plans-to-set-up-EU-army.html (accessed 16 November 2017).

Defence Secretary Tom King underlined the importance of NATO and warned for establishing a 'competing structure'. [202]

After meeting with Chirac in London on 25 November 1999, Blair felt the need to re-emphasize that the UK remained committed to the Atlantic partnership.[203] The next year, Blair also assured that, in contrast to the WEU, the current defence efforts did not hinder NATO.[204] Instead, according to British Defence Secretary Geoffrey Hoon, the EU intended to ensure a stronger European contribution to NATO, not a replacement of NATO.[205] Lord George Robertson agreed and emphasized that the CSDP would strengthen NATO.[206] The identification of forces and capabilities showed that the EU was willing to make a difference. Robertson emphasized that 'only in close cooperation with NATO can such a European option be developed successfully'. This included coherent NATO and EU defence planning.[207]

Defence Secretary Hoon responded to the Tories that: 'They should be ashamed of themselves for trying to use Armed Forces to further their own anti-European obsessions. This is not a standing European army. It is a pool of potentially available national forces'.[208] Also Blair insisted that the European efforts would not result in the establishment of a European army. Foreign Secretary Robin Cook added that all decisions on British participation in military operations would be taken by the British government. A senior defence official told *the Guardian* that the UK did not 'envisage the EU taking on a nation state'.[209]

---

[202] Michael Kallenbach, 'Blair 'can't be trusted' on military manoeuvre EU defence force', *The Daily Telegraph,* 23 November 2000 (via LexisNexis).
[203] McElderry, 'British, French leaders discuss European defence at summit'.
[204] Kallenbach, 'Blair 'can't be trusted' on military manoeuvre EU defence force'.
[205] Geoffrey Hoon, 'New EU-force aims to complement NATO', letter to the editor, *The Daily Telegraph*, 21 November 2000 (via LexisNexis).
[206] 'Minister denies Euro army move', *BBC News,* 14 November 2000, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/1023049.stm (accessed 16 November 2017); Ian Black and Michael White, '100,000 troops committed to EU force', *The Guardian,* 21 November 2000, https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2000/nov/21/eu.politicalnews (accessed 16 November 2017).
[207] Speech by Lord Robertson, 'Turkey and European Security and Defence Identity', Istanbul, 23 November 2000, https://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2000/s001123a.htm (accessed 16 November 2017).
[208] Kallenbach, 'Blair 'can't be trusted' on military manoeuvre EU defence force'; see also McSmith, 'Tories will scrap plans to set up EU army'.
[209] Richard Norton-Taylor, and Ian Black, 'Europe sets up rapid reaction force: Cook insists troop commitment does not mean common army', *The Guardian*, 20 November 2000 (via LexisNexis).

During the European Council meeting in Nice, US concerns revived. The EU's decision to plan operations outside the NATO framework combined with the French remarks on independent operational planning was interpreted as being aimed at competing with NATO. As a result, in the words of US senators Jesse Helms and Gordon Smith, the Nice summit generated 'transatlantic fireworks'.[210] In *The Telegraph*, they wrote:

> 'European leaders should reflect carefully on the true motivation behind ESDP, which many see as a means for Europe to check American power and influence within Nato. It certainly explains the EU's hesitation in expanding the initiative's links with Nato and in accepting Nato operational planning capabilities for ESDP military missions'. [211]

Earlier that month US Defence Secretary William Cohen already warned that if the EU wanted 'a separate operational planning capability . . . from [that of] NATO itself, then that is going to weaken the ties between the United States and NATO and NATO and the EU'.[212] In other words, such a decision would have negative consequences. Secretary-General Lord Robertson similarly argued that setting up such an independent operational planning capability, as France insisted on, was neither desirable nor necessary, 'and given limited defense budgets it would be a bit of a waste of money to have it'.[213] So, if the EU wanted to have access to NATO's assets, it had to use NATO's planning system.[214] Secretary of State Albright argued that there was 'no room for rivalry, jealousy or complacency'.[215] Instead, the EU needed to coordinate its efforts with NATO. As part of a solution, Albright suggested that NATO ministers would arrange the EU's assured access to NATO operational planning. Albright did not consider this 'a gift from NATO to the EU', rather, it was in NATO's own interests to avoid duplication and enable the EU to focus on the development of capabilities.[216]

The UK noticed the discontent across the Atlantic and tried to dispel the concerns. Therefore, in February 2001, the UK published a document on the EU relations with NATO.

---

[210] Jesse Helms and Gordon Smith, 'European defence policy is dangerous', *The Telegraph,* 28 December 2000, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/letters/4258080/European-defence-policy-is-dangerous.html (accessed 16 November 2017).
[211] Helms and Smith, 'European defence policy is dangerous'.
[212] Cited in Hunter, *The European Security and Defense Policy,* 106.
[213] Jeffrey Ulbrich, 'NATO foreign ministers have first discussion of EU military proposals', *BC Cycle, 14 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).*
[214] Stephen Castle, 'French slapped down over NATO threats', *The Independent,* 14 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).
[215] Ulbrich, 'NATO foreign ministers have first discussion of EU military proposals'.
[216] Ibidem.

The document held that the EU Capabilities Commitments Conference should be preceded by a meeting of a new NATO/EU capabilities group, thereby enabling the EU and NATO to exchange information on capability goals and actual capabilities. Later that month, Blair also assured that there would be a joint command. In contrast to French statements, Blair argued that military planning would take place within NATO. Also, Blair repeated the disputed right of first refusal which he attributed NATO. Now, the tables had turned. This time it was the UK which tried to alter the path but stumbled upon resistance, particularly from France. According to an EU official, 'France will not let the UK reverse the last two years'.[217]

The timing of Blair's reassurances was not a coincidence, since it came just one month after the inauguration of the new US president, George W. Bush. Initially, Blair and Bush seemed to agree that the European rapid reaction force would not be a threat to NATO.[218] David Sanger, White House correspondent for the *New York Times*, noted that the informal setting of the meeting between Bush and Blair and their message of solidarity, 'were clearly intended to dampen fears on both sides of the Atlantic that Mr. Bush would prove unable to strike the kind of close, easygoing friendship with Mr. Blair that former President Bill Clinton enjoyed'.[219] Soon, however, the scepticism reappeared in the US. 'The devil's in the details', US Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld said. And those details still had to be worked out.[220]

### 3.4 Conclusions

The decisions made in St. Malo not only opened possibilities for the EU member states, but at the same time closed off other options because of path-dependency. France and the UK, followed by the European Council, had agreed to develop an autonomous defence policy, but within the framework of NATO. Until 2003, the member states had to stick to this agreement because the institutional framework did not allow for change. The main reason was the existence of the formal rule that decisions had to be taken unanimously, a decision made by France and the UK themselves in St. Malo. Since the interests of the member states regarding the role of NATO continued to diverge, it was difficult, or even impossible, to change the initial agreement.

---

[217] Cited in: Gegout, 'The French and British change in position in the CESDP', 75.
[218] Hugo Young, 'We've lost that Allied feeling: Bush's first moves aren't winning Europe's heart', *The Washington Post,* 1 April 2001 (via LexisNexis).
[219] David Sanger, 'Bush tells Blair he doesn't oppose new Europe force', *The New York Times,* 24 February 2001 (via LexisNexis).
[220] 'Rumsfeld: "Devils in the details" on European Defence', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 21 March 2001 (via LexisNexis).

Next to this formal rule, also the informal norm of credibility played a role in limiting the member states' options. To play a role in the international stage, credibility is important. Without it, a state risks isolation. This means that states must live up to agreements made in the past. For France, this implied that it had to allow NATO to have a say in the CSDP, since it had attributed NATO a role in the CSDP by signing the St. Malo agreement. But also for the whole European Union credibility was at stake which meant that it had to live up to its promises and implement its goals.

Actual institutions also attempted to influence the CSDP. The institutions of the EU itself proved to have limited influence. The European Parliament was the institution that was most vocal about the developments in the CSDP, often pressuring the EU to up its efforts, still it lacked actual influence. A more important institutional actor was NATO. The US, but also the British Conservative opposition, was keen to point out the importance of NATO for Europe's security. The American support for the development of the CSDP therefore depended upon the policy's complementarity with NATO. When the US voiced its critique, reassurances from the EU often followed, suggesting that NATO did have indirect influence on the EU. Such assurances also appeared in each official EU document, revealing the value the EU attached to having a good relationship with both the US and NATO.

# Chapter 4. A new juncture

After St. Malo, the only option for EU member states was to continue the path that they had started, unable to change or reverse the agreement. In 2003, however, the EU member states were able to alter the path they had chosen in the late 1990s, changing the Helsinki Headline Goals. What changed exactly? And, how was this change possible? This chapter will shed light onto these questions.

## 4.1 Pressure for developing the CSDP

Although peace had not returned completely to the Balkans in the early twenty-first century, the situation had become less acute. Because the Yugoslav wars constituted an important legitimization for the CSDP, the absence of war made the development of the CSDP less important. But at the same time, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 placed the CSDP back on the agenda. On 11 September 2001, Al Qaeda attacked the US, killing and injuring thousands of people. The day after the terrorist attacks, EU foreign ministers stressed complete solidarity with the US government and its people. 'These horrendous acts are an attack not only on the United States but against humanity itself and the values and freedom we all share', the ministers declared.[221] That same day, NATO invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, determining that an attack against one Ally was an attack against all Allies, for the first time in history. In the following days, the EU offered the US assistance, for example in helping with search and rescue as well as with identifying, bringing to justice and punishing the perpetrators and by preventing new terrorist attacks.[222]

In an extraordinary session on 21 September 2001, the European Council made the fight against terrorism a 'priority objective of the European Union'.[223] In December 2001, the Council, convening in Laeken, similarly stated that the role the EU had to play in the future

[221] Special meeting of the General Affairs Council in Brussels, 'Declaration by the European Union', 12 September 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 143-144, 143.
[222] Javier Solana, 'A broad consensus against terrorism', *Financial Times,* 13 September 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 145-146; Special meeting of the General Affairs Council in Brussels, 'Declaration by the European Union', 12 September 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 143-144, 143; 'Joint EU-US ministerial statement on combating terrorism', Brussels, 20 September 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 149.
[223] Extraordinary European Council meeting in Brussels, 'Conclusions and Plan of Action of the Extraordinary European Council meeting on 21 September 2001', 21 September 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 150-154, 150.

was 'that of a power resolutely doing battle against all violence, all terror and all fanaticism'.[224] This did not mean that the EU had to go in a complete new direction. On the contrary, the EU assumed that the CSDP in its original shape was also fit for the task of fighting terrorism, which became an official Petersberg task in June 2002.[225] Therefore, it was considered of even greater importance to make the CSDP operational as soon as possible.[226] As HR Solana noted, the Petersberg tasks did not become obsolete, but even 'more relevant and urgent'.[227]

Starting in 2002, several EU leaders also stressed the importance of further developing the CSDP. President Chirac and Chancellor Schröder, during meetings on 30 July 2002 and 22 January 2003, pledged to step-up their efforts to advance the rapid reaction capacity of the EU.[228] In July 2002, in a letter addressed to the architects of St. Malo, Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt stated that, 'we must re-launch the idea of a European defence and rekindle

[224] European Council in Laeken, 'Presidency Conclusions, Annex I: Laeken Declaration on the future of the European Union', 14-15 December 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 113- 119, 114.
[225] European Council in Laeken, 'Presidency Report on European security and defence policy', 14-15 December 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 122-130, 122; European Parliament, 'The progress achieved in the implementation of the common foreign and security policy', resolution, Strasbourg, 25 October 2001, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P5-TA-2001-0576&format=XML&language=EN (accessed 16 November 2017); European Council in Seville, 'Presidency Conclusions, Annex V: Draft Declaration of the European Council on the contribution of CFSP, including ESDP, in the fight against terrorism', 21-22 June 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003), 272-274.
[226] Joint declaration by the heads of state and government of the EU, the president of the European Parliament, the President of the European Commission and the High Representative of the CFSP, Brussels, 14 September 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 147-148, 148.
[227] Speech by Javier Solana, 'CFSP: The State of the Union', Paris, 1 July 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003), 104-111, 109.
[228] Franco-German Summit in Paris, 'Joint declaration by M. Jacques Chirac, president of the French Republic, and M. Gerhard Schröder, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany', 22 January 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003) 16-21, 18; Franco-German Defence and Security Summit, 'Schwerin Statement', 30 July 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003), 115-117.

the Saint-Malo spirit'.[229] Furthermore, Solana called in October 2002 for further improvements in the CSDP: 'we must do more (and better)'.[230]

The threat of war in Iraq only increased this need for European military capabilities. The transatlantic crisis already started after the inauguration of US president George W. Bush in 2001. On 15 June 2001, Solana wrote in an article for the *Financial Times* that there were 'divisions and misgivings' about trade, the US rejection of the Kyoto protocol on global warming, its plans for missile defence, and uncertainty about continued US engagement in the Balkans.[231]Almost a year later, after 9/11, Solana added that the new direction of the US government with regard to fight against terrorism resulted in a 'heated debate about the future of transatlantic relations'.[232] The US considered prevention, not merely punishment, the right response to terrorism. This standpoint was controversial since pre-emptive strikes touched upon the limits of international law. Acting militarily after an attack was considered legitimate, but preventive military action was prohibited according to international law. But, the concept of pre-emption was new and therefore not officially against international law. Nevertheless, the legal status of pre-emptive strikes remained controversial.

In addition, the US developed strong unilateralist tendencies. Deputy Secretary of Defence Paul D. Wolfowitz explained that the US would implement its policy, even when other countries disagree with it. By using 'different coalitions for different missions', or 'flexible coalitions', the coalition would not unravel if one country decided to participate in one operation but rejected the other.[233] This American unilateralism became particularly strong regarding Iraq, a country the US designated as part of an 'axis of evil' in January 2002. The country was said to pose a grave and growing danger to the peace in the world because it, in the American view, manufactured weapons of mass destruction (WMD).[234] On 12

---

[229] Letter from Guy Verhofstadt, Brussels, 18 July 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003), 112-114, 113.
[230] Informal meeting of EU defence ministers in Rethymnon, Summary of intervention of Javier Solana, 4-5 October 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003), 132-133, 133.
[231] Javier Solana, 'Destined to cooperate', *Financial Times,* 14 June 2001, in Maartje Rutten (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002), 22-23, 22.
[232] Speech by Javier Solana, Washington DC, 20 May 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003), 62-64, 62.
[233] Speech by Paul D. Wolfowitz, Munich, 2 February 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003), 22-29, 24-25.
[234] Speech by President George W. Bush, 'State of the Union', Washington D.C., 29 January 2002, https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html (accessed 20 November 2017).

September 2002, Bush requested the UN Security Council to take a stand on Iraq.[235] On 14 November 2002, the Security Council responded with Resolution 1441, urging Iraq to disarm and establishing a more robust inspection regime to enable inspections that were obstructed by the Iraqi regime ever since these were started in 1991.

Although the EU supported the resolution and urged Iraq to cooperate with the weapons inspectors, the prospect of a possible military intervention caused high tensions within the EU.[236] Opinions on possible military action in Iraq varied widely between one camp supporting military intervention and the other urging for peaceful disarmament.[237] To the latter camp belonged France, Germany, and Belgium. In Chirac's view: 'War is always the admission of defeat and is always the worst of solutions'.[238] Although this position was also supported by the European Commission, European Parliament and by HR Solana, the French and German rejection of military action in Iraq was not received well by the proponents of such action.[239] Jon Henley explained in *the Guardian* that the countries' rejection of war in Iraq 'has exasperated America and angered eight European leaders enough to push them into publishing their support for the US position'.[240] Rumsfeld responded by calling France and Germany the 'old Europe'.[241] The leaders of Spain, Portugal, Italy, the UK, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Denmark sided with the US government and echoed

---

[235] 'George Bush's speech to the UN general assembly', *The Guardian,* 12 September 2002, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/sep/12/iraq.usa3 (accessed 20 November 2017).
[236] Statement by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on Security Council Resolution 1441 (Iraq), Brussels, 14 November 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003) 141.
[237] General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels, 'Conclusions', 27 January 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003) 342.
[238] Lindley-French, *A Chronology of European Security and Defence 1945-2006*, 295; Joint declaration by Russia, Germany and France on Iraq, Paris, 10 February 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003) 346; '1st lead : France, Germany celebrate friendship, present joint European vision', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 22 January 2003 (via LexisNexis); Joint declaration by Belgium, France and Germany on Iraq, Brussels, 16 February 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003) 347
[239] 'Act within U.N. framework, Europe's politicians again urge Bush', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 4 September 2002 (via LexisNexis); 'Solana warns against unilateral attack on Iraq', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 8 September 2002 (via LexisNexis); 'U.N. must all to avoid "catastrophe of war": Solana', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 19 January 2003 (via LexisNexis); 'European Parliament opposes US strikes on Iraq', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 30 January 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[240] Jon Henley, Le Touquet summit: Analysis: Dextrous president begins to manoeuvre away from anti-war axis with Germany'', *The Guardian,* 5 February 2003 (via LexisNexis); Alan Freeman, 'France, Germany defy U.S.; By pooling their influence, Paris and Berlin hope to head off war in Iraq', *Globe and Mail,* 23 January 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[241] 'U.S. Defense Secretary: Germany and France are "old Europe"', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 22 January 2003 (via LexisNexis).

