THE EU-NATO RELATIONS IN THE POST-COLD WAR EUROPEAN SECURITY: COHABITATION OR SEPARATION?

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ASLIGÜL SARIKAMIŞ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JUNE 2004

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof.Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı   _____

Assoc.Prof. Dr. Ramazan Gözen   _____

Assist.Prof. Dr Sevilay Kahraman   _____

ABSTRACT

**THE EU-NATO RELATIONS IN THE POST-COLD WAR EUROPEAN
SECURITY: COHABITATION OR SEPARATION?**

Sarıkamış, Aslıgül

M.Sc., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı

June 2004, 175 pages

This thesis aims at analyzing the EU's quest for autonomous defence vis-à-vis NATO with a special reference to the ESDP. The major research question asked is what kind of relationship exists between the EU and NATO. Accordingly, the argument is that the EU's desire to gain autonomy through the ESDP is unlikely to pose a threat to the primacy of NATO in European Security. In this framework, firstly, the legacy of the Cold War and transition from the ESDI to the ESDP are discussed. Secondly, the political aspect of the EU-NATO relations is addressed by touching upon the views of major powers in the EU-NATO relations. The main obstacles for the development of the EU-NATO relations are explored in the third part. The last part is allocated to the recent developments in the EU-NATO relations within the post September 11 context. This thesis is concluded by suggesting that although the evolving nature of the EU-NATO relations does not provide sufficient

evidence for giving a clear answer to whether the EU and NATO cohabitate or separate, the EU and NATO should strive for cohabitating and working together in a complementary and harmonious way.

ÖZ

SOĞUK SAVAŞ SONRASI AVRUPA GÜVENLİĞİNDE AB-NATO İLİŞKİSİ: BİRLİKTE VAROLMA VEYA AYRILMA?

Sarıkamış, Aslıgül

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof.Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı

Haziran 2004, 175 Sayfa

Bu tezin amacı, AGSP'ye özel bir referans vererek AB'nin NATO'ya karşı otonom bir savunma oluşturma arayışının analiz edilmesidir. Temel araştırma sorusu AB ve NATO arasında ne tür bir ilişki var olduğudur. Buna uygun olarak, bu çalışmanın temel düşüncesi, AB, AGSP aracılığıyla otonomi kazanma isteğinin Avrupa Güvenliği'nde NATO'nun birincil rolünü tehdit edecek durumda olmadığıdır.Bu çerçevede, ilk olarak Soğuk Savaş'ın mirası ve AGSK'dan AGSP'ye geçiş tartışılmıştır. İkinci olarak, AB-NATO ilişkisinin siyasi yönü, ana aktörlerin AB-NATO ilişkisi ile ilgili görüşlerine değinilerek ele alınmıştır. AB-NATO ilişkisinin gelişmesinin önündeki temel engeller üçüncü bölümdeincelenmiştir. Son bölüm ise AB-NATO ilişkisinde 11 Eylül sonrası dönemde AB-NATO ilişkisindeki gelişmelere ayrılmıştır. Bu tez çalışması sürekli olarak gelişen AB-NATO ilişkisinin AB ve NATO'nun birbirinden ayrılacağı veya birarada varolmaya devam edeceği

sorusuna net bir cevap verilebilmesi için yeterli delil sağlamadığı, ancak AB ve NATO'nun bir arada varolma ve birbirleriyle uyumlu ve birbirlerini tamamlayıcı şekilde çalışmak için gayret göstermeleri gerektiği önerisiyle sonuçlanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: AGSK, BAB, NATO, AGSP, Avrupa Savunması, AB, Berlin Artı.

To my mother, Fatma Sarıkamış, with love and respect

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Professor Hüseyin BAĞCI for having first sparked my interest in European Security which made it possible for me to write this thesis. I would like to thank my supervisor for his guidance, insight and contributions. He has also provided me with very useful books from which I got many ideas. I profited greatly from the comments and suggestions of Assistant Prof. Dr. Sevilay KAHRAMAN as the thesis went through its different stages from proposal to writing. Moreover, I express my sincere appreciation to her for giving her time willingly and generously. I also owe thanks to Associate Prof. Dr. Ramazan GÖZEN for the time he spent to examine this thesis. His comments and critics contributed to the final version of the thesis.

I wish to extend my thanks to Ömür ATMACA, Berna SÜER and Aslı ERGÜL for their patience and good humour during the work.

Finally I would like to acknowledge my two important personal debts. A special word of thanks to my wonderful sisters - Çiğdem and Emine - for putting up with me throughout the process of writing. Last, but not least, I wish to express heartfelt thanks to my mother Fatma Sarıkamış, to whom this thesis is dedicated, for making the dark stretches passable.

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: Signature:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xi

LIST OF ABBREVATIONS

BTO   Brussels Treaty Organization

CEES   Central and Eastern European Countries

CESDP   Common European Security and Defence Policy

CFSP   Common Foreign and Security Policy

CJTF   Combined Joined Task Force

COPSI   The EU's Interim Political and Security Committee

EC   European Community

ECAP   European Capability Action Plan

ECSC   European Coal and Steel Community

EDC   European Defence Community

EEC   European Economic Community

ERRF   European Rapid Reaction Force

ESDI   European Security and Defence Identity

ESDP   European Security and Defence Policy

EU	European Union
EUMC	European Union Military Committee
EUMS	European Union Military Staff
DCI	Defence Capabilities Initiative
FYROM	Former Republic of Macedonia
HFC	Helsinki Force Catalogue
HHC	Helsinki Headline Catalogue
IGC	Intergovernmental Conference
IFOR	Implementation Force
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan
KFOR	Kosovo Force
KLA	Kosovo Liberation Army
OPLAN	Operation Plan
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council

NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NRF	NATO Rapid Reaction Force
PfP	Partnership for Peace
PSC	Political and Security Committee
SACEUR	Supreme Allied Force Europe
SFOR	Stabilization Force
TEU	Treaty of European Union
US	United States
UN	United Nations
WEU	Western European Union

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The development of the European security arrangement has been on the agenda of both Europeans and Americans since the beginning of the Cold War. Although Western European Union (WEU) was formed as the *only* European security and defence institution with the Brussels Treaty, it transferred most of its functions to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). During the Cold War NATO had been at the center of European security and protected Western Europe from immediate Soviet military domination. Furthermore, it represented an alliance of collective self defence and security regime that reflected shared norms, values and the convergence of interests. On the other hand, the European Union, then European Economic Community (EEC), attempted to add a defence dimension to a continuing European integration process through European Defence Community (EDC) and the Fouchet Plan. Since these attempts failed, they could not challenge the primacy of NATO in European Security. Moreover, the bipolar international system of the Cold War affected the European Community's (EC) pursuit of defence ambitions. As a result, the EC employed mainly economic means for pursuit of its goals and constrained its development in economic and trade areas. In this respect, the EC has been regarded as a civilian power for a long time.

The fall of Berlin Wall in 1989 and consequently, the dissolution of the Soviet Union into its constituent units marked the end of Cold War and heralded a

new security environment where threats and principles of the previous era became irrelevant. Moreover, the perceptions about the nature of threat and risks altered dramatically. The meaning of security widened and went beyond violence and military instruments. Security began to cover social, economic and environmental issues and thus became a multidimensional concept. The East–West conflict and the Soviet military threat were replaced by multifaceted security challenges such as political and economic instability in Southern Europe, ethnic and nationalistic conflicts, refugee movements and illegal immigration, drug trafficking and finally proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and international terrorism. These new challenges necessitated restructuring of NATO and the EU. They introduced new instruments and policies in order to adjust themselves to the post-Cold War context. In this respect, NATO has assumed new missions like crisis management, peacemaking and peacekeeping in addition to the collective defence mission. Parallel to this process, the EU transformed itself and decided to take over greater responsibility for its security and defence. The Gulf War and Yugoslavian Crisis became influential on the development of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) beginning from the Maastricht Treaty. Afterwards, ethnic and nationalist conflict in Bosnia, Serbia and Crotia revealed the fact that the EU was incapable of acting decisively in international crisis without effective and credible military capability. Besides, it became apparent that the EU could not use its economic leverage for political purposes. The EU relied on NATO, namely, the United States (US), in terms of providing security and stability to Europe. Nevertheless, this gave rise to problems when the interests of the US and Europeans did not coincide in the new circumstances of the post- Cold War era. Since the EU member states were not

able to assert their preferences against United States dominance, they embarked a new and ambitious course towards moving autonomy in the defence of Europe.

NATO welcomed above mentioned attempts of the EU and advocated the development of European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) for strengthening the European defence pillar of the Alliance. However, the EU member states wanted to design a new institutional set up and capabilities that do not necessarily depend upon NATO assets. Kosovo crisis became main driving force for propelling the EU into launching European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). The EU accepted the objective ESDP in Cologne Council and gave substance to it through European Rapid Reaction Force in Helsinki. Consequently, the EU searched for a greater autonomy in its security and defence through ESDP. This gave rise to overlapping of the defence and security dimension of the EU with certain role and functions of the NATO.

Against this background, this thesis aims to investigate the EU-NATO Relations in the post-Cold War Security context on the basis of these questions:

Do NATO and the EU cohabite or separate from each other in European Security?

What will be the implications of ESDP for the future of NATO?

To What extent does the EU's quest for an autonomous defence through ESDP pose a serious challenge to NATO?

I have chosen to examine the EU-NATO relations in the post-Cold War context for three reasons: Firstly, I think that both of them are the main organizations that have a deep impact on the European security. After the end of the Cold War, both of them have adapted themselves to the new security environment and brought new dimensions to their functions and missions. In this regard, NATO has assumed new

missions like crisis management, peacekeeping and peace making. The EU has quickened its pace towards being a credible and effective actor in international politics and developed the CFSP and the ESDP as a complementary to CFSP. Secondly, the evolving nature of ESDP where competencies of NATO and EU have overlapped entails an analytical study of the subject from different perspectives. Thirdly, being as a non-EU member of NATO, Turkey will be affected by the nature of the EU-NATO relations and this brings the subject more prominently into the spotlight.

My overall argument is that while the ESDP provides encouraging steps to the EU's desire to possess autonomy pertaining regional defence and security of the Europe, it is not capable of posing a threat to primacy of NATO in European security. In spite of the EU's aim of being an autonomous security actor, NATO will preserve its dominant position in European security for the foreseeable future. From our point of view, there is no way other than arrangement of a constructive, complementary and transparent relation between the EU and NATO, thus cohabitation of NATO and the EU together.

For the purpose of this study, we discuss the main topic of this thesis in five chapters. In the first chapter, we try to shed light on the European security arrangements in the Cold War. Therefore, we want to find out the legacies of the Cold War to the Post Cold War Europe. We deal with NATO-the EC-WEU triangle and examine their roles and functions throughout the Cold War.

The second chapter starts with the explanation of the New World Order and then addresses the EU and NATO's adaptation to the new era. Afterwards, we examine the transition from ESDI to ESDP in stages. We constrain our discussion the

developments between 1990 and 2001. In other words, we begin the NATO's adaptation process and end with the institutionalization of the ESDP.

The third chapter focuses on the political aspect of the EU-NATO relations. We analyze the views of the primary actors, i.e., the United States (US), France, Britain and Germany owing to the fact that their approaches will be very influential in shaping the on going and the future of the EU-NATO relations.

The fourth chapter of this thesis is allocated to the main obstacles for the development of the EU-NATO relations. Hence, military capability gap, the implication of twin enlargement of the EU and NATO and financial constraints are emphasizes as the major challenges.

The last chapter attempts to address the recent developments beginning from the September 11 attacks. It mainly explains the outcome of the Convention on the future of Europe, the resolution of the Berlin Plus dispute and Operation of Concordia. In this part, the EU Security Strategy paper which was prepared by Javier Solana, the High Representative for CFSP, isn't- deliberately touched upon. Because, Security Strategy paper mainly focuses on the weapons of mass destruction and international terrorism, which isn't covered by this thesis. In this sense, the debate on the EU Security Strategy Paper is excluded from the study since it doesn't go beyond pointing out the need for the consolidation and development of the EU-NATO interface.

Thereby, we try to contribute the debate on the EU-NATO relations by specific reference to the ESDP. In this sense, we seek to explore in detail the EU's quest for autonomous defence vis-à-vis NATO and clarify what kind of relation does exist between the EU and NATO in the defence of Europe.

5

During the conduct of this study, a qualitative research technique has been employed along with a comprehensive literature review. In this sense, a qualitative analysis of primary sources including the EU, WEU and NATO Summit declarations and communiqués and other core documents will be made. Also, secondary resources like books, scholarly written articles and journalistic explanations have been used. As result of both library and internet searches, I was able to reach a variety of resources including academic papers, treaty documents, country specific views and NATO and EU institutions' views, which carry a significant potential for making this study achievable and feasible.

CHAPTER 2

THE LEGACY OF THE COLD WAR: NATO-WEU- THE EC
TRIANGLE

This chapter aims to provide a brief history about the Cold War security arrangements with a specific reference to the functions of NATO, WEU and the EC. The legacies of these organizations to the post-Cold War era will be examined owing to the fact that a new security and defence framework discussions in Europe in the late 1990s have retreated that of the early post-war period[1] as regards to the question of political union and the concern of a common foreign policy for West Europe.

In the 20th century, Europe suffered from two devastating world wars that broke out as European wars. The First World War did not create a stable international system; consequently interwar years were characterized by rising tensions, clashing interests of nation states.[2]

In contrast to World War I, the World War II gave rise to the transformation of Europe and thus had far reaching impacts. In regard to security, Western European states started to form new alliances in the early post-war international climate.[3] After the end of World War II, both the West Europeans and the US were aware of the fact

---

[1] Philip Gummett, ' Foreign, Defence and Security Policy', in M. Rhoades, P. Heywood and V. Wright (eds.), Developments in West European Politics (United Kingdom: Macmillan Press, 1997), p.207

[2] Neill Nugent, The Government and Politics of the European Union, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), pp.4-6.

[3] Gummet, op.cit., p.208.

that economic development and political stabilisation were necessary for preventing future conflicts.[4] By the end of 1948, the perceived Soviet threat, though less apparent initially, intensified with the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia and the Soviet blockade of West Berlin.[5] The impact of Soviet communism became evident with the public support of communist parties of Western Europe, particularly in France and Italy. In view of these circumstances, the US decided to cooperate and assist with Western Europe to protect from both Soviet military and ideological threat.[6] In fact, the Soviet Union was not perceived as an enemy by European states until late 1947. In the early post war European context in which Europe was geographically divided into east and west blocs and military vulnerable, the continuation of the Soviet blockade of West Berlin from June 1948 to May 1949 revealed the Soviet aggression intent. Consequently, secret negotiations began among the Britain, Canada and the US on Atlantic security arrangements from March to April 1948.[7]

In this context, the United States played crucial role in the reconstruction of Western Europe. European reconstruction was carried out through Marshall Plan as an economic policy and establishment of NATO as a defence policy.[8] In other words, NATO was created as the military equivalent of the Marshall Plan.[9] While US protection of West Europe against Soviet attack came into being in the form of

---

[4] Ibid., p.490

[5] Hazel Smith, European Union Foreign Policy, What it is and What it Does, (England: Pluto Press 2002)., p.40.

[6] Desmond Dinan, Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration, (Boulder, Colo: L.Rienner Publishers, 1999), pp.15-16

[7] Fergus Carr and Kostas Ifantis, NATO in The New European Order, (Britain: MacMillan Press Ltd.,1996), p. 56.

[8] Holly Wyatt-Walter, The European Community and Security Dilemma,1979-1992 (Macmillan Press: London, 1997), p.16-18

[9] Spencer M. Di Scala, Twentieth Century Europe, (Newyork: McGraw-Hill,2004), p.492.

NATO in the military and security field, the economic equivalent of NATO was the Marshall Plan.[10] Marshall Plan, which could be viewed as the primary instrument of the US for the encouragement of European integration,[11] was developed by US Secretary of State, George Marshall. In his speech at Harvard University in 1947 Marshall explained the aims for the US aid to recovery of Europe as follows "... to avoid political disturbances and desperation, to restore the world economy and to nurture free institutions."[12] According to Wyatt-Walter, Marshall Plan was created to ensure Western European economic coordination, because the United States government knew the fact that reconstruction of Western Europe couldn't be realized single handily. For this reason, the United States put pressure for a coordinated European response to post war conditions.[13]

In these circumstances, the pioneer of these alliances was the Brussels Treaty Organization (BTO). It was regarded as the first West European Security arrangement.[14] The root of the Brussels Treaty was the 1947 Treaty of Dunkirk which was mutual defence solidarity of France and Britain against a continuing German militarism. Afterwards, the Treaty of Dunkirk was extended to involve the Benelux countries and thus formed the basis of Brussels Treaty. Under the terms of the Brussels Treaty, the parties agreed "to take such steps as may be held necessary in the event of renewal by Germany of a policy of aggression". Moreover, the Treaty included a generalised collective defence clause if any of the parties is to be "the

---

[10] Nugent., op.cit., p.13.

[11] Dinan, op.cit., p.16.

[12] Henry Kissenger, Diplomacy, (NewYork:Touchstone, 1994), p.453.

[13] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.18.

[14] Smith, op.cit., p.40.

object of an armed attack".[15] This collective defence commitment constituted main feature of the Treaty. Also, based on this commitment, military cooperation were launched and a plan for common defence, including the integration of air defences and joint command organization.[16]

While the Treaty of Dunkirk called for the security of Britain and France against possible German aggression explicitly, the Brussels Treaty mainly focused on collective defence of signatory parties, this is to say, against "any situation which may constitute a threat to peace, in whatsoever area, this threat should arise"[17] Nevertheless, signatory parties of both treaty knew that collective defence commitment was adequate with provided that there would be an American military support.[18]

Following World War II, the US had no commitment to a continued existence of American military forces in Europe. Moreover, it was expected that President Roosevelt would withdraw all American soldiers within two years since the policy of isolationism was still strong. However, it was the obstination of Stalin, the most notable Soviet leader following Lenin's death in 1924 that led to the recreation of the Western alliance. As a consequence of efforts of British and partly Canadian government, the US was convinced to stay Europe militarily.[19] After negotiations, Washington talks took place among the US, Canada and the Brussels Treaty Powers

---

[15] Charlotte Bretherton and John Vogler , The European Union as a Global Actor (London: Routledge, 1999), p.199.

[16] available on line at: www.weu.int/History. htm accessed on 08.01.2004.

[17] Quoted in Holly Wyatt-Walter, The European Community and Security Dilemma,1979-1992 (Macmillan Press: London, 1997).p.17.

[18] Ibid., p.17

[19] L.H Gann and Peter Duignan, Contemporary Europe and the Atlantic Alliance ; a Political History, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), p.146.

and resulted in agreement on North Atlantic Treaty.[20] In April 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed by the US, Canada and European countries: France, Italy, the UK, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, Ireland and Portugal. Being an alliance of sovereign states, NATO aimed to provide security against perceived Soviet military threat.[21] In the North Atlantic Treaty, it was stated that NATO's purpose was the prevention of a war by deterrence. In this respect, the principles of mutual assistance and balanced collective forces were the guiding concepts of the NATO while the latter implied the assignment of military tasks to those nations whose capabilities lie primarily in certain directions, the former meant combination of member state forces.[22] Thus, NATO represented an alliance for collective defence of the West that linked North America and Europe against the Soviet threat and ensured American commitment to the West Europe. According to Lord Ismay, a British general and first secretary general of NATO, NATO was established "to keep the Russians out, the Germans down and the Americans in!"[23] Similarly, Christoph Bluth states that three main tasks as follows: providing security to Western Europe against Soviet threat, incorporating and containing West Germany in NATO and keeping the US in Europe.[24] From the point of view of Kissinger, the aim of NATO was to look after European security. Being as the first peace time

---

[20] Carr and Ifantis, op.cit., p.56

[21] Robert Kennedy, ' Current Security Arrangements and Models for the Future: An American View', in NATO Defence College (ed), Cooperative Security Arrangements in Europe, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang Gmbh,1997) p. 122

[22] Charles M. Spofford, "Toward Atlantic Security", *International Affairs*,Vol.27., No.4, October 1951 ,p.434.,available on line at www.jstor.org

[23] L.H Gann and Peter Duignan, op.cit., p.146

[24] Christoph Bluth, Germany and the Future of European Security, (Britain: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000), p.104.

military alliance in American history, NATO became important means of linking the US to the defence of Western Europe.[25]

As regards to the content of North Atlantic Treaty, NATO was created in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations (UN), particularly the framework of Article 51 of the UN Charter.[26] Under the terms of the Treaty, Article 2 pointed out characteristics of NATO that are other than military alliance like encouragement of economic collaboration, development of peaceful and friendly international relations. Article 3 of the Treaty committed "separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack." Article 4 allowed for alliance members consultations "whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any parties is threatened." Therefore, Article 4 created a transatlantic forum for the discussion of events that affect the security of Alliance members both inside and outside the NATO area. Article 5 comprised the defining characteristic of the Treaty as follows:

> The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized by Article 51 of the United Nations will assist the Party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measure necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.[27]

---

[25] Henry Kissenger, op.cit. pp. 456-457.

[26] Fergus Carr and Theresa Callan, Managing Conflict in The New Europe, (NewYork: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p.83.

[27] North Atlantic Treaty, Article 5.

According to Carr and Callan, article 5 does not call for the action to be taken, but it envisages action in order to restore security an imperative of membership.[28] Article 6 puts limitation on the application area of the Treaty by constraining the Alliance to respond only to an attack "on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America."[29] Article 9 provided organizational structure of NATO which does not include any supranational element. NATO's organs have not delegated power.[30] Article 10 of the Treaty states decision-making procedure of the Alliance that was based on the agreement of all parties.

In addition to the formation of NATO, European integration was launched in the early 1950s. However, unlike the Marshall Plan, which was a short term project, European integration has been a long term project. In this sense, it had three main aspects: European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), European Defence Community (EDC) and European Economic Community.

ECSC was established with the French Foreign Minister Robert Schumann's plan for establishing the European Coal and Steel Community by means of economic cooperation.[31] Announced in May 1950, Schumann Plan pooled French and German coal and steel production under a supranational High Authority. The significance of this body was to implement policies and enforce its decisions in coal and steel communities.[32] Although the plan was open to the participation of all European

---

[28] Carr and Callan, op.cit., p.83.

[29] Carr and Ifandis, op.cit., p.57

[30] Spofford, op.cit., p.435.

[31] Ramses A., Wessel, The European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, A Legal Institutional Perspective, (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1999), p.1

[32] DiScala,op.cit., p.485

countries, it was formalized with the Paris Treaty of 1952 by the participation of France, West Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries.