American statements about Iraq as a 'clear threat to world security'. [242] Their so-called 'letter of eight' stated that European governments had 'a common responsibility to face this threat'.[243] Eventually, in March 2003, the US-led intervention in Iraq took off.

The crisis, not only in the transatlantic, but also intra-European relations increased the pressure on EU member states to continue their work on the CSDP. Then director of the European Union Institute for Security Studies Nicole Gnesotto explained: 'The prospect of an intra-European or transatlantic split drives the Europeans to finding bases for reconciliation elsewhere'.[244] And indeed, Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt noted: 'If we want to count on the international scene, if we want to avoid division, which we experienced during the Iraq crisis, then it's absolutely necessary that we have European defence'. 'Otherwise', he added, 'EU foreign policy is not credible'.[245]

Chirac and Blair, who found themselves on opposing sides regarding the Iraq war, met on 4 February 2003 in Le Touquet where they agreed to step up efforts in the CSDP and considered developing the capacity for rapid reaction a priority.[246] More importantly, the two introduced the idea of revising the capability objectives which the EU had set itself in 1999.[247] Parliament, in addition, proposed to delay the Headline Goal to 2009. By this year, Parliament wished the Union to be capable 'of carrying out within the European geographic area an operation at the level and intensity of the Kosovo conflict, in cooperation with NATO or autonomously if the alliance does not wish to'.[248]

---

[242] Joint letter to *The Times* by the leaders of eight European countries, 'European Leaders call for Europe and United States to stand united', 30 January 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003) 343-344, 343.
[243] Joint letter to *The Times* by the leaders of eight European countries, 'European Leaders call for Europe and United States to stand united', 30 January 2003, 344.
[244] Nicole Gnesotto, 'Preface', in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 9-10, 9.
[245] Ian Black, 'France, Germany deepen UK rift', *The Guardian,* 30 April 2003, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/30/iraq.iraq (accessed 22 November 2017).
[246] Franco-British Summit in Le Touquet, 'Declaration on strengthening European cooperation in security and defence, 4 February 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003) 36-39, 36; Hugh Schofield, 'France and Britain fail to resolve differences on Iraq', *Agence France Presse,* 4 February 2003 (via LexisNexis); 'Analysis: chirac and Blair to meet as bilateral tensions are high', *Deutsche Presse-agentur,* 5 February 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[247] Franco-British Summit in Le Touquet, 'Declaration on strengthening European cooperation in security and defence, 4 February 2003, 38.
[248] European Parliament, 'The new European security and defence architecture - priorities and deficiencies', resolution, Strasbourg, 10 April 2003,

The opponents of the Iraq war drew an additional lesson, namely that not only the CSDP but specifically the capacity for autonomous military action had to be developed. To this end, Belgium, Germany, France, and Luxembourg proposed to establish 'a nucleus collective capability for planning and conducting operations of the European Union', an autonomous headquarters to be installed in Tervuren, Belgium.[249] Although France and Germany insisted that it was not an 'anti-American' gathering, it gained a lot of political and media attention.[250] The US was not fond of this proposal, mainly because it constituted unnecessary duplication of NATO, something the EU had pledged to prevent.[251] Blair agreed and emphasized that the EU should not undermine the relationship with NATO, suggesting that this proposal was doing so. Therefore, the proposal was 'extremely unhelpful'.[252] Also, unnecessary duplication would bring with it unnecessary costs.[253] Several countries shared the British concerns, including the EU's smaller states. Czech President Vaclav Klaus warned that creating a headquarters outside Brussels was risky and something of a financial luxury that smaller states could not afford. While Czech Republic at that moment had yet to become a member of the EU, as it did on the 1st of May 2004, the country was prepared to 'fight Brussels' bureaucracy' to halt the proposal.[254] Considering this opposition, the establishment of a European headquarters was unlikely.

The UK came up with an alternative proposal, calling for the creation of a European planning cell at SHAPE, NATO's headquarters in Brussels.[255] This idea was much better received in NATO circles, but not necessarily within the EU where both Belgium and

---

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P5-TA-2003-0188+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN (accessed 22 November 2017).

[249] European defence meeting 'Tervuren' in Brussels, 'Meeting of the heads of state and government of Germany, France, Luxembourg and Belgium on European defence', 29 April 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 76-80, 79-80.

[250] George Wright, 'EU military summit angers Britain', *The Guardian,* 29 April 2003, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/29/eu.politics (accessed 22 November 2017).

[251] Craig S. Smith, 'Europeans plan own military command post', *The New York Times,* 3 September 2003, http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/03/world/europeans-plan-own-military-command-post.html (accessed 22 November 2017).

[252] Black, 'France, Germany deepen UK rift'.

[253] Informal meeting of EU defence ministers in Rome, 'British non-paper 'food for thought'', 29 August 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 204-207, 204-6.

[254] 'Czech president slams EU defence plan', *Agence France Presse,* 21 October 2003 (via LexisNexis); Black, 'France, Germany deepen UK rift'.

[255] Informal meeting of EU defence ministers in Rome, 'British non-paper 'food for thought'', 29 August 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 204-207, 205.

Parliament continued to call for a European planning capacity.[256] This changed after Nicholas Burns, US ambassador to NATO, voiced his concerns, calling the initiative the 'most significant threat to NATO's future'.[257] Hereafter, Chirac urged that European defence must be 'completely consistent' with the commitments to NATO, and Verhofstadt said that the EU would not compete with NATO.[258] Finally, in November, a consensus had emerged that a European headquarters should not duplicate the planning resources available at SHAPE.[259] France, Germany and the UK, discussing the possible modalities of the European planning capacity, proposed 'a small EU cell [that] should be established at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE).'[260] Regarding autonomous EU operations, the countries proposed to use national headquarters, which could be multinationalized, or, when necessary, to draw on the collective capacity of the EUMS. [261] Later the paper was taken over in entirety by the EU Italian presidency and submitted to European Council.[262]

While terrorism and the following transatlantic crisis created awareness in the EU about the need to develop autonomous military capacities, this need became even stronger when the EU proved unable to attain the Helsinki Headline Goal. Although Solana was optimistic of the progress made, stating: 'Three years after Helsinki, we are going to be ready', this proved not to be the case.[263] In May 2003, the EU foreign ministers reflected on the progress made and concluded that 'the EU now has operational capability across the full

[256] Martin Reichard, *The EU-NATO Relationship: A Legal and Political Perspective* (Aldershot 2006) 84; Smith, 'Europeans plan own military command post'; European Parliament, 'The annual report from the Council to the European Parliament on the main aspects and basic choices of CFSP, including the financial implications for the general budget of the European Union', resolution, Strasbourg, 23 October 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 235-249, 242.
[257] Lindley-French, *A Chronology of European Security and Defence 1945-2006*, 308-309.
[258] Honor Mahony, 'EU seeks to reassure US on defence, *EUObserver,* 18 October 2003, https://euobserver.com/news/13094 (accessed 22 November 2017).
[259] Reichard, *The EU-NATO Relationship*, 86
[260] Joint paper by France, Germany and the United Kingdom, 'European defence: NATO/EU Consultation, Planning and Operations', Naples, 29 November 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 283-284, 283.
[261] Joint paper by France, Germany and the United Kingdom, 'European defence: NATO/EU Consultation, Planning and Operations', Naples, 29 November 2003, 284.
[262] European Council in Brussels, 'European defence: NATO/EU Consultation, Planning and Operations', 12 December 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 322-323.
[263] Remarks by Javier Solana following the agreement on the establishment of EU-NATO permanent arrangements, Brussels, 16 December 2002, 179.

range of Petersberg tasks', although 'limited and constrained by recognized shortfalls'.[264] The EU was thus able to mobilize up to 60,000 troops. But, 'high risk may arise at the upper end of the spectrum of scale and intensity, in particular when conducting concurrent operations', the ministers declared. Moreover, the EU was not yet able to deploy the troops in the given time. The ability to deploy troops rapidly depended on 'the political willingness and ability to accelerate decision making', two issues the EU had yet to improve. [265] During an informal meeting of defence ministers, Solana similarly stressed the importance of political will, not only for providing resources but also for increasing the ability to make more decisive and concrete actions.[266] Soon, however, the EU proved to have this political will to deploy troops rapidly, only not the rapid response force designed in the Headline Goal.

### 4.2 Testcase for autonomous rapid military action

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) was the location where the EU for the first time tested the concept of autonomous military rapid response. In Bunia, a city in north-eastern DRC, tribal fighting had broken out, killing hundreds of people. On 10 May 2003, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan contacted President Chirac to request French military deployment to Bunia.[267] France responded positively and started planning the operation, initially called operation Mamba. Chirac realized that the situation could serve as a testcase for an autonomous EU-led operation, therefore attempted to convince his EU partners to send troops along the French.[268] Other considerations also might have pressured Chirac to look for partners. On 14 May, the head of the Rwandan-backed rebel group Union of Congolese Patriots, which had seized Bunia, announced that they would consider French troops as enemies.[269] Rwandan presidential advisor, Patrick Mazimhaka, similarly feared that a French military presence in Congo might aggravate the situation. Mazimhaka referred to the events in

[264] General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels, 'Conclusions', 19-20 May 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 86-90, 86-7.
[265] General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels, 'Conclusions', 19-20 May 2003, 88.
[266] Informal meeting of defence ministers in Brussels, Remarks by Javier Solana at the Capabilities Conference, 19 may 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 95-96, 96.
[267] Paul Geitner, 'European Union approves Congo peacekeeping mission – first outside Europe and without NATO help', *The Associated Press,* 4 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[268] Kees Homan, 'Operation Artemis in the Democratic Republic of Congo', in Andrea Ricci and Eero Kytömaa (eds.), *Faster and more united? The debate about Europe's crisis response capacity* (Luxembourg 2007) 151-155, 152; Koivula, 'The Origins and First Years of the European Union Battlegroups', 117.
[269] 'DRC rebel group says French UN troops would be viewed as "enemies"', *Agence France Presse,* 14 May 2003 (via LexisNexis).

Rwanda in 1994. Then, a French UN force had to evacuate the genocidaires. Given the presence of many of those genocidaires in north-eastern Congo, the residents 'might think the French are coming to protect them again', Mazimhaka believed.[270] Moreover, on 21 May, spokesman of the UN Secretary-General, Fred Eckhard, stated that governments were arranging 'a force that would have the necessary strength and also the political balance to be most acceptable to all the parties in this conflict'.[271] With this statement Eckhard implied that the current force that was being set up, a French force, was not acceptable to all parties.

After intense diplomatic activity at the level of the Political Security Committee (PSC), France was able to convince the EU member states to establish a European, not French, operation.[272] On 19 May, the EU's foreign ministers tasked HR Solana to initiate a Crisis Management Concept, thereby setting the political-strategic parameters for operations. Then, the UN Security Council issued resolution 1484 on 30 May 2003, authorizing an Interim Emergency Military Force in Bunia. This force had to contribute to the stabilization of the security and humanitarian situation. Moreover, it was supposed to protect the airport, the internally displaced persons in the camps and, if necessary, the population, UN personnel and the humanitarian presence.[273] On 5 June 2003, the Council of the EU decided to conduct a military operation, named Artemis, in accordance with the mandate set out in resolution 1484.[274]

France did maintain the lead of the operation and was designated as framework nation. Furthermore, the Operational Headquarters was installed in France.[275] France also provided the bulk of the 1,400 troops. Additional troops were deployed by Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden and the UK.[276] On June 6, the first elements arrived in Bunia and took

---

[270] 'Rwanda, DR Congo rebels opposed to French deployment', *Agence France Presse,* 15 May 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[271] 'Daily Press Briefing by the Office of the Spokesman for the Secretary General', *United Nations,* 21 May 2003, http://www.un.org/press/en/2003/db052103.doc.htm (accessed 22 November 2017).
[272] Balossi-Restelli, 'Fit for what?, 159.
[273] United Nations Security Council, 'Security Council authorizes interim force in Bunia, Democratic Republic of Congo, until 1 September', 30 May 2003, https://www.un.org/press/en/2003/sc7772.doc.htm (accessed 22 November 2017).
[274] Joint Action 2003/432/CFSP on the European Union military operation in the Democratic Republic of Congo (Artemis), Brussels, 5 June 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 99-105, 101.
[275] Joint Action 2003/432/CFSP on the European Union military operation in the Democratic Republic of Congo (Artemis), Brussels, 5 June 2003, 101.
[276] Stephen Castle, 'Military Mission to Africa is first for the EU', *The Independent*, 5 June 2003; Michael Smith, *Europe's Common Security and Defence Policy* (Cambridge 2017) 92.

over from about 750 U.N. peacekeepers from Uruguay.[277] On 12 June, the UN Security Council officially launched Operation Artemis. The EU force would provide a 'bridging element' between two phases. Therefore, the mission was set to end on 1 September. From then on, a UN force led by Bangladesh would take over.[278]

The mission was believed to be risky. 'The situation is anything but safe or stable at the moment', EU spokesman Diego de Ojeda said.[279] General Bruno Neveux, operation commander of the EU force, said to be 'well aware' of the risks but was confident that the mission would be fulfilled.[280] One week later, Neveux stated that the situation already appeared to be stabilizing.[281] French Defence Minister Michele Alliot-Marie was equally positive and said on 3 August that the mission was accomplished. The European Council similarly concluded several months later that all objectives were achieved. The security conditions were improved to allow for a timely reinforced UN presence. Also, the operation contributed to a 'smooth' implementation of the peace process and the setting up of the transitional institution in Kinshasa.[282]

After the EU Police Mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina (started on 1 January 2003) as the first crisis management operation and operation Concordia in former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (started on 31 March 2003) as the first military crisis management operation based on Berlin plus arrangements, Operation Artemis was the first autonomous military operation.[283] Alliot-Marie considered this a 'historic moment'. Operation Artemis proved that the EU was able to deploy autonomously a battlegroup-sized force in Africa within 15 days after a UN resolution. Moreover, the success of the operation demonstrated that such a force was able to a difference on the ground. Therefore, Alliot-Marie argued that it would serve as a

---

[277] Lindstrom, *Enter the EU Battlegroups,* 10-11; Geitner, 'European Union approves Congo peacekeeping mission – first outside Europe and without NATO help'.
[278] 'E.U. gears up for "risky" Congo peace mission', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 5 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[279] Paul Geitner, 'European Union approves Congo peacekeeping mission – first outside Europe and without NATO help', *The Associated Press,* 4 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[280] 'E.U. military mission in Congo on track, says operation commander', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 13 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[281] 'Strife-torn DR Congo town more stable after arrival of EU force: general', *Agence France Presse,* 19 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[282] European Council in Brussels, 'ESDP Presidency report', 12 December 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 299-310, 299.
[283] European Council in Thessaloniki, 'Presidency report on European security and defence policy', 20 June 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 153-159, 153.

model for the European rapid reaction force the EU aimed to put together by the end of the year.[284] Moreover, Alliot-Marie argued that the security of Africa was 'from now on inscribed in the field of priorities that the Europeans handle collectively in their common policy of foreign affairs and security', whereas the focus earlier was on the security of Europe's neighbourhood.[285]

### 4.3 Introducing the Battlegroups

While conducting its first autonomous military operation, the EU also developed its first strategic document. In May 2003, Solana was tasked to formulate the EU's security strategy.[286] Solana submitted a draft version in June, which was finalized and published in December. This European Security Strategy (ESS) identified four key threats (terrorism, proliferation of WMD's, regional conflicts, and failed states and organized crime) and three objectives (to contribute to the stability and good governance in the neighbourhood, to build an international order based on effective multilateralism and to tackle threats). The EU had to become more active, more coherent and more capable.[287]

Whereas the ESS was limited to relatively broad and vague statements, France and the UK had a clear idea of how the EU should go forward regarding the establishment of the capacity for military rapid response. As the French defence minister already predicted in June, Operation Artemis would serve as a model for the European rapid response force. Chirac and Blair declared on 24 November that, in their view, the EU should build on the precedent set by Operation Artemis, 'so that it is able to respond through ESDP to future similar requests from the United Nations, whether in Africa or elsewhere'. [288] Therefore, Blair and Chirac

---

[284] '"Mission accomplished" for French-led EU force in DR Congo: minister', *Agence France Presse,* 3 August 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[285] 'France: Security of Africa becomes EU priority', *Xinhua General News Service,* 2 September 2003 (via LexisNexis).
[286] General Affairs and External Relations Council in Luxembourg, 'European security and defence policy', 16 juni 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 119-123, 121.
[287] Report by Javier Solana on the Security Strategy of the EU, 'A secure Europe in a better world', Thessaloniki, 20 June 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 160-169, 162-168; European Council in Brussels, European Security Strategy, 'A secure Europe in a better world', 12 December 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 324-333, 326.
[288] Franco-British Summit in London, 'Franco-British declaration on strengthening European cooperation in security and defence', 24 November 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 280-282, 281.

stated that the EU should be 'capable and willing' to deploy in troops for an autonomous operation within 15 days. Moreover, they introduced the battlegroup-sized forces, each around 1,500 troops.[289] Although the Parliament had earlier suggested to lower the number of forces to 5,000, it was Operation Artemis that proved to serve as a template.