Apart from above mentioned attempts for economic integration, the events of that period gave rise to initiatives for integration in other fields. Especially, the Korean War linked economic integration to the issue of European defence.[33] At a first glance, Korean War meant North Korean aggression against South Korea. However, the Korean War occupied a special place in Cold War history since it represented the confrontation of the US and the Soviet Union on a global scale. Also, it brought West German rearmament to the agenda of US policy. In the summer of 1950, the US wanted to realize German rearmament in NATO for strengthening ground forces and thus filling the man-power gap. Consequently, the US demanded for the creation of German formations under NATO command at September 1950 NATO Council Meeting.[34] France did not support the US proposal for reappearance of an independent German army and tried to prevent West German rearmament under NATO framework.

In response to the US proposal for German rearmament in NATO, France came with an alternative proposal so called the Pleven Plan. Because, following the World War II, France had the orientation of "demilitarisation, decentralization and deindustralisation"of Germany.

Therefore, the Pleven Plan put forward German rearmament through the creation of a European army. As a result, it sought to solve the problem of German

---

[33] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.20

[34] Martin J.Dedman, The Origin and Development of the European Union 1945-95 (New York: Routledge, 1996).pp.70-72

rearmament through European integration under French leadership, instead of putting it under auspices of an Anglo-Saxon dominated NATO.[35] France believed that German rearmament shortly after the World War II undermined Schumann Plan since West Germany would be unwilling to proceed with the Plan.[36] In the words of Jean Monnet, chairman of Schumann Plan and important supporter of French proposal, the main driving force behind the Pleven Plan was to prevent German rearmament from destroying ECSC.[37] Nevertheless, this rationale was not shared by everyone. For example, Di Scala stated that despite the fact that Pleven Plan seemed to be an alternative route for German rearmament, it would have prevented the Germans from having a separate army under their own command, therefore provided an opportunity to France for supervising the military progress of Germany.[38] In a similar vein, Secretary of State Dean Acheson viewed the Plan as a French tactic to postpone Germany's rearmament and entry into NATO. [39]

The origin of the Pleven Plan envisaged the establishment of European Army composed of troops from each member state. In this respect, Germany was supposed to provide twelve divisions of 13000 soldiers. Thus, German military forces constituted basic units of the army. A multinational corp was placed above the divisions under the command of a NATO leader, finally the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe (SACEUR). Moreover, one of the provisions of the Treaty addressed against possibility of German aggression. In accordance with this article,

---

[35] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.21

[36] Ibid., p.73

[37] Renata Dwan, "Jean Monnet and the European Defence Community, 1950-54", *Cold War History,* Vol. 1, No. 1, August 2000.

[38] DiScala, op.cit., p.492

[39] Dwan, op.cit., pp.145-146

aircraft, atomic, chemical, biological weapons, heavy ships and other specified items can not be produced in strategically exposed regions without the unanimous approval of the Council.[40]

Pleven Plan called for a European army that attached to the European Defence Community (EDC), whose institutional structure resembled that of the ECSC. The Plan introduced a Commission, a Council, an Assembly and a Court. Apart from these, the EDC would have common institutions, common armed forces and common budget. Both Commission and the Council could take decisions by majority of voting and legal personality of the EDC was undisputed.[41] According to the Plan, except for Germany, all participating states would have a national control over their forces that were not under the command of the EDC. Therefore, Germany would have deprived of an independent military action.[42]

In addition to the control of German rearmament, the Pleven Plan was designed to further European integration project.[43] Particularly, Jean Monnet acknowledged potential of defence integration for a European political community.[44] Monnet's intention was to forward the European political community through the EDC. In his opinion, the European army had the only potential to quicken the European political construction process. In the words of Monnet "It constitutes a peaceful revolution. The success of the ECSC and EDC projects removes the greatest

---

[40] Lawrence S.Kaplan, "NATO and Adenauer's Germany: Uneasy Partnership", *International Organization*, Vol.15, no.4, Autumn 1961, p.620

[41] Wessel, op.cit., p.2

[42] Dedman, op.cit., p.74

[43] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p. 21

[44] Renata, op.cit., p. 145

material and psychological obstacle to the economic and political unification of Europe."[45]

Since the Pleven Plan envisaged an alternative to the US's option of incorporating West Germany into NATO, it could receive limited support from the US and West European governments.[46] West Germany preferred NATO solution. Pleven Plan due to the unequal status of Germany in Pleven Plan. From German point of view, rearmament and sovereignty were closely related with each other, and rearmament would herald return of formal sovereignty.

Britain's attitude towards a European army was not affirmative. Despite the fact that Britain backed the idea, it could not merge its forces in a European army. Anthony Eden, Britain's the Conservative Foreign Secretary from October 1951 to 1955, made clear that the Britain would not join a European army bluntly at a NATO meeting in Rome in 1951.[47] Britain was afraid of withdrawal of the US forces from Western Europe after the establishment of the EDC. Consequently, the Britain would not give support to any policy that may undermine the essential US commitment. In this respect, Britain's approach could be summarized by quoting Churchill's Strasbourg Speech of August 1950 as "we are with Europe, but not of it, we are interested and associated but not absorbed."[48]

In the US, the governing elites were split into two with respect to the Pleven Plan. While political elites responded positively and regarded as a bid for solving the

---

[45] Ibid., p.155.

[46] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit, pp.21-22.

[47] Dedman, op.cit., pp.76-77.

[48] Quoted in Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.22.

issue of integrated European defence, military elites were not satisfied with possibility of establishing nationally integrated combat division.[49]

After negotiations of the Pleven Plan, a draft Treaty of Paris establishing the EDC was signed on 27 May 1952 with the participation of six states: France, Belgium, Italy, West Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands However, the Treaty had to be ratified in the parliaments of the six states. The parliamentary ratification process was lenghty due to discussions and political objections to EDC, lack of a European defence and foreign policy and weak democratic feature of the EDC.[50] Among the six states, legislative approval in French National Assembly became problematic. Firstly, France demanded for obtaining additional potocol in order to protect her national control overseas defence forces and to withdraw from European army. Nonetheless, the acceptance of these conditions by other states did not resolve the problem; the French government persisted in laying down new reservations about the treaty. [51]

According to Wessel, the reason for the French rejection of the EDC can be summarised as follows:[52] The objection of both the Gaullists and the Communists, the fear of German rearmament, absence of the UK, changes in international climate. Let me dwell for a moment on these reasons:

Firstly, both the Communists and Gaullists were opposed to the EDC for different reasons in the French National Assembly. While former's hostility resulted from reluctancy of Soviet government for European interest in defence, the latter was

---

[49] Ibid., p.23.

[50] Wessel, op.cit., p.2.

[51] Kaplan, op.cit., p.620.

[52] Wessel., op.cit., p.3.

concerned about sacrifice of national sovereignty. Secondly, it was argued that French rejection was apparent long before 1954; therefore, the reason for delaying ratification was to "counter US Pressure for German rearmament." To put it another, France gained by delaying ratification process. Because, rather than the dispute over realization of German rearmament; there was a dispute on means of German rearmament, either NATO or EDC. Thus, lengthy ratification process and ultimately rejection of the Treaty provided the postponement of NATO solution to German rearmament. Thirdly, the other factor in French rejection of the EDC was the reluctancy of the Britain joining the EDC. In the eyes of opponents of the EDC, this meant the state of inferiority in relation to Britain. Because, the supranational form of the EDC necessitated the renounciation of French sovereignty in defence/security areas while Britain retained her sovereignty in these areas. Consequently, this impaired Franco-British equality and reduced France's status vis-à-vis the big powers of the West. Although France did not demand for equality with the US, it was very sensitive about Franco-British equality.[53] Given the human and material resources of France, the French felt that they were unable to compete with the US, but they thought that they could compete with the UK since French resources were regarded comparable to those of the UK. Having seen qualitative superiority of the UK over France, French politicians saw the UK "with a mixture of guilt, admiration, envy and uncertainty about their own ability to evaluate the British achievement."[54] Against this background, France attached the great significance for British entrance into EDC. Yet, absence of the UK in EDC discouraged France to join EDC for the purpose of

---

[53] Nathan Leites and Christian de la Malene, " Paris from EDC to WEU", *World Politics*, Vol.9, No.2, (Jan., 1957), available on line at www.jstor.org, , pp.206-208.

[54] Ibid., p.209.

maintaining the feeling of equality between Paris and London. Fourthly, the changes in international climate like death of Stalin and the end of Korean War in 1953 deteriorated the prospect for EDC ratification.[55]

In addition to above-mentioned factors, the prospect of a European army under a supranational entity was another crucial reason that made the EDC unacceptable. In other words, supranational aspect of the EDC which implied denationalization of the French Army became one of the major obstacles for the establishment of EDC.[56] Nevertheless, France was not ready to transfer part of its sovereignty over French military forces to supranational entity. Even though the EDC never came into existence due to the French rejection, it had repercussions on European integration. First of all, the rejection of EDC had a suppressing effect on the quest for European defence identity for about 40 years. Moreover, it was seen that people were not ready for the establishment of a communitarian or supranational European institution in defence area. As regards to time, the EDC was regarded as "too far ahead of its time".[57] Therefore, the failure of the EDC indicated difficulties involved in integrationist approaches particularly quasi-federalist tendencies in politically sensitive areas.[58] With the failure of the EDC, West Europeans did not give up European integration, but they emphasized more on the higher stages of European economic integration. Thus, they adopted more gradual approach in defence and security issues. According to Desmond Dinan, the failure of EDC and subsequent

---

[55] Dedman., op.cit., p.83 and Wyatt-Walter., op.cit., p.26.

[56] Leites and Malene, op.cit., p.197.

[57] Charles G. Cogan, Third Option: The Emancipation of European Defense, 1989-2000, (Westport, CT, USA: Greenwood Publishing, 2001), p.2

[58] Nugent, op.cit., p.39.

initiatives following the EDC highlighted limitations of European integration in 1950s and beyond, this caused the six to concentrate on the issue of economic integration.[59] In this issue, Wyatt-Walter stated that the EDC affected next stage of economic integration and led to the development of the EC outside the explicitly defined security realm.[60]

Following the failure of the EDC project, an alternative solution was found to the question of rearmament of Germany and thus linking Germany to the defence of the west without antagonizing France.[61] British Prime Minister Anthony Eden introduced a proposal to facilitate rearmament of Germany, to put limit on German military power, to relieve French concerns and to secure West German sovereignty that Chancellor Adenauer's desire and finally to strengthen intergovernmental structure of transatlantic alliance hereby satisfying British preferences.[62]

As a result, at a special conference in London in 1954, Italy and West Germany acceded to the Brussels Treaty and seven countries amended the Treaty, therefore created WEU. With the establishment of WEU, West German rearmament was achieved through explicitly European Institution.[63] In this respect, West Germany entered into NATO in 1955 and German troops were put under direct control of SACEUR and production of atomic, biological and chemical materials of war in German industry was forbidden.[64] Therefore, the emergence of the WEU after the

---

[59] Dinan, op.cit., pp.27-28.

[60] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.26

[61] Kaplan, op.cit., p.621

[62] Brian White, Understanding European Foreign Policy , (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p.145

[63] Bretherton and Vogler, op.cit., p.200.

[64] Kaplan, op.cit., p.621

failure of the EDC resulted from two factors: Europeans' aspiration to resolve in security issues and the problem of German rearmament in a way accepted by Germany, Britain and France.[65] The protocol to the Brussels Treaty, Modifying and completing the Brussels Treaty regulated the relationship between NATO and WEU in Article 4 as follows:

> In the execution of the Treaty, the High Contracting Parties and any organs established by them under the Treaty shall work in close cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Recognizing the undesirability of duplicating the military staff of NATO, the council and its agency will rely on the appropriate military authorities of NATO for information and advice on military matters[66]

Although the parties of the modified Brussels Treaty intended to link the WEU to European integration process, the development of WEU took place more close to NATO.[67] Due to the lack of sufficient military capabilities, the WEU could not serve its original aim. Therefore, it paid attention to political objectives, particularly binding the Britain to continent to counterbalance Germany. Despite the fact that Article 5 of the WEU Treaty was much more binding than Article 5 of NATO, following Germany's accession to NATO in 1955 the WEU became obsolete. In regard to functions, WEU's military responsibilities were delegated to NATO. Thus, its functions were receded to permission of West German rearmament within certain limits.[68] In spite of its inactivity, the WEU was in an emasculated state with no military forces. The major parts of European military forces were under the

---

[65] Simon Duke, "The Second Death (or the Second Coming?) of the WEU", *Journal of Common Market Studies* Vol. 34, No. 2, ‚June 1996, p.168.

[66] Article IV of the Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty, 1954.

[67] Duke, op.cit., p.168.

[68] Kennedy, op.cit., p.103.

command and control of the SACEUR. Hence, WEU was superfluous due to prominence of NATO.

In early years of the establishment, the WEU played an important role in settling the Franco-German Saar dispute; afterwards the WEU remained passive up to 1984 in European security. According to Simon Duke, the reasons for the WEU's inability to assume a distinguishable role were explained as follows: the reluctancy of NATO, suspicious attitudes of France and Britain towards German rearmament. [69]

Consequently, as an organization, WEU was characterized as "a loosely structured, essentially consultative, primarily defence oriented." With respect to creation and organizational design, WEU had internal functions such as providing arms control regime for Federal Republic of Germany and lying the UK to continent where as that of East-West antagonism following the Cold War.[70] Between the periods of 1954 to 1973, the WEU functioned as a liaison between the EC and the UK; attained confidence builder role by providing that West Germany's pledge of not producing certain categories of armaments and integrated West Germany into NATO.[71]

Following the participation of the UK in the EC in 1973, the activities and relevance of the WEU slowed down until 1984. The Rome Declaration of 1984 and the Hague Platform in 1987 became the stepping stones for reactivation of WEU. In the Cold War, the WEU's military functions were eclipsed by NATO, the EC's

---

[69] Duke, op.cit., p.169

[70] Peter Schmidt, In the Midst of Change: On the development of West European Security, (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1992), p.192

[71] Kennedy, op.cit., p.103

development of EPC from 1970 overtook the WEU's political functions.[72] In the early 1980s, the extension of the EPC's competence to security and defence issues was proposed in Genscher-Colombo Plan in response to the tensions in transatlantic relations. However, the failure of this plan prompted the reactivation of the WEU.[73]

The revival of the WEU took place in the mid 1980s. In 1984, the Ministerial Council of WEU decided to reactivate the WEU for strengthening a European identity in security and defence realms. While French, Luxembourg and Belgian government supported reactivation. West Germany did not support the revival of the WEU unless restrictions of WEU on manufacturing conventional weapons were lifted. Following the abolishment of these restrictions, Germany supported the reactivation on the basis of need for Europeanizing alliance. Having considering tensions after the Falkland experience and invasion of Grenada, Britain accepted the reactivation, thus increased cooperation in European security as a means of giving a message to the US.[74]

The motivations for the reactivation of the WEU were the advancement of European cooperation in security issues and strengthening European pillar within the alliance. In the words of Alfred Cahen, Secretary General of the WEU Council, above mentioned motivations was stated as follows:

> It would seem natural that such a Union should have a security dimension along with its other dimensions. The economic dimension through Political Cooperation. The new Western European Union, the beginnings of a European Pillar of Alliance, must therefore have close contacts and most effective coordinated relations with the Alliance.[75]

---

[72] Carr and Ifantis, op.cit., p.69

[73] Bretherton and Vogler, op.cit., p.202

[74] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.120

[75] Speech by Alfred Cahen, Secreatry-General of WEU, tok WEU plenary session, Decmber 2,1985, in *Europe Documents*, 31 December 1985 no.1385 quoted in Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.121.

As it was seen, the reactivation was not proposed as an alternative to NATO. On the contrary, the commitment of WEU to NATO was stressed.[76]The aspirations of various member states to take apart from the US without hampering the Atlantic Alliance or maintenance of cohesion in Western Europe in security and defence issues gave rise to reactivation of the WEU. Against this background, we can draw a conclusion that the motivations for the reactivation were closely related with internal factors, rather than external challenges and risks.[77]

Above mentioned aspirations of WEU member states reflected in the Rome Declaration, which was in fact the founding text of WEU's reactivation. In this declaration, the foreign and defence ministers of the WEU underlined "continuing necessity to strengthen western security and that better utilization of WEU would not only contribute to the security of Western Europe, but also to an improvement in the common defence of all countries in the Atlantic Alliance." Furthermore, the ministers accepted to consider the implications for Europe of crises in other regions of the world. In accordance with decisions taken in Rome, institutional return of WEU was realized. Henceforth, the WEU Council began to meet twice a year at Ministerial level.[78]

The Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Agreement between the US and Soviet Union on withdrawal of all intermediate nuclear forces pointed a need for European consultation on defence capability. In this sense, the formation of a joint

---

[76] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.120.

[77] Schmidt, op.cit., p.207.

[78] available at on line www.weu.int/ History.htm., accessed on 08.01.2004.

Franco-German brigade was proposed as a first move towards a European military force.[79] The WEU Council and its special war group prepared a report on European security conditions and responsibilities of Europeans in their defence along with the NATO. [80] On this basis, the WEU adopted a "Platform on European Security Interests" in 1987. The declaration stated that:

> …we recall our commitment to build a European Union in accordance with the Single European Act, which we all signed as members of the European Community. We are convinced that the construction of an integrated Europe will remain in complete as long as it does not include security and defence.[81]

In the words of Anne Deighton, during the Cold War the EC was a 'nested organization' that was in practice protected by NATO and the EC member states' own defence arrangements, while the WEU was a partially living organization that was solely irregularly charged with political or security missions in NATO- EC- WEU triangle.[82] By relying on these explanations, the role of NATO, the EC and WEU in the Cold War can be summarized as follows: While the EC concentrated on the progressing in economic integration, NATO was the main international organization in defence and security matters. While NATO and the EU became dominant institutions of Western Europe, WEU remained a dormant organization in the Cold War.

---

[79] Bretherton and Vogler, op.cit., p.202.

[80] available at on line www.weu.int/ History.htm., accessed on 08.01.2004

[81] WEU, Platform on European Security Interests, the Hague, October 1987

[82] Anne Deighton, "The European Security and Defence Policy", *Journal of Common Market Studies,* Vol.40, No.4, 2002, p. 722.

CHAPTER 3

THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE EU AND NATO TO THE NEW WORLD ORDER: TRANSITION FROM THE ESDI TO THE ESDP

In this chapter, we attempt to explain the developments in the defence of Europe with a specific reference to post-Cold War context. First, we investigate the emergence of the new world order following the end of Cold War. Afterwards, we deal with the EU's and NATO's adaptation to the new era on the basis of treaties and summits. In this way, we assess the movement from the ESDI to ESDP in the late 1990s.

3.1. The New World Order

The Cold War ended with the collapse of Berlin Wall in 1989 and the dissolution of Soviet Union into its constituent units in 1991. Therefore, the end of Cold War brought about a "geopolitical earthquake" that caused the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and unraveling of Soviet Union.[83] Furthermore, the principles and conventional paradigms of Cold War became obsolete in the new international climate. In this context, US President Bush expressed the phrase "New World Order" highlighting "a new international system of states to replace the bipolar cold war order based on a consensus among the major powers on international norms, principles of international law and human rights that should govern relations among

---

[83] Ronald Asmus, "Double Enlargement: Redefining the Atlantic Partnership after the Cold War", in David C. Gombert and Stephen Larrabee (eds), <u>America and Europe- A partnership for a new era</u>-, (RAND: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p.24.

states."[84] However, this new world order has been examined differently by scholars. While some observers like Wohlforth identified it with unipolar international politics where the US is the sole superpower, for others such as Huntington, the existence of a sole superpower did not necessarily mean unipolar world. According to Huntington, the contemporary international system is characterized by a hybrid, uni-multi polar system with one superpower and concomitant major powers. [85] On the other side, Ifantis emphasized on structural heterogeneity as one of the important aspect of the new international system. For Ifantis, structural heterogeneity meant "the existence of different international structures corresponding to the different kinds of power: military, monetary, trade, industrial and so on." [86]

With respect to multipolarity, there were discussions about whether the world returned to multipolarity of world system preceded 1945. However, there have been significant differences between multipolarity of contemporary era and traditional multipolarity existed in 18th and 19th century. Above all, contemporary multipolarity avoided war. In other words, military power has become less significant in the contemporary multipolarity in Europe due to end of rivalry between the US and the USSR.[87]

From the other perspective, the end of the Cold War was identified with "a sense of deeper change". In this respect, Francis Fukuyama viewed the collapse of communism with the end of Cold War as a triumph of western liberal democracy. He claimed the end of history since liberal democracy of West was become the only and

---

[84] Bluth, op.cit., p.39.

[85] Carr and Callan, op.cit., p.40.

[86] Carr and Ifantis, op.cit., p.35.

[87] Stephen J. Cimbala, " Security in Europe After The Cold War", *European Security*, Vol.2, No.2, 1993, pp.164-165.

final form of political system.[88] In addition to Fukuyama's ideological perspective to the end of Cold War, Huntington characterized the Post Cold War context where "ideological struggles of the past replaced by new conflicts over cultural values." He claimed clash of civilizations among major civilizations he depicted, subsequently, Huntington's ideas were criticized by many scholars[89].

The New World Order, which has already discussed, has significant implications for European politics, evaluation and agenda of the EU and the understanding of concept of security.

In the area of European politics, the end of Cold War gave way to the birth of a new European order marked by the unification of Germany and emergence of the new pluralistic democracies in Eastern Europe.[90] In this respect, the collapse of communism in Europe did not cause the 'end of history' as Fukuyama claimed. The political agenda of part of Eastern and Central Europe, the Balkans and the former Soviet Union were shaped by intrastate tensions, ethno-political conflict, nationalism and separation. Also, national minorities began to challenge the future of Europe. The pattern of secession in the former Yugoslavia led to the ethnic violence [91]

On the other side, the accommodation of reunified Germany became another issue in immediate Post Cold War context. Throughout the Cold War, Germany's linkage to West on security matters was provided by the US leadership within NATO, while that linkage on political issues was ensured through French leadership within the EU. However, after reunification, Germany has shifted from middle power having

---

[88] Andrew Heywood, Politics, (London: Macmillan Press, 1997), p.29

[89] Cogan, op.cit., p.17

[90] Carr and Ifantis, op.cit., p.15

[91] Ibid, p.22

a number of constraining structures and institution to a major player with its new size, economy and geostrategic location in new Europe. In the words of Hoffman, within the EC, the relative equilibrium among the "big three France, Federal Republic of Germany and the UK has broken in Germany's favor" [92]

The impact of the end of the Cold War on European integration process has been in the form of deepening and widening. The former has paved the way to development of an effective Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and European Monetary Union (EMU), the latter refers to enlargement of the EU including Central and Eastern European Countries. [93] Another impact of the end of the Cold War has been the questioning of EU's civilian power image[94]. Many of the Europeans have become content with Europe's civilian power image. In the Cold War, the EC acted as a civilian power and contributed to European security by

---

[92] S.Hoffman, " America and Europe in an Era of Revolutionary Change" in Haftendorn,H., Tuschoff C., (eds), <u>America and Europe in an Era of Change</u>, (Boulder Colo: West view Press, 1993), p.63, quoted in Carr and Ifantis, op.cit., p.38

[93] Bluth, <u>op.cit</u>., p.131

[94] In the literature, civilian power as a concept depicted differently. According to Hans Maull, civilian power means focusing on non-military mainly economic means in pursuit of national goals, recognition of necessity of cooperation with other for international objectives and a desire to develop supranational structures for dealing critical issues of international management. On the other side, Christopher Hill defined EC's civilian power model as follows: "The European Community's interest as a civilian group of countries long on economic power and relatively short on armed force is as far as possible to domesticate relations between states including those of its own members and those with states outside its frontiers." In the words of Karen Smith, the EC was a civilian power since it made use of economic and diplomatic instruments to affect other actors. Moreover, this civilian power image was reflected in values and objectives of the EC, which were different from those of superpowers. In this respect, the EC emphasized importance of economic stability for ensuring political stability, respect for human rights and regional cooperation. For a detailed analysis of civilian power concept, see Karen Smith, "The end of Civilian Power Europe: A Welcome Demise or Cause Concern?" *International Spectator*, Vol.35(2), 2000, pp. 25-48

economic and political means. To put it differently, the EC left defence issues to NATO's responsibility. With the end of Cold War, civilian power image of the EU began to be questioned. Particularly, immediate Post Cold War events like withdrawal of many US military forces, the Gulf War and the Yugoslav Crisis indicated the necessity of development of the EU's military capabilities along with diplomatic and economic instruments[95].

On the side of NATO, the end of the Cold War posed a serious challenge to raison d'etre of NATO. The sequence of events that marked the end of Cold War such as the collapse of Berlin Wall on 9 November 1989; reunification of Germany in 1991, dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and then the Soviet Union caused both relief and confusion for NATO.[96] In other words, the reunification of Germany and the demise of NATO's main threat, the Soviet Union removed NATO's existence ground and led to discussions about necessity or validity of NATO in the changing strategic circumstances.

The discussions about NATO's maintenance and relevance in the Post Cold War era were shaped by two broad schools of thought. NATO pessimists viewed NATO as a military alliance and argued that the end of Cold War would cause "the progressive weakening and marginalisation of NATO."[97]

In contrast to pessimistic views about NATO's survival in the Post Cold War, NATO survived and continued its existence. According to Smith and Timmins,

---

[95] Sinem Akgül Açıkmeşe, "Has the period of 'civilian power Europe' come to period come to an end?", A*nkara Review of European Studie*s, Vol.2, No.3, Fall 2002,.pp.1-4.

[96] Robert B.McCalla, "NATO's Persistence after the Cold War", *International Organization*, Vol.50, No.3 , Summer,1996, available on line at www.jstor.org p.448.

[97] Martin Smith, Graham Timmins, Building a Bigger Europe, (England : Ashgate, 2000), p.102.

the continuation of NATO is related with the extent of NATO's expansion and development in institutional terms that made more than a military alliance. For them, although "Russians out", one of three purposes of NATO's establishment, was no longer relevant in Post Cold War, the other two purposes "the Americans in" and "Germans down" have been instrumental in assuring NATO's continued existence. They pointed out that significance of American military presence in Western Europe under the framework of NATO for the maintenance of stability and security. They emphasize the role of NATO for ensuring "Germany's peaceful and non-threatening intentions to its neighbors." [98] After the Cold War, many commentators expected that NATO might disintegrate since NATO's rationale, the Soviet threat evaporated. Consequently, NATO has not only survived but also elaborated its political and military organizational structures and assumed new roles in the post-Cold War era. Namely, NATO updated its strategic concept, preserved its integrated military structure, involved in joint military planning, training and exercises. Moreover, NATO developed policies for fostering dialogue and security cooperation with Central Eastern Europe States (CEES). Most strikingly, it played a crucial role in enforcement of UN Security Council resolutions in ex-Yugoslavia. Besides, NATO continued to gain support from its members, to illustrate, German political leaders were willing to maintain and strengthen NATO after reunification of Germany. Correspondingly, French officers often appreciated enduring value of NATO. [99]

The reasons for NATO's enduring relevance can be categorized as follows: the existence of sufficient external threats that justify preservation of the alliance,

---

[98] Ibid., pp.103-104

[99] John S. Duffield, "NATO's Functions after the Cold War", *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol.109, No.5 (Winter 1994-1995), pp.764-766

NATO's capacity for institutional adaptation, NATO's intra alliance functions. Consequently, while NATO lacks single rationale as it had in the Cold War, it continues to fulfill neutralizing the residual Russian threat, addressing conflicts within Central and Eastern Europe and stabilizing the formed bloc.[100]

In the post-Cold War era, NATO has not only survive but also taken on new roles and functions, which can be categorized as the enlargement of NATO and the promotion of democratic values and principles to Central and Eastern Europe, peace support operations and crisis management.[101]Concerned to first role, NATO enlargement has been regarded as the most important and enduring role of NATO. However, it should be borne in mind that other international institutions such as the EU, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) or Council of Europe have the function of promoting democratic values. What differs NATO from them is its role in "fostering and supporting the consolidation of democratic norms and practices amongst the military and defence establishments in Central and Eastern Europe."[102] In this respect, military cooperation programmes have been carried on through NATO's North Atlantic Council and Partnership for Peace Programmes (PfP)[103] NATO's involvement into military cooperation in Central Eastern Europe contributed relevance of NATO.[104] NATO's second task, peace support operations, has reflected institutionalized relationship between the UN and to a lesser extent the OSCE. Especially, civil war in Bosnia became main catalyst for the UN-NATO

---

[100] Ibid., p.768-772

[101] Smith and Timmins,op.cit., p.105

[102] Ibid, p.117

[103] Ibid., p.107

[104] Ibid., p.110

institutional and operational relations.[105] Also, NATO's involvement in Bosnia consolidated NATO's place at the center of European security affairs. According to Schulte, the Director of Bosnia Task Force in NATO's international staff, "involvement ex-Yugoslavia ... gave the impetus for many aspects of NATO's transformation".[106]The third mission crisis management came to the agenda of NATO with Kosovo crisis. This newest mission entailed engagement of member states in crisis management and crisis response operations and stated in Washington Summit of NATO.[107]

As well as changes in the EU's and NATO's role, the nature of concept of security has changed with the end of Cold War. The Cold War marked as a time of certainty where the concept of security was linked to the ideas dominated by the US and the Soviet Union. Since the end of the Cold War, the period of certainty has been placed by uncertainty of the Post Cold War. In this context, the concept of security has discussed widely.[108] At the start of 1980s, the notion of "common security" was introduced by the Palme Commission. The notion of "common security" pointed out threats resulted from existence and proliferation of nuclear weapons in Europe which was seen as a threat collectively greater than perceived threat regarded by NATO and the Warsaw Pact.[109]

---

[105] Ibid, p.117

[106] Ibid, p.115

[107] Ibid, p.116

[108] Clive Archer, " What Security? What Order?",   in Martin A.Smith, Graham Timmins (eds) Uncertain Europe: Building a new European order?, (London: Routledge, 2001), pp.1-4.

[109] Ibid. p.1.

In the 1990s, in line with broadening of security agenda, a distinction was made as regards to hard and soft security. According to the Danish Foreign Minister, soft security is defined as "all aspects of security short of military combat operations including defence of the national territory", while hard security was tied with "territorial defence against an outside aggressor."[110] As a result, the concept of security has not been limited to weapons and armies any longer in post-Cold War Europe. The understandings of security have widened by including building peace, justice, stability and well being in addition to weapons and armies. [111] Therefore, the conceptualization of security has moved from threats to risks; from military perspective to societal, economic and institutional perspectives.[112]

Consequently, with the end of the Cold War, the threats and principles of the Cold War became insufficient to grasp features of new security environment. The perceptions about the nature of threat and risks altered dramatically. Intangible and diffuse risks including unfocused fears, perceptions of insecurity and feelings of unease have dominated the new security agenda.[113] In particular, the European security agenda has occupied with conditions for a stable and enduring peace rather than prevention of war.

3.2. The Evolution of the ESDI from London to Brussels

Among the western security institutions, NATO was the earliest one with respect to transforming itself. It has been argued that NATO's this attempt affected

---

[110] Ibid, p.11.

[111] Ibid, p.16.

[112] Carr and Callan, op.cit., p.19

[113] Adrian G.V, Hyde-Price, " 'Beware of Jabberwock': Security Studies in the Twenty-First Century", in Heinz Gartner *et all*(eds), Europe's new Security Challenges, (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001), p.27.

the reconstruction process of other institutions. In other words, NATO not only tried to reconstruct itself but also became the shaper of the reconstruction of other institutions. In this connection, the London Summit of NATO, which was held just eight months after the collapse of the Berlin Wall, indicated the first stage of NATO adjustment to the new world order. [114]

Concerned to NATO's reconstruction, two starkly opposing camps, namely, the minimalist and the maximalist emerged. The minimalists wanted to constrain NATO's function to collective defence in accordance with Article 5, and restrict NATO's activities in the regions specified by Article 6 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Accordingly, the minimalists adopted notions such as 'NATO Treaty area and defensive alliance.' [115] This position was supported by France, Spain, Belgium and Greece. These countries advocated the development of a security and defence identity separate from the US and gave importance to the evolution of the CFSP within the EC. Regardless of the fact that they saw NATO as the main security platform, they stressed on the evolution of the CFSP. The minimalists agreed on that NATO's structuring should not undermine the evolution of the CFSP. [116]

The maximalist position argued for traditional formula of the Atlantic community. Proponents of this new view stress on the transatlantic communality of values and Alliance's ability to share risks and sovereignty. While this view accepted European identity in security and defence matters, it concerned about West European bloc building. The potential marginalization of the US in the alliance and the

---

[114] Gülnur Aybet, A European Security Architecture after the Cold War, (NewYork: St.Martin's Press, 2000), p.50.

[115] Schmidt, op.cit., p.201.

[116] Aybet, op.cit, p.55.

36

emergence of a political border line between Western and Eastern Europe.[117] As Gülnur Aybet regarded NATO's reconstruction debate in a more detailed way and went one step further by adding a third category named atlanticist position. According to Aybet, the atlanticist position supported a framework of interlocking structures, where NATO would be in charge of military stability, and WEU could act as a bridge between NATO and the EC for European security. In Aybet's words, the maximalists refer to group led by a group of officials within the international staff. This view assumed broad interpretation of NATO Treaty and suggested out of area for NATO. Besides, the maximalists regarded NATO as the main security forum for Europe that reached the Eastern Europe and Mediterranean states. Aybet argued that among three position the views of maximalists group was materialised in the reconstruction of NATO. [118]

While the above-mentioned political debates continued until the mid-1991, the London Summit took place in July 1990. Before the Summit, various NATO organs had made preparation for a new nuclear strategy, a more politically oriented NATO and initiatives for extension of friendship toward Eastern NATO. At the Summit, it was apparent that NATO was looking for a new role that would let it go beyond the confines of a Cold War military alliance. Especially, US planners strove for the idea of developing a new strategic concept over which a sharp disagreement emerged between the US and France.[119]

---

[117] Schmidt, op.cit, p.202

[118] Aybet, op.cit., pp.54-56

[119] Cogan, op.cit., p.32.
.

The London Declaration called for NATO must and would adopt, the document stated that NATO remains a 'defensive alliance'. According to Simon Duke, the most far reaching outcome of the London Summit was the role of nuclear weapons. He expressed that: "... upon the complete withdrawal of Soviet forces and the full implementation of the CFE agreement, [nuclear weapons] would become 'truly weapons of last resort". This meant that NATO should maintain 'a conventional defence that by itself can blunt nonnuclear aggression'.[120] Concerned to downgrading role of nuclear weapons, France put some reservations end disassociated itself from the strategy of the use of nuclear weapons only as a last resort. [121] At that time, France opposed to Declarations committed to a new strategy of making nuclear forces weapons of last resort since it undermined independence of the *force de frappe*. From the perspective of Mitterrand: "... [I] argued against the concept of nuclear forces being weapons of last resort ... The French position is well known; France, who possesses nuclear weapons does not intend to be dependent upon a foreign decision."[122] Notwithstanding this resolution, France subscribed to the London Declaration, which was to have an impact on France's rapprochement with NATO in the following years[123].

Apart from the role of nuclear forces, at the London Declaration NATO recognized the movement of the EC toward political union and development of a

---

[120] Simon Duke, The New European Security Disorder, (Britain: Macmillan Press, 1994), p.278

[121] Cogan, op.cit., p.33.

[122] Statement by Francois Mitterand following the NATO Summit Meeting in London, 6 July 1990, quoted in Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., p.172.

[123] Cogan, op.cit., p.40.

European identity in the domain of security for the first time. The concept of identity was to become a leitmotif in the four summits after the London Declaration.[124]

Shortly after the London Declaration, Iraq invaded Kuwait on August 2, 1990 and subsequently Gulf War broke out. In fact, the Gulf War, where a rogue state-Iraq- attempted to take over another state, represented one of the potentially most difficult problems of the Post Cold War.[125] Additionally, the Gulf War had an impact on the EC, WEU and NATO, which can be explained as follows:

The EC responded the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq through EPC politically and WEU militarily swiftly. At the same time as the war, the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) on Political Union had been commenced and tentative proposals for defining the CFSP suggested. Concerned to lessons learned in Gulf War, the Member States of the EC drew different conclusions. Declining political solidarity of EC Member States in later stages of crisis and during the fighting itself reinforced conviction of Britain, Denmark and the Netherlands that NATO was inescapable and thus, an ambitious CFSP would not be realistic and advisable whereas France, Italy and Spain regarded war as the evidence of the need for working harder for such a common policy.[126] Italy which was held the Presidency of the EC at that time, suggested a proposal for folding WEU into the formal EC machinery. In response to the proposal: the members of the Community were divided into two: Atlantics and Europeanists. The Atlantics pioneered by the UK and including Portugal, Denmark and Ireland and the Netherlands opposed, while the Europeanists led by France

---

[124] Ibid, p.39.

[125] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit, p.187.

[126] Ibid, pp.188-189.

including Spain, Belgium and Luxembourg backed the proposal. As a matter of fact, the aim of this Italian proposal was more related to domestic affairs of Italy, legitimizing Italy's participation to Gulf coalition under a European umbrella, rather than Italy's integrationist axis.[127]

As regards to Europe's military capability, the Gulf War indicated constraints of independent European military capacity and Europe's reliance on the US for intelligence, airlift and logistics and high technology weapons.[128] But this was perceived differently from members of the EC. The Member States who wanted to keep the transatlantic link and NATO's primacy in European security viewed the Gulf War as an evidence that underscored vitality of transatlantic component in European security. On the other side, the member states who supported the establishment of a separate European defence and security identity regarded the Gulf War as an indication of the need for development of European defence component.[129]

Concerned to WEU, the Gulf War highlighted the WEU's out of area capability since no geographic boundary was specified according to the wording of the Modified Brussels Treaty. Therefore, provided the WEU had sufficient political will and operational capabilities, it could involve crisis or conflict anywhere.[130] Nonetheless, the Gulf War also pointed out the WEU's lack of operational capacity. Following the UN Security Council Resolution which called on Member States to coordinate their naval forces to put into force UN sanctions in the Gulf, WEU could not make a decision or a joint operation under a WEU command for enforcing the

---

[127] Ibid, p.178.

[128] Ibid, p.132.

[129] Aybet, op.cit., pp.102-103.

[130] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit, p.194.

embargo. Although the naval units of member states involved in enforcing the embargo on the Gulf, they remained under national command. During the fighting stage, these national commands worked with close coordination with US command and other participants by using the assets of NATO's integrated military structure, this also revealed the WEU's impotence in terms of operational capability. With respect to NATO, Gulf War sharpened the out of area debate. The Atlanticist view favored NATO's out of area operations. The basis of this argument was the new interpretations of NATO's operational jurisdiction owing to new range of security threats in the Post Cold War era. Therefore, the Gulf War came into agenda with redefinition of NATO's security interests and reexamination of NATO's capacity to act in out of area operations. [131]

Following the London Summit, the sixteen NATO members including France formed ad hoc Strategy Review group in order to develop NATO's new strategic concept. Prior to presentation of the new strategic concept, the foreign ministers of the Alliance met at North Atlantic Cooperation (NAC) in Copenhagen on 6-7 June 1991. The ministerial meeting of the NAC at Copenhagen outlined the NATO's core functions and contributed the shaping of interlocking institutions that had begun to evolve in Europe. In this respect, the Copenhagen communiqué depicted NATO's core functions and endorsed the development of a European security and defence identity. [132]

In this sense, NATO's core functions were stated as follows:

---

[131] Aybet, op.cit, p.111.

[132] Ibid, p.56.

a) The provision of stability in Europe based on democratic institutions.

b) Serving as the transatlantic link

c) Deterrence and defence against any threat of aggression against a NATO state.

d) The preservation of the strategic balance in Europe.[133]

Despite the fact that questions were aroused concerning to "how NATO could provide stability in areas outside its operational jurisdiction or which military balance it was to preserve after the demise of the Warsaw Pact", the communiqué could be seen as "an insurance policy directed against uncertainty". [134] Concerned to the development of European security and defence identity, the Copenhagen Communiqué confirmed Europeans' efforts for strengthening "the security dimension in the process of European integration" and endorsed the progress made by the members of the EC "towards the goal of political union, including the development of a common foreign and security policy."[135]

At the NATO's Rome Summit, two important documents were presented: the "new Alliance Strategic Concept" on 7 November 1991 and the Declaration of Rome on Peace and Cooperation" on 8 November 1991.

The new strategic concept meant a response of NATO to new security environment and the prospect of a decline in NATO forces. It mainly involved two significant changes; shift from 'forward defence' to a 'reduced forward' presence and the modification of the "flexible response principle" to reflect a reduced reliance on

---

[133] Cogan, op.cit, p. 51

[134] Aybet, op.cit., p.57

[135] Cogan, op.cit, p.50

nuclear weapons. Forward defence was made up of army corps which was consisted of troops one nation aimed at defending the territorial integrity of NATO at the point of penetration, which precluded other defensive notions, such as defence-in-depth. As a result of the shift from forward defence, the NATO's forces arranged into six multinational corps, which would pursue the same operational doctrines, command procedures, logistical coordination etc.[136]

Moreover, the new strategic concept asserted that the notion of a "predominant threat" had lost its validity with the end of the East-West confrontation and gave way to the risks. In this respect, it noted that: [137]

> ...risks to Allied security are less likely to result from calculated aggression against the territory of the Allies, but rather from the adverse consequences of instabilities that may arise from the serious economic, social and political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes which are faced by many countries in Central and Eastern Europe.[138]

In this context, the strategic concept not only confirmed the four core functions stated in Copenhagen Communiqué, but also adopted 'broad approach to security'. Therefore, the concept of security was broadened to have political, economic, social, environmental and defence aspects.[139] In line with a "broad approach to security", the new strategy adopted three mutually reinforcing elements as 'dialogue, cooperation and maintenance of collective defence capability.'[140] At this

---

[136] Duke, The New European..., op.cit., p.289-290

[137] Carr and Ifantis, op.cit., p.75.

[138] North Atlantic Council, *The Alliance's Strategic Concept*, (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press) p. 41 , quoted in Carr and Callan, op.cit., p.87.

[139] Carr and Ifantis, op.cit., p.75.

[140] Aybet, op.cit., p.60

juncture, Michael Brenner pointed out that the extension of NATO's mandate to include the sources of potential, unidentifiable, security threat was a radical element in the new strategic concept. Furthermore, the Rome Summit moved NATO from a military alliance to a means of wide range of political cooperation. Besides, Michael Brenner regarded the Rome Summit 'a triumph for the US diplomacy'[141] The NATO's new strategic concept involved everything within the 'wish list' of the Bush Administration. According to Brenner, from the US perspective Rome Summit marked rebirth of NATO and 'US leadership in Europe given an expanded lease.'

Another point to mention is that the Rome NATO Summit Declaration on Peace and Cooperation which asserted the NATO as 'the essential forum for consultations of the Allies on defence matters under the Washington Treaty."[142] Therefore, the primacy of NATO in the immediate Post Cold War security environment was highlighted. Moreover, the role of WEU was stated as a bridge between NATO-EU relations.[143]

In addition to above mentioned far-reaching statements, NATO's Rome Declaration also pointed out importance of interlocking institutions in Europe as follows:

> …the challenges we will face in this new Europe can not be comprehensively addressed by one institution alone, but only in a framework of interlocking institutions tying together the countries of Europe and North America. Consequently, we are working toward a new European security architecture in which NATO, the CSCE, the European Community, the WEU and the Council of Europe complement each other.[144]

---

[141] Michael Brenner, Terms of Engagement, (Washington: Praeger Publishers,1998), CSIS Washington Papers/176, pp.28-29

[142] Cogan, op.cit., p.51

[143] Carr and Ifantis, op.cit., p.77

[144] Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Goverments Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Rome, 7-8 November 1991, para.3

Therefore, the NATO Declaration acknowledged the role of other international institutions within emerging European security architecture. As NATO was assuming new function, the EC was adopting itself to new world order. The security and defence dimension of the EC, which was a taboo subject throughout the Cold War, came into the agenda of the EC. Following the Gulf War, the Europeans concluded that a recognized international role closely linked with the ability of projection of power, yet the Europeans were not capable of projecting power.[145] In this respect, Kohl and Mitterrand called on a "Political Union should include a true common security policy which would in turn lead to a common defence... we are convinced that the Atlantic Alliance as a whole will be strengthened by the increased role and responsibility of the Europeans and by the establishment within NATO of a European pillar." [146]

Afterwards, at the first Ministerial meeting of the IGC on Political Union in February 1991, Germany's Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher and France's minister Roland Dumas proposed a security initiative, which went on:

> ... within the framework of the CFSP, political union will implement a common security policy in the aim of setting up a common European defence system in due course without which the construction of the EU would remain incomplete.[147]

This Franco-German initiative stated the position of the WEU as a "cooperation channel between Political Union and NATO", however, WEU would be

---

[145] Simon J.Nuttall, European Foreign Policy (United States: Oxford University Press, 2000).p.147

[146] Quoted in Ibid, p.125

[147] *Europe Docum*ents, 15 February 1991, no.1690 quoted in Wyatt-Walter,op.cit., p.196

under auspices of the European Council. Despite that fact that this Franco-German initiative was more specific compared with the letter in December 1990, it was far from clarifying certain issues like the idea of 'common security policy', 'vital common interest'.[148]

In response to Franco-German initiative, the US, Bush Administration set out her views through the speech of Ambassador William Taft IV as follows:

> …we support a European pillar, but one that doesn't duplicate the Alliance, one that operates within the Alliance to do Alliance tasks and outside the Alliance only where it wishes to take on new missions... The US public would not understand what was going on if the Europeans stopped using NATO or began replacing it with other structures to perform its historic tasks.[149]

Much more explicit that this warning, the US sent a diplomatic note so called "Bartholomew Memorandum" to the foreign and defence ministers of the WEU member states. Reginald Bartholomew, the US undersecretary of state, outlined certain criteria for European's design for an ESDI. Although the US expressed its support for Europeans' arrangement for common European foreign, security and defence policy, it underlined the significance of NATO as a security platform. According to Brenner, the crux of "the US position was insistence on a distinction between a WEU that formed a loose European entity within NATO and was militarily derivative of it, on the one hand, and a WEU constituted as an arm of the community on the other."[150]

Prior to the Maastricht treaty, the expectations of Member States were high concerned to the inclusion of security and defence issues. However, the expectation

---

[148] Wyatt-Walter, op.cit., pp.196-197

[149] Speech at ISSS, London, 8 February 1991, quoted in Wyatt-Walter., op.cit, p.198

[150] Brenner, op.cit, pp.27

and the agreements did not coincide with each other in the end. The discussions and negotiations on the European Union brought about the Maastricht Treaty, the declaration of the WEU Council and a Franco-German declaration on the rearrangement of the Franco-German brigade into a Euro Corps.[151]

The Maastricht Treaty which was signed in February 1992, created a new organization, namely the European Union which was to be based on three pillars: respectively, the European Communities, Common Foreign and Security Policy, and Cooperation in the Fields of Justice and Home Affairs.[152] Therefore the architectural structure of the Union was made up of "three pillars capped with the European Council." The pillar two and three were constructed on an intergovernmental basis and left outside the Rome Treaty. [153]

In accordance with the Maastricht Treaty, the member states agreed on the establishment of CFSP which "shall include all question related to the security of the Union, including the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time, lead to a common defence." [154]The article made a distinction between a 'common defence policy and 'a common defence'. According to Nuttall, both 'a common defence policy' and 'a common defence' represented aspirations for the future, rather than commitments. Moreover, the degree of enthusiasm was different from each of them. While, 'a common defence policy' was regarded as something that would definitely be framed "a common defence" marked the result of this policy which might be possible in time. Yet, there is no certainty about the realization of

---

[151] Scmidt, op.cit., p.215.