Moreover, the declaration stated that these troops could be offered by a single nation or through multinational or framework nation force package. The forces had to be able to operate under a Chapter VII mandate, referring to Chapter VII of the UN Charter which allowed the use of force. And like in the case of Operation Artemis, the forces could be deployed to stabilize a situation or meet 'a short-term need' until peacekeepers from the UN or other regional organizations, acting under UN mandate, could arrive or be reinforced. So, in many ways the French-British proposal for the European rapid reaction force resembled Operation Artemis. At the same time, the force had to be compatible with NATO. Blair and Chirac stated that the EU had to work with NATO 'to improve the links between the two organisations and enhance their rapid reaction capabilities in a compatible manner'. [290]

On 26 November 2003, Germany supported the concept of Battlegroups that France and the UK introduced.[291] On 10 February, the three countries submitted the Battlegroups proposal to the PSC. This proposal differed only slightly from earlier proposals since it specified that the rapid reaction forces were appropriate for use in failed states or failing states. Since most of these were in Africa, this argument however was not very innovative. Moreover, the proposal underlined that the rapid response forces 'need not necessarily be large'. Rather, they needed to be able to be 'militarily effective, credible, coherent and capable of stand-alone operations'.[292] The proposal added the requirement of complementarity with UN's Standby High-Readiness Brigade (SHIRBRIG). In principle, this complementarity already existed. In contrast to the French-British-German proposal, SHIRBRIG was larger, slower and had to deal with Chapter VI operations dealing with the peaceful settlement of disputes. The detailed interrelation of the two rapid response forces still needed to be developed.[293]

---

[289] Franco-British Summit in London, 'Franco-British declaration on strengthening European cooperation in security and defence', 24 November 2003, 281.
[290] Ibidem.
[291] Lindley-French, *A Chronology of European Security and Defence 1945-2006*, 311.
[292] UK/France/Germany Food for Thought Paper, the Battlegroups Concept, Brussels, 10 February 2004, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *EU security and defence: core documents 2004*, Chaillot Paper 75 (Paris 2005), 10-16, 10-12
[293] UK/France/Germany Food for Thought Paper, the Battlegroups Concept, Brussels, 10 February 2004, 15.

### 4.4 Revising the Headline Goal

The proposal for establishing Battlegroups instead of a larger rapid response force soon became a key objective of the EU. To overcome the capabilities gap identified in May 2003, the European Council decided in December that the EU should set a new Headline Goal with a horizon of 2010.[294] As Mika Kerttunen argued, the Helsinki Headline Goal of 1999 set the institutional framework and the new Headline Goal 2010, tried 'to put some flesh on the bones'.[295] Rapid response remained to be an important concept, as set out in the ESS and in the Battlegroup concept of France, Britain and Germany. In April 2004, the defence ministers responded positively to the established concept, further developed by the EUMS and proposed 2007 as the target date for operational capability.[296] The next month the foreign ministers agreed on the Headline Goal 2010 with the Battlegroups as the key component.

The Headline Goal 2010, as approved by the foreign ministers on 17 May 2004, included 'the main parameters for the development of EU military capabilities with a 2010 horizon, notably the definition of the level of ambition for rapid reaction battlegroups'. The ambition on decision-making was within five days, and deployment within ten days after the decision. The new Headline Goal reflected the altered context, specifically 'the new Headline Goal reflects the European Security Strategy, the evolution of the strategic environment and of technology'. At the same time, it drew 'on lessons learned from EU-led operations'. Regarding the lessons learned, these were specifically those learned from Operation Artemis. As Britain, France, and later also Germany argued, the EU needed a rapid response force that was able to conduct Artemis-like operations. Therefore, the Headline Goal included the countries' proposal to establish Battlegroups. Regarding the altered strategic environment and the ESS, these Battlegroups had to deal with an expanded list of tasks, now including joint disarmament operations, support for third countries in combating terrorism and security sector reform as additional tasks. This way, the Battlegroups were relevant for the new strategic

[294] European Council in Brussels, 'ESDP Presidency report', 12 December 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 299-310, 301; Lindley-French, *A Chronology of European Security and Defence 1945-2006*, 308.
[295] Kerttunen, 'The EU Battlegroup', 128.
[296] Lindley-French, *A Chronology of European Security and Defence 1945-2006*, 318; Council of the European Union - European Union Military Committee, 'EU Battlegroup Concept', 13618/1/06, COSDP 775, Brussels, 2 October 2006, partly declassified 11 December 2012, http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-13618-2006-REV-1-EXT-1/en/pdf (accessed 28 November 2017), 6.

environment.[297] These additional tasks were part of the Constitutional Treaty signed in 2004. Since this treaty was never ratified, it was the Lisbon Treaty of 2009 that officially expanded the range of the Petersberg tasks.[298] On 17-18 June 2004, also the heads of state and government in the European Council endorsed the Headline Goal 2010.[299]

### 4.5 Copy-paste

Whereas Operation Artemis served as a model for the Battlegroup concept, inspiration was also drawn from the NATO Response Force. The force was established just a few months earlier in response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the US. As argued in Chapter 2, the terrorist attacks altered the EU's strategic environment but not its strategy. Instead, the EU's expanding 'toolbox' was considered as relevant for the new threat of terrorism as it was for existing threats. In the US, in contrast, the idea emerged that additional instruments were necessary. According to US officials, 9/11 demonstrated the need to be able to respond quickly.[300] As one US official said: 'There are no more threats to NATO from within Europe, but from a nexus of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction'. Therefore, 'NATO needs an expeditionary force, a strike force, that can move fast'.[301]

During a meeting of NATO defence ministers in Warsaw, Poland on 24-25 September 2002, US Secretary of Defence Rumsfeld announced the American proposal to establish such a 20,000-strong rapid reaction force within NATO.[302] NATO endorsed the proposal in November. To be able to carry out all possible missions, NATO member states believed it required field forces that were rapidly deployable. Effective military forces, the heads of state and government declared, were essential for safeguarding the freedom and security of their population and for contributing to international peace and security. To this end, it was decided to create a NATO Response Force (NRF) consisting of 'technologically advanced, flexible,

---

[297] General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels, 'European security and defence policy – Council conclusions', 17 May 2004, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *EU security and defence: core documents 2004*, Chaillot Paper 75 (Paris 2005), 63-70, 63-64.
[298] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', 62.
[299] European Council in Brussels, 'Presidency report on ESDP, Annexe I: Headline Goal 2010', 17-18 June 2004, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *EU security and defence: core documents 2004*, Chaillot Paper 75 (Paris 2005), 111-116, 111.
[300] 'Editorial: Nato Response Force', *Voice of America News,* 26 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).
[301] Steven Erlanger, 'Rumsfeld urges NATO to set up Strike Force', *The New York Times,* 25 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).
[302] 'Nato chief pleads for unity', *BBC News,* 25 September 2002, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2280249.stm (accessed 20 November 2017).

deployable, interoperable and sustainable force' which included land, sea and air elements.[303] The NRF was supposed to have initial operational capability before October 2004 and full operational capability before October 2006.

The proposal for the NRF resembled the EU's Headline Goal in several ways. Both forces shared the objective of transforming national armed forces, covered similar tasks (crisis management in particular) and drew from the same pool of forces.[304] According to Christopher Reynolds, this resemblance was not a coincidence. Reynolds explained that 'the NRF could also be seen as a deliberate reaction – and competitor – to concomitant EU efforts at establishing its own rapid reaction force through the Helsinki Headline Goal, not least since both would invariably draw upon the same troops and same capabilities'.[305] Moreover, NRF was 'a clear example of a NATO initiative inspired by the ESDP'.[306] However, not Rumsfeld nor other defence officials ever made this explicit. Instead, Rumsfeld argued that the NRF had to be compatible with its European equivalent. Similarly, NATO Secretary-General Lord Robertson argued that claims of the NRF competing with the EU's forces were 'complete rubbish'.[307] Also, whereas the EU force focused on low-level operations, Rumsfeld's proposal aimed at developing a 'warfighting capability'.[308] The NRF thus also had to be capable of dealing with the high end of the conflict spectrum.[309]

Despite the assurances on the compatibility of the NRF with the force the EU was developing, resemblance between the two raised concerns, particularly in France and Germany. France accepted the proposal but believed that the area of operation of the NRF had

---

[303] NATO Summit in Prague, 'Declaration by the Heads of State and Government', 21-22 November 2002, in Jean-Yves Haine (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003) 156-163, 157.
[304] Major and Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', 13; NATO Summit in Prague, 'Declaration by the Heads of State and Government', 21-22 November 2002, 157; Jens Ringsmose and Sten Rynning, 'The NATO Response Force: A qualified failure no more?', *Contemporary Security Policy* (2017) 1-14, 2-3; Janet McEvoy, 'Seeking anti-terror role, NATO allies welcome US response force plan', *Agence France Presse,* 24 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).
[305] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 216.
[306] Ibidem, 239.
[307] Honor Mahony and Lisbeth Kirk, 'Robertson: EU is 'flabby giant' not 'pygmy'', *EUObserver*, 8 October 2002 (via LexisNexis).
[308] Press Conference by Donald Rumsfeld, Warsaw, 25 September 2002, http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020925c.htm (accessed 20 November 2017); Pamela Hess, 'Rumsfeld to propose new NATO force', *United Press International*, 20 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).
[309] 'Defense Department Background Briefing Re: Secretary Rumsfeld's Upcoming Trip To The Informal NATO Ministerials in Warsaw, Attributable to a Senior Defense Official, Location: Pentagon Briefing Room, Arlington, Virginia', *Federal News Service,* 20 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

to be limited to NATO's borders. 'We mustn't lose sight of what motivated the creation of NATO from the start', French Defence Minister Michele Alliot-Marie said. 'NATO must cling to its original geographical purpose'.[310] France furthermore argued that the NRF should only act after UN approval.[311] Similarly, German Foreign Minister Joschka Fisher gave his support, but only under three conditions. Decisions to send the NRF had to be taken by the NAC, German participation was conditional and required parliamentary approval and finally, the NRF had to be compatible with the European rapid response force. The latter argument was finally agreed upon by both the EU and NATO. The heads of state and government agreed that the EU and NATO should coordinate their efforts. The NRF and the 'related work of the EU Headline Goal should be mutually reinforcing while respecting the autonomy of both organisations', the declaration read.[312] As a result, the NRF became an additional institutional actor the EU had to coordinate its efforts with, thereby limiting the room for manoeuvre of the EU.

On 21 February 2003, the UK and Italy reflected on the establishment of the NRF and noted that the approach to force generation used for the NRF 'will be equally applicable to ESDP rapid reaction operations'. Copying NATO was, in a way, a conscious decision. As the UK and Italy wrote, applying the same approach to force generation would promote 'the harmonious development of NATO and European rapid reaction capability'.[313] The French-British-German proposal, similarly, stated that Battlegroup formations possibly could be used as a contribution to the NATO Response Force rotations. To this end, 'European and NATO's rapid response forces had to be complementary and mutually reinforcing, with both providing a positive impetus for capability improvement'. Moreover, the countries 'urged for transparency between the EU and NATO concerning member state contributions during force generation for operations'.[314]

This line of reasoning was reproduced in the EU Battlegroup Concept of October 2006 in which it was considered of 'utmost importance' that wherever 'possible and applicable, standards, practical methods and procedures mentioned in this document are analogous to

[310] 'U.S. proposes worldwide NATO strike force', *Reuters,* 24 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).
[311] 'U.S. proposes worldwide NATO strike force'.
[312] NATO Summit in Prague, 'Declaration by the Heads of State and Government', 21-22 November 2002, 157.
[313] UK-Italy summit in Rome, 'Declaration: defence and security', 21 February 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003) 40-45, 41.
[314] UK/France/Germany Food for Thought Paper, the Battlegroups Concept, Brussels, 10 February 2004, 15.

those defined within NRF', mainly because the EU could commit its assets and capabilities to both the EU Battlegroups and the NRF.[315] This could only be attained by joint coordination and information exchange.[316] Therefore, in May 2004, the foreign ministers stated that a EU-NATO Capability Group, established in March 2003 to ensure EU-NATO complementarity, was to ensure coherence, transparency and the mutual reinforcing development of the Battlegroups and the NRF.[317]

The EU indeed based its certification criteria for the Battlegroups on those for the NRF.[318] Moreover, in December 2005, the European Council discussed EU training programmes for the Battlegroups, 'which would be compatible with the NRF's training and exercises programme'.[319] So, the existence of the NRF clearly influenced the way the EU worked out the details. However, it is an overstatement to argue that the Battlegroup initiative could be a response to the establishment of the NRF as Christopher Reynolds suggested, simply because other factors matter as well.[320] Especially Operation Artemis proved to be a very important source of inspiration for the Battlegroup concept. The Battlegroup concept resembled this operation more than the NRF. Therefore, it is more precise to state that the Battlegroup concept was based on the template of Operation Artemis and coordinated with the NRF, rather than that it was established solely in response to the latter.

### 4.6 Conclusions

Although the momentum faded after two years of rapid development, the CSDP was placed back on the agenda because of the terrorist attacks, the transatlantic crisis and the inability to attain the original Headline Goal. Especially for France and the UK, the two countries that had set the whole project in motion in 1998, this was particularly painful. Therefore, the duo

---

[315] Council of the European Union - European Union Military Committee, 'EU Battlegroup Concept', 13618/1/06, COSDP 775, Brussels, 2 October 2006, partly declassified 11 December 2012, http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-13618-2006-REV-1-EXT-1/en/pdf (accessed 28 November 2017), 12.
[316] Kerttunen, 'The EU Battlegroup', 131; General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels, 'Conclusions', 17 November 2003, in Antonio Missiroli (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003), 256-268, 259.
[317] General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels, 'European Security and Defence Policy – Council Conclusions', 17 May 2004, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *EU security and defence: core documents 2004*, Chaillot Paper 75 (Paris 2005), 63-68; Lindstrom, *Enter the EU Battlegroups,* 49.
[318] Major and Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', 13.
[319] European Council in Brussels, Contributions by Javier Solana to the improvement of defence capabilities, 15-16 December 2005, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *EU security and defence: core documents 2005*, Chaillot Paper 87 (Paris 2006),428-439, 430.
[320] Reynolds, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy,* 239.

managed to overcome their divisions about the Iraq war and proposed to set new military capability goals. However, it was only after the successful experience with Operation Artemis that EU member states could overcome the limitations resulting from path-dependency.

Equally to the critical juncture of St. Malo, this juncture proved to be a source of inspiration for the new decisions. Inspired by Operation Artemis, France and the UK knew which direction to take, soon agreed upon by the EU member states. The conclusion was that the EU had to develop Battlegroups that could conduct the Petersberg tasks in failed states. The size of the force was thus downscaled and the location changed from Europe's neighborhood to Africa. The main aim, to establish a rapid response force able of conducting the Petersberg tasks, thus remained the same.

So, whereas the lessons learned again proved to be a source of inspiration for the Headline Goal, the new force also had to fit within the institutional context. Since the St. Malo agreement of 1998, the EU had underlined the importance of complementarity with NATO. For the Battlegroups, especially the recently established NATO Response Force was an important institutional actor it had to be coordinated with. To ensure this complementarity, the EU tuned its standards, practical methods and procedures with those of the NRF. This coordination allowed the EU forces to be deployed to both the Battlegroups and the NRF. So, while inspiration for the size and aims of the Battlegroups was drawn from Operation Artemis, the details were based upon NATO standards.

# Chapter 5. Inefficient outcome

Since the Battlegroups became fully operational ten long years followed. Although many crises emerged in which the Battlegroups could have been deployed, these forces remained on standby. The reason was that there were several obstacles to the deployment of the Battlegroups. This chapter analyses how these obstacles have emerged and why it proved so difficult for the EU member to remove them.

## 5.1 Obstacles to deployment

Around the time the Battlegroups reached operational status, the UN requested the EU to step up its efforts and intervene in complex conflicts.[321] On 27 January 2007, Solana already noted that the demand for EU military operations was increasing. Although the Battlegroups had not been deployed yet, Solana argued that the concept had been validated. 'It is not just a concept but already a reality. And, increasingly, our battlegroups capacity is at the heart of the EU's ability to act quickly and robustly where needed. But what all operations had in common was that they required a joined-up agile, tailor-made and rapid response, each drawing on a mixture of civilian, military, economic, political and institution-building tools. This – rightly – is becoming our trademark. And this is why we are in demand.'[322] According to Solana, the Battlegroups were thus the right means to deal with the new conflicts.

Also, the American distrust about European defence vanished, allowing for Battlegroup deployment. The Bush administration had taken upon a more constructive attitude towards the CSDP that continued after the new US administration under President Barack Obama took over in 2009. In contrast to earlier administrations, the Obama administration believed that the EU was not doing too much in the field of security and defence, rather too little.[323] The administration wanted the EU to share the burden of global leadership with NATO, by taking the lead in Europe's neighbourhood.[324] So, it was up to the EU to take the lead and to meet the growing demand.