[152] Nugent., op.cit, p.63.

[153] Dinan, op.cit., p.143.

[154] Article J.4 of the Maastricht Treaty

common policy.[155] Therefore, a step-by-step approach was adopted for the achievement of full fledged political union[156].

Although Paragraph 2 of Article J.1 of the Maastricht Treaty defined the objectives of the CFSP as "to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests and independence of the Union" and "to develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms", the Treaty did not mention about the ways for achievement of these objectives except for the establishment of cooperation and joint action among the Union Members.[157] Nevertheless, the CFSP is not a common policy like the Common Agricultural Policy or Common Commercial Policy. The EU member States have not delegated their authority on foreign and security policy to the Union. Foreign and Security Policy has been within the responsibility of the member states.[158]

In conjunction with the defence matters, WEU's integration with the Union was the subject of intense debate. While Britain and the four neutrals or non-aligned members (Austria, Finland, Ireland and Sweden) were against the full integration of the WEU with the EU; Belgium, France Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and Spain put forward a protocol for the full integration of the WEU with the EU. In spite of these differences, Maastricht Treaty envisaged the strong relation between the WEU and the EU in the Article J.4 (2) as follows:

> The Union requests the Western Union (WEU) which is an integral part of the development of the Union to elaborate and implement decisions and

---

[155] Nuttall, op.cit., pp.177-178.

[156] Schmidt, op.cit. p.216.

[157] Trevor Taylor, " West European Security and Defence Cooperation: Maastricht and Beyond" , *International Affairs*, Vol.70, No.1, 1994, p.8.

[158] Dinan, op.cit, p.508.

actions of the Union which have defence implications. The Council shall, in agreement with the institutions of the WEU, adopt the necessary practical arrangements.

Even though, under Article J.4 (2), the WEU was given the responsibility to elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defence implications, the wording of the article left ambiguous concerned to who exactly made decisions.[159] Despite this provision, in practice WEU did not implement any decision of the EU with defence implication.[160] Yet, the EU Council requested WEU's support in

- Planning international police operations to assist the Albanian authorities (Council Decision, 22 September 1998, followed by a more operational one on 5 March 1999),
- Organizing a de-mining operation in Croatia (Council decision, 9 November 1998) and
- Monitoring the situation in Kosovo through the imagery provided by the WEU satellite center" (Council decision, 13 November 1998)[161]

While WEU's role in relation to the EU was determined as its security branch, its objective in relation with NATO was expressed with the following statement:

The objective is to develop WEU as a means to strengthen the European pillar of the Atlantic Alliance. Accordingly, WEU is prepared to develop further the close working links between WEU and the Alliance and to strengthen the role, responsibilities and contributions of the WEU Member States in the Alliance. This will be undertaken on the basis of the necessary transparency and complementarity between the emerging European security and defence identity and the Alliance.[162]

---

[159] Duke, op.cit, The New Europe..., p. 234.

[160] Gilles Andréani et all, Europe's Military Revolution, (London: CER Publishing, 2001), p.8.

[161] Antonio Missiroli, CFSP, defence and flexibility, *Chaillot Papers*, no. 38, (Paris, Institute for Strategic Studies, February 2000), p. 18.

[162] Declaration of the Member States of the WEU which are also members of the European Union on the Role of the WEU and its relations with the European Union, annexed to the TEU, 7 February, 1992

As an outcome of the Maastricht, the WEU was granted a pivotal role in the new European Security architecture. Although the CFSP envisaged the development of a defence policy, the working of treaty was remained unclear as "might in time lead to a common defence". Hence, the contending visions of the major European powers were reconciled. The WEU was arranged as both the defence component and the European pillar of NATO and thus it was placed equidistant between the Two. [163]

According to Simon Duke, under the terms of Maastricht Treaty, the WEU was charged with dual loyalty to the both EU and NATO and named this duality to as the 'acute institutional schizophrenia' of the WEU.[164] Moreover, it caused two immediate problems: "the question of membership and the nature of its tasks." Because of WEU's dual role straddling the EU and NATO, membership became problem.[165] In order to resolve this problem, Associate membership status created by the Declaration on WEU attached to the Maastricht and non-EU members of NATO were included in to WEU. The associate membership status was elaborated and formalized in the Petersberg Declaration of 19 June 1992.[166]

Being a non-Modified Brussels Treaty status, associate Members were not granted with full membership rights. They were charged with non-article V activities. However, they could take part fully in the meetings of the WEU Council and they had

---

[163] Carr and Ifantis, op.cit.,p.49

[164] Duke, op.cit., The new Europe..., p.235

[165] Nuttall, op.cit., p. 241

[166] Münevver Cebeci, " CESDP: A Turkish Perspective", in Peter G.Xuereb (ed), Euro-Mediterranean Integration, (Malta: EDRC;2002) available on line http://home.um.edu.mt/edrc/publications/documents/chapter/.pdf. p. 147.

the right to speak and submit proposals. Yet, they did not veto a consensus decision of full members.[167]

Concerned to activities of the WEU, the member states of the WEU agreed on the Petersberg Declaration. In addition to the fulfillment of defence obligation in compliance with Article 5, the military units of WEU member states could be engaged with humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.[168]

In contrast to desires of France and Germany, the WEU was determined as an organisation that could be called upon by the EU Member States to act on their behalf. In line with the inclusive membership of WEU, Spain and Portugal joined the WEU and subsequently Greece joined the WEU in 1995. Denmark and Ireland became observers in 1992 and Iceland, Norway and Turkey became associate members.

The WEU committed to strengthen working links and the role, responsibilities and contributions of its member states in NATO. The WEU pledged to act in line with the Atlantic Alliance's stances and accepted a number of commitments to increase its operational identity. NATO Brussels Summit in January 1994 endorsed the Maastricht Treaty and the commencement of the European Union. In conformity with the wording of the WEU Declaration, the NATO declaration pointed out emergence of an ESDI for strengthening the European pillar of the Alliance, reinforcing the transatlantic link and enabling European allies to assume greater responsibility for their common security and defence. Furthermore, the NATO Declaration expressed the common strategic interests between NATO and the EU.

---

[167] Ibid, pp.147-148.

[168] Nuttall, op.cit., p.243.

The members of NATO agreed on making collective assets of the Alliance available for WEU operations conducted by European NATO members for the CFSP on the basis of consultations in the North Atlantic Council.[169]. Consequently, the important role of the ESDI within the evolving European security system was acknowledged in the NATO Brussels Summit. Thus, European allies were encouraged to take on missions with forces which are "separable but not separate" from NATO within the context of evolving ESDI.[170]

In this regard, NATO's support for emergence of ESDI as a means for strengthening the European pillar of NATO was stated explicitly as follows:

> …[NATO members] confirm the enduring validity and indispensability of our Alliance. It is based on a strong transatlantic link, the expression of shared destiny. It reflects a European security and defence identity gradually emerging as the expression of a mature Europe. It is reaching out to establish new patterns of cooperation throughout Europe.[171]

Furthermore, the Brussels Summit welcomed strengthening of the European pillar of the Alliance through WEU and provided the WEU with an operational capability and declared that:

> We therefore stand ready to make collective assets of the Alliance available on the basis of consultations in the North Atlantic Council, for WEU operations undertaken by the European allies in pursuit of their Common Foreign and Security Policy. We support the development of separable but not separate capabilities which could respond to European requirements and contribute to Alliance security. Better European Coordination and Planning will also strengthen the European pillar and the Alliance itself.[172]

---

[169] Kostas Ifantis, <u>NATO and the New Security Paradigm: Power, Strategy, Order and the Transtatlantic Link,</u>(London: Frank Cass, 2002), ASAM Ankara Papers 4, pp.49-50.

[170] Stanley Sloan, <u>NATO, The European Union, and the Atlantic Community,</u> (US: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers, 2003) , p.168.

[171] NATO Press Communique M-1 (94)3, Declaration of the Heads of State and Government Participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels , 11 January 1994, quoted in Simon Duke, <u>The Elusive Quest for European Security,</u> (NewYork: Palgrave, 1999) p.189.

[172] <u>Ibid</u>.

In addition to NATO's intention to build the emerging ESDI, NATO declared its decisiveness to endorse Combined Joined Task Force (CJTF) concept. At first, CJTF was regarded as a means for NATO to deploy forces in an out-of-area military crisis in uncertain circumstances. Also, it was an instrument of the Alliance to effectuate an ESDI. [173]

The CJTF was put forward to give NATO's military forces mobility and flexibility in order to respond crisis better. In spite of the fact that the CJTF provided the NATO different capabilities, it did not add a new structure. The uniqueness of CJTF was the fact that it institutionalised the multinational task-force concept. Contrary to NATO's highly integrated but static military structures that executed mission of territorial defence, the CJTF concept envisaged a unique, hybrid capability that responded crisis quickly with highly trained multinational forces. In the words of Barry, "with the CJTF, NATO has the same highly capable forces to use in crises beyond its borders that it has always maintained for defence of its borders." [174]According to P. Cornish, CJTF "will enable the development and growth of ESDI to be carefully controlled; there will be no Article 5/non-Article 5 division of labour, and it is most unlikely that a serious rival to NATO could now develop" [175]

In sum, at the Brussels Summit of NATO, many of the Euro-Atlanticist tensions, at least the institutional level, were eased. Moreover, the summit underlined

---

[173] Terry Terriff, " The CJTF Concept and the Limits of European Autonomy" in Jolyon Howorth and Keeler John T.S., (eds) Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, (England: Palgrave Macmillan,2003) p.39

[174] Charles Barry, "NATO's CJTF in Theory and Practice", *Survival*, Vol. 38, No. 1, Spring 1996, pp. 81-82

[175] Paul Cornish, " European Security: The end of architecture and The new NATO", *International Affairs*, Vol.72, No.4, 1996, p.764

the primacy of NATO and thereby the leadership of the US. While many of the French analysts and officials conceived it an US support for Europeanization of the Alliance, the US side regarded it an attempt toward a stronger European role in the Alliance.[176]

3.3. Transition from the ESDI to the ESDP

In the Berlin Ministerial meeting of NATO, the decisions of Brussels Summit were reinforced and moved ahead. In the summit declaration, NATO's determination to the creation of ESDI within the Alliance was restated. Yet, different from the Brussels Summit, the Berlin ministerial portrayed the most specific endorsement of the ESDI. As a result, the spring 1996 session of NATO ministers in Berlin affected most of the policy developments in the second half of the 1990s. The Berlin ministerial was decisive in the evolution of the US policy towards the establishment of a more coherent European role in the Alliance. In Berlin, the ESDI was clarified and European security architecture appeared to be brought together.[177]

The Foreign Ministers of NATO allies made a progress in WEU's operational capacity in the Berlin Ministerial meeting of NATO. They agreed on making NATO "assets and capabilities" available for the future military operations commanded by the WEU within the ESDI framework. Also, the allies decided on three fundamental objectives for the adaptation of the NATO to the post-Cold War security context. These were ensuring the alliance's military effectiveness and taking

---

[176] Sloan, <u>NATO,The European Union</u>...,<u>op.cit,</u> p.169.

[177] Ifantis, <u>op.cit</u>, p.51.

on new military roles besides to collective defence, preserving the transatlantic link and supporting the development of an ESDI.[178]

The ministerial meeting accepted the establishment of ESDI within NATO and authorized the development of CJTF. Moreover, it determined many issues influencing the transatlantic bargaining: "The primacy of NATO; US leadership in security and defence matters; the contribution of the Europeans and as a result the short-run and medium term prospects of a self contained ESDI." [179]

Robert Hunter analysed this development within the framework of 'grand bargain'. His point of departure was the NATO's Berlin (June 3, 1996) and Brussels (June 13, 1996) foreign and defence ministerial meetings. According to Hunter , the essence of the bargain was that NATO would facilitate the establishment of ESDI that drew upon military capabilities 'separable but not separate' from the alliance. However, the ESDI would not be completely independent or separate from Atlantic Alliance.[180]

Despite these new arrangements, in practice the European allies did not take on responsibilities for military operations in the late 1990s. In this respect, they did have neither military resources nor political will to take on operations like Implementation Force (IFOR) or Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia. This revealed the fact that European allies lacked required military capacity to provide security on

---

[178] Sloan, NATO, The European Union..., op.cit, p. 170.

[179] Ifantis, op.cit, p.52.

[180] Hunter, Robert E., The European Security and Defence Policy: NATO's Companion or Competitor?, (RAND Publications, 2002) , p.14.

the borders of EU-WEU states. [181]Michael Brenner made comments on this issue as follows:

> The cumulative record of EU failure and NATO's recovery sharpened the issue of whether on ESDI built within NATO on the CJTF principle was satisfactory, for the European allies, the record could be read two ways; as making a compelling case for them to take more drastic measures to augment their military resources and to cement their union or as providing telling evidence that the quest for an autonomous ESDI was futile.[182]

> Western intervention in the Balkans, crisis revealed how little relevance much of the duel over ESDI had for what the allies in practice were willing or able to do. Too often, preferences in choosing among EU, WEU and NATO had more to do with enhancing the status of preferred bodies thus with performing missions.[183]

Despite the statements in the NATO's meetings, the reform of NATO and the development of ESDI did not move forward between 1994 to 1996. Therefore, this period was regarded as 'missing time' on these issues. However, this 'missing time' gave impetus to more independent elements within the EU to prompt the Union toward autonomy in defence. It could be argued that if the conditions stated in NATO's Berlin Communiqué in 1996 were implemented, there would have been no need for a movement towards autonomy and the process that caused the St. Malo. [184]

In the EU's turn towards autonomous defence, the Amsterdam Summit and Treaty established the ground. Even though Amsterdam didn't bring defence into the EU, it opened the road. The Amsterdam Treaty made reference to making closer relations between the WEU and the EU and integrated WEU's Petersberg tasks to the

---

[181] Sloan, NATO,The New European Union..., op.cit, p.170.

[182] Brenner, op.cit., p. 35.

[183] Ibid, p.33.

[184] Cogan, op.cit , p. 97-98.

EU's second pillar. Besides, the WEU was involved in the stepping up of an EU Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit[185].

Although Amsterdam Treaty paved the movement towards autonomous defense, the convergence of ideas of Britain and France on European defence made CFSP and ESDI tangible.[186] Despite the fact that Tony Blair maintained Conservative Party's position of blocking Franco-German plans to strengthen the EU's role in defence at the Amsterdam Summit, afterwards, he shifted his policy about the defence. [187] At the informal meeting of the EU leaders in Pörtschach, Austria in October 1998, Tony Blair expressed 'fresh thinking' on how to cooperate more closely and effectively on defence without damaging NATO alliance and put forward possible different options. [188] Moreover, Tony Blair declared alteration of British position publicly for the first time. He called for Europe's Bosnia and Kosovo experience as 'unacceptable, weak and confused. In this regard, Pörtschach constituted EU Member States' first step towards the creation of European crisis management capability with a more effective military infrastructure.[189]

This sudden, unexpected shift in British policy prompted France to work with Blair and revitalize Franco-British relationship. The result was the assertive and clear declaration of St. Malo in December 1998[190]

---

[185] Wyn Rees, "The Eliminating the Middle Man", in. Martin A. Smith, Graham Timmins (eds), Uncertain Europe : Building a new European Security Order, . (New York: Routledge, 2001) ,p. 99

[186] Cogan, op.cit., 98.

[187] Andréani *et all*, op.cit., p.9.

[188] Missiroli, op.cit., p.25

[189] Peter Van Ham, Europe's New Defence Ambitions: Implications for NATO, the US and Russia, (Garmish-Partenkirchen, Germany: George Marshall European Center for Secuirty Studies, April 2000) p.5

[190] Andréani *et all*, op.cit., p.11.

St. Malo Declaration was a watershed in the European defence in terms of different perspectives. First of all, it symbolized the major shift in British security policy. With this shift, Britain convicted that the US would not automatically engaged with European security like in the Cold War. Britain regarded the ESDP as a means of strengthening Atlantic Alliance, rather than threat.[191] Secondly, it paved the way for the EU emerging as a security actor in its own right[192]. Thirdly, France and Britain stated that "the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises". This statement constituted most striking part of the declaration. Because the word "autonomous" was used in European security blueprint for the first time. However, the meaning of autonomy was not defined. It can be argued that autonomy referred to "the ability to engage in a military/security mission with whom the US might disagree politically, involving the capacity to carry out that mission without having recourse to US assets." However, this definition did not explain what autonomy generally means. Following the St. Malo Declaration, the Britain attempted to convince its EU partners to relinquish the concept of autonomy, but the word 'autonomy' was included subsequent declarations like Helsinki. Toward the end of 1999, US defence and foreign policy officials warned the EU to order over alleged aspirations to take the notion of autonomy too seriously. Concerned to autonomy, Jolyon Howorth pointed out that rather than the word of autonomy, the

---

[191] Jolyon Howorth,, "Britain, France and the European Initiative", *Survival* Vol. 42, No. 2, Summer 2000, p.43.

[192] Jolyon Howorth, "European Defence and the changing Politics of the European Union: hanging together or hanging separately?", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.39, No.4, 2001, p.769

existence of autonomy matters.[193] Yet, having seen the much misunderstandings of the word autonomy, J. Howorth explained it as "the political and military capability on the part of the EU to take decisions and to embark on initiatives involving the projection of military power with limited or no assistance from the United States."[194]

Besides, St.Malo Declaration argued for providing the EU with appropriate structures and capacity for the achievement of making decisions and approving military action where the Alliance is not engaged with this statement:

> …in order for the European Union to take decisions and approve military action where the Alliance as a whole isn't engaged, the Union must be given appropriate structures and a capacity for analysis of situations, sources of intelligence and a capacity for relevant strategic planning...
> ... the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military resources, the means to decide to use them and a readiness to do, so, in order to respond to international crises.

St. Malo Declaration prefigured the absorption of the WEU into the EU and expressed that the EU would take "account of the existing assets of the WEU and the evolution of its relations with the EU." According to Cogan, with the WEU out of way, this would imply that the EU would be the European defence counterpart of NATO. Therefore, the EU would bring coherence and balance to the Euro-American equation. Although WEU's role remained ambiguous in Saint Malo declaration, it seemed apparent that the EU would be at the front of a European defence identity following the Saint Malo. Moreover, St. Malo declaration marked the first indicators of tangible steps toward the abandonment of the WEU and its absorption into the EU. Moreover, St. Malo Declaration stated that "the European Union will also need to

---

[193] Howorth, " *Britain, France...*",op.cit, , p.44

[194] J. Howorth, John T.S Keeler "The EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy" , in Howorth Jolyon and Keeler John T.S., (eds) Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) pp. 5-6

have recourse to suitable military means. "Therefore, the emphasis was shifted from ESDI to autonomy and 'bicephalic role' of European defence capability which could be inside or outside NATO was heralded. [195]

Shortly after the Saint Malo declaration, Kosovo crisis broke out. Although trouble in Kosovo had been predictable, the Western powers were not able to develop a strategy to prevent it. The conflict exacerbated when Serb Special Forces raided the villages considered to be backing the newly formed Kosovo Liberation Army.[196]

As a result, NATO launched a campaign over Kosovo in March 1999. The three-month bombing campaign revealed the inability of the Europeans to conduct a sustained strategic campaign without half of Americans.[197] The campaign highlighted US military capability superiority in terms of intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance. With respect to NATO, it indicated NATO's internal capability gap. As regards to the EU, Peter Van Ham stated that the Kosovo made more progress on the development of Europe's defence identity than the post-Maastricht deliberations of the CFSP.[198] With Kosovo, Europe was prompted to think on the abilities of EU/WEU and NATO in the complex issues of crisis prevention, crisis management, peacekeeping and warfare. According to Peter Van Ham, the main lesson that would be drawn from the Kosovo was the important role of the US for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Europe as long as Europe does not have willingness to take on more responsibility for its own defence. Thus, the main lesson of Kosovo prompted reconsideration of European defence cooperation to provide the EU with

---

[195] Cogan, op.cit., pp. 99-100.

[196] Ibid.,p.101

[197] Andréani *et all*, op.cit., p.12.

[198] Van Ham, op.cit, p.5.

the military capabilities to back its available diplomatic means, rather to undermine NATO This didn't imply a European army but demonstrate the necessity for establishing a new partnership with the US grounded on more balanced military capabilities and shared political leadership [199] On the other side, Frédéric Bozo portrayed Kosovo crisis as "the size of the gap threatening to open up between Europeans and Americans in realm of capabilities, responsibilities and especially priorities." [200]He argued that the Kosovo operation also revealed the constraints of NATO's functioning in a major crisis and underlined political and military unsuitability of NATO to perform 'new missions' other than Article V. This unsuitability resulted from both NATO's serious gaps in the implementation of the initial strategy and in the decision-making process and uncertainty concerned to allies that would have been able to implement any strategy other than mechanical pursuit of air strikes.[201]

Following the Kosovo, both the British and French Ministers of Defence published reports concerned to lessons of Kosovo called "Kosovo-lessons from the Crisis" and "the lessons of Kosovo" respectively. While the British report praised the role of NATO in the Kosovo Crisis and its significance for the future, [202] the French document referred to gaps in French military capabilities and criticized NATO's functions and the way of the conduct of the campaign.[203] In this respect, French

---

[199] Ibid, pp.7-8

[200] Frédéric Bozo, " The effects of Kosovo and The Limits of European Autonomy", in Jolyon Howorth and John Keeler T.S., (eds) Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p.61

[201] Ibid, p.64

[202] Cogan, op.cit, pp.104-105

[203]Ibid.,. p.109

Defence Ministry advocated that Europe should have certain military autonomy as follows:

> The crisis in Kosovo reinforces our determination to give to the European Union the capability for deciding, conceiving and conducting a major military operation in the framework of the missions included in the Amsterdam Treaty... Europe must provide itself progressively with autonomous strategic capabilities, particularly in the field of intelligence, [air] transport and command [systems]...[204]

In the wake of Kosovo crisis, NATO's Washington Summit on 24 April 1999 supported the movement towards more robust and effective European defence capability[205] While the Summit communiqué acknowledged "the resolve of the European Union to have the capacity for autonomous action so that it can take decisions and approve military action where the Alliance as a whole isn't engaged", it also affirmed continuation of the ESDI's evolution within NATO.[206] Based on Berlin Decisions of 1996, NATO allies agreed on new arrangements that facilitate EU's access to NATO collective assets and capabilities of the alliance for operations in which the Alliance as a whole was not engaged. [207] In this regard, three kinds of multinational military operation involving Europeans would be suitable: "a NATO mission; an autonomous EU mission; or an EU mission that used NATO assets." For the last category, NATO's Council envisaged provisions that were known as 'Berlin Plus', which refers to

- Assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations

---

[204] available at http: www.defence.guuv.fr/actualities/dossier/d36/intro.htm, p. 4 quoted in Cogan, op.cit. p.109

[205] Van Ham, op.cit., p.9

[206] North Atlantic Council, Washington Summit Communiqué, para.6 quoted in Cogan, op.cit, p.110

[207] Cogan, op.cit, p.110

- The presumption of availability to the EU of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU led operations;
- Identification of a range of European command options for EU-led operations, further developing the role of D-SACEUR in order for him to assume fully and effectively his European responsibilities
- The further adaptation of NATO's defence planning system to incorporate more comprehensively the availability of forces for EU-led operations.[208]

Despite these concessions of NATO, the EU moved further towards autonomy and started to refer to ESDI as ESDP, where the P means "policy".

Apart from Berlin Plus accords, NATO's Washington Summit was important with respect to three main issues. Firstly, NATO committed to accept new members which were Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic. Secondly, it provided legal ground for NATO's intervention to crisis management. Thirdly, it commenced a Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) in order to ensure the effectiveness of Allies operations and improving interoperability among alliance forces[209].

At the same time with Kosovo campaign and NATO's Washington Summit, Germany combined the presidencies of the EU and the WEU. Germany used these presidencies to push forward the work on ESDP. Particularly during its EU presidency, Germany laid out some guiding principles and determined key areas that need to be addressed in order to give substance to St. Malo Declaration. The efforts of Germany resulted in the EU's Cologne Summit in June 1999[210] In the Cologne Summit Declaration the EU called for:

---

[208] North Atlantic Council, Washington Summit Communiqué, para. 10.

[209] Cogan, op.cit, p.111.

[210] Giovanna Bono, "European Security and Defence Policy: theoretical approaches, the Nice Summit and Hot issues", Research and Training Network: Bridging the Accountability gap in ESDP/ Democracy, February 2002, pp.29-31.

> …the [European] Council should have the ability to take decisions on the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the Treaty on European Union, the 'Petersberg tasks'. To this end, the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises without prejudice to actions by NATO.[211]

Moreover, the Cologne Summit Declaration expressed for a structure and a capability to give body to European autonomous defence concept. Some officials in the US perceived these statements as an initiative for 'to fence in' NATO as 'Article 5' organization and leaving crisis management to the EU. However, the summit Declaration referred to the EU either using NATO assets or using national or multinational assets of EU member states in order to carry out Petersberg tasks. While St.Malo Declaration standed for a Anglo-French stance, the Cologne Summit implicated the EU as a whole. In this regard, it has a more unwelcome surprise to US than St. Malo.[212]

Rather than ESDI, Union's objective was defined as ESDP. Moreover, EU Member States agreed on the establishment of new institutions in Brussels. Besides, the EU Cologne Summit called for the absorption of the WEU by the EU. Moreover, the Summit Declaration stated the possible participation of all the EU Member States, including non-allied members to EU operations on an equal footing. Thereby, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Ireland and Sweden, which had been observers in WEU, acquired full membership of the EU's new defence organization.[213]

---

[211] Conclusions of the European Council Meeting in Cologne, 3-4 June 1999, Annex III European Council Declaration on strengthening the CFSP.

[212] Cogan, op.cit., pp.112-113.

[213] Andreani *et all*, op.cit. pp.21-22.

Following the Cologne, at the EU's Helsinki Summit in December 1999, EU

Member States made important progress in order to boost Europe's military

capabilities. In the EU's Helsinki Summit, the EU member states agreed on:

> ... the headline goal: by the year 2003, cooperating together voluntarily, they will be able to deploy rapidly and then sustain forces capable of the full range of Petersberg tasks as set out in the Amsterdam Treaty, including the most demanding, in operations up to corps level (up to 15 brigades or 50,000-60,000 persons). These forces should be militarily self-sustaining with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support services and additionally, as appropriate , air and naval elements. Member States should be able to deploy in full at this level within 60 days, and within this to provide smaller rapid response elements available and deployable at very high readiness. They must be able to sustain such a deployment for at least one year. This will require an additional pool of deployable units (and supporting elements) at lower readiness to provide replacements for the initial forces.[214]

Concerned to the EU-NATO relations, the Helsinki Summit Declaration

acknowledged the centrality of NATO. By referring to NATO's important role in

crisis management, crisis response was not excluded from NATO preview. More

important than these, the EU's action role was constrained circumstances where

NATO would not be involved.[215]

After the establishment of Headline Goal, a number of political institutions

which had been the part of the WEU have been transferred to the EU to implement

Headline Goals Till 1998, the WEU was charged with the implementation of defence

aspect of EU's CFSP in cooperation with NATO. Therefore, EU did not need to have

any military structure or forces under its direct control. Nonetheless, when the EU

had taken over the most of the acquis of the WEU including its defence tasks and

institutions, the ESDP established organs under Pillar II of the EU. The institutional

dimension of the ESDP indicates first significant steps taken towards the

---

[214] Conclusions of the European Council in Helsinki, 10-11 December 1999, Annex I.

[215] Cogan, op.cit, p.117.

'Brusselization' of EU member states's foreign, security and defence policies. The new institutions established were the Political and Security Committee (PSC), the EU Military Committee (EUMC), the Military Staff (EUMS), the Situation Center, the Civilian Crisis Management Committee (CIVCOM).

The PSC is the main body for decision-making on the CFSP and ESDP policies. It functions both as a crisis-monitoring and crisis-management body. It gives advices the Council on the overall EU strategy to be implemented in given crisis situation. The EUMC is the top military body created within the Council. It gives military advice and recommendations to the PSC on all military matters within the EU when requested. The EU Military Staff provides early warning, situation assessment, strategic planning for the Petersberg Tasks. [216]

As regards to the institutionalization of the ESDP, Giovanna. Bono stipulated that the newly created political institutions have provided the EU with the "*potential* to act as a credible international security actor." Moreover, by using economic, diplomatic and legal resources in conflict prevention and crisis management in a way different than NATO, the new institutions do not resemble the NATO'S institutions. The institutional aspect of the Headline Goal marked further movement toward a deeper European integration simultaneously with the EU member states' pooling of their sovereignty in the areas of security and defence. In addition to the above-mentioned positive aspects of new institutions, there are some shortcomings. The most important one is the adoption of bottom-up approach, in the establishment of them. Due to competing national agendas, EU member states did not

---

[216] For a detailed analysis of the institutionalization the ESDP, see Giovanna Bono, "Implementing the Headline Goals: The Institutional Dimension" in Joachim Krause, Andreas Wenger, Lisa Watanabe (eds) Unraveling the European Security and Defence Policy Conundrum, (Bern et al:Loc: Peter Lang, 2003), pp. 67-91.

agree on a strategic concept for ESDP. Thus, the new political arrangements are portrayed as weak. Moreover, this weakness of new political arrangements have affected the EU's democratic deficit adversely.[217]

Shortly after the EU's Summit at Santa Maria de Feira in Portugal at June 2000, the institutionalization of the NATO-EU relationship commenced; though hesitation of France. In July 2000, four joint committees started to work on four main issues. [218] The first group has been on security that has prepared draft of an EU-NATO security agreement. It dealt with exchanges of information, both the EU's and member states' personnel access to NATO planning bodies. The second group studies on capability goals and ensure complementarity of both the EU's headline and capabilities goals and NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative. The third group is on the issue of the EU's access to NATO assets and capabilities. The final group is about defining the permanent arrangements to link the EU and NATO and examines the structures and consultation procedures that should connect the EU and NATO in times of Crisis and non-crisis. The ambassadors of the EU and NATO member states met on September 19, 2000 for the first time. In the EU's Nice Summit, EU member states decided on the revision of EU treaties and approved 60 pages of documents on the implementation of the defence initiative. Among them, French Presidency report and military capabilities commitment declaration and annexes on the strengthening of EU capabilities for civilian aspects of crisis management and standing arrangements for consultation between the EU and NATO were approved. The annex on 'standing arrangements for consultation between the EU and NATO' elaborated the need for attendance of NATO secretary-general attendance to EU General Affairs Council,

---

[217]Ibid., p.68

[218] Cogan, op.cit, p.112

67

and outlined procedures for regular contacts between both NATO Secretary General and EU's High Representative. The annex had also an appendix on issues concerned to terms of EU's use of NATO's assets, command structures and planning capabilities. Despite EU's approval, NATO as a whole were not able to approve this document due to Turkey's veto on EU's assured access to NATO planning in normal circumstances [219]

At Nice, the principle of enhanced cooperation which meant any group of 8 or more countries pursue greater integration in certain areas, was accepted. However, Nice Treaty excluded defence from the areas where enhanced cooperation can be applied. At Nice, the Defence bodies of the EU, the PSC, the EUMC and the EUMS, which were created on a temporary basis at Helsinki were made permanent. At Nice Summit, the French Presidency's Report on The European Security and defence Policy was accepted. This report reiterated the principles of Helsinki Summit and underlined that the EU's development of more effective military capabilities would not involve the establishment of a European Army. The report included annexes, one of which stated arrangements about non-EU European NATO members and accession countries (Annex VI) and arrangements for consultation and cooperation between the EU and NATO (Annex VII). However, these arrangements were regarded as 'guiding principles more than fully worked out rules of procedure'. Despite the approval of French Presidency Report at the Nice Summit, the content of report was not reflected in the public declaration owing to Britain's reservations. [220]

---

[219] Andreani *et all*, op.cit., pp.28-29

[220] Cogan, op.cit, pp.126-127

In the wake of Nice Summit, *The Economist* assessed the EU-NATO relations with following statements: "the terms of a deal between NATO and the Union seem clear in outline, with NATO doing the planning and lending its European friends military equipment that is not needed elsewhere. But many details still need to be worked out." [221]

With the Nice Treaty, which was signed by the Heads of State on March 2001, the EU's role in security and defence has changed. Firstly, since the most of the functions of the WEU would be transferred to the EU, the defence dimension of the EU's CFSP would be shaped by the EU itself, rather than the WEU. Nice Treaty introduced specific clauses on the ESDP's relation with the enhanced cooperation. 'Enhanced cooperation' permit groups of states to move further in a specific policy without the consensus of all EU member states. The Nice Treaty incorporates enhanced cooperation in CFSP, yet it limited its scope to common positions and joint actions which based on in-advance unanimous decisions. Also, the area of military cooperation has not included the application of enhanced cooperation rule. [222]

---

[221] *The Economist*, December 16-22, 2000, p. 28 quoted in Cogan,op.cit., p.127.

[222] Giovanno Bono, "*European Security...*", op.cit,., pp.20-22

CHAPTER 4

THE POLITICAL ASPECT OF THE EU-NATO RELATIONS

In this chapter, we try to shed light on the approaches of main actors towards the development of the EU-NATO relations. We deal with the US and major players of the EU namely, France, Britain and Germany. Therefore, we attempt to find out whether or not a common ground can be established for the ongoing and the future direction of the EU-NATO Relations.

4.1. The US Perspective on the EU-NATO Relations

The origins of the US support for the European Integration process goes back to the genesis of the ECSC. The objectives of US support for European integration have been accounted for different perspectives. According to Gardner, the US fathered European integration for the achievement of political objectives, rather than economic ones. Having intervened the Europe twice in the 21st century, the US strove for the promotion of Franco-German reconciliation. Especially, the establishment of ECSC, which pooled of sovereignty in the field of coal and steel, would sign the end of balance of power game that had marked feature of European history for centuries. Thus, the objective of European stability outweighed the economic objectives.[223]

Another scholar, Ivo Daalder, explained the US engagement in Europe mainly on the ground of geostrategy. For Daalder, the primary reason for the US

---

[223] Anthony Laurence Gardner, <u>A New Era in US-EU Relations</u>?, (England: Ashgate, 1997), pp.3-4

engagement was the prevention of a single power from dominating the Eurasian mass. The US prevented the emergence of single power form in Eurasia owing to the prospect of domination of North America by that single power. Therefore, the US intervened in Europe in two world wars in order to prevent German domination. In the Cold War, the US engaged in Europe due to the threat of Soviet domination since Europe was regarded weak in the sense that could not resist to Soviet threat either politically or militarily. Thus, the aim of the US engagement in Europe was 'to strengthen Europe so that Europe could defend itself.' That is why the US protected Europe militarily and supported European Integration efforts.[224]

On the other side, James Sperling linked the EU's predecessor institutions, the EEC and the ECSC, with the US economic and strategic preferences. Economically, the revival of Europe was expected to provide better customers for US goods: Strategically wealthier Europe would decrease the US burden of common defence against the Soviet Union.[225] For the purpose of this study, we will focus on US approach to the development of the ESDP in the post Cold War period.

Despite the divergence of views with regard to reasons for US support to European integration, it was apparent that the US played a key role in the early years of European integration process. In the words of Walter Hallstein, the first President of the European Commission, "There is a saying that the Americans are the best Europeans and there is much truth to that." [226]

---

[224] Ivo H. Daalder, " A US View of ESDP", available on line at http: // www.brook.edu./views/ articles/ Daaelder /20011ecadpt.htm, accessed on 08.12.2003.

[225] James Sperling, " The United States: Strategic Vision or Tactical posturing?" in Martin A. Smith, Graham Timmins (eds),Uncertain Europe : Building a new European Security Order, (New York: Routledge, 2001), p.116.

[226] Quoted in Gardner, op.cit., p. 3

Following the end of Cold War, European governments started to decrease their defence expenditures for realization of a 'peace dividend'. In response to evolutionary process of change, the elder Bush administration gave priority to the continuation of US international leadership and administration officials suspected the movements within the EU to provide a defence dimension. Although the US supported European cooperation in economic, political and defence fields in the Cold War era, the US did not face with the prospect of European defence cooperation that could be a substitution for NATO at that time. In this respect, the US perception of European effort in this area can be named as 'yes, but' policy; to put it differently, while the US supported European efforts, it warned Europeans of possible negative consequences. According to Stanley Sloan, the US support for European integration continued in the rhetoric of US policy, yet, the skeptical tendencies became influential due to the lack of striving geostrategic necessity for supporting European Union. As a result, 'but' was stressed on in a 'yes, but' policy. [227]

In line with this policy, the US officials adopted a cautionary attitude towards the increased moves of Europeans on a defence identity. To illustrate, William Taft IV, the US ambassador to NATO, stated the US's support for strengthening of the European pillar within NATO via revival of the WEU, yet, he warned about the prospect of relaxation transatlantic ties and the duplication of NATO and discrimination against non-EU NATO members. Later on, these warnings

---

[227] Sloan, NATO and the European Union..., op.cit, pp.164-165

would constitute the basis of the Clinton Administration 'three D's'; duplication, decoupling and discrimination.[228]

By this way, the US has been characterized as the ambivalent supporter of European integration. Despite the fact that the US administrations have seemed to pursue supportive policies, they have often been concerned if European efforts threatened to impede US's leadership role.[229]

After President Bill Clinton came into power in 1992, the Clinton Administration focused on domestic issues like economic and social problems rather than foreign policy. [230] However, this did not cause a substantial change in US foreign policy. Both the elder Bush Administration and the Clinton Administration had common points in terms of their foreign policy objectives. In this regard, both administration strove for the establishment of a new division of labour in the Atlantic Alliance so as to shift the burden and responsibilities of the US regarding regional stability to US's NATO partners. Both of them provided a conditional support for European efforts in defence area and emphasized predominance of NATO as a security institution. Besides, they searched for a linkage between the economic and military aspects of the Atlantic Alliance in order to decrease the burden of US leadership. Hence, despite the slight different both administrations dealt with maintenance of the US leadership role at lower cost.[231]

---

[228] Sloan Stanley, The United States and European Defence, (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2000), p. 6

[229] Ivo H.Daaelder and James M. Goldgeier, " Putting Europe First", Survival, Vol.43, No.1, Spring 2001, p.79

[230] Gardner, op.cit, p.10

[231] Sperling, op.cit, p.119

Like elder Bush administration's aim of Europe as a 'whole and free', President Clinton had the aim of 'peaceful, undivided and democratic Europe.' The main instrument for that end was not only the institutional enlargement of NATO and the EU but also a broader strategy of extending the stability and security in Western Europe to entire Europe[232]. Additionally, unlike the elder George Bush, Clinton emphasized that he not only favored an economically integrated Europe but a Europe with a security and defence identity. Only then Europe would meet Kennedy's vision of European pillar in Atlantic Alliance. As Secretary of State Warren Christopher put it:

> The United States looks to Europe to be a strong partner for the United States and a capable actor on the world stage of course, the choice of mechanisms is for EU members themselves to decide. But the United States has a clear interest in Europe's continued integration and its enhanced ability in foreign and security policy.[233]

In January 1994, NATO Summit meeting in Brussels, President Clinton put forward the creation of CJTF as a part of NATO's integrated command structure. Moreover, the Brussels declaration stated the significance of European level cooperation and the constructive role of the WEU.[234]

Concerned to the US Perspective on ESDI, Michael Brenner drawed our attention to the US security globalism. In this sense, while the US has been a global power, the allies of the US have regional security perspective. No matter the outcome of the ESDI or the CFSP, this situation is unlikely to change. Therefore, from US perspective: "an ESDI of (Western) Europe, about Europe, and for (Western) Europe

---

[232] Daalder and Goldgeier, op.cit, p.77

[233] US Department of State, "Charting a Transatlantic Agenda for the 21st Century", Speech bySecretary of State Warren Christopher, 2 June 1995 in Madrid., quoted in Gardner, op.cit., p.23

[234] Sloan, The United States..., op.cit, p.11

is less attractive than an ESDI that is of Europe about the wider international system and for the West."[235] The effect of the US security globalism on US attitude towards ESDI can be explained twofold: first, the US claims itself as a European power on the ground of security globalism. Consequently, Holbrook pointed out that the US is not only a great power with interests in Europe but also part of Europe politically. This conviction of European power has provided the justification ground for a dominant role of the US in the arrangement of security relations in the post-Cold War Europe. Secondly, according to Michael Brenner, European power status of the US requires "the subordination of ESDI to overarching institutions and relationships of which the US is an essential part." [236]

Having been surprised by Anglo-French agreement on EU defence, the Americans were quick to response St. Malo Declaration. Madeleine Albright, US Secretary of State articulated that the US was the supportive of an ESDI within the NATO. In the words of Albright, "we enthusiastically support any such measures that enhance European capabilities." However, she laid three standards for enhancement of European moves in defence field, which were known as "three D's": duplication, decoupling and discrimination.[237] In the words of Madeleine Albright,

> The key to a successful initiative is to focus on practical military capabilities. Any initiative must avoid preempting Alliance decision making by *de-linking* ESDI from NATO, avoid *duplicating* existing efforts and avoid *discriminating* it against non-EU members. [emphasis added] [238].

---

[235] Brenner, op.cit, p.13.

[236] Ibid, p.15.

[237] Hunter, op.cit, p.33.

[238] Madeleine Albright, North Atlantic Council ministerial meeting, Brussels, December 8, 1998 quoted in Hunter, op.cit., p. 33-34.

'Three D's' reflected Clinton Administration's main concerns and indicated the US's "yes, but" response to Blair initiative. The first 'D', delinking, was closely connected with the idea of autonomous European action envisaged in St. Malo. The main reason for the US concern about delinking was the actions of the US or its European allies which would give rise to decoupling of the security of the two sides of Atlantic. [239]

The second 'D,' discrimination, refers to the position of non-EU members, which were Canada, the US, Iceland, Norway and Turkey at the time of St. Malo. However, this issue specifically applied to the Turkey.[240] Except for Turkey, other non-EU members of NATO didn't give priority to participation of decision making process of the ESDP. Being as a non-EU NATO member, Turkey expected a political role in decision-making. In the mid 1990s, the phrase 'separable but not separate' linked with debates on ESDI and CJTF indeed reflected another aspect of decoupling concerns. On the issue of the ESDP, the reason for fear of decoupling is the likelihood of a politically autonomous EU backed by institutional infrastructure of ESDI and thus emergence of a 'Europe alone'. Strategically, decoupling refers to divergence in technology and defence spending of the US and the EU caused by in pursuit of different set of goals. The fears of decoupling are based on the prospect of a more independent and stronger ESDP that could separate the security of the EU from NATO structure in terms of policy and strategy. Another aspect of the duplication is the distinction between necessary and unnecessary duplication. Necessary duplication refers to the duplication of NATO's assets and capabilities that

---

[239] Hunter, op.cit, p.34

[240] Hunter, op.cit, p. 36

are 'spread thin'; in this regard, the selective duplication of certain capabilities like strategic lift can provide the EU and NATO greater flexibility of action since duplication of key capabilities enable NATO and the EU to carry out two missions at the some time.[241] Duplication' marked the most tangible of '3 Ds' at the time of St. Malo. It aimed to prevent the Europeans from spending scarce resources on obtainment of capabilities that were available in NATO.