---

[321] Nicole Gnesotto, 'Preface', in Catherine Glière (ed.), *EU security and defence: core documents 2006,* Chaillot Paper 98 (Paris 2007), 11-12, 11.
[322] Address by Javier Solana in Berlin at the European Security and Defence Policy Conference, 'From Cologne to Berlin and beyond – operations, institutions and capabilities', 29 January 2007, in Catherine Glière (ed.), *EU security and defence: core documents 2007,* Chaillot Paper 112 (Paris 2008), 21-25, 22.
[323] Grant, *Is Europe doomed to fail as a power?,* 12.
[324] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 139.

But, there were several obstacles that hindered the Battlegroups' deployment. These political, military and financial obstacles were the result of both decisions made and not made.[325] The main military obstacle was that the Battlegroups were designed after a specific military operation and therefore, were often not considered the right response to a specific crisis situation. Based on the experiences in Operation Artemis, the EU had decided that the Battlegroups should be deployed within a few days and that these had to be sustained for a maximum of 120 days. If a crisis situation required a longer military operation, the Battlegroups were considered unfit for the task. Similarly, if a situation did not require rapid response, the EU preferred to deploy another force than a Battlegroup. Finally, the Battlegroups were designed for autonomous operations. If the EU was asked to deploy forces to an already existing mission or as part of a NATO-led operation, the Battlegroups were also not the force of choice.[326]

Whereas the decision to design the Battlegroups after Operation Artemis had created military obstacles, the political and financial obstacles were the result of decisions *not* made. The political obstacles included diverging strategic cultures among the member states. As explained in chapter 1, this meant that opinions differed on the questions where, when and how military force should be used.[327] Each country had, based on its unique history, diverging interests. France, for instance, was interested in Africa because of its colonial ties. And, Germany was reluctant to use military force due to its role as aggressor in the Second World War. Relevant documents such as the Battlegroup concept and the ESS did not sufficiently sort out when, where and how the EU would deploy the forces. Instead these documents left much room for manoeuvre for the member states to decide whether the operation suited their interests. Moreover, because of the earlier mentioned unanimity rule, the opposition of one member state was enough to halt Battlegroup deployment.[328]

---

[325] Jan Joel Andersson, 'Adapting the Battlegroups', Alert -European Union Institute for Security Studies (2017) 1, 1-2, 1;
[326] Andersson, 'If not now, when?, 1-2; Anna Barcikowska, 'EU Battlegroups – ready to go?', Brief Issue – European Union Institute for Security Studies (2013) 40, 1-4, 2; Koivula, 'The Origins and First Years of the European Union Battlegroups', 122; Chappell, 'Deploying the EU Battlegroups', 7
[327] See Alessia Biava, Margriet Drent and Graeme P. Herd, 'Characterizing the European Union's Strategic Culture: An Analytical Framework', *Journal of Common Market Studies* (2011), 1-22; Chappell, 'Differing member state approaches'.
[328] Andersson, 'If not now, when?, 1-2; Barcikowska, 'EU Battlegroups – ready to go?', 2; Chappell, 'Differing member state approaches to the development of the EU Battlegroup Concept', 417; Koivula, 'The Origins and First Years of the European Union Battlegroups', 122; Menon, 'Empowering Paradise?', 235; Major and Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', 7; Chappell, 'Deploying the EU Battlegroups', 7.

Finally, the decision not to fund the deployment of the Battlegroups through the Athena mechanism had created a financial obstacle. This mechanism was established in 2004 to cover the common costs for military operations of the EU. Battlegroup deployment, instead, had to be funded through the 'costs lie where they fall' principle in which the greatest troop contributors needed to pay the largest part of the bill.[329] The result was that even countries that highly supported the deployment of the Battlegroups were reluctant to deploy their own forces. This latter obstacle became even more pressing when in 2008 the financial crisis set in. Most EU member states lacked a financial basis for deploying the battlegroups.[330]

### 5.2 Battlegroups in action or inaction?

Since 2006, possibilities for Battlegroup deployment emerged but because of the political, financial or military obstacles, or a combination of these, the Battlegroups remained on standby. In 2006, when the Battlegroups had initial operational capability, the first such possibilities for deployment emerged in Congo and Lebanon. However, the EU deployed other forces other than the Battlegroups to the DRC for EUFOR RD Congo and to Southern Lebanon for UNIFIL. Regarding Lebanon, the Battlegroups were not considered an option since the envisaged European troops would be part of the well-established UNIFIL operation, led by the UN. Battlegroups, instead, were always led by the EU.[331] The Battlegroups were thus considered unfit for the specific operation.

The case of the DRC was somewhat different because the Battlegroups were considered an option. Solana, who was asked by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon to enable European military deployment to the DRC, was keen to put the Battlegroup concept to the test.[332] At that time, French and German troops composed the Battlegroup on standby. Germany rejected the request due to several concerns such as misgivings over being lead nation, lack of high risk deployment experience and the volatile situation in Congo. Also, in the German view, the situation did not require rapid response.[333] At the same time, the situation required a deployment of four to five months. As Lindstrom argued, this was 'going

[329] Andersson, 'Adapting the Battlegroups', 1; Barcikowska, 'EU Battlegroups – ready to go?', 2; Reykers, 'No supply without demand', 355-356; Major and Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', 22; Balossi-Restelli, 'Fit for what?, 174; Chappell, 'Deploying the EU Battlegroups', 8-10.
[330] Balossi-Restelli, 'Fit for what?, 171.
[331] Lindstrom, *Enter the EU Battlegroups,* 59.
[332] Balossi-Restelli, 'Fit for what?, 165.
[333] Chappell, 'Deploying the EU Battlegroups', 8; See also Menon, 'Empowering Paradise?', 235-6.

beyond the EU BG sustainability horizon' since the Battlegroups were designed for deployment of 30 days, with a possible extension to 120 days.[334] So, also for the operation in the DRC, the Battlegroups were considered unfit. But, also political arguments played a role, since Germany was concerned for being instrumentalised by France to defend the French colonial interests in Africa.[335]

In July 2007, France raised the possibility of deploying the Nordic Battlegroup to Chad.[336] An EU diplomat then commented that the Battlegroups could be used: 'If a UN-sponsored mission with a projected timespan of six months to a year is not suitable for a battlegroup, then what is?'[337] The deployment of the Nordic Battlegroup was discussed at some point, but soon the EU decided to establish a 'normal' CSDP operation. Eventually, the EU launched the operation EUFOR CHAD/CAR in March 2008. According to Rear Admiral Stefan Engdahl, Swedish Military Representative to the EU, the Battlegroup could have been deployed. But, it would have required Swedish follow-on forces.[338] Similarly, Wade Jacoby and Christopher Jones indicated that the length of the operation (one year) and the required number of troops exceeded the scope of the Battlegroups. So, there were mainly military obstacles that led to the non-deployment of the Nordic Battlegroup. In addition, Jacoby and Jones argued that Sweden had 'quietly signalled' that it could not afford a Battlegroup deployment.[339] Similarly, *BBC Monitoring Europe* reported in August 2005 that there were 'conflicting bits of information on the willingness of the Nordic countries [including Sweden] to take part in such an operation'.[340]

Then, in 2008, the UN requested EU military support of MONUC, the UN peacekeeping force in the DRC.[341] The chairman of the EUMC, General Henri Bentegeat, considered such a deployment theoretically possible. It only required agreement of the

---

[334] Lindstrom, *Enter the EU Battlegroups,* 58.
[335] Chappell, 'Differing member state approaches', 428; Menon, 'Empowering Paradise?', 241.
[336] 'Finnish government considering sending troops to Chad instead of Darfur', *BBC Monitoring Europe,* 15 August 2007 (via LexisNexis).
[337] Jamie Smyth, 'EU may deploy troops to Chad this year', *The Irish Times,* 21 July 2007 (via LexisNexis). Gowan, 'From Rapid Reaction to Delayed Inaction?', 605.
[338] Gianluca Cazzaniga, 'EU Battlegroups: where do we stand?', *Military Technology* 9 (2009), 146-149, 148.
[339] Wade Jacoby and Cristopher Jones, 'The EU Battle Groups in Sweden and the Czech Republic: What National Defense Reforms Tell Us about European Rapid Reaction Capabilities', *European Security*, 17 (2008) 2-3, 315-338, 332.
[340] 'Finnish government considering sending troops to Chad instead of Darfur', *BBC Monitoring Europe,* 15 August 2007 (via LexisNexis).
[341] Balossi-Restelli, 'Fit for what?', 155

member states. [342] Also the Finnish Foreign Minister Alexander Stubb supported the deployment of a Battlegroup because these forces were designed for situations like the one in the DRC. Therefore, Stubb asked himself: 'If we don't send them to Congo, where do we send them?'[343] During the meeting of foreign ministers in December 2008, the Belgian Foreign Minister Karel de Gucht plead for deploying the Battlegroups, without success.[344] This time, the UK and Germany opposed the deployment of a Battlegroup because the countries feared that the Battlegroups would not be able to handle the situation.[345] British Foreign Secretary David Miliband argued that action should be taken through the UN and MONUC instead.[346] French President Nicolas Sarkozy added another argument, namely that the EU's military forces were too stretched because these were committed elsewhere.[347] This argument in particular made Foreign Minister de Gucht wonder whether the Battlegroups were a paper army, since the answer to a troop request was that there were no troops available. The purpose of the Battlegroups after all was that troops were always available for deployment in conflict situations within a few days.[348]

In 2011, the EU faced another opportunity for Battlegroup deployment in Libya. Riots inspired by the Arab Spring turned into a general uprising against Libya's leader Colonel Muammar Gadaffi, and finally into a civil war. The crisis was exactly the one the CSDP was designed for. In the words of Jolyon Howorth, 'Libya checked all the boxes for the ideal CSDP mission', because it called for a medium-scale mission in the EU's neighbourhood and for a combination of military and civilian crisis management components, an approach that the EU highlighted in its Security Strategy.[349] A European mission eventually did not take place, but France and the UK did lead the enforcement of a no-fly zone with the aim of

[342] Balossi-Restelli, 'Fit for what?', 165.
[343] 'ROUNDUP: EU fails to agree on peacekeeping mission to Congo', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 8 December 2008 (via LexisNexis); Major and Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', 22.
[344] Bernard Bulcke, 'EU blijft weg uit Congo', *De Standaard,* 9 December 2008, http://www.standaard.be/cnt/cq23pi9e (accessed 28 November 2017).
[345] 'ROUNDUP: EU fails to agree on peacekeeping mission to Congo'; Major and Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', 22.
[346] Ian Traynor and Julian Borger, 'UK blocking European Congo Force', *The Guardian,* 12 December 2008, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/dec/12/congo-european-union-foreign-policy (accessed 28 November 2017).
[347] Constant Brand, 'Sarkozy: African, not EU forces, fight in Congo', *Associated Press Online*, 12 December 2008 (via LexisNexis).
[348] Bulcke, 'EU blijft weg uit Congo'.
[349] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 137.

protecting civilians. NATO, leading the implementation of the arms embargo, later also took the lead of the no-fly zone.[350]

The Battlegroups were not deployed for multiple reasons. Firstly, those forces were considered not fit for the task of protecting civilians by installing a no-fly zone, simply because it did not have the right means to do so. The use of Battlegroups was suggested for implementing other tasks such as installing a maritime embargo. Although the Battlegroups were fit for this task, EU members could not reach an agreement on this issue. Moreover, the US wanted NATO, not the EU, to oversee both the air and naval campaign. This implied that the EU-led Battlegroups could not be deployed. Another option, it was suggested, was to deploy Battlegroups for a humanitarian operation.[351] The European council agreed in April 2011 to launch EUFOR Libya to support humanitarian assistance.[352] The Dutch-led or Nordic Battlegroup were on standby at that time and one of these had to perform this task. But, participants in the Nordic Battlegroup were hesitant about putting boots on the ground in Libya, mainly because of worries about the political consequences of such action and because of the military costs.[353] Moreover, both countries deemed it too early to draw out the details of the operation and wanted to await the request from OCHA.[354] The Dutch-led Battlegroup instead, was ready to be deployed. Even Germany, although the country had abstained in a vote on resolution 1973 in March, agreed in April to deploy its forces as part of the Dutch-led Battlegroup.[355] A spokesman of the German government stated that the operation was not a

[350] Blockmans, 'The Influence of NATO on the Development of the EU's common Security and Defence Policy', 264.
[351] Reykers, 'No supply without demand', 352-4.
[352] European council, 'Council decision on a European Union military operation in support of humanitarian assistance operations in response to the crisis situation in Libya (EUFOR Libya)', 1 April 2011, 2011/210/CFSP, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:089:0017:0020:en:PDF (accessed 1 December 2017).
[353] Timo Behr, 'The Nordic countries and the Arab Spring. From 'Nordic Internationalism' to 'Nordic Interventionism'?', in Larbi Sadiki (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of the Arab Spring: rethinking democratization* (Abingdon/New York 2015), 574-586, 581; Fredrik Doeser, 'Sweden's Libya decision: A case of humanitarian intervention', *International Politics* 51 (2014) 2, 196-213, 199-200.
[354] Valentina Pop, 'Foreign ministers wary of EU military role in Libya', *EUObserver,* 12 April 2011 (via LexisNexis).
[355] 'Berlin open to Humanitarian Involvement in Libya', *Spiegel Online,* 8 April 2011, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/change-of-course-berlin-open-to-humanitarian-involvement-in-libya-a-755817.html (accessed 4 December 2017); 'Nederlandse steun voor EU-missie naar Misrata', *NRC,* 12 April 2011, https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2011/04/12/nederlandse-steun-voor-eu-missie-naar-misrata-12010129-a478065 (accessed 4 December 2017).

military operation. Instead, military means were used for humanitarian assistance and Germany did not have problems with that kind of work.[356]

But, the European Council had decided that a Battlegroup would only be deployed if the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) requested the Council to do so. According to Yf Reykers, OCHA did not consider the EU fit for the task of protecting humanitarian assistance.[357] Moreover, as reported in *The Guardian* on 18 April 2011, OCHA's head Valerie Amos had 'privately told EU leaders she is reluctant to make the request and wants to explore all civilian options for the aid operation before seeking military help.[358] Also, there were worries about Russia and China possibly attacking the EU operation at the UN Security Council. Moreover, since Gaddafi's troops possibly could not distinguish EU-led forces from NATO, there was a risk of hostage-taking of EU troops to halt NATO airstrikes.[359] The fact that a request from OCHA was unlikely raises the question whether EU member states were truly willing to deploy a Battlegroup to Libya. In the end, a request from OCHA never came.[360]

The next year, France suggested the deployment of a Battlegroup to Mali. Again, the proposal was rejected. German willingness to deploy forces as part of the Weimar battlegroup was doubtful. Poland was reluctant out of fear for overstretch because it had forces in Afghanistan. Both countries also feared being instrumentalised by France. France, in turn, had concluded that it was better to establish a French-led intervention because it already had forces in the region. Therefore, this option was chosen. [361] In 2013, the use of Battlegroups in the Central African Republic was explored as an option. However, HR Ashton explained later that the Battlegroups were not the preferred option because the 'foreseen operation was not in line with the Battlegroup Concept, which foresees the use of a Battlegroup as an entry force to be deployed up to 120 days'.[362] Instead, the EU deployed EUFOR RCA.[363]

---

[356] Juurd Eijsvogel and Mark Kranenburg, 'Nederlandse troepen in beeld voor EU-missie naar Misrata', *NRC Handelsblad*, 11 April 2011 (via LexisNexis).
[357] Reykers, 'No supply without demand', 352-4.
[358] Ian Traynor, 'Libya conflict: EU awaits UN approval for deployment of ground troops', *The Guardian,* 18 April 2011, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/apr/18/libya-conflict-eu-deployment-ground-troops (accessed 30 November 2017).
[359] Reykers, 'No supply without demand', 354; Gowan, 'The EU and Libya'.
[360] Major and Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', 22-23
[361] Reykers, 'No supply without demand', 355-6; Faleg, 'Castles in the Sand', 2 and 3.
[362] European Parliament, 'Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission', 29 April 2014, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/questions/reponses_qe/2014/000752/P7_RE(2014)000752_EN.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017).

### 5.3 Institutional change

While EU member states struggled with putting the Battlegroup concept to the test, the whole institutional structure of the EU changed with the Lisbon Treaty coming into effect in December 2009. The EU's foreign policy no longer represented a separate pillar since this pillar structure was abolished. The main decision-making authorities, however, remained to be the European Council and the then Foreign Affairs Council, consisting of the EU's foreign ministers.[364] Moreover, with regard to the formulation and conduct of the CSDP, the Parliament and the Commission were not given additional powers.[365] The Commission only gained the additional task to ensure, together with the European Council, consistency 'between the different areas of its external action and between these and its other policies'.[366] The Parliament, in turn, had to establish a good working relationship with the new HR-VP, the permanent President and the rotating Presidency. As Gerrard Quille explained, by building a good working relationship with important institutional actors in the CSDP, Parliament had the possibility to increase its influence.[367] Before, Parliament had mainly tried to increase its influence in an antagonistic manner, for instance by pressing for parliamentary scrutiny of the CSDP. With a friendlier approach, the member states would no longer try to circumvent Parliament and listen instead.[368]

Still this was not enough to push for additional change, but this did not withhold Parliament from trying. Throughout the years, Parliament expressed dissatisfaction with the non-deployment of the Battlegroups and gave its support for proposals on the flexible use of these forces, including the use of Battlegroups for normal CSDP operations. Parliament further proposed to change the financial mechanism and to specialise one of the Battlegroups in niche capabilities.[369] In addition, Parliament urged that the EU needed to show 'the

---

[363] Reykers, 'No supply without demand', 357-9.
[364] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', 60-61.
[365] Gerrard Quille, 'The Lisbon Treaty and its implications for CFSP/ESDP', Briefing Paper, Policy Department External Policies, European Parliament, 31 January 2008, http://www.statewatch.org/news/2008/feb/ep-esdp-lisbon.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017) 5.
[366] 'Treaty of Lisbon, Amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community', *Official Journal of the European Union* (2007/C 306/01), Title II, Article 10A (3), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:12007L/TXT&from=EN (accessed 4 December 2017).
[367] Quille, 'The Lisbon Treaty and its implications for CFSP/ESDP', 18.
[368] Ibidem, 18-19.
[369] European Parliament, 'Implementation of the European Security Strategy and the Common Security and Defence Policy', resolution, Strasbourg, 10 March 2010, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=EN&reference=P7-TA-2010-61

necessary political will' to 'address the challenges'.[370] Parliament considered such changes important because the 'lack of use in the face of several windows of opportunity has become a liability'.[371] Parliament added that the Battlegroups' existence would be 'difficult to justify over time'.[372]

The main change regarding the CSDP concerned the function of High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, whose job description expanded exponentially. The post was renamed to High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy but also came to include the function of Vice-President of the Commission (HR-VP). At the same time, the HR-VP had to chair the meetings of foreign ministers, make proposals in CFSP matters, ensure implementation of decisions made by the European Council or the foreign ministers, and to ensure consistency of external action, also including issues like overseas trade and development aid.[373]

Catherine Ashton, appointed as the successor of Javier Solana, was the first having to perform this demanding job, and this did not go particularly smoothly. According to François Heisbourg, special adviser to the Security Research Foundation in Paris, the 'death bells' tolled with the appointment of Catherine Ashton as HR in 2009. Ashton arguably had 'no interest at all in common security and defence policy'.[374] New to the foreign policy field and with little international diplomatic experience, the appointment of Ashton as HR was not appreciated by everyone. Columnist Rod Liddle, in what Howorth called 'one of the kinder

---

(accessed 4 December 2017); European Parliament, 'The development of the common security and defence policy following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty', report, 28 April 2011, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2011-0166+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN (accessed 4 December 2017).

[370] European Parliament, 'EU's military structures: state of play and future prospects', resolution, Strasbourg, 12 September 2013, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=EN&reference=P7-TA-2013-381 (accessed 4 December 2017).

[371] European Parliament, 'The implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)', report, 31 October 2012, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A7-2012-0357&language=EN (accessed 4 December 2017).

[372] European Parliament, 'The implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)', report, 31 October 2013, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *Defence Matters: EU key documents 2013* (Paris 2014), 97-120, 106-107.

[373] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', 61, Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 55-57.

[374] 'EU's defence project sidelined in Libya crisis', *EUbusiness,* 30 March 2011, http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/libya-conflict.9c6/ (accessed 4 December 2017).

comments on the first HR-VP postholder', wrote that: 'Never elected by anyone, anywhere, totally unqualified for almost every job she has done, she has risen to her current position presumably through a combination of down-the-line Stalinist political correctness and the fact that she has the charisma of a caravan site on the Isle of Sheppey'.[375]

The harsh criticism did not ebb once she took office. Comparisons were often made with her predecessor, which did not run in her favour since Solana had set very high standards.[376] Jolyon Howorth, depicting Ashton as ineffective, however argued that this was not solely a result of her personality and lack of experience in security and defence issues. When the tasks of the HR expanded, it became impossible to attend all the meetings. Ashton was expected at several places at the same time.[377] Although one can argue about the question if it was Ashton's own fault or not, the result was a decreased pressure on further developing the CSDP, an additional obstacle.

The creation of another post, that of a permanent President of the European Council, was not enough to compensate the decreased pressure on the CSDP. Former Belgian Prime Minister Herman van Rompuy was appointed the first President and therefore had to 'drive forward' the work of the Council, 'endeavour to facilitate cohesion and consensus within the European Council' and 'ensure the external representation of the Union on issues concerning its common foreign and security policy'.[378] Although the press wrote much less critically about Herman van Rompuy, he also struggled with his new tasks. The Spanish Presidency, the first after the Lisbon treaty, attempted to remain the high-profile status that used to come with the Presidency. Similarly, also the Obama administration did not accept the new President right away. US President Obama cancelled a meeting with the EU in early 2010 because it was not clear who represented the Union. Regarding the results of van Rompuy's work, the new President was considered more effective than the new HR. However, van Rompuy had to

[375] Cited in Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 58.
[376] Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet and Rüger, *The High Representative for the EU Foreign and Security Policy,* 296-298.
[377] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 60-61.
[378] 'Treaty of Lisbon, Amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community', *Official Journal of the European Union* (2007/C 306/01), Title II, Article 9B (6), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:12007L/TXT&from=EN (accessed 4 December 2017).

devote his time mainly to the Greek sovereign debt crisis instead of the Union's military capabilities.[379]

### 5.4 Attempts to change

Because the EU institutions and institutional actors had limited influence on the CSDP, it was up to the member states themselves to change the Battlegroup concept in such a way to enable deployment. But, during the first years of the Battlegroups' existence, little innovation took place, mainly because the EU member states had no clue about how to make deployment of the Battlegroups possible. France, holding the Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the second half of 2008, set capacity-building as one of the top priorities. But as Howorth stated, many of the agreements in the 'Declaration on Strengthening Capacities' 'remained in "letter of intent" mode'.[380] This was to change when the European Council tasked the incoming presidency in June 2009 'to promote increased usability and flexibility of the EU Battle-groups as instruments for crisis management'.[381]

The next Presidency was held by Sweden, a country that had invested much in the Battlegroups. According to Swedish Defence Minister Sten Tolgfors, Sweden invested about 100 million euros to make its troops ready for rapid response duties. Moreover, Sweden led the Nordic Battlegroup, for which it provided the bulk of the personnel. Not least for justification of these enormous efforts at the domestic level, Sweden was keen to put the Battlegroup concept to the test and particularly frustrated by the failure to do so.[382] 'In the long run, tax payers might want to see more concrete results from them', Tolgfors said during an informal meeting of defence ministers in September 2009.[383]

While Sweden wanted to see the Battlegroups in action, we have seen earlier that even this country was not always willing to contribute its own forces, primarily because of financial reasons. Nevertheless, the country took its mandate seriously and looked for ways to make the Battlegroups more usable and flexible. In general, the Swedish argument was that

---

[379] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 53-55; Tony Barber, 'The Appointments of Herman van Rompuy and Catherine Ashton', *Journal of Common Market Studies* (2010) 48, 55-67, 55 and 63.
[380] Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union,* 82-83.
[381] European Council in Brussels, 'ESDP Presidency Report', 18-19 June 2009, in Catherine Glière (ed.), *EU security and defence: core documents 2009,* (Paris 2010), 173-194, 193.
[382] Cazzaniga, 'EU Battlegroups', Major and Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', 22; Jacoby and Jones, 'The EU Battle Groups in Sweden and the Czech Republic', 326.
[383] Mike Corder, 'EU ministers discuss use of rapid response forces', *Associated Press International*, 28 September 2009 (via LexisNexis).

the Battlegroup concept was a 'good' concept.[384] Therefore, the concept should not be changed right away, but it had to be tested first.[385] Solana supported this position and argued in September 2009 that the EU had to make full use of the potential of the Battlegroups, without reducing the level of ambition.[386]

Obviously, without Battlegroups deployment, the concept could not be tested. Therefore, Swedish Foreign Minister Carl Bildt, already in 2008, had suggested the possible routine deployment of the Battlegroups to test the deployment ability and to demonstrate what the EU was capable of. 'I'm certain it will be seen as more meaningful by the forces themselves than just waiting somewhere for nothing to happen', Bildt added.[387] In the Swedish view the Battlegroups, or elements of it, could be deployed as part of other EU missions instead of as a self-sustaining and autonomous force.[388] Tolgfors discussed this proposal with the EU defence ministers in Gothenburg. Several countries agreed with Tolgfors, but he also stumbled upon criticism from ministers who believed that this change would fundamentally alter the nature of the Battlegroups. The Battlegroups were established as autonomous forces able to conduct stand-alone operations, not to be a part of other operations.[389] After the initial sceptical reactions, the European Council did conclude in November that the Battlegroups could be used in a more flexible manner. But, this had to follow a 'voluntary approach', had to be evaluated on a case by case basis and required consensus within the EU. Furthermore, the Council emphasized that 'the EU Battlegroups must not become the default gap filler during force generation'.[390] In other words, only a very diluted and limited version of the Swedish proposal was accepted.

Sweden also pointed at other points for improvement. Olof Skoog, a diplomat representing the Swedish Presidency, stated in September 2009 that what was needed, was a political discussion on the question why the Battlegroups had not been deployed until then.

---

[384] Valentina Pop, 'Sweden seeks scrutiny of EU Battlegroups', *EUObserver,* 8 September 2009, https://euobserver.com/news/28627 (accessed 28 November 2017).
[385] Cazzaniga, 'EU Battlegroups', 147.
[386] Informal meeting of Defence ministers in Gothenborg, Remarks by Javier Solana, 28-29 September 2009, in Catherine Glière (ed.), *EU security and defence: core documents 2009,* (Paris 2010), 257-259, 257-258.
[387] Balossi-Restelli, 'Fit for what?, 167.
[388] Marcin Terlikowski, 'Polish-led EU Battlegroup', *Bulletin – The Polish Institute of International Affairs* 3 (2010) 80, 159-160, 160.
[389] Corder, 'EU ministers discuss use of rapid response forces'.
[390] External Relations Council in Brussels, 'Council conclusions on ESDP', 17 November 2009, https://www.eda.europa.eu/docs/documents/Council_conclusions_on_ESDP.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017) 13; see also Terlikowski, 'Polish-led EU Battlegroup', 160.

Skoog argued that there were 'variations' in the political commitment of member states, referring to the reluctance of certain member states to deploy the Battlegroups.[391] In addition, the process of decision-making in the EU was considered too slow. Swedish Defence Minister Sten Tolgfors pointed to the fact that it took five meetings spread over six months to agree on the mission in Chad.[392] But besides the lack of political will and the slow decision-making process, the lack of capabilities such as strategic airlift was also a problem that had to be solved. Most member states lacked such strategic airlift, making quick deployment impossible, or at least very difficult, simply because this airlift was required to bring the troops to the area of operation.[393] Eventually, the Swedish efforts had little results and non-deployment continued.

The absence of a European force in Libya led some commentators to proclaim the end of the CSDP or, in the words of a European diplomat, 'closed until further notice'.[394] Another EU diplomat went further and stated that: 'The CFSP died in Libya - we just have to pick a sand dune under which we can bury it'.[395] Politicians more and more called for the Battlegroups to be used. In June 2013, the German representative of the Christian Democratic Union in the European Parliament Michael Gahler, for instance, argued that if the EU did not deploy the Battlegroups, people might start to wonder if the EU should hold on to those forces. At some point, Gahler added, 'no one will believe in this option anymore'.[396] Similarly, Dutch Minister of Defence Jeanine Hennis repeated the expression that was heard more often regarding the Battlegroups: use them or lose them. After all, the Battlegroups were not established with the sole aim of practicing.[397]

The awareness had thus set in that the EU might not have created the most efficient type of forces but nevertheless EU's leaders held on to the concept. But it remained unclear to the member states how they could change the concept to enable Battlegroup deployment. When Lithuania took over the Presidency in 2013, another attempt was made by making the

[391] Pop, 'Sweden seeks scrutiny of EU Battlegroups'.
[392] Corder, 'EU ministers discuss use of rapid response forces'.
[393] Pop, 'Sweden seeks scrutiny of EU Battlegroups'.
[394] Menon, 'European Defence Policy from Lisbon to Libya', 76.
[395] Cited in: Larivé, *Debating European Security and Defense Policy,* 209-210.
[396] Christoph Hasselbach, 'Debate surrounds future of EU Battlegroups', 1 June 2013, http://www.dw.com/en/debate-surrounds-future-of-eu-battle-groups/a-16852649 (accessed 4 December 2017).
[397] Boogaard, 'Hennis: stuur Europese strijdkrachten het veld in'.

usability of the Battlegroups a priority.[398] The Swedish proposal for the flexible use of the Battlegroups, often referred to as a 'modular approach', was raised again.[399] But, also the revision of financial arrangements was put on the agenda. Lithuania made additional proposals for extending the standby periods of the Battlegroups to reduce training-related costs, or to improve the planning of the forces. Regular discussions by defence ministers could help in building consensus in advance, in identifying and dealing with national caveats and in tailoring the Battlegroups to specific operational requirements.[400]

At the same time, Ashton urged that 'the case for highly capable and interoperable forces, available at very short notice for EU operations', was 'stronger than ever', and pushed the EU member states to endorse a new approach to the Battlegroups. This approach echoed the Lithuanian proposal because it included modularity, enhancement of the exercises and certification, improvements of advanced planning, and common funding.[401] Ashton acknowledged that it would not be easy for the EU to implement these changes, particularly the latter.[402] Common funding proved to be a sensitive issue, especially for the UK.[403] But most proposals were never implemented.

Why did the EU member states, even after ten years of non-deployment, hold on the Battlegroup concept. Why did they still argue that this was a good concept and that it should not be abolished? Historical institutionalism offers several explanations for why people tend to hold on to institutions once they are created, even when these are not efficient. One is that, to change the concept, unanimity is required. And as before, it proved difficult for the EU to agree on alternative measures that went beyond the agreements made in the past. While some were in favour of a modular approach, other believed that this was against the nature of the Battlegroups. Some felt that the financial mechanism had to change, while others did not want to include Battlegroup deployment to the common costs funded by the Athena mechanism.

---

[398] 'The future of EU Battlegroups to be discussed in London', *Premium Official News*, 14 October 2013 (via LexisNexis).
[399] 'First really used in 'Lithuania: the future of EU Battlegroups addressed in London', *TendersInfo*, 16 October 2013 (via LexisNexis).
[400] 'Ways to increase efficiency of EU Battlegroups discussed in Lithuania', *LETA*, 5 September 2013 (via LexisNexis); 'Lithuania: the future of EU Battlegroups addressed in London', *TendersInfo*, 16 October 2013 (via LexisNexis).
[401] High Representative preparing the European Council on Security and Defence in Brussels, 'Final Report on CSDP', 15 October 2013, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *Defence Matters: EU key documents 2013* (Paris 2014), 43-96, 64-67.
[402] High Representative preparing the European Council on Security and Defence in Brussels, 'Final Report on CSDP', 15 October 2013, 65-66.
[403] Niklas Nováky, 'Who wants to pay more? The European Union's military operations and the dispute over financial burden sharing', *European Security* 25 (2016) 2, 216-236, 224-225.

Also regarding changing the training, standby period, or the decision-making process, there was not enough common ground between the member states to move into another direction.

Moreover, since the EU has invested much time and money in the Battlegroups, the forces have become resistant to change. While changing the concept was difficult and might cost additional money, abolishing the concept and replacing it by something completely different was also a waste of money. Finally, there is the question of credibility. As Gahler stated, the Battlegroups 'represent Europeans' ambitions to have their own crisis forces'.[404] Abolishing the Battlegroups would imply a change in or even lack of ambition on the side of the EU. This would harm the credibility of the EU. Therefore, the only option was to continue the same track and attempt to modify the existing concept. Moreover, path-dependency thus meant that the EU member states could not take alternative measure, but also that they could not return to the critical juncture and undo everything.