In November 1999, Lord Robertson, NATO Secretary General, tried to shift debate from the 'three D's' of the US to more positive formulations, named the 'three I's': improvement, inclusiveness, indivisibility. He delivered a speech in the forty-fifth annual session of NATO Parliamentary Assembly and stated that:

> For any part, I will ensure that ESDI is based on three key principles, the three I's: improvement in European defence capabilities; inclusiveness and transparency for all Allies and the indivisibility of transatlantic security, based on shared values. [242]

On the side of Europe, Cologne and Helsinki EU Summits, which were turning points for giving substance to the ESDP, were held in 1999. However, the statement that went on: "The Union must have the capacity for autonomous action backed by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises *without prejudice to actions by NATO*(emphasis added)" gave rise to the reaction of the US. The Clinton Administration noted that the phrase "without prejudice to actions by NATO" left the impression of division of labour were crisis management would be the prerogative of

[241] Rachel Anne Lutz, "The European Security and Defence Policy: Rebalancing the Transatlantic Security Relationship", (DUPI: Copenhagen, 2001), Report 2001/4 pp.17-18.

[242] George Robertson, NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Amsterdam, 15 November, 1999 quoted in Hunter, op.cit., p.100.

the EU while NATO would only be responsible for Article 5 collective defence clause operations. [243] According to Hunter, at Cologne, members of the EU avoided the statements that affirmed primacy of NATO either implicitly or explicitly. In this connection, the phrase "without prejudice to actions by NATO" was viewed as an effort that aimed evading NATO's role set out in NATO's Washington Summit, which is "where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged." [244]

Following the Cologne, the concerns of Clinton Administration were expressed by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott as follows: "[The United States] would not want to see an ESDI that comes into being first within NATO, but then grows out of NATO and finally grows away from NATO, since that could lead to an ESDI that initially duplicates but that could eventually compete with NATO." [245] According to Gnesotto and Kaiser, the US has mainly two concerns regarding European defence: the fear of political arise from the EU's egalitarian ambitions with respect to NATO and the fear of strategic decoupling caused by the technological obsolescence and insufficiency of European defence expenditure. Both of these concerns in fact reflected the burden-sharing debate within the Alliance. [246]

As a matter of fact, the burden-sharing debate or in the words of Rachel Anne Lutz, '*burden versus responsibility sharing debate'* has been one of the important point in analyzing the US view on the EU-NATO relations. The history of

---

[243] Alexander Moens, " ESDP, the United States and the Atlantic Alliance" in Jolyon Howorth and John T.S. Keeler (eds), <u>Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy</u>, (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p.30.

[244] Hunter, <u>op.cit.</u>, pp.56-57.

[245] US State Department, Washington File, October 7, 1999, quoted in Hunter, <u>op.cit</u>, p. 58.

[246] Nicole Gnesotto and Karl Kaiser, " European- American Interaction" in Heisbourg François (eds), <u>Defence:Making It Work</u> (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2000) , p.36

78

this debate goes back to NATO's inception in 1949; however the debate exacerbated within the dissolution of "US as leader, EU as lead" roles following the end of the Cold War. Furthermore, with its improving capabilities through this ESDP, the EU expects a greater responsibility in transatlantic relations.[247]. Therefore, the establishment of more equitable burden and responsibilities between the US and the EU is very important for transatlantic relationship. According to Lutz, the revival of transatlantic security relationship is closely linked with both the US sharing power and responsibility with the EU and the EU's improvement of its capabilities. In this respect, rebalancing the US-EU security relationship in a *quid pro quo* approach can be called as the 'Grand Bargain'. The basis of the Grand Bargain is that the US consents to a greater say of Europeans within the Alliance in return for the EU's increasing financial and military contribution to the defence of Europe. However, the EU's 'credibility gap' together with US's unwillingness to leave its leadership position in the transatlantic security relationship caused an impression that before the resolution of burden part of the debate in a tangible way, equitable responsibility sharing will unlikely to occur.[248]

Shortly before the Helsinki European Council Summit, the US demanded Prime Minister Blair to persuade Chirac about the inclusion of the phrase "where the alliance as a whole isn't engaged into the EU Council Conclusions. [249] Therefore, the US concentrated on the elimination of the differences between NATO's Washington Summit and the EU's Cologne Summit. At the end, the US concerns were taken into

---

[247] Lutz, op.cit., p.13.

[248] Ibid, p.21.

[249] Moens, op.cit. p.30.

account and hence the emergence of another American disquiet was prevented with the following statement.

> The European Council underlines its determination to develop an autonomous capacity to take decisions and where NATO as a whole isn't engaged to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises. This process will avoid unnecessary duplication and doesn't imply the creation of a European army.[250]

In response to the EU's efforts to improve institutional and military capabilities of the ESDP after the Helsinki, the US Secretary of Defence William Cohen expressed US concerns in different meetings. At the meeting of NATO, Defence Ministers in Birmingham in October 2000, Cohen expressed that "… we agree this goal not grudgingly, not with resignation, but with whole-hearted conviction. The notion that Europe must begin to prepare for an eventual American withdrawal from Europe has no foundation in fact and policy…"[251]

Thus, Secretary of Defence Cohen expressed the US support for the development of CESDP and opposed the eventual withdrawal of the US forces from Europe, which often used as a rational ground for CESDP. In his comments, Cohen emphasized on "but" side of "yes, but" policy.[252]

Stanley Sloan pointed out a divergence of emphasis and approach between the US officials and agencies 'under the surface of consistent US policy'. Among the agencies, the State Department took on the most sceptical attitude towards the ESDP. At the Pentagon, while the civilian officials stresssed on the improvement of military

---

[250] Helsinki European Council, Presidency Conclusions, December 10-11, 1999, paragraph II Common European policy on security and defence.

[251] William Cohen, Remarks at the NATO informal Defence Ministerial October 10, 2000, quoted in Hunter, op.cit., p.102.

[252] Sloan, op.cit, pp.177-178.

capabilities of European allies and thus adopted 'alert but relaxed' approach, military officials concerned about NATO's integrated command structure and the Alliance itself. [253] However, on the whole, the Clinton Administration and the Senate adopted a constructive approach to ESDP and emphasized the improvement of European defence capabilities, rather than the establishment of new institutions.[254] Particularly, In the late 1999, the Clinton Administration's statements shifted from 'three D's' approach to more positive tones, stressing on more 'yes' side of 'yes, but' policy in the late 1999. But, this did not mean the change of attitude; the concerns about of 'three D's' remained, but change in emphasis was observed. [255]

Following the Clinton era, the Bush Administration attitude towards the ESDP was firstly explained by the US Secretary of Defence, Donald Rumsfeld in February 2001. In his speech delivered at the annual Munich Conference on European Security Policy, he expressed preliminary views of the new US administration on ESDP as following:

> I favor efforts that strengthen NATO. What happens within our Alliance and what happens to it must comport with its continued strength, resilience, and effectiveness. Actions that could reduce NATO's effectiveness by confusing duplication or by perturbing the transatlantic link would not be positive. Indeed they run the risk of injecting instability into an enormously important Alliance. And if I may add one more point: whatever shape the efforts may finally take, I personally believe it should be inclusive/open to all NATO members who wish to take part.[256]

---

[253] Sloan, The United States..., op.cit , pp.25-26.

[254] Sperling, op.cit, p.130.

[255] Sloan, The United States..., op.cit., p.23.

[256] Speech by Donald Rumsfeld, Wehrkunde Security Conference, February 3.,2001,quoted in Jolyon Howorth and John T.S. Keeler, (eds) Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, (England: Palgrave Macmillan,2003), p. 109..

Rumsfeld's remarks were regarded as a disappointing regression by ESDP supporters. Many of the ESDP supporters criticized President Bush's team for disregarding the post-Cold War evolution of the EU that took place. However, Rumsfeld's comments reflected continuing concerns of the US and problems related with the ESDP. [257]

The Bush Administration was very sensitive on the likelihood ESDP that might undermine NATO. At this juncture, Britain Prime Minister, Tony Blair, assured Bush that ESDP would not impede to NATO. [258] Therefore, while Bush and Blair addressed their support for the ESDP, they confirmed primacy of NATO as the essential foundation of transatlantic security at their first meeting. In the meeting, Bush and Blair agreed on the framework of a transatlantic bargain on European defence, consequently, the US would support ESDP provided that its role would be constrained to peacekeeping operations which NATO did not involve.[259]

Therefore, this limited role of ESDP endorsed by President Bush allowed him to become more positive about European military capabilities compared to the Clinton Administration. After the Bush-Blair meeting, the Bush Administration seemed to have a relatively passive attitude toward the ESDP. The priority was given to ballistic missile defence, sale of it the allies and reformation of the US defence establishment. However, the September 11 attacks displaced all other concerns of the

---

[257] Kori Schake, "The United States, ESDP and Constructive Duplication", in Jolyon and Keeler John T.S., (eds) <u>Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy</u>, (England: Palgrave Macmillan,2003), p. 104.

[258] Sloan, <u>NATO and The European Union</u>...,<u>op.cit,</u> p.180.

[259] Schake, <u>op.cit</u>, pp. 109-110.

Bush Administration and the war against terrorism become priority of the Bush Administration. [260]

In this sense, even the Secretary of State Colin Powell, the architect of US's sensitive approach expressed the US concerns in NATO foreign ministers meeting. Powell said that the EU's defence initiative must be full integrated with the planning activities of NATO.

At the NATO Summit in June 2001, President Bush called for:

It is in NATO's interest for the EU to develop a rapid reaction capability. A strong, capable European force integrated with NATO would give us more options for handling crises when NATO, as a whole, chooses not to engage. NATO must be generous in the help it gives the EU. And similarly, the EU must welcome participation of NATO allies who are not members of the EU and we must waste scarce resources, duplicating effort or working at cross purposes. Our work together in the Balkans shows how much the 23 nations of NATO and the EU can achieve when we combine our efforts.[261]

According to Stanley Sloan, the Bush Administration's attitude towards the ESDP in its eighteen month in office can be characterized as 'a policy of benign neglect'. In spite of this fact, many of the administration officials, especially several high-level Department of Defence officials, have suspected about European pledges and asserted that the US should not rely too much on the likelihood of radically improved European military capabilities. Major concerns of the US such as impact of evolution of ESDP on transatlantic relations have still continued in the Bush Administration. It seems that these concerns are unlikely to put rest in the near term.[262]

---

[260] Sloan, <u>NATO and the European Union</u>..., <u>op.cit</u>., p.181.

[261] President Bush, Press Conference with NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson, Brussels, June 13, 2001, quoted in Kori Schake, <u>op.cit</u>, p.110-111.

Although Bush's statements were more graceful than the Clinton Administration's 'three D's', he expressed three concerns of US Administration about the development of European Force. President Bush reiterated the formula agreed at St. Malo declaration that European military force would act on the condition that NATO as a whole is not engaged. Therefore, from Clinton to Bush Administration; the US attitude towards ESDP has not changed substantially. The Bush Administration didn't directly oppose the ESDP, despite the presence of misgivings. The rationale behind this reflected five important developments in security policy. Firstly, The Bush Administration has greater confidence in US's leadership ability, thus it does not want to involve in EU's internal developments. Secondly, the Bush Administration isn't much interested in the types of crisis management missions that the ESDP is formulated to involve. Thirdly, President Bush has emphasized that a more capable European military force is in compliance with the US interests. [263] Therefore, unlike the Clinton Administration, Bush Administration has not perceived the ESDP as a potential threat to integrity of NATO. The Bush Administration has favored any capacity in the period of 'war against terrorism'. In the final analysis, the Bush Administration looks at military capabilities. Consequently, Bush Administration is more concerned with declining European defence budgets rather than the potential of an European Rapid Reaction force and NATO rivalry.[264]

Fourth, the Bush Administration has seen shifting more responsibility to Europe for persistence of transatlantic relations. If Europeans desire to work with the

---

[262] Sloan, NATO and The European Union..., op.cit, pp.181-182.

[263] Schake, op.cit., p.111.

[264] Moens, op.cit., p.35.

US in security matters, American-European cooperation can only be realized through NATO framework. Fifth, the Bush Administration agenda has not been as ambitions as that of its predecessors for NATO. [265] According to Penska and Mason, the US regarded the ESDP as attractive if it contributes to sharing of costs and risks of providing stability to European regional security environment. Hence, the Bush Administration's support to ESDP is based on the hope that ESDP will improve European military capabilities, assets that will be available for NATO and the US led missions. They suggest that in order to balance a desire to US engagement in European security with efforts for more autonomous and comprehensive security and defence capability, the US should be willing to share the costs and risks of European security and as well as global security, albeit to a lesser extent. [266]

4.2. France's Approach to the EU-NATO Relations

In the Cold War era, the bipolar international system provided a comfortable environment where French political leaders pursued a French course in external relations[267]. In this regard, constraining Soviet influence on Western Europe and fostering Germany's ties with the west were given priority by French diplomacy. As a reflection of its pursuit of ostensibly independent external policy, France developed a national nuclear deterrent capability and withdrew from NATO's integrated military system. Consequently, France remained outside the NATO's integrated military structure and conducted its policy of national independence "without having to

---

[265] Schake, op.cit., p.111.

[266] Pensksa Susan., Mason L. Warren., ' EU Security Cooperation and the Transatlantic Relationship' *Cooperation and Conflict* Vol.38(3), 2003, pp.268-270.

[267] R.E : Utley, " France: willing the means to the end?", in Martin A. Smith, Graham Timmins (eds), Uncertain Europe : Building a new European Security Order, (New York: Routledge, 2001), p.136.

renounce security benefits provided by NATO and the US"[268]. Thus, France sustained its semi-detached position to Atlantic Alliance. Moreover, France criticized the US and had more affirmative approach to the Soviet Union and prompted West European cooperation.[269]

With the end of the Cold War, France realized that national responses to multidimensional security challenges of the post- Cold War era were neither practical nor feasible. Moreover, France was not capable of sufficient political, financial and military capabilities for asserting itself in international affairs. As a result, France made significant changes in the understanding of its external defence and security issues. Instead of traditional Gaullist imperatives of autonomy of independence, France started to emphasize on multilateral and cooperative approach in dealing with international security challenges. [270] Therefore, France insisted on the need for Europeans to assume more responsibility for their own defence following the end of Cold War. The rationale behind this insistence can be explained as follows. Firstly, Europe began to be perceived as an instrument for the achievement of traditional French foreign and defence policy objectives which weren't probably achieved by France alone. Secondly, European cooperation was regarded essential considering the 'danger of superpower domination in European security'. Rather than striving for European pillar of NATO as in the 1980s, France sought a putative European defence organization which is separate from transatlantic security structure. This was explicable partly in terms of a perception of a necessity for building an intra-

---

[268] Michael Meimeth, " France and the Organization of Security in Post-Cold Europe", ,in Call Cavanagh Hodge (ed), <u>Redefining European Security</u>. (Newyork: garland Pusblishing, 1999), pp.146-147

[269] Utley, <u>op.cit.</u>, p.136

[270]<u>Ibid,</u> p.138-139

European defence cooperation within European integration framework, partly in terms of increasing tensions in France-US relations at the beginning of the 1990s. The ideas for an enhanced security role for the EC were formalized in Franco-German Proposals, the IGC of the EC and the Joint Letter to the EC Presidency in October 1991. However, France didn't consider the building of a European arrangement that could replace NATO in these initiatives. Although, France endorsed the transatlantic link, the aim of French initiatives was to promote a European defence identity. Nevertheless, they came to be perceived as a threat to primacy of NATO.[271]

From the fall of Berlin Wall to start of a Gaullist right wing government under Edouard Balladur, Europe was gone through a transformation such as the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, unification of Germany and outbreak of Yugoslavian Conflict.[272] Concomitantly, this period represented the high point of French initiatives to establish purely European security schemes trivial to NATO. Under Balladur, French rhetoric continued to emphasize the need for European defence cooperation. [273] In this respect, French tried to cement European security cooperation in the Maastricht Treaty. Under the terms of the Maastricht Treaty, the notion of CFSP for Europe was established. In addition to the elevation of the CFSP on the European agenda, Maastricht envisaged a common defence and a means to implement it without the US. In this respect, it would be said that Maastricht fulfilled many of the French objectives. In the words of Prime Minister Pierre Bérégomy, the progress that was made towards the European security at Maastricht Treaty

---

[271] Anand Menon, <u>France, NATO and the Limits of Independence</u> 1981-1997, (Britain: Macmillan Press, 2000), pp.123-126

[272] <u>Ibid</u>, p.40

[273] <u>Ibid,</u> p.127

represented 'the most dazzling aspects of the developments that influenced French security following the end of Cold War'. [274]

France endeavored to improve the role and the status of European partners in NATO. In this regard, France contributed police force the NATO controlled no-fly zone over Bosnia and extension of political participation in the NATO.[275] Moreover, the NATO Brussels Summit in 1994 represented a breakthrough in the evolution of France's relationship with NATO in the post-Cold War period. France agreed with initiatives that were put forward by the US like CJTF, PfP. Hence, the Brussels Summit was characterized as 'the best NATO Summit ever from France's view point' by one of French official. Moreover, the Summit supported two main French policy objectives, the development of a European Security and Defence Identity through the WEU.[276]

Within the months of NATO's Brussels Summit, the French government published a new defence White Paper (Livre Blanc). Since it was firstly produced in 1972, the White Paper came into questioned many of the central principles of traditional defence policy. Particularly, it modified the notion of military independence, which limited the cooperation of France with its allies for a long time by partly replacing it with the notion of strategic autonomy. The notion of strategic autonomy relied partly on France's ability to handle with complicated international

---

[274] Utley, op.cit., p.140

[275] Ibid., , p. 143

[276] Robert P. Grant, "France's New Relationship with NATO", *Survival*, Vol.38, No.1, 1996, p.58

crises engaged with multinational contributions and partly on France's willingness to

give priority to conventional forces, rather than nuclear forces[277].

In the preface of the White Paper, the Prime Minister Edouar Balladur,

wrote that "with the coming into effect of the Treaty on European Union, our defence

policy must in fact contribute to the gradual construction of a common defence" [278]

Moreover, in his own preface to White Paper, Defence Minister François

Léotard stated that

> At the heart of any thoughts is Europe…France must set an example. Not
> France by itself in a concert of great powers as we knew in the nineteenth
> century. But France in Europe … The European project will only succeed is
> [France] actively contributes to it, assuming a leading role and she sacrifices
> that this implies. No longer by playing one state against another, but in
> reuniting, for the first time in the tormented history of the old continent, a
> *mutualization of power,* in the service of the defence of Europe and a
> security common to states engaged in its construction.[279]

According to Jolyon Howorth, the meaning of 'mutualization of power' is

not exactly known. However, Menon draws our attention to the striking difference

between "talk of overcoming traditional balance of power" politics to arrive at a

'mutualization of power' and the traditional realist stance of Paris. [280]

Under the new Presidency of Jacques Chirac beginning from 1995, the

relation between France and NATO sustained to improve:[281] However, the

culmination of France's rapprochement with NATO came with unexpected

---

[277] Anand Menon, " From Independence to Cooperation: France, NATO and European Security",
Internatioanl Affairs, Vol. 71, No.1 ,p.28

[278] Livre Blanc, p. 6, quoted in Jolyon Howorth, 'France'in Howorth and Menon (eds), The European
policy and National Defence Policy, (London: Routledge, 1997) p. 27

[279] François Leotard, Preface, in live Blanc, p. 5, quoted in Menon, op.cit., p. 28)

[280] Howorth, " France ...", op.cit, p.28

[281] Utley, op.cit., 143

announcement of foreign minister Herve de Charette. He declared that France would henceforth participate regularly in the work of the Alliance; France would take full seat in NATO's military committee.[282] According to Robert P. Grant, four successive developments played a role in the France's rapprochement with the Alliance. The first development was a number of events that caused to frustrate French hopes for progressing ESDI. In this regard, Europe's failure to act effectively in former Yugoslavia; the difficulty in ratification process of Maastricht Treaty and a dramatic decrease in military expenditure and manpower moved France to conclude that France had to engage more with the US and NATO to deal with Europe's new challenges and to establish itself as an effective actor. The second development was the role of the US in resolving Bosnian conflict. Having considered limitations of Europe in the Bosnian conflict, France became concerned about US disengagement to Europe, rather than US engagement. The third major development was the greater interest of the new Clinton Administration to relieve the US defence burden, finally, emergence of a conservative-centrist coalition in the French National Assembly after the 1993 election quickened the France's rapprochement with the Alliance. [283]

By relying on these explanations, it can be said that *L'Europe puissance,* probably constitutes fundamental of French views on Europe. From the president De Gaulle to Chirac, France has pursued a policy that aimed gradually building of *L'Europe puissance.* Concomitantly, it is one of the most attractive means to make the French people, grown up 1000 years of proud history, to support the European integration process that required the relinquishing part of French sovereignty. In this

---

[282] Grant, op.cit., p.58

[283] Ibid, pp.63-64

respect, Yves Boyer depicted *L'Europe puissance* as "deepening the European construction in order to build up the EU as a power, possessing various means, including military forces, to assert and defend its interests and to make its voice heard and respected on the world stage." Therefore, French conceptualization of *L'Europe puissance* implies that European integration process not only a free market agreement but also a political project aiming at integrated and unified policies especially in defence and external issues. [284]

4.3. Germany's Approach to EU-NATO Relations

Beginning from the 1950s, Germany's place in international politics was based on *Westbindung*(West/Western integration).Bonn's commitment to westbindung was closely related with consequences of West Germany's security dilemmas and its international rehabilitation. Hence, the commitment of Westbindung was resulted from the need to overcome the historical Franco-German rivalry for establishing hegemony in Europe and hostilities that had born from two world wars.[285]

In this regard, NATO has a central place in *Westbindung*. The Atlantic Alliance has a profound influence on the federal government's security policy since 1950s. Indeed, the defence of Germany constituted the main aspect of the common defence, NATO itself became Germany's defence policy. Consequently, the Bundeswehr had a decentralized structure and lacked a general staff. Moreover, unlike their British and French counterparts, German generals were able to plan

---

[284] Yves Boyer, " France and the European project: Internal and External Issues", in Kjell Eliassen (ed), <u>Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union</u>, (London: Sage Publications, 1998), pp.94-99

[285] Bluth, <u>op.cit</u>, p.128, Christopher Blutt preferred to use Western Integration instead of Westbindung

91

military strategy solely within NATO. In the outbreak of war, operational command over all combat units of the German armed forces would have been delegated to NATO. Therefore, German conventional forces were the largest and the most integrated forces in Western Europe. [286]

The other aspect of the *Westbindung* was the European Integration process that closely linked with Franco-German relations. In this respect, Germany pursued both Atlantic option and European option simultaneously, thus benefited from both Atlantic and Western European relations, sometimes "even plays one option against the other." [287]