### 5.5 Small breakthrough

Only after almost ten years, a small breakthrough took place. In March 2015, the European Council agreed to the idea of common funding, at least partially. The Council agreed to include the strategic transport by air, sea or land for the Battlegroups to theatres of operation to the common costs funded through the Athena mechanism, but a compromise was made. A political declaration stated that Athena mechanism would cover the costs for two years, until December 2016. If approved by the member states, the agreement could be extended for another two years after December.[405] The decision to extend the agreement was made in November 2016.[406]

This achievement was possible after finances were put on the agenda during the Lithuanian Presidency. At the end of this Presidency, the European Council had agreed to re-examine the financial aspects of EU missions and operations rapidly to improve the EU rapid response capabilities, 'including in the context of the Athena mechanism review'.[407] The Athena mechanism, established by the Council of the European Union in 2004, was reviewed on a regular basis. In September 2014, the EU launched the following review. During this

[404] Hasselbach, 'Debate surrounds future of EU Battlegroups'.
[405] Margriet Drent, Dick Zandee and Eva Maas, 'Defence Matters: more urgent than ever', *Clingendael Report,* April 2015, 1-44, 16-17; Nicole Koenig and Marie Walter-Franke, 'France and Germany: Spearheading a European Security and Defence Union?', *Policy Paper Jacques Delors Institut* 202, 19 July 2017, 1-18, 11.
[406] Andersson, 'Adapting the Battlegroups', 2.
[407] European Council in Brussels, 'Conclusions', 19-20 December 2013, in European Union Institute for Security Studies, *Defence Matters: EU key documents 2013* (Paris 2014), 151-162, 154.

review, the member states were still not able to agree on the expansion of common funding to include the costs for Battlegroup deployment, in particular the UK opposed this effort.[408] But, as stated above, the UK did agree to expand the common costs temporarily, mainly because the decision was not definitive and had to be renewed every two years. In addition, the costs would only be incurred if a Battlegroup would be deployed. And, since the UK maintained its veto over Battlegroups' deployment, it would not have to pay for such a deployment if the country had no interest in it.[409]

Parliament was rightly sceptical about this development since it was not a permanent arrangement. Also, regarding the other issues such as modularity and decision-making, the EU had not made any progress yet. This lead Parliament to conclude that 'the lack of a constructive attitude among all Member States has served as a political and operational impediment to the deployment of battlegroups'.[410] Much more had to be done. Parliament made several proposals such as setting-up a start-up fund to finance the initial phases of military operations, making more flexible financial rules and the revision of the Athena mechanism.[411]

In September 2016, the German and French defence ministers, Ursula von der Leyen and Jean Yves le Drian took a further step and decided to make the temporal agreement official.[412] This decision was made in the context of the Brexit. When the UK voted for the Brexit, EU member states felt that an important obstacle for security and defence cooperation was lifted or would be lifted soon, since the UK often halted proposals for more profound

---

[408] Nováky, 'Who wants to pay more?', 216.
[409] European Scrutiny Committee of the House of Commons, 'Conclusions on Council Decision on establishing a mechanism to administer the financing of the common costs of European Union operations having military or defence implications (Athena)', 18 March 2015, https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201415/cmselect/cmeuleg/219-xxxvi/21939.htm (accessed 5 December 2017).
[410] European Parliament , 'The implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)', resolution, 21 May 2015, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/seance_pleniere/textes_adoptes/definitif/2015/05-21/0213/P8_TA(2015)0213_1_EN.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017).
[411] European Parliament, 'Implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)', report, 3 November 2016, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/seance_pleniere/textes_deposes/rapports/2016/0317/P8_A(2016)0317_EN.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017) 1-14, 9.
[412] Joint Position by Defence Ministers Ursula von der Leyen and Jean Yves le Drian, 'Revitalizing CSDP, towards a comprehensive, realistic and credible Defence in the EU', 11 September 2016, https://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/17/DOSSIER/990802/3_propositions-franco-allemandes-sur-la-defense.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017), 1-6, 4.

cooperation. Mogherini stated on 8 September that there was now a consensus on the need to move forward in defence.[413] In the whole Union, the future of European defence had become a hot topic. As a title of an article in *The Guardian* read on 9 September 2016, the 'Brexit vote revives dream of EU army'.[414] It was in this context that le Drian and von der Leyen met to outline their plan for future defence cooperation, including the adjustment of the Athena mechanism. President of the Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker went even further proposed the establishment of a European military headquarters, a proposal that the UK was not fond of.[415] British Defence Secretary Michael Fallon, however, stated that the UK would veto such initiatives as long as the UK was a member of the EU.[416]

Whereas the UK continued to halt proposals for an EU headquarters or for the establishment of a European army, the UK did agree to the French-German proposal for common funding. On 18 May 2017, foreign ministers agreed that Athena should cover both the deployment and redeployment costs of the Battlegroups.[417] HR Mogherini welcomed this 'major step', because it were mainly the difficulties in the financial mechanism that obstructed the Battlegroups deployment.[418] Although the obstacles were not removed yet, Mogherini said to 'have seen a strong determination from Member States to work for removing them'.[419] Also, according to the Estonian Defence Minister Margus Tsahkna, it was always a question of 'who's paying'. With the Estonian Presidency coming up, Tsahkna intended to work towards sharing the costs of Battlegroups deployment among the member states. 'We use the battle groups together, thus we need to pay for it together', Tsahkna told

---

[413] Chris Johnston, 'EU reveals plans for military cooperation following Brexit vote', *The Guardian,* 8 September 2016, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/sep/08/european-union-plans-military-battlegroups-after-brexit-vote (accessed 4 December 2017).
[414] Jonathan Marcus, 'Brexit vote revives dream of EU army', *The Guardian,* 9 September 2016 (via LexisNexis).
[415] 'Juncker proposes EU military headquarters', *BBC News,* 14 September 2016, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-37359196 (accessed 4 December 2017).
[416] Tom Peck, 'Britain will veto EU army, says Defence Secretary', *The Independent,* 17 September 2016, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/britain-will-veto-eu-army-says-defence-secretary-a7313081.html (accessed 4 December 2017).
[417] Koenig and Walter-Franke, 'France and Germany', 11.
[418] 'Mogherini welcomes further progress on EU security and defence agenda', *European Union External Action,* 18 May 2017, https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/26489/mogherini-welcomes-further-progress-eu-security-and-defence-agenda_en (accessed 4 December 2017).
[419] 'Remarks by the HR/VP Federica Mogherini at the press conference following the Commission orientation debate preparing the Reflection paper on the future of European defence and security', *European Union External Action,* 14 May 2017, https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/26853/remarks-hrvp-federica-mogherini-press-conference-following-commission-orientation-debate_en (accessed 4 December 2017).

reporters. But, Tsahkna added, the EU was 'very close to getting a deal about using the European battle groups with common funding'.[420] And indeed, late June 2017 the European Council agreed 'that the deployment of Battlegroups should be borne as a common cost by the EU-managed Athena mechanism on a permanent basis'.[421] But, this deal has yet to be formalised.

Also, the question remains whether this deal will lead to actual Battlegroups deployment soon. According to the main proponents of common funding, the lack of a financial agreement was the major hurdle. But, opponents of expanding common funding pointed to the lack of political will that continued to exist. The variations in the political commitment of several member states to deploy the Battlegroups, underlined earlier by a Swedish diplomat, did not disappear.[422] But also the inflexibility of the Battlegroup concept still existed. In addition, common funding creates another difficulty. Non-participating states are possibly less willing to support a mission that does not serve their interests. Therefore, they might block the deployment of a Battlegroup so as not having to pay for it.[423]

### 5.6 Conclusions

Demand for the EU was growing. Supply, however, lagged. The many possibilities for the deployment of the Battlegroups that emerged were not used, for three main reasons. The choice to design the Battlegroups after Operation Artemis limited the type of operations these forces could conduct. The EU was thus waiting for the perfect crisis to which it could deploy its forces. But, when such a crisis emerged, there remained other obstacles that the EU needed to overcome. The EU had not made a financial arrangement for Battlegroup deployment, making it very expensive for participating states to deploy their forces. Also, the EU had not developed processes to make decision-making easier and faster. The requirement of unanimity was again problematic since there was always one country opposing Battlegroup deployment. The institutional change of the EU in 2009 did not make things easier, perhaps even more difficult since the attention of both the HR and the new President was paid to other

[420] Caroline Houck, 'European Union Battle Groups may finally get the funding to fight', *Defense One,* 6 June 2017, http://www.defenseone.com/politics/2017/06/european-battle-groups-may-finally-get-funding-fight/138455/ (accessed 4 December 2017).
[421] European Council, 'Conclusions on security and defence, 22 June 2017, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/06/22-euco-security-defence/ (accessed 4 December 2017).
[422] Pop, 'Sweden seeks scrutiny of EU battle groups'.
[423] Reykers, 'EU Battlegroups: High costs, no benefits', 226.

issues than the Battlegroups. Also, the Parliament had hardly any influence on the CSDP. Therefore, it was up to the member states to take the lead.

The political, military, and financial obstacles were the result of decisions both made and not made during the critical juncture of 2003. But, once decisions were made, or not made, path-dependency again impeded change of the status quo. Abolishing the concept proved to be equally difficult. The unanimity rule again proved crucial. Besides this rule, also credibility was at stake. The EU had to live up to its ambitions and deploy the Battlegroups. Abolishing the Battlegroup or changing the concept fundamentally would imply that the EU had failed. The result was that the EU member states had to stick to the outcome of the decision-making process, even though it was an inefficient outcome considering the fact that Battlegroup deployment, in contrast to normal CSDP operations, has not taken place yet.

Only in 2015, a small breakthrough took place. For years, the UK had strongly opposed the extension of common funding to include the Battlegroups' deployment. But in 2015, the UK had agreed on expanding the common costs so as to include the strategic transport of the Battlegroups to the area of operation. But, this was not a permanent agreement. And, the UK maintained its veto to halt a Battlegroup deployment, that could be used if the UK did not want to pay for a specific deployment. Although the EU, in the meantime, has agreed to make the arrangement definitive, this agreement still has to be implemented. And, more importantly, the question remains whether the Battlegroups will be deployed in the near future because so far only one of the three major obstacles has been removed.

# Conclusion

The goal of the EU, explicated in Cologne in 1999, to develop the 'necessary means and capabilities to assume its responsibilities regarding a common European policy on security and defence', has become reality. Since 2007, the EU has the capacity to rapidly deploy two Battlegroups in crisis situations to conduct Petersberg tasks. But, the EU never made use of this capacity. This thesis posed the question why the EU had developed this capacity in the first place, yet did not use it. Literature on the Battlegroups provides few and only partial answers. Most academic works have limited themselves to factual descriptions of the emergence of the Battlegroups without asking critical questions, let alone applying a theoretical lens. Besides, many works have focused on normative questions, asking what is wrong with the Battlegroup concept and giving policy advice on how the EU can overcome the existing obstacles. The literature thus focuses on the present and the future, but forgets about the past.

While the specific question of why and how the Battlegroups have been developed remained unanswered, academics did attempt to answer the question why the EU member states decided to cooperate in the field of security and defence since the 1990s, applying insights from European integration and International Relations theories. Many of these insights do contribute to our understanding of the emergence of the CSDP and specifically of the Battlegroups. Neorealism, for instance, underlined the importance of the systemic change after the Cold War and the changing relationship between the EU and the US in explaining European security and defence cooperation. Also the constructivist assumption that ideas influence preferences is relevant because EU leaders had already gotten used to the idea the EU needed to take responsibility for its own security. But, as liberal intergovernmentalism suggests, the decision to implement this idea lay with the EU member states since it were the EU heads of state and government who had the final say about defence issues.

However, every theory has its own difficulties explaining the emergence of the EU Battlegroups, mainly because these are limited in their focus on single causes. While these causes do say something about the emergence of the Battlegroups, specifically about the question why EU member states chose to develop the CSDP, most cannot account for the subsequent non-deployment of the Battlegroups. This thesis aimed to overcome this gap by analysing the process of the Battlegroups' development from a historical institutionalist perspective. The focus was thus no longer solely on the question why member states decided

to cooperate and develop the Battlegroups. Nor did this thesis limit itself to the question why the member states did not want to deploy the Battlegroups. Instead, the focus was placed on the decision-making process within the historical institutionalist context, including not only analysis of the decisions made but also of the decisions *not* made.

The metaphor of a tree, introduced by Margaret Levi, is very helpful for understanding the EU decision-making about security and defence issues. Leaders within the EU stood at the roots of the tree ever since the 1950s, aiming to climb the tree by developing a security and defence policy. But only after the experiences with the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s, mainly the incapability of the European communities and later EU to intervene in these wars combined with the US disinterest in Europe's neighbourhood, EU leaders drew the lesson that the Union needed to develop the capacity for autonomous military action. At this moment, the EU member states arrived at a critical juncture. This is the point where the trunk of the tree branched into different smaller branches. The range of opportunities seemed to be endless.

But, even during the critical juncture, this range of opportunities was not unlimited because agreement between the member states could only be reached within a specific context. The result was that the decisions made during the juncture clearly reflected the context in which the decisions were made. At the same time, it was unlikely that the EU would decide on the development of a completely other type of force, for example one that would be completely dependent on NATO because this deviated from the lessons learned. The political behaviour of the EU member states and the eventual decisions were thus not solely the result of after intergovernmental bargaining about the national interests, as liberal intergovernmentalism suggests. Instead, the political behaviour and outcomes were influenced by the historical context, lessons learned, and expectations based on the past. Inspiration for the Helsinki Headline Goal was drawn from experiences in the Balkans. The historical context provided the institutional framework of the EU, including the unanimity rule. Expectations based on the institutional context, finally, proved to be the source of inspiration for the EU's new military bodies.

The choice to climb on a specific branch of the tree, made during the critical juncture, immediately limited the range of options available to the EU member states. Pressure from institutional actors such as Parliament and NATO was limited. The main factor limiting the EU's room for manoeuvre was the unanimity rule. EU member states simply could not agree on alternative measures such as creating an independent rapid response force because the national interests diverged. In other words, they could not climb to another branch. And,

climbing back to the trunk was not desirable because this would harm the credibility of the member states. Therefore, the only way was up.

In 2003, the EU arrived at a new juncture where the branch split into multiple smaller branches. This juncture was possible because of the increasing pressure to further develop the CSDP following the terrorist attacks and the crisis about the Iraq war, combined with the experience with the Union's first autonomous military operation in the DRC. Again, the choice for a specific branch was influenced by the lessons learned, specifically those drawn from Operation Artemis. The result was the current Battlegroup concept. The NRF that had come into existence just before the Battlegroups constituted the institutional framework and provided a template after which the EU arranged the details of the Battlegroups. The main aim to have the capacity for autonomous rapid military action, however, remained the same. This meant that the EU did not climb down to the trunk to choose a different branch, but climbed further up along a new branch.

After the choice was made for this new branch, this had immediate consequences for the EU member states. In a new constructive environment, the EU was in a position to deploy the Battlegroups. But, because of past decision, or a lack thereof, there were obstacles to such deployment. There was no decision-making procedure that allowed for quick decisions about deployment. The decision to deploy the Battlegroups was simply laid with the member states but these had difficulties agreeing unanimously to such deployment. There was also no financial arrangement such as the Athena mechanism that would cover the costs for deployment, making it a very expensive endeavour to deploy forces as part of a Battlegroup. On the contrary, a decision that was made, that of designing the Battlegroups after Operation Artemis, also proved to be an obstacle because the Battlegroups were often not considered the right response to a crisis situation.

Only a decade later, the EU was able to make a limited change to the concept by expanding the common costs of the Athena mechanism to include Battlegroup deployment. But, this arrangement is not made official yet. And, if it ever will be, the question remains if this is sufficient to make Battlegroup deployment possible. Nevertheless, EU member states continue to argue for the importance of the Battlegroups as the Union's capacity for autonomous military rapid response, even in an altered strategic context. Credibility is key here, because abolishing the Battlegroups implies admitting that the Union has failed. Again, this is also something the EU member states would not agree to.

The tree metaphor reveals that there was no linear development. The development of the Battlegroups was not the direct result of the ambition of EU leaders in the late 1990s. Only through intervening steps, the EU chose its path upwards. The choices for specific branches were made based on the specific context, not solely based on member states' interests. Once the EU arrived at one branch, it had become very difficult to return to the trunk of the tree. It was equally difficult to climb to another branch. In other words, institutions had become resistant to change. These insights, derived from historical institutionalism, proved very helpful in explaining how the Battlegroups have developed.

The approach of historical institutionalism and in particular the concept of path-dependency might also help us understand why any effort in the CSDP was limited and diverges from the ambitious rhetoric of the EU. But, since historical institutionalism is an approach for doing in-depth case studies, explanations for one specific phenomenon do not automatically explain broader issues. Further research into decision-making within the CSDP, and possibly also the CFSP, is necessary to analyse whether the room for manoeuvre was equally limited as regarding the Battlegroups and what factors explain this limitation. It will be particularly interesting to compare such research with this thesis because military operations within the CSDP, although limited in scope and ambition, did take place. This will give insight into the decision-making procedures in the CSDP but also improves our understanding of the Battlegroups by answering the question why Battlegroup deployment in contrast to normal CSDP operations proved impossible.

The approach of historical institutionalism can also be used to study wider decision-making processes. The thesis has confirmed that although decisions within the CSDP had to be made unanimously, the EU member states were not free from influence by the historical institutional context. In other EU policy fields, this might be even more the case because of the important role of supranational actors in decision-making processes. The approach can even be extended to analyze decision-making on the national level. This will help us understand not only why national leaders chose particular policies but also what options they had and what policies they did not opt for.

In addition to historical institutionalism, alternative approaches might also be very helpful to better understand the decision-making processes within the CSDP, but also outside. One such approach is network analysis. Although the thesis has argued that the role of EU bodies like the European Parliament, the European Commission, the High Representative and the Permanent President was generally limited in that they did not have decision-making

powers, it will be interesting to analyse to what extent these bodies have indirect influence. Behind the scenes these bodies might play a larger role than on paper, for example because of having regular contacts with the decision-making authorities, namely the EU member states.

Finally, I will reflect on some points for improvement, the first concerning the approach of historical institutionalism, specifically when it comes to the occurrence of critical junctures. Following the approach of historical institutionalism, the thesis has indicated which forces contributed to the occurrence of such critical junctures. The question that is left unanswered, is why such critical junctures did not take place at other moments in time. For example, after the terrorist attacks in the US on 11 September 2001, the strategic context of the EU altered with terrorism becoming a new threat. All EU heads of state and government agreed that the EU had to fight this threat. The question remains why this did not result in altered strategies and why the EU member states held on to the original plans for European security and defence cooperation, including the development of a force as designed in the Helsinki Headline Goal. In other words, why was there no critical juncture after the 2001 terrorist attacks? Further research into the question why certain junctures were not critical, is necessary to further develop the approach of historical institutionalism.

A further limitation of this thesis does not necessarily concern the approach of historical institutionalism but my reliance on written sources such as official declarations and agreements, as well as other documents such as newspapers. With the sources I used, I was able to establish a clear outline of what decisions have been made and which proposals were not implemented. The question why EU member states chose specific directions and rejected others, at times, proved more difficult to answer on the basis of the sources used. Interviews with politicians and policymakers who were involved with decision-making about the development of the Battlegroups can be particularly useful for a better understanding of the rationale behind the states' intentions. In addition, interviews might give a better insight into what happened 'behind the scenes'. But, one must be aware on the pitfalls of using interviews. One such pitfall is that the memory of the interviewees is not always accurate and might be different from what actually happened. A way to overcome this is to talk with many people who were involved in the same meetings. This way, one can compare the experiences of these people.

# Bibliography

## Primary sources

*Council of the European Communities*

Council of the European Communities, 'Treaty on European Union', Maastricht, 7 February 1992, https://europa.eu/european-union/sites/europaeu/files/docs/body/treaty_on_european_union_en.pdf (accessed 16 November 2017).

*Council of the European Union*

Council of the European Union - European Union Military Committee, 'EU Battlegroup Concept', 13618/1/06, COSDP 775, Brussels, 2 October 2006, partly declassified 11 December 2012, http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-13618-2006-REV-1-EXT-1/en/pdf (accessed 28 November 2017).

External Relations Council in Brussels, 'Council conclusions on ESDP', 17 November 2009, https://www.eda.europa.eu/docs/documents/Council_conclusions_on_ESDP.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017).

*European Council*

European Council, 'Conclusions on security and defence', 22 June 2017, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/06/22-euco-security-defence/ (accessed 4 December 2017).

European Council, 'Council decision on a European Union military operation in support of humanitarian assistance operations in response to the crisis situation in Libya (EUFOR Libya)', 1 April 2011, 2011/210/CFSP, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:089:0017:0020:en:PDF (accessed 1 December 2017).

*European Parliament*

European Parliament, 'Implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)', report, 3 November 2016, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/seance_pleniere/textes_deposes/rapports/2016/0317/P8_A(2016)0317_EN.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017).

European Parliament, 'The implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)', resolution, 21 May 2015, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/seance_pleniere/textes_adoptes/definitif/2015/05-21/0213/P8_TA(2015)0213_1_EN.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017).

European Parliament, ‘Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission’, 29 April 2014, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/questions/reponses_qe/2014/000752/P7_RE(2014)000752_EN.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017).

European Parliament, ‘EU’s military structures: state of play and future prospects’, resolution, Strasbourg, 12 September 2013, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=EN&reference=P7-TA-2013-381 (accessed 4 December 2017).

European Parliament, ‘The implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)’, report, 31 October 2012, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A7-2012-0357&language=EN (accessed 4 December 2017).

European Parliament, ‘The development of the common security and defence policy following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty’, report, 28 April 2011, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2011-0166+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN (accessed 4 December 2017).

European Parliament, ‘Implementation of the European Security Strategy and the Common Security and Defence Policy’, resolution, Strasbourg, 10 March 2010, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=EN&reference=P7-TA-2010-61 (accessed 4 December 2017).

European Parliament, ‘The new European security and defence architecture - priorities and deficiencies’, resolution, Strasbourg, 10 April 2003, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P5-TA-2003-0188+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN (accessed 22 November 2017).

European Parliament, ‘The progress achieved in the implementation of the common foreign and security policy’, resolution, Strasbourg, 25 October 2001, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P5-TA-2001-0576&format=XML&language=EN (accessed 16 November 2017).

European Parliament, ‘A common European security and defence policy after Cologne and Helsinki’, resolution, 30 November 2000, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+20001130+ITEMS+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN#sdocta10 (accessed 16 November 2017).

European Parliament, ‘Security and Defence with a view to the Feira European Council’, resolution, 15 June 2000, http://www.bits.de/CESD-PA/23-e-f.html (accessed 10 October 2017).

*European Union Institute for Security Studies*

European Union Institute for Security Studies, *Strategy Matters. Key Documents 2015-2016* (Paris 2016).

European Union Institute for Security Studies, *Defence Matters: EU key documents 2013* (Paris 2014).

Glière, Catherine (ed.), *EU security and defence: core documents 2009,* (Paris 2010).

Glière, Catherine (ed.), *EU security and defence: core documents 2007,* Chaillot Paper 112 (Paris 2008).

Glière, Catherine (ed.), *Eu security and defence: core documents 2006,* Chaillot Paper 98 (Paris 2007).

European Union Institute for Security Studies, *EU security and defence: core documents 2005*, Chaillot Paper 87 (Paris 2006).

European Union Institute for Security Studies, *EU security and defence: core documents 2004*, Chaillot Paper 75 (Paris 2005).

Missiroli, Antonio (ed.), *From Copenhagen to Brussels. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 67 (Paris 2003).

Haine, Jean-Yves (ed.), *From Laeken to Copenhagen. European defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 57 (Paris 2003).

Rutten, Maartje (ed.), *From Nice to Laeken. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 51 (Paris 2002).

Rutten, Maartje (ed.), *From Saint Malo to Nice. European Defence: core documents,* Chaillot Paper 47 (Paris 2001).

*NATO*

Press Conference by Donald Rumsfeld, Warsaw, 25 September 2002, http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020925c.htm (accessed 20 November 2017).

Speech by Lord Robertson, 'Turkey and European Security and Defence Identity', Istanbul, 23 November 2000, https://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2000/s001123a.htm (accessed 16 November 2017).

*United Nations*

United Nations Security Council, 'Security Council authorizes interim force in Bunia, Democratic Republic of Congo, until 1 September', 30 May 2003, https://www.un.org/press/en/2003/sc7772.doc.htm (accessed 22 November 2017).

'Daily Press Briefing by the Office of the Spokesman for the Secretary General', *United Nations,* 21 May 2003, http://www.un.org/press/en/2003/db052103.doc.htm (accessed 22 November 2017).

*Other*

European Scrutiny Committee of the House of Commons, 'Conclusions on Council Decision on establishing a mechanism to administer the financing of the common costs of European Union operations having military or defence implications (Athena)', 18 March 2015, https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201415/cmselect/cmeuleg/219-xxxvi/21939.htm (accessed 5 December 2017).

Hansard Volume (House of Commons Debates), Session 2000-01, volume 359, part 4, column 443-447, Mr. Iain Duncan Smith, 11 December 2000, https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200001/cmhansrd/vo001211/debtext/01211-31.htm#01211-31_spnew0 (accessed 14 November 2017).

Joint Position by Defence Ministers Ursula von der Leyen and Jean Yves le Drian, 'Revitalizing CSDP, towards a comprehensive, realistic and credible Defence in the EU', 11 September 2016, https://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/17/DOSSIER/990802/3_propositions-franco-allemandes-sur-la-defense.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017).

'Mogherini welcomes further progress on EU security and defence agenda', *European Union External Action,* 18 May 2017, https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/26489/mogherini-welcomes-further-progress-eu-security-and-defence-agenda_en (accessed 4 December 2017).

'Remarks by the HR/VP Federica Mogherini at the press conference following the Commission orientation debate preparing the Reflection paper on the future of European defence and security', *European Union External Action,* 14 May 2017, https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/26853/remarks-hrvp-federica-mogherini-press-conference-following-commission-orientation-debate_en (accessed 4 December 2017).

Speech by President George W. Bush, 'State of the Union', Washington D.C., 29 January 2002, https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html (accessed 20 November 2017).

'Treaty of Lisbon, Amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community', *Official Journal of the European Union* (2007/C 306/01), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:12007L/TXT&from=EN (accessed 4 December 2017).

WEU Foreign and Defence Ministers, Rome Declaration, 27 October 1984, https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2003/7/11/c44c134c-aca3-45d1-9e0b-04d4d9974ddf/publishable_en.pdf (accessed 7 November 2017) 1-4.

**News articles**

'1st lead: France, Germany celebrate friendship, present joint European vision', *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 22 January 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘Act within U.N. framework, Europe’s politicians again urge Bush’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 4 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

‘Albright told that NATO and Europe’s defence are complementary’, *Agence France Presse,* 10 December 1998 (via LexisNexis).

‘Analysis: Chirac and Blair to meet as bilateral tensions are high’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 5 February 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘Berlin open to Humanitarian Involvement in Libya’, *Spiegel Online,* 8 April 2011, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/change-of-course-berlin-open-to-humanitarian-involvement-in-libya-a-755817.html (accessed 4 December 2017).

Black, Ian, ‘France, Germany deepen UK rift’, *The Guardian,* 30 April 2003, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/30/iraq.iraq (accessed 22 November 2017).

Black, Ian, ‘Nice summit: Chirac gives way in row with Blair on Nato: Security Differences on defence remain despite a show of unity’, *The Guardian*, 9 December 2000, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2000/dec/09/eu.defence (accessed 16 November 2017).

Black, Ian and Michael White, ‘100,000 troops committed to EU force’, *The Guardian,* 21 November 2000, https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2000/nov/21/eu.politicalnews (accessed 16 November 2017).

Boogaard, Frans, ‘Hennis: stuur Europese strijdkrachten het veld in’, *Algemeen Dagblad,* 27 April 2017, https://www.ad.nl/politiek/hennis-stuur-europese-strijdkrachten-het-veld-in~a7fcce38/ (accessed 4 December 2017).

Brand, Constant, ‘Sarkozy: African, not EU forces, fight in Congo’, *Associated Press Online*, 12 December 2008 (via LexisNexis).

Bulcke, Bernard, ‘EU blijft weg uit Congo’, *De Standaard,* 9 December 2008, http://www.standaard.be/cnt/cq23pi9e (accessed 28 November 2017).

Castle, Stephen, ‘Military Mission to Africa is first for the EU’, *The Independent*, 5 June 2003.

Castle, Stephen, ‘French slapped down over NATO threats’, *The Independent,* 14 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).

Corder, Mike, ‘EU ministers discuss use of rapid response forces’, *Associated Press International*, 28 September 2009 (via LexisNexis).

‘Czech president slams EU defence plan’, *Agence France Presse,* 21 October 2003 (via LexisNexis);

‘Defense Department Background Briefing Re: Secretary Rumsfeld's Upcoming Trip To The Informal NATO Ministerials in Warsaw, Attributable to a Senior Defense Official, Location: Pentagon Briefing Room, Arlington, Virginia’, *Federal News Service,* 20 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

‘DRC rebel group says French UN troops would be viewed as "enemies"’, *Agence France Presse,* 14 May 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘Editorial: Nato Response Force’, *Voice of America News,* 26 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

Eijsvogel, Juurd and Mark Kranenburg, ‘Nederlandse troepen in beeld voor EU-missie naar Misrata’, *NRC Handelsblad*, 11 April 2011 (via LexisNexis).

Erlanger, Steven, ‘Rumsfeld urges NATO to set up Strike Force’, *The New York Times,* 25 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

‘EU's defence project sidelined in Libya crisis’, *EUbusiness,* 30 March 2011, http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/libya-conflict.9c6/ (accessed 4 December 2017).

‘E.U. gears up for “risky” Congo peace mission’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 5 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘E.U. military mission in Congo on track, says operation commander’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 13 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘European Parliament opposes US strikes on Iraq’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 30 January 2003 (via LexisNexis).

Evans, Michael, ‘U.S. tries to end EU’s right to fight without NATO consent: In the lead-up to three key European meetings, U.S. officials express misgivings over military ambitions’, *The Vancouver Sun,* 23 November 1999 (via LexisNexis).

Evans-Pritchard, Ambrose, ‘Cook demands removal of Nice defence clause’, *The Daily Telegraph*, 5 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).

‘Finnish government considering sending troops to Chad instead of Darfur’, *BBC Monitoring Europe,* 15 August 2007 (via LexisNexis).

‘First really used in Lithuania: the future of EU Battlegroups addressed in London’, *TendersInfo*, 16 October 2013 (via LexisNexis).

‘France: Security of Africa becomes EU priority’, *Xinhua General News Service,* 2 September 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘Franco-British talks to further plans on EU military capability’, *Agence France Presse,* 24 November 1999 (via LexisNexis).

Freeman, Alan, ‘France, Germany defy U.S.; By pooling their influence, Paris and Berlin hope to head off war in Iraq’, *Globe and Mail,* 23 January 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘The future of EU Battlegroups to be discussed in London’, *Premium Official News*, 14 October 2013 (via LexisNexis).

Garden, Timothy, 'The lesson of Kosovo is: more troops, not air power', *The Independent,* 22 July 1999, http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/the-lesson-of-kosovo-is-more-troops-not-air-power-1108029.html (accessed 15 November 2017).

Geitner, Paul, 'European Union approves Congo peacekeeping mission – first outside Europe and without NATO help', *The Associated Press,* 4 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).

'George Bush's speech to the UN general assembly', *The Guardian,* 12 September 2002, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/sep/12/iraq.usa3 (accessed 20 November 2017).

Hasselbach, Christoph, 'Debate surrounds future of EU Battlegroups', 1 June 2013, http://www.dw.com/en/debate-surrounds-future-of-eu-battle-groups/a-16852649 (accessed 4 December 2017).

Helms, Jesse and Gordon Smith, 'European defence policy is dangerous', *The Telegraph,* 28 December 2000, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/letters/4258080/European-defence-policy-is-dangerous.html (accessed 16 November 2017).

Henley, Jon, 'Le Touquet summit: Analysis: Dextrous president begins to manoeuvre away from anti-war axis with Germany', *The Guardian,* 5 February 2003 (via LexisNexis).

Hess, Pamela, 'Rumsfeld to propose new NATO force', *United Press International*, 20 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

Hoon, Geoffrey, 'New EU-force aims to complement NATO', letter to the editor, *The Daily Telegraph*, 21 November 2000 (via LexisNexis).

Houck, Caroline, 'European Union Battle Groups may finally get the funding to fight', *Defense One,* 6 June 2017, http://www.defenseone.com/politics/2017/06/european-battle-groups-may-finally-get-funding-fight/138455/ (accessed 4 December 2017).

Johnston, Chris, 'EU reveals plans for military cooperation following Brexit vote', *The Guardian,* 8 September 2016, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/sep/08/european-union-plans-military-battlegroups-after-brexit-vote (accessed 4 December 2017).

'Juncker proposes EU military headquarters', *BBC News,* 14 September 2016, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-37359196 (accessed 4 December 2017).

Kallenbach, Michael, 'Blair 'can't be trusted' on military manoeuvre EU defence force', *The Daily Telegraph,* 23 November 2000 (via LexisNexis).

Landry, Carole, 'US gives cautious welcome to Franco-British defense pact', *Agence France Presse,* 4 December 1998 (via LexisNexis).

'Lithuania: the future of EU Battlegroups addressed in London', *TendersInfo*, 16 October 2013 (via LexisNexis).

Mahony, Honor, 'EU seeks to reassure US on defence, *EUObserver,* 18 October 2003, https://euobserver.com/news/13094 (accessed 22 November 2017).

Mahony, Honor and Lisbeth Kirk, ‘Robertson: EU is 'flabby giant' not 'pygmy'’, *EUObserver*, 8 October 2002 (via LexisNexis).

Marcus, Jonathan, ‘Brexit vote revives dream of EU army’, *The Guardian,* 9 September 2016 (via LexisNexis).

McElderry, Kevin, ‘British, French leaders discuss European defence at summit’, *Agence France Presse*, 25 November 1999 (via LexisNexis).

McEvoy, Janet, ‘Seeking anti-terror role, NATO allies welcome US response force plan’, *Agence France Presse,* 24 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

McSmith, Andy, ‘Tories will scrap plans to set up EU army’, *The Telegraph,* 12 June 2000, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1342311/Tories-will-scrap-plans-to-set-up-EU-army.html (accessed 16 November 2017).

‘Minister denies Euro army move’, *BBC News,* 14 November 2000, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/1023049.stm (accessed 16 November 2017).

‘”Mission accomplished” for French-led EU force in DR Congo: minister’, *Agence France Presse,* 3 August 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘Nato chief pleads for unity’, *BBC News,* 25 September 2002, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2280249.stm (accessed 20 November 2017).