The Adenauer's legacy of *Westbindung* shaped the central tenet of West German transformationalist foreign policy. It put emphasis on multilateralism and European integration. The Adenauer sought to enmesh Germany in Western institutional structures, where NATO and the EU constituted the primacy anchors. [288]

In the post war period, West Germany pursued the foreign policy of a civilian power. [289] The Civilian power conceptualization has been deeply influenced by political guilty of German fascism. As a result of Germany's traumatic post described by military aggression, holocaust and repression, Germans developed mostly a military political culture which didn't endorse the use of military force

---

[286] Johannes Bohen, " Germany" in Call Cavanagh Hodge (ed), <u>Redefining European Security</u>. (Newyork: Garland Pusblishing, 1999), p.56

[287] Reimond Seidelmann, " The Security Policy of a United Germany", in Kjell Eliassen (ed), <u>Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union</u>, (London: Sage Publications, 1998), p.111

[288] Lisbeth Aggestam, " A Common Foreign and Security Policy", in Lisbeth Aggestam, Adrian Hyde-Price (eds), <u>Security and Identity in Europe</u>,, (Britain: Macmillian Press, 2000) p.104

[289] Aggestam, <u>op.cit.</u>, p.105

except for national defence. In a similar vein, German political class adopted a reserved attitude towards external military engagements.[290]

Additionally, the role of armed forces was restricted in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany.(FRG) Their role was constrained to defensive purposes for preventing the armed forces from being an instrument of military aggression.[291] With the end of the Cold War, the Soviet military threat which largely determined German foreign and security policy was removed. The two main approaches emerged regarding to Germany's foreign and security policy in the new era. Former Chancellor Kohl, President Herzog and former defence minister Rühe and some prominent academics like Michael Stirmer and Hans-Peter Scwarz articulated rehabilitated position of Germany in the international community and argued that Germany should be a 'normal state'. Moreover, they that asserted Germany had to play a leading role in Europe given the Germany's economic and military resources and its geographical location in the center of Europe. On the other side, the people from the left wing parties and the realist branch of the Green Party asserted that Germany should remain a 'civilian power'. In this regard they stipulated that Germany should refrain from military action abroad and emphasize multilateral security arrangements and resolution of conflicts by negotiations. [292]

In connection with *Westbindung,* West German foreign policy marked with "mould of a civilian power". In this regard, the West Germany has played the role of a 'civilian power' through promoting, "multilateralism, institution-building and supranational integration" and striving for constraining the use of force in

---

[290] Bohnen, op.cit., p.53

[291] Bluth, op.cit., p.55

[292] Ibid. p.54

international affairs via national and international norms.[293] As a reflection of civil power identity, the *Bundeswehr*, unlike the French and British military, did not participate in any war, hostile operation or military intervention from 1956 to 1997. This historical record of *Bundeswehr* indicates a radical change of German foreign policies of the post. Rather than the use of power politics, Germany has opted to pursue a soft power politics that based on economic and diplomatic instruments. [294]

Against this background, Germany's attitude towards European Defence in the post cold War period can be explained as follows: in the early 1990s, when the Maastricht negotiations took place; Germany pursued a dual strategy in the sense that it supported maintenance and reform of NATO along with unification and Western Europe with an emphasis on the development of a CFSP that would eventually involve defence issues. Although Germany endorsed the persistence of NATO as the bedrock of German security as also favored a reformed NATO. Seen from Germany, NATO had to be a more European organization through reforms. Therefore, Germany assumed the role of an active 'interlocutor' and 'mediator' between the US and France.[295] Germany's this role had been criticized in Western capitals for 'doing the splits'. However, the Germans believed that an effective European defence could only be achieved within an Atlantic framework. In this respect, Germany's Defence Minister Volker Rühe stated that: "European Integration and a trusting transatlantic partnership don't preclude each other." [296]

---

[293] Hanns W. Maull, "Germany and the Use of force: Still a ' Civilian Power'?" *Survival*, Vol.42, No. ', 2000, p.56

[294] Seidelmann, op.cit, pp.108-109.

[295] Bohnen, op.cit., p. 51.

[296] Quoted in Bohnen, op.cit., p.52.

Faced with security challenges, multidimensional threats of new era, German security policy, at least in principle, made a shift towards, the acceptance of the need for German military participation outside of traditional collective defence clause of NATO. In this regard Germany's reluctancy to use force outside NATO's collective defence began to change from 1990. The Kuwait Crisis and the Gulf War in 1990-1991 became the first driving force in the change of this reluctancy. Germany's unwillingness to have any direct role in Gulf War gave rise to tensions with the US and other allies. Consequently, Germany decided to serve the UN Traditional Authority in Cambodia with a small number of medical units in 1992-1993. In 1993-1994, Germany involved in Somali with 1700 soldiers. Afterwards, Germany took a more intense military role in Yugoslavian Crisis.[297]

Seen from Germany's domestic politics, these military involvements gave rise to the debate about whether or not they were covered by the constitution. In particular, the Gulf Crisis opened up the debate on constitutional implications for the use of force. [298] Under the terms of constitution, the Article 87 stated that "Except for defence, armed forces may only be used as expressly permitted by the Basic Law." Article 26 expressed the prohibition of a war of aggression. But the article 24(2) went on:

> To preserve the peace the Federal government can take part in a system of mutual collective security; it will agree in the process to such inroads into its sovereign rights as bring about and safeguard a peaceful and lasting order in Europe and between the nations of the world. [299].

---

[297] Maull, op.cit., pp.57-58.

[298] Bluth, op.cit., p.60.

[299] Quoted in Bluth, op.cit., p.61.

This statement was interpreted by some such as the former defence minister and law professor Rupert Scholz as permission for Germany's involvement into UN and NATO's out of area with its own forces.[300].However, these liberal interpretations of Conservatives were not shared by everyone. As a result, the Constitutional Court ruled that:

> In accordance with Court's ruling, deployment of military forces in operations other than individual or collective defence requires three significant preconditions: The objective in compliance with the promotion of international peace, security partners and an institutional context in which to act and a positive vote of the Bundestag [301]

Therefore, it was accepted Germany's participation to operations outside the NATO area under a UN mandate did not constitute a violation of the Constitution in July 1994. Nevertheless, the Constitutional Court's interpretation of those clauses did not resolve debate politically. For political parties in the coalition, the debate that had begun with the Gulf Crisis continued in Bosnia Crisis. The implication of the Yugoslav Conflict for Germany was that it revealed that Germany had an important role as a major regional power. It also provided the political context for the review of constraints on the use of military force.[302] Yet, the Kosovo Crisis represented a significant progress in the party's evolution of attitudes towards the use of forces. Germany's military participation to Kosovo crisis can be regarded exceptional. The use of military force without an international mandate will unlikely to occur in the future.[303]

---

[300] Bluth, op.cit., p.61

[301] Quoted in Maull, op.cit., p.71

[302] Cluth, op.cit, pp. 99-100

[303] For details see Maull, op.cit, pp.56-65

Shortly after the outbreak of war in Kosovo, a new coalition government formed by Social Democrats (SDP) Gerhard Schröder as Chancellor and Greens, as foreign minister Joschka Fischer in September 1998. This political transition raised questions on whether the foreign policy of Kohl government would continue. However, Chancellor Gerhard Schröder led both the first military campaign of the Germany since the World War II and presided over EU's activities. German ground troops took place in Kosovo Force (KFOR) and contributed fully armed peacekeeping. The German government sent 8500 soldiers to the KFOR.

Following the Kosovo Crisis, the debate on evolution of the ESDP came to the agenda of the EU more intensively. In this respect, Cologne Summit was an important step on the road to the ESDP. Germany's Foreign Minister Fischer advocated that the evolution of the ESDP must be based on the ideals of *Zivilmacht*, emphasizing non-military dimensions of European security. For Fischer, the evolution of EU's security and defence capability did not mean 'a militarization of the EU', it meant EU's acquisition of 'an effective and decisive power which is able, as was the case in Kosovo, to bolster the rule of law and renounce violence and thereby to consign war as a political tool in Europe to the past' Therefore, Germany searched for affecting the EU's security policy with non-military instruments that signified political cooperation rather than military intervention. The stability Pact aimed at security stability through democracy-building, economic development and respect for humanity. According to Miskimmon, the main dichotomy of Germany

about the CESDP is whether Germany has desire for establishment of machinery for CESDP without first having a clear vision as the use of that machinery.[304]

As implication of above mentioned issues, it can be argued that Germany, at least in principle, can take part in NATO or EU's military operations beyond traditional missions of collective defence. However, the shift in Germany's security policy has mainly been political, rather than military. It is expected that reform of the armed forces, the Bundeswehr is unlikely to receive financial and political support that is required.[305]

Maull pointed out a number of reasons that cast doubt on Germany's contribution to European defence through resources or energy. Firstly, Germany's involvement to any intervention that was grounded by humanitarian actions has resulted in a backlash. Consequently, the lively discussion on pros and cons of military crisis management and preventive policies. Secondly, this illussionment with humanitarian intervention has given rise to emphasis on conflict prevention. Thirdly, Germany's responsibilities and commitments in the Balkans and within the context of the recent European defence efforts have meant a necessity for restructuring of Bundeswehr with a specific emphasis on crisis reaction forces. However, Bundeswehr doesn't have sufficient financial resources for restructuring itself. For the foreseeable future, this implies that the Bundeswehr will unlikely to contribute European or NATO operations with additional forces.[306]

---

[304] For details see Alister John Miskimmon, "Recasting The Security Bargains: Germany, European Security Policy and the Transatlantic Relationship" in Douglas Weber (ed), New Europe,New Germany, Old Foreign Policy, (Britain: Frank Cass, 2001). pp.93-101

[305] Maull, op.cit., pp.56-57

[306] Maull, op.cit, pp .73-75

In the future, it is expected that the use of the Bundeswehr will have to take place due to compelling or emotive reasons that touch on Germany's principal values. Moreover, the Bundeswehr did not operate on its own; it will act with partners or within allies.

Although Germany will contribute to provide support for the evolution of a more integrated political and military machinery for ESDP, it continues to regard military power as an instrument for achievement of political ends. In this sense, Germany has not accepted the military power with wide range of implications of ESDP. [307]

4.4. Britain's Approach to the EU-NATO Relations

The British view of European defence is distinguished from other major European players in several aspects. Above all, historically speaking, Britain was inclined to avert the idea of European defence integration. The British prepared to defence cooperation in Europe, it did not want to involve an integrated structure. Secondly, the British understanding of Europe is different. Britain have feared about the domination of Europe by a single power, thus strove for prevention of this kind of domination. Despite the fact that Britain has been one of the major players of Europe, Britain has not conceived itself as the leader of Europe owing to cultural and philosophical differences between continental Europe and Britain. In terms of united Europe, Britain has the perception of a united Europe that always involves the risk of being against Britain.[308] Thirdly, the British conceptualization of defence is not similar to that of many European states. The defence of the territory from

---

[307] Ibid, p.77

[308] David Chuter, " The United Kingdom", in Howorth and Memon (eds), The European Union and National Defence Policy, (London: Routledge,1997) , pp.105-107

conventional attack has not been a concern for Britain owing to its geographical position of island. Taking part in military forces particularly the army has been seen as a kind of profession or career that does not differ from other professions of business life very much. Besides, the armed forces have fostered a narrow professionalism that excludes much affiliation with politics. Unlike from the many European practices, the career civil servants take important part in the management and finance of the defence programme. [309]

Influenced by this legacy, the Britain systematically prefers to stay outside the EEC/EC, the EU's initiatives related with defence or international security from 1947/48 to 1997/98. During this period, Atlanticism became main reference point of Britain. This was resulted from four reasons: confidence and closeness to the US; non-existence of confidence in the European pretender and concern about the discrimination against non-EU NATO members. Yet, more important than these, Britain feared that any moment towards European autonomy would undermine the Alliance by pushing the USA towards isolationism.[310]

Following the end of the Cold War, Britain's Atlanticist attitude did not change dramatically. In this respect, the protection of NATO as the security anchor of Europe and the continuation of military presence of the US in Europe has been major concern of British security policy. Consequently, Britain has characterized by a 'status quo power ' by some analysts since it did not consider any major departures in its security policy to adapt itself to a dramatically changed international

---

[309] Ibid. p.112

[310] Jolyon Howorth, " Britain, NATO and CESDP: Fixed Strategy, Changing Tactics", *European Foreign Affairs Review,* vol 5., pp.377-378

environment.[311] With regard to a 'status quo power' feature of Britain, Michael Clarke points out that if the British care ambiguous about what might be constructed, they are very certain about what has to be preserved in any kind of European security arrangements. According to Clarke, the British has been keen on preserving three core elements. The first element has been the preservation of the US's interest and involvement in European security issues. From the perspective of Britain, US's involvement in European security is an essential factor that would be difficult to go without. Because the US supplies such tangible economic and military resources that can not be substituted by Europeans. Besides these tangible economic and military resources, the US provides the intangible, but enormous value of interest for European security. Secondly, the British wants to preserve their special relationship with the US. Although this special relationship was relevant in the conditions of the Cold War, it continued with reappearances. Thirdly, Britain is in need of maintaining room for political military manoeuvre. In this regard, the British policy makers want to have both the opportunity and the desire to obtain some flexibility in the way of their deployment of forces. In line with this third element, Britain advocated strict intergovernmentalism concerning to defence and security issues in IGC of 1996-1997. The rationale behind strict intergovernmentalism was to guarantee certain degree of freedom of manoeuvre to pursue both "external interests" and requirements of domestic unity".[312]

The point that must be noted that Britain insisted on preservation of long-standing attitudes in the environment where the status quo is rapidly changing. From

---

[311] Aggestam, op.cit, p.99

[312] Michael Clarke, " British Security Policy", in Kjell Eliassen (ed), <u>Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union</u>, (London: Sage Publications, 1998) , pp.127-130

the British perspective, security arrangements of the Cold War proved themselves and provided some kind of predictability in international behavior. Western alliance succeeded in performing collective defence task. Therefore, it would not be meaningful to challenge these institutions. Moreover, given the vagueness of institutional arrangement of the new era, British have advocated a step by step process of change. [313]

Although the Britain tried to maintain the presence of the US in Europe, the US decided to be more selective in terms of its involvement into security crisis in Europe due to the dramatic changes of the post-Cold war era. This led Britain to give more importance to the balance of power within the Europe. [314]

Britain advocated the development of a robust military capacity *within* NATO. In this regard, Britain played a prominent role in the establishment of a European defence and security capacity. Yet, Britain always regarded the ESDI as a NATO project. However, as a consequence of the disagreement between the Atlanticist states and the other Europeans, the ESDI did not go beyond the ambiguous idea. It suffered from competing visions of Atlanticists and Europeanists. While the latter contemplated an ESDI that was separate but associated with NATO, the former regarded ESDI as a means of strengthening NATO. The Europeanist approach appeared to be faded as 1997 turned into 1998 and PfP became the primary project of NATO, instead of ESDI. Meanwhile, the crises in Albania (Spring 1997) and Kosovo (1998-1999) revealed European's dependency to US for military operations other

---

[313] Ibid., p.143

[314] Stuart Gordon, "The United Kingdom: between a rock and a soft place", in Martin A. Smith, Graham Timmins (eds) Uncertain Europe : Building a new European Security Order, (New York: Routledge, 2001), p.154

than medium scale policing of an existing political settlement. These crises indicated the urgent European need for effective political and military institutional capability. By the end of 1997, the main actors in the EU and Britain reached a conclusion that an effective European capacity had become a condition, rather than a threat for the survival of the NATO.[315]

The profound shift in British approach to European defence took place in Franco-British Summit at Saint Malo on 3-4 December 1998. Hence, despite the fact that France took a prominent part in European security activities until the St. Malo, beginning from the December 1998, the UK played a leadership role in each step of European security initiatives. Although St. Malo, in essence, marked a Franco-British dialogue on the issue of defence, both powers regarded CESDP from different starting points. While the Britain sees it guaranteeing the survival and consolidation of NATO as the main object of the ESDP, France's point of departure has been the need to construct and consolidate a European policy. [316]

According to Jolyon Howorth, the primary motivation for this shift of policy undertaken by Blair government has been giving the EU genuine capacity in the defence and security field; in order to strengthen and perpetuate the Atlantic Alliance. As an implication of these motivations, the UK wanted to provide the EU with a robust and responsible decision-making capability in the defence and security issues. [317] In this regard, the institutions that has established following the Helsinki were mainly proposed by the UK government.

---

[315] Howorth, " Britain, NATO...,"op.cit.., pp .381-382.

[316] Ibid, pp.387-388.

[317] Ibid, pp.384-385.

103

St. Malo represented the stepping stones of closer defence cooperation between Britain and France. Seen from London, St. Malo agreement was partly linked with the idea of European defence cooperation that operates with shifting coalitions of forces potentially independent from the US and having flexible and task based orientation. Despite the fact, Franco-British relations have been considered as a rivalry, St. Malo agreement referred to symbolic step towards Franco-British security partnership. Shortly after St. Malo, Tony Blair pointed out convergence of British and the US interests and fundamental ideas in world politics. This close relations with the US and the objective of preserving NATO let British politicians to perceive themselves as a bridge as a mediator between the US and Europe.[318]

Although the Blair government declared its enthusiasm for the ESDP, it also underlined the fact that Britain did not endorse the EU's fulfillment of collective defence task and the reaction of any standing army. Moreover, the UK did not view the CESDP as a way of creating a 'European Superstate'. The UK's support for ESDP can be perceived as 'the action of a middle-ranking power no longer able to pursue objectives alone'. Britain attempted to create capabilities to obtain political options other than an unpredictable dependency to the US. As Gordon stated, unless Britain chooses definitively between the US and Europe.. Britain remains between a rock and soft place. [319]

---

[318] Aggestam, op.cit., pp.99-100.

[319] Gordon, op.cit., pp.166 167.

CHAPTER 5

THE OBSTACLES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EU-
NATO RELATIONS

In this chapter, we address main challenges for the evolution the EU-NATO relations. We examine these challenges in three parts: military capabilities gap, twin enlargement of the EU-NATO with a view to membership issue and financial constraints.

5.1. Military Capabilities Gap

Before explaining the EU's efforts for developing an effective and credible European military capabilities, let me clarify the concept of military capability. Capabilities do not mean a combination or list of assets like mechanised infantry battalions, mine-sweepers, strike air-craft. Therefore, when a state or organization has an asset, this does not necessarily imply that it owns a capability. Unless the asset is relevant for the task given, a capability does not exist. To be a capability, an asset needs the relevant level of training, equipment, deployability, sustainability and effectiveness. [320]

The physical assets of combat formations and support structures are named as forces, while attributes or performance characteristics refers to capability. [321] Throughout the Cold War period, the European military establishments had given

---

[320] Hans-Christian Hagman, European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities, (Oxford: International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 353, 2002), p.13

[321] Hans Binnendjik and Richard Kugler, " Transforming European Forces", *Survival*, Vol.44, No.3, 2002, p.125

importance to fighting continental wars close to their home. They had specialized on 'homeland defence' role and provided troops, tanks, air defence, antisubmarine for NATO. The Europeans hadn't been concerned with intelligence satellites, command systems and offensive counter-operations. Following the end of the Cold War, the Europeans realized that their large, mainly conscript armies were needed restructuring and were not suitable for deployment outside of NATO area. In this respect, the Gulf War became the first wake-up call.[322]

Kosovo Crisis in 1998-1999 became a watershed on the way to the establishment of robust European defence. Having seen Serb's unwillingness to respect basic human rights, the prospect of humanitarian catastrophe and the risk of regional instability, NATO members decided to intervene in Kosovo Crisis.[323] NATO's operation *Allied Force* started on 24 March 1999. Operation Allied Force was made up of mostly air operations with the participation of 14 of NATO members. Czech Republic, Iceland, Luxembourg and Poland did not involve the operation since they did not have relevant capabilities and Greece opted out to participate due to the political reasons.[324]

Operation Allied Force in Kosovo revealed transatlantic disparities in terms of military power, particularly high tech intelligence gathering, command systems and precision-guided weaponry. Although the US flew half of the air combat missions, it carried out 80% of the strike missions. In a similar vein, more than 90 %

---

[322] Andréani *et all*, op.cit., p.54

[323] Martin Ortega, Military Intervention and The European Union, (Paris: The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2001), p.25

[324] David Yost, "The NATO Capabilities Gap and The European Union", *Survival*, Vol.42, No.4, Winter 2000-2001, p. 103

of the smart weapons were refueled by the US aircraft.[325] Some capabilities like offensive electronic warfare, airborne command and control, all-weather precision munitions, air-to-air refueling and mobile target acquisitions were only and mostly provided by the US. The Europeans made contribution to operation Allied Force with combat air patrol, air-to-ground strike operations in good weather, surveillance, reconnaissance and battle-damage assessment with unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and manned aircraft like Tornados, Standard IVPs and Mirage IVPs. The Allies other than the US made 97 % of the air to ground strike sorties, however, the Europeans and Canadians' operations and actions were mainly relied on good weather conditions. Furthermore, the Operation Allied Force highlighted information systems that give rise to interoperability challenges. [326]With regard to Europe's military deficiencies in Kosovo experience, George Robertson, the NATO Secretary General and Former British Secretary of State for Defence pointed out that:

> The Kosovo air campaign demonstrated just how dependent the European Allies had become on US military capabilities. From precision-guided weapons and all weather aircraft to ground troops that can get to the crisis quickly and that stay there with adequate logistical support, the European Allies did not have enough of right stuff. On the paper, Europe has 2 million men and women under arms –more than the United States. But despite those 2 million soldiers, it was a struggle to come up with 40000 troops to deploy as peacekeepers in the Balkans. Something is wrong, and Europe knows it[327]

European's military shortfalls that revealed in operation Allied Force in Kosovo provided driving force for the emergence of the US-led NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI). As a matter of fact, the DCI originated in June 1998 to point out the increasing technological discrepancy between the US and its NATO

---

[325] Andréani *et all*, op.cit., pp.54-57

[326] Yost, op.cit., pp. 103-105

[327] Lord Robertson, " Rebalancing NATO for a Strong Europe", remarks at tha Defence Week Conference, 31 January 2000, quoted in Yost., op.cit., p.99

allies. With the Europe's military deficiencies in Kosovo, the DCI was turned into NATO's policy. The DCI depicted 58 vital areas for upgrading NATO's capabilities ranging from deployability and mobility, sustainability and logistics to effective engagement, command and control and information systems. NATO's DCI was interpreted differently by the member states of the Alliance. Eastern European NATO members regarded the DCI as a long-run project that would be possible after they finished adaptation of their armed forces. Smaller NATO countries approved the DCI, yet, they expressed that their contribution would be marginal in large, high-tech projects. The UK and France perceived it as recognition of restructuring of their military establishments. Germany approved the DCI selectively, and interested in solely 3 elements: strategic lift, command and control and intelligence. On the other side, the US has viewed the DCI as a means of pushing its allies to the 'field of 21st century force'. [328]

The point in the development of the DCI was to motivate the Europeans to improve and upgrade their military capabilities, so that they can intervene the crisis more rapidly. Although the DCI envisaged the procurement of equipment, it also involved training standards and other kinds of cooperation that could facilitate operations and actions of allied forces together.[329] Despite the fact that DCI goals incorporated into NATO's defence-planning process, no deadline for the achievement of goals was specified. [330]

---

[328] Hagman, op.cit., pp.15-17

[329] Kori Shake, " Constructive Duplication: Reducing EU Reliance on US Military Assets", CER paper, available on line at www.cer.org.uk p.13

[330] Yost, op.cit, p.119.