‘Nederlandse steun voor EU-missie naar Misrata’, *NRC,* 12 April 2011, https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2011/04/12/nederlandse-steun-voor-eu-missie-naar-misrata-12010129-a478065 (accessed 4 December 2017).

Norton-Taylor, Richard, and Ian Black, ‘Europe sets up rapid reaction force: Cook insists troop commitment does not mean common army’, *The Guardian*, 20 November 2000 (via LexisNexis).

Peck, Tom, ‘Britain will veto EU army, says Defence Secretary’, *The Independent,* 17 September 2016, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/britain-will-veto-eu-army-says-defence-secretary-a7313081.html (accessed 4 December 2017).

Pop, Valentina, ‘Foreign ministers wary of EU military role in Libya’, *EUObserver,* 12 April 2011 (via LexisNexis).

Pop, Valentina, ‘Sweden seeks scrutiny of EU Battlegroups’, *EUObserver,* 8 September 2009, https://euobserver.com/news/28627 (accessed 28 November 2017).

‘ROUNDUP: EU fails to agree on peacekeeping mission to Congo’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 8 December 2008 (via LexisNexis).

‘Rumsfeld: “Devils in the details” on European Defence’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 21 March 2001 (via LexisNexis).

‘Rwanda, DR Congo rebels opposed to French deployment’, *Agence France Presse,* 15 May 2003 (via LexisNexis).

Sanger, David, ‘Bush tells Blair he doesn’t oppose new Europe force’, *The New York Times,* 24 February 2001 (via LexisNexis).

Schofield, Hugh, ‘France and Britain fail to resolve differences on Iraq’, *Agence France Presse,* 4 February 2003 (via LexisNexis).

Smith, Craig S., ‘Europeans plan own military command post’, *The New York Times,* 3 September 2003, http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/03/world/europeans-plan-own-military-command-post.html (accessed 22 November 2017).

Smith, David, ‘The death of the European superstate’, *Sunday Times,* 17 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).

Smyth, Jamie, ‘EU may deploy troops to Chad this year’, *The Irish Times,* 21 July 2007 (via LexisNexis).

‘Solana warns against unilateral attack on Iraq’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 8 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

Starck, Peter, ‘Belgium and Sweden pledge pragmatism on rapid reaction force’, *The Irish Times,* 12 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).

‘Strife-torn DR Congo town more stable after arrival of EU force: general’, *Agence France Presse,* 19 June 2003 (via LexisNexis).

Traynor, Ian, ‘Libya conflict: EU awaits UN approval for deployment of ground troops’, *The Guardian,* 18 April 2011, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/apr/18/libya-conflict-eu-deployment-ground-troops (accessed 30 November 2017).

Traynor, Ian and Julian Borger, ‘UK blocking European Congo Force’, *The Guardian,* 12 December 2008, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/dec/12/congo-european-union-foreign-policy (accessed 28 November 2017).

Ulbrich, Jeffrey, ‘NATO foreign ministers have first discussion of EU military proposals’, *BC Cycle, 14 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).*

‘U.N. must all to avoid “catastrophe of war”: Solana’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 19 January 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘U.S. Defense Secretary: Germany and France are “old Europe”’, *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* 22 January 2003 (via LexisNexis).

‘U.S. proposes worldwide NATO strike force’, *Reuters,* 24 September 2002 (via LexisNexis).

‘Ways to increase efficiency of EU Battlegroups discussed in Lithuania’, *LETA*, 5 September 2013 (via LexisNexis).

Webster, Philip, Richard Beeston and Martin Fletcher, 'French trigger Nato furore', *The Times,* 8 December 2000 (via LexisNexis).

Wright, George, 'EU military summit angers Britain', *The Guardian,* 29 April 2003, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/29/eu.politics (accessed 22 November 2017).

Young, Hugo, 'We've lost that Allied feeling: Bush's first moves aren't winning Europe's heart', *The Washington Post,* 1 April 2001 (via LexisNexis).

**Secondary sources**

Andersson, Jan Joel, 'Adapting the Battlegroups', *Alert -European Union Institute for Security Studies* (2017) 1, 1-2.

Andersson, Jan Joel, 'If not now, when?', The Nordic EU Battlegroup', *Brief Issue – European Union Institute for Security Studies* (2015) 11, 1-2.

Balossi-Restelli, Ludovica Marchi, 'Fit for what? Towards explaining Battlegroup inaction?', *European Security* 20 (2011) 2, 155-184.

Barber, Tony, 'The Appointments of Herman van Rompuy and Catherine Ashton', *Journal of Common Market Studies* (2010) 48, 55-67.

Barcikowska, Anna, 'EU Battlegroups – ready to go?', *Brief Issue – European Union Institute for Security Studies* (2013) 40, 1-4.

Behr, Timo, 'The Nordic countries and the Arab Spring. From 'Nordic Internationalism' to 'Nordic Interventionism'?', in Larbi Sadiki (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of the Arab Spring: rethinking democratization* (Abingdon/New York 2015), 574-586.

Biava, Alessia, Margriet Drent and Graeme P. Herd, 'Characterizing the European Union's Strategic Culture: An Analytical Framework', *Journal of Common Market Studies* (2011), 1-22.

Bickerton, Chris, Bastien Irondelle and Anand Menon, 'Security Co-operation beyond the Nation-State: The EU's Common Security and Defence Police', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49 (2011) 1, 1-21.

Blockmans, Steven, 'The Influence of NATO on the Development of the EU's common Security and Defence Policy', in Ramses A. Wessel and Steven Blockmans (eds.), *Between Autonomy and Dependence. The EU Legal Order under the Influence of International Organisations* (The Hague 2013) 243-268.

Capoccia, Giovanni and R. Daniel Kelemen, 'The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism', *World Politics* 59 (2007) 3, 341-369.

Cazzaniga, Gianluca, 'EU Battlegroups: where do we stand?', *Military Technology* 9 (2009), 146-149.

Chappell, Laura, 'Deploying the EU Battlegroups: Mission Impossible?', *CFSP Forum* 7 (2009) 6, 7-12.

Chappell, Laura, 'Differing member state approaches to the development of the EU Battlegroup Concept: implications for CSDP', *European Security* 18 (2009) 4, 417-439.

Checkel, Jeffrey, 'Process Tracing', in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash (eds.), *Qualitative Methods in International Relations. A Pluralist Guide* (Basingstoke/New York 2008), 114-130.

Cladi, Lorenzo and Andrea Locatelli, 'Bandwagoning, not balancing: why Europe confounds realism', *Contemporary Security Policy* 33 (2012) 2, 264-288.

Collier, Ruth B. and David Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena. Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement and Regime Dynamics in Latin America* (Notre Dame 2002).

Conran, James and Kathleen Thelen, 'Institutional Change', in Orfeo Fioretos, Tulia Faletti and Adam Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford 2016) 1-25.

Coolsaet, Rik, Sven Biscop and Jo Coelmont, 'Mali: Another European Intervention without the EU?', *European Security Brief* 42 (2013) 1, 1-4.

Cornish, Paul and Geoffrey Edwards, 'The Strategic culture of the European Union: a progress report', *International Affairs* 81 (2005) 4, 801-820.

Daalder, Ivo H. and Michael O'Hanlon, 'Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo', *Foreign Policy* (1999).

Diez, Thomas and Antje Wiener, 'Introducing the Mosaic of Integration Theory', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 1-24.

Doeser, Fredrik, 'Sweden's Libya decision: A case of humanitarian intervention', *International Politics* 51 (2014) 2, 196-213.

Dover, Robert, 'The Prime Minister and the Core Executive: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Reading of UK Defence Policy Formulation 1997-2000', *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 7 (2005) 4, 508-525.

Drent, Margriet, Dick Zandee and Eva Maas, 'Defence Matters: more urgent than ever', *Clingendael Report,* April 2015, 1-44.

Faleg, Giovanni, 'Castles in the Sand: Mali and the demise of the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy', *CEPS Commentary*, 18 January 2013, 1-3.

Fioretos, Orfeo, Tulia G. Falleti, and Adam Sheingate, 'Historical Institutionalism in Political Science', in Orfeo Fioretos, Tulia Faletti and Adam Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford 2016) 1-32.

Gegout, Catherine, 'The French and British change in position in the CESDP: A security community and historical-institutionalist perspective', *Politique Européene* 4 (2002) 8, 62-87.

Gowan, Richard, 'From Rapid Reaction to Delayed Inaction? Congo, the UN and the EU', *International Peacekeeping*, 18 (2011) 5, 593-611.

Gowan, Richard, 'The EU and Libya: Missing in Action', *ECFR Commentary*, 31 May 2011.

Granholm, Niklas, 'EU-Battlegroups: Some new capabilities, actually', *The RUSI Journal* 151 (2006) 6, 62-66.

Grant, Charles, *Is Europe doomed to fail as a power?* (London 2009).

Grevi, Giovanni, 'ESDP institutions', in Giovanni Grevi, Damien Helly and Daniel Keohane (eds.), *European Security and Defence Policy. The First 10 Years (1999-2009)* (Paris 2009) 19-68.

Haine, Jean-Yves, 'An historical perspective', in Nicole Gnesotto (ed.), *EU Security and Defence Policy. The first five years (1999-2004)* (Paris 2004) 35-54.

Hall, Peter, 'Politics as a Process Structured in Space and Time', in Orfeo Fioretos, Tulia Faletti and Adam Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford 2016) 1-26.

Hall, Peter and Rosemary Taylor, 'Political Science and Three New Institutionalisms', *Political Studies* 44 (1996), 936-957.

Ham, van, Peter, 'Europe's Common Defense Policy: Implications for the Trans-Atlantic Relationship', *Security Dialogue* 31 (2000) 2, 215-228.

Heisbourg, François, 'Europe's Strategic Ambitions: The Limits of Ambiguity', *Survival* 42 (2000) 2, 5-15.

Hoffmann, Stephanie C., 'CSDP: Approaching Transgovernmentalism?', in Xymena Kurowska and Fabian Breuer (eds.), *Explaining the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy. Theory in Action* (Basingstoke 2012), 41-62.

Hoffmann, Stephanie C., 'Overlapping institutions in the realm of international security: The case of NATO and ESDP', *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (2009) 1, 45-52.

Homan, Kees, 'EU-Battle groups. Use them or Lose them', *Armex* (2011) 4, 18-19.

Homan, Kees, 'Operation Artemis in the Democratic Republic of Congo', in Andrea Ricci and Eero Kytömaa (eds.), *Faster and more united? The debate about Europe's crisis response capacity* (Luxembourg 2007) 151-155.

Horsák, Vojtech, 'The European Parliament and the Common Security and Defence Policy: Does the Parliament care?', *Focus* (2011) 2, 1-4.

Howorth, Jolyon, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union* (Basingstoke 2014).

Howorth, Jolyon, 'Britain, France and the European Defence Initiative', *Survival* 42 (2000) 2, 33-55.

Hunter, Robert E., *The European Security and Defense Policy: Nato's Companion – or Competitor?* (Santa Monica 2002).

Jacoby, Wade and Cristopher Jones, 'The EU Battle Groups in Sweden and the Czech Republic: What National Defense Reforms Tell Us about European Rapid Reaction Capabilities', *European Security*, 17 (2008) 2-3, 315-338.

Jones, Seth G., 'The Rise of a European Defense', *Political Science Quarterly* 121 (2006) 2, 241-267.

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdepence* (Boston/Columbus/Indianapolis 2012).

Kerttunen, Mika, 'The EU Battlegroup – its Background and Concept', *Diskussion & Debatt* 1 (2010) 127-150.

Koenig, Nicole and Marie Walter-Franke, 'France and Germany: Spearheading a European Security and Defence Union?', *Policy Paper Jacques Delors Institut* 202, 19 July 2017, 1-18.

Koivula, Tommi, 'The Origins and First Years of the European Union Battlegroups', *Diskusion & Debatt* 1 (2010), 110-126.

Koutrakos, Panos, *European Security and Defence Policy* (Oxford 2013).

Larivé, Maxime, *Debating European Security and Defense Policy. Understanding the complexity* (Farnham 2014).

Lindley-French, Julian, *A Chronology of European Security and Defence 1945-2006* (Oxford 2007).

Lindley-French, Julian, 'The Revolution in Security Affairs: Hard and Soft Security Dynamics in the 21st Century', *European Security* 13 (2004) 1-2, 1-15.

Lindstrom, Gustav, *Enter the EU Battlegroups*, Chaillot Paper 97 (Paris 2007).

Lisbonne-de Vergeron, Karine, *France, European Defence and NATO* (London 2008).

Mahoney, James, 'Path Dependence in Historical Sociology', *Theory and Society* 29 (2000) 4, 507-548.

Major, Claudia and Christian Mölling, 'EU Battlegroups: What contribution to European defence?', *Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik Research Paper* 8 (2011) 1-36.

Menon, Anand, 'European Defence Policy from Lisbon to Libya', *Survival* 53 (2011) 3, 75-90.

Menon, Anand, 'Power, Institutions and the CSDP: the Promise of Institutionalist Theory', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49 (2011) 1, 83-100.

Menon, Anand, 'Empowering Paradise? The ESDP at Ten', *International Affairs* 85 (2009) 2, 227-246.

Mérand, Frédéric, *European Defence Policy: Beyond the Nation State* (Oxford 2008).

Meyer, Christoph O. and Eva Strickmann, 'Solidifying Constructivism: How Material and Ideational Factors Interact in European Defence', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49 (2011) 1, 61-81.

Moravcsik, Andrew and Frank Schimmelfennig, 'Liberal Intergovernmentalism', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 67-90, 68-73.

Moravcsik, Andrew, 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: a Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31 (1993) 4, 473-524.

Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet, Gisela and Carolin Rüger (eds.), *The High Representative for the EU Foreign and Security Policy – Review and Prospects* (Baden-Baden 2011).

Nováky, Niklas, 'Who wants to pay more? The European Union's military operations and the dispute over financial burden sharing', *European Security* 25 (2016) 2, 216-236.

Niemann, Arne and Philippe C. Schmitter, 'Neofunctionalism', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 44-66.

Ojanen, Hanna, 'The EU and NATO: Two Competing Models for a Common Defence Policy', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44 (2006) 1, 57-76.

Page, Scott, 'Path Dependence', *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* (2006) 1, 87-115.

Pierson, Paul, 'Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics', *The American Political Science Review* 94 (2000) 2, 251-267.

Pierson, Paul, 'The Path to European Integration. A Historical Institutionalist Analysis', *Comparative Political Studies* 29 (1996) 2, 123-163.

Pohl, Benjamin, 'Neither bandwagoning nor balancing: Explaining Europe's security policy', *Contemporary Security Policy* 34 (2013) 2, 353-373.

Pollack, Mark A., 'The New Institutionalisms and European Integration', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 125-143.

Posen, Barry R., 'European Union Security and Defense Policy: Response to Unipolarity?', *Security Studies* 15 (2006) 2, 149-186.

Quille, Gerrard, 'The Lisbon Treaty and its implications for CFSP/ESDP', Briefing Paper, Policy Department External Policies, European Parliament, 31 January 2008, http://www.statewatch.org/news/2008/feb/ep-esdp-lisbon.pdf (accessed 4 December 2017).

Reichard, Martin, *The EU-NATO Relationship: A Legal and Political Perspective* (Aldershot 2006).

Reykers, Yf, 'No supply without demand: explaining the absence of the EU Battlegroups in Libya, Mali and the Central African Republic', *European Security* 25 (2016) 3, 346-365.

Reynolds, Christopher, *Understanding the Emergence of the European Security and Defence Policy* (Baden-Baden 2010).

Ringsmose, Jens and Sten Rynning, 'The NATO Response Force: A qualified failure no more?', *Contemporary Security Policy* (2017) 1-14.

Risse, Thomas, 'Social Constructivism and European Integration', in Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory* (Oxford 2009) 144-162.

Rosamond, Ben, *Theories of European Integration* (New York 2000).

Sheperd, Alistair J.K., ''A Milestone in the history of the EU': Kosovo and the EU's international role', *International Affairs* 85 (2009) 3, 513-530.

Smith, Michael, *Europe's Common Security and Defence Policy* (Cambridge 2017).

Smith, Michael E., *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy. The institutionalization of cooperation* (Cambridge 2004).

Steinmo, Sven, 'Historical Institutionalism', in: Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences. A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge 2008), 118-138.

Terlikowski, Marcin, 'Polish-led EU Battlegroup', *Bulletin – The Polish Institute of International Affairs* 3 (2010) 80, 159-160.

Thelen, Kathleen and Sven Steinmo, 'Historical Institutionalism in comparative politics', in Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen and Frank Longstreth (eds.), *Structuring Politics. Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (Cambridge 1992), 1-32.

Toje, Asle, 'The Consensus-Expectations Gap: Explaining Europe's Ineffective Foreign Policy', *Security Dialogue* 39 (2008) 1, 121-141.

Tonra, Ben and Thomas Christiansen, 'The study of EU foreign policy: between international relations and European Studies', in Ben Tonra and Thomas Christiansen (eds.), *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy* (Manchester/New York 2004) 1-9.

Vennesson, Pascal, 'Case Studies and process tracing: theories and practices', in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating (eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences. A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge 2008), 223-239.