Today, the outcome of the DCI can be summarised as follows: the DCI was beneficial since it provided a comprehensive list of measures without pushing defence budgets through ceiling. Rather than focusing on a limited number of specific forces, it had a more general approach and impact on spreading its measures across the entire European defence postures. [331] However, the DCI failed to fulfill its ambitious goals, therefore, its success has been very limited. It resulted in funding of less than half of DCI's identified goals[332] and made little contribution to the development of European military capabilities.[333]

Following the NATO's Washington Summit, member states of the EU declared their intention to improve EU's military capabilities at the Cologne European Council Summit in the following terms.

> The focus of our efforts therefore would be to assure that the European Union has at its disposal the necessary capabilities (including military capabilities and appropriate structures for effective EU decision-making in crisis management within the scope of the Petersberg tasks. This is the area where a European capacity to act is required most urgently. The development of an EU military crisis management capacity is to be seen as an activity within the framework of the CFSP[334]

A month after the Cologne Summit, Anglo-Italian 'Joint Declaration Launching the European Defence Capabilities Initiative' proposed a concrete

---

[331] Binnendjik& Kugler, op.cit., p.126.

[332] Shake, op.cit., p. 13.

[333] Hagman, op.cit., p.18.

[334] Cologne EU Summit, Presidency Report on Streghtening of the Common European Policy on Security and defece/ Guiding principles

approach for improvement of military capabilities. In this regard, they suggested definitive targets and objectives for improvement of European capabilities.[335]

In November 1999, the auditing of assets and capabilities of European states that were available for Petersberg tasks carried out by the WEU. The WEU audit of assets stressed on the areas that need improving for realization of autonomous operations. The concession of the audit underlined European forces' weaknesses in military strategic lift. The audit also pointed out very limited capabilities in areas like intelligence provision both at the level of strategic political and military, deployable secure tactical communications in theatre, psychological warfare. Although the findings of the audit were not binding, the EU could make use of it as spring board towards Helsinki Headline Goal approved at Helsinki EU Council in December 1999.[336]

The Headline Goal composed at the Helsinki Council of the European Union was stated as follows:

> To develop European capabilities, Member States have set themselves the headline goal: by the 2003, cooperating together voluntarily, they will be able to deploy rapidly and then sustain forces capable of the full range of Petersberg tasks as set out in the Amsterdam Treaty, including the most demanding, in operations up to the corps level (up to 15 brigades or 50.000 or 60.000 persons). These forces should be militarily self-sustaining with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support services and additionally, as appropriate, air and naval elements. Member states should be able to deploy in full at this level within 60 days, and within this to provide smaller rapid response elements available and deployable for at least one year.[337]

---

[335] Shepherd, Alistair, J., K., "Top-Down or Bottom-Up: Is Security and Defence Policy in the EU a Question of Political Will or Military Capability", *European Security* ,Vol.9, No. 2, Summer 2000, p.16.

[336] Hagman, op.cit., pp.18-20

[337] Conclusions of the Helsinki European Council.

Being an inspired idea, the Helsinki Headline Goal demonstrated the required capability improvements from various countries within comprehensive and politically attractive package. Following the Helsinki Summit, the Headline Goal broke down and refined into specific goals that were attributed to individual countries within a top-down framework. In this regard, the EU Capabilities Commitment Conference took place in November 2000. EU defence ministers tried to reconcile the needs of the headline goal with the rational commitments offer. As a result, two catalogue named the Helsinki Headline Catalogue (HHC) and Helsinki Force Catalogue (HFC) elaborated "the required number of troops, transport aircraft, field hospitals, aircraft carriers, armored vehicles, command systems etc." in line with operational scenarios.[338] HFC composed of EU member states contributions to Petersberg missions and EU partner nations like Norway and Turkey. So, while HHC represented operational demand side, HFC referred to supply side. The gaps and shortfalls between two catalogues gave rise to a third catalogue so called the Helsinki Progress Catalogue (HPC), which became most tangible driving force/impetus behind the force planning process. [339]

In November 2001, the EU's foreign and defence ministers gathered for the EU Capability Improvement Conference in order to evaluate HPC. The EU Member States confirmed their pledges to Capability Improvement Conference and claimed to meet two thirds of the 144 capability requirements identified. They also noted that the progress on the improvement of military capabilities wouldn't be completed by 2003

---

[338] Sten Rynning, " Why Not NATO? Military Planning in The European Union", *the Journal of Strategic Studies,* Vol.26," NO.1, 2003, p.59

[339] Ibid. p.55

and moreover, certain shortfalls would not be fulfilled until at least 2008. [340] Furthermore, at the conference the EU Member States decided to address the shortcomings identified in European Capability Action Plan (ECAP). The ECAP was aimed at rectifying the deficiencies of Headline Goal process. It divided shortcomings identified in the several parts "where a pilot country or group of countries would constitute leading Groups' to progress capability implementation.[341] The plan proposed a forum for addressing requirements, improving multilateral coordination and fostering rational efforts on capabilities. The plan advocated the multinational solutions that could involve "the co-production, financing, acquisition or capabilities", especially for large-scale projects. [342]

Although EU Documents refrained from referring to NATO's DCI, both DCI and the EU's headline goal included overlapping elements. Both of the documents advocated improvement of command, control, communications and intelligence sustainability and strategic mobility of ground forces. DCI was distinguished from the EU's headline goal in that it emphasized more on power projection and precision strike. Additionally, DCI pointed out urgent need for defences against Cruise and ballistic missiles, chemical and biological weapons and improved electronic attack capabilities which did not take place in Helsinki Headline Goal. [343]

According to James Thomas:

---

[340] European Security Review, No. 9, Dec. 2001, p. 1

[341] Rynning, op.cit., p.55

[342] Hagman, op.cit., p.24

[343] Yost, op.cit, p.119

meeting the requirements of the most difficult Petersberg tasks would also furnish many of the capabilities needed to participate alongside US forces in large-scale combat operations in or beyond Europe. This would help to reconcile the EU's Headline and Capability Goals with NATO's DCI objectives of improved deployability, logistics, strike assets, force protection and communications, command and control.[344]

According to Hagman, the Headline Goal has been mainly a political project and focused on the Petersberg tasks, which marked the lowest common denominator among the EU member states. He underlined that most of the European governments have their own interpretations with regard to Headline Goal. EU Member States agreed to create a rapid reaction force of 60000 personnel. Concerned to challenges relating to achievement of Headline Goal, one-year sustainability, sixty-day readiness and self-sustainability has constituted major challenges. With regard to sustainability, building up a 60000 soldiers force that involve a considerable part of Europe's assets and military capabilities has been important commitment. Linked with commitments of other nations involving European military operation the availability and rotation of troops may cause problems. Given the deployment of 60000 soldiers in threat by NATO more than 60 days, with the support of US strategic lift, EU member states will unlikely deploy 60000 soldiers at a short notice of time. In a similar vein, militarily self sustaining headline goal force that have required intelligence, transport and communication and control capabilities has not be easy to tackle.[345]

For the assessment of the implementation of the Headline Goal, Tania M. Chacko made use of a planning tool named Operation Plan (OPLAN), employed also by EU Military Committee. Hence, she aimed to provide a methodological tool for

---

[344] James Thomas, The military Challenges of Transatlantic Coalitions, Adelphi paper 333, London: Oxford Press for the ISSS, 2000, Quoted in Yost, *op.cit.*, p. 120

[345] Hagman, op.cit. pp.36-39

113

the assessment of Headline Goal. The importance of the OPLAN is that it precludes all elements required to determine the stages for the achievement of EU's operational rapid reaction force capability. According to her study, the EU should at least provide three elements for the achievement of an operational rapid deployment capability by 2003: clear mission guidance to military commanders; improved and integrated intelligence capabilities and strategic airlift; and increased defence funding. [346]

Following the EU's Helsinki Summit, NATO allies agreed on the establishment of the NATO Response Force (NRF) at NATO's Prague Summit in 2002. The NRF is envisaged to be a technologically advanced, flexible and readily deployable under short notice of the North Atlantic Council requests. Therefore, it will be interoperable and sustainable for a least 30 days without resupply. In this way, it wil not be a permenant or standing force. Full operational of NRF is planned by October 2006. A wide range of tasks such as a flag-force deterring agression, crisis-response operations are included the tasks of NRF. Being a joint multinational force, the NRF will consist of troops taken from several pools of forces with rotating status while military command will be change of the strategic comander of operations.[347]

Concerned to the ERRF and NRF relations, several challenges have been pointed out.. Firstly, the EU member states are not able to develop a concensus on interpretation of the Petersberg tasks. While France advocates EU's involvement in major operations with combat component, Britain argues taht high intensity crisis

[346] Tania M. Chacko, "Implementing Headline Goal, The military aspect", in Joachim Krause, Andreas Wenger, Lisa Watanabe (eds) Unraveling the European Security and Defence Policy Conundrum, (Bern et al:Loc: Peter Lang, 2003), p.50

[347] Daniel Riggio, " EU-NATO Cooperation and Complementarity between the Rapid Reaction Forces", *International Spectator*, Vol.XXXVIII, No.3, 2003, p.49

management operations remain outside the scope of the Petersberg declaration. Other countries like Sweden and Finland have been willing to support coercive operations and articulated the condition of specific mandate by the Un Security Council. Secondly, the use of planning capacities has been another contentious issue. Some nations, particularly France, have been many of NATO's de facto veto over the potential EU-led crisis management and recommended an autonomous planning capacity. Thirdly, the transatlantic capability gap raises difficulties about interoperability of NRF and ERRF. Finally, legal and political considerations for the activation of both ERF and NRF affects the efficiency of military opearations.[348]

5.2. The Twin Enlargement of the EU and NATO and Its Implications on the EU-NATO Relations

The end of the Cold War caused the EU and NATO member states to reconsider both the European integration process and the European security structure. The main aim of this reconsideration was to provide supportive political response for post communist transformation of the Central and Eastern European States (CEES). [349] In this regard, being as the part of both the EU and NATO, enlargement process has been means of creating stability in Europe's periphery. [350] Moreover, both

---

[348] Ibid., pp.52-55

[349] Martin A.Smith and Graham Timmins, Building a Bigger Europe: EU and NATO Enlargement in Comparative Perspective, England:Ashgate Publishing, 2000), p.3

[350] Per Carlsen, "NATO and the EU: Assessing prospects and options for genuine co-operation", (Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies Report 2003/2, 2003), pp.1-2.

enlargement process is closely interrelated since the stabilization of Europe space involves economic and military aspect security. [351]

In so far as NATO enlargement is concerned, NATO's eastward enlargement came into the agenda within the framework of NATO's adjustment to the Post-Cold War circumstances. The rationale behind this enlargement was to help exporting stability to east Europe and prevent the existence of a security vacuum in Central and Eastern Europe. [352]

In this respect, NATO's Eastern agenda has been shaped in three different stages. The first stage, between early 1990s and NATO's Madrid Summit in 1997, marked the period that main decisions for NATO's Eastern Policy were made. The establishment of North Atlantic Council and Partnership for Peace was the good illustrations of this era. The second stage started following the NATO's Madrid Summit and end with NATO's Washington Summit in 1999. Kosovo crisis, the debate on NATO's new strategic concept and initiatives for harmonization of attitudes of NATO and the EU towards crisis management were the major issues of this era.[353] With the Prague Summit of NATO in November 2002, third stage started. In this stage, seven countries-namely Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia were invited to join NATO. Therefore, important steps were taken on the way to overcoming division of Europe. [354]

---

[351] Julian Lindley-French, 'Dilemmas of NATO Enlargement', in <u>Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy</u>, Howorth Jolyon; Keeler John T.S (eds), (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

[352] F. Stephen Larrabee, <u>NATO's Eastern Agenda in a New Strategic Era</u>, (RAND: 2003) , p. 1

[353] <u>Ibid.</u> p.2

[354] <u>Ibid</u>.p.3

In addition to NATO, the EC became another institutional framework for Central Europe's adaptation to a new security environment. The 'Europe Agreements' were signed between the Post-Communist Central Europe and the EC. [355]Enlargement is seen as a "security policy in its own right" since it has extended the norms, rules, opportunities and constraints of the EU to accession states. Therefore, it makes instability and conflict less likely in the wider Europe. Also, new members of the EU have brought interest and skills that enhance the scope of common external policies. To illustrate, the Southern Enlargements of 1980s took part in the completion of transition from post authoritarianism to democracy, consolidation of Community's presence in the Mediterranean basin and extension to the European influence to the Americas.[356]

Along with the EU and NATO enlargement processes, EU has given impetus to the development of ESDP. Particularly, the decisions made at Cologne and Helsinki European Council on the establishment of RRF and the creation of political and military institutions were important advances for providing the EU with a defence role and operational military capability. EU's evolving ESDP together with twin enlargement of the EU and NATO has raised questions about the future development of ESDP, the linkage between Europeanization of defence and the enlargement of the EU and NATO.[357]

---

[355] Vladimir Bilcik., "ESDP and the Security Policy Priorities and Perspectives of Central European EU Countries", in Joachim Krause, Andreas Wenger, Lisa Watanabe (eds) <u>Unraveling the European Security and Defence Policy Conundrum</u>, (Bern et al:Loc: Peter Lang, 2003) ., pp.126-127

[356] Antonio Missiroli , " EU Enlargement and CFSP/ ESDP", *European Integration*, Vol.25, 2003.p.

[357] Andrew Cottey, " The European Dimension of Defence Reform: From the WEU to the EU's New Defence Role" in Gyarnati,I., Winkler T., (eds), <u>Post Cold War Defence Reform Lessons Learned in Europe and United State</u>s, (Washington: Brassey's Inc., 2002 , pp.19-20

Generally speaking, NATO membership has been security priority of CEES due to the guarantees of collective defence. Thus, NATO membership became a more pressing priority to the EU membership. While most of the EU member states were discussing on the evolution of the ESDP, the majority of the EU candidate states were making effort for joining NATO. Additionally, the candidate states wanted to maintain their transatlantic link due to partly historical experience and partly from their threat perception. Having felt more exposed to dangers of instability perhaps more than West European States, CEES stressed on continuation of US engagement in Europe. Therefore, the EU candidate states have invested intensively in gaining and maintaining NATO membership. [358] In the late 1990s, candidate states from Central and Middle Europe responded defensively to the launch of the ESDP since they gave importance to their relationship with NATO and the US. They feared that their involvement to the ESDP could impede NATO's internal cohesion and get Americans out of Europe. The states which were not a member of NATO concerned that their involvement to the ESDP could be seen as an alternative to the future NATO membership. The EU candidate states who were NATO member suspected about a clearly defined relationship with the Alliance. Their attitudes have evolved in time and their fear was overcome on the way to the accession. Particularly, the Helsinki Headline Goal for the establishment of the ERRF caused a more positive attitude for them, though some residual ambivalence on the implications of the ESDP still exist.[359] From the perspective of CEES, the development of ESDP is beneficial in principle as long as it does not give rise to a weakening of NATO or the transatlantic

---

[358] Bilcik.,op.cit. p.133-134

[359] Missiroli, " *EU Enlargement and...*", op.cit.., pp.3-4

relations. They perceive the US presence in Europe as a sine quo non for European Security. In this respect, they favor Atlanticism and put themselves on the side of Britain, Spain and Italy on security and defence issues. Their entrance to the EU seems to strengthen the Atlanticist view in the EU; hence, it can be difficult for Europeanists to push the EU as a counterweight to the US. It is predicted that accession of CEES will make it harder for them to speak with one voice on foreign and security issues.[360] Furthermore, Central and Middle Europe states, whether already NATO members or just prospect ones, they do not want to be pushed for a choice between NATO and the EU on security matters. Thus, they have been very satisfied with the 'Berlin Plus' agreement between the EU and NATO in mid December 2002.[361]

In regard to the effect of the twin enlargement of NATO and the EU, scholars argued diverging views. According to Missiroli the new ten partners would pay more attention to the US and NATO and concentrate intensely on Russia and neighborhood issues and less on other geographical regions. They would not dramatically alter the general sensitivities present in the EU about the ESDP matters. [362]Moreover, they do not have overseas interests or extensions due to historical and geographical reasons. Unlike the previous enlargements, the latest enlargement has not entail an important widening of the horizons of the Union's external policies.

---

[360] Larrabee, op.cit,. p.36

[361] Missiroli, " EU Enlargement and ...", op.cit., p.8

[362] Ibid.., p. 12

Nevertheless, they have a strong interest in foreign policies of enlarged union which may influence their immediate neighbor. [363]

According to Vladimir Bilcik, enlargement brings both opportunities and problems concerned to the future effectiveness and cohesion of the ESDP. For Bilcik, the potential positive contribution can be the endurance of a strong transatlantic link and future formation of the EU's eastern policy. However, uncertainities, concerns and even confusion on transatlantic relations and the ESDP developments are still present. Given the EU's involvement in ESDP, absence of clarity about ESDP's direction in relation with NATO seems obstacle for the future success of ESDP in the future. [364] Apart from these problems, the EU enlargement has offered some positive gains for more visible and meaningful EU role in international politics. Despite their financial and military constraints, the new EU members have potential to bring fresh ideas, regional initiatives to the enlarged Union. [365]

With regard to implications of these on Central and Eastern European states, it is argued that the development of the CESDP has caused a crucial political pressure for CEES to contribute to the military capabilities of the EU. Secondly, the creation of new CESDP institutions equipped the EU with means for evaluating military capabilities of CEES and then offering ways for enhancing their military capabilities. Thirdly, political and military cooperation between the EU and CEES is likely to foster CEES's western oriented security and defence policies and their political operability with the EU. This evolving relationship is likely to confirm CEES's trend

---

[363] Ibid. p.8

[364] Bilcik, op.cit,. p.120.

[365] Ibid., p.143.

towards building smaller, more professional armed forces that focus on peace keeping and enforcement operations. [366]

In this connection, Julian Lindley-French proposed optimistic and pessimistic scenarios for the impact of NATO enlargement on NATO-EU relations. From optimistic point of view, NATO enlargement could help to reinforce interlocking institutions, endorse the EU-NATO relations and create a broad security guarantee in the European security space in collaboration with the OSCE. From pessimistic point of view, this could lead Russia toward an aggression posture, duplicate OSCE, enhance the military role of the EU, which may undermine that of NATO and thereby impede the basic political consensus and military mission of the Atlantic Alliance. [367]In addition to these scenarios, Lindley-French expressed the problems of NATO enlargement that have influenced the EU. Firstly, NATO enlargement put political pressure on EU to enlarge itself. Secondly, it exacerbates asymmetric membership that renders interinstitutional relations between the EU and NATO more complicated. Third, this complexity leaves both institutions "politically paralyzed with the result that everybody, member and candidate alike, find themselves in a kind of political no mans land."[368]In order to reduce the complexity, Lindley-French offered coordination of the EU-NATO membership. In the words of her, European security is a function of economic security, as well as military security. Instead of competing for scarce resources, NATO and EU enlargements must be

---

[366] Cottey, op.cit., .p.31.

[367] Julian Lindley-French, op.cit. p.183

[368]Ibid., p.185.

coordinated to include force improvements and economic packages to facilitate EU and NATO membership.[369]

5.3. Financial Constraints

The financing of the ESDP has been one of the obstacles for an effective and complementary relationship between the EU and NATO. Initially, the financial aspect of CFSP was formulated in Article J.11 of the Maastrict Treaty as follows:

> Administrative expenditures which the provisions relating to the areas referred to in this Title entailed for the institutions shall be charged to the budget of the European Communities.
>
> The Council may also either decide unanimously that operational expenditure to which the implementation of those provisions gives rise is to be charged to the budgets of the European Communities; in that event, the budgetary procedure laid down in the Treaty stabling the European Community shall be applicable; or determine that such expenditure shall be charged to the member states, where appropriate in accordance with a scale to be decided.

Under the terms of this provision, the interpretation of separating 'operating' expenditure from 'expenditure' causes problems. This problem firstly emerged in October 1993, when the EU decided to engage in two-year civilian administration of Western Bosnian town of Mostar in ex Yugoslavia. With the inclusion of 'Petersberg tasks' to the Amsterdam Treaty, the scope of possible CFSP operations were broadened. Article J.11 was modified and became Article 28 of the Maastricht Treaty,which is still in force. In accordance with these provisions, administrative expenditure is covered by the EU budget under a community instrument while operating expenditure is met by either the EU budget or not. [370]

---

[369] Ibid., p.197

[370] Antonio Missiroli, "€uros for ESDP", (Paris: ISIS, Occasional Paper 45, 2003) , p.6

In the case of NATO, NATO missions are financed in compliance with the principle of 'cost lie where they fall'. In this regard, NATO allies pay for the personnel and equipment. With respect to budget, NATO's civil budget is covered mainly by appropriations of ministries of foreign affairs whereas military budget is founded by the that of Defence Ministries. [371]

Concerned to financial limitations of the EU, it has been argued that the EU's all ambitious goals and the proposals for more capable European forces necessitate serious investment. Despite EU member states' efforts for restructuring their forces, they do not increase the money allocated for expensive enabling capabilities substantially. [372] Given the defence budgets in real terms, they are not adequate enough to finance either new capabilities or maintain force levels over a period of time[373]. On the other side, there are good arguments that express the EU's present military spending is enough to fulfill Europe's strategic challenges since Europe does not have the same level commitments with the US.[374] To illustrate, François Heisbourg articulated that Europe's problems concerned to its defence capabilities and defence identity are not resulted from inadequate defence spending. European members of NATO spend 60 percent of the US's spending on defence. Taking into account the lack of collective defence commitments of European allies outside the NATO area, this ratio must be more than required to tackle with contingencies both inside and along the periphery of Europe. The problem is that the

---

[371] Ibid. pp. 18-19

[372] Timoty Garden, "The Future of ESDP- Defence Capabilities For Europe", *The International Spectator*, Vol XXXVIII, No.3, 2003, p.10.

[373] Ibid..

[374] Andréani *et all*. op.cit., p. 55

Europeans can not get 60 percent of US' capabilities as a return of their defence spending. Many of the European NATO allies' defence budget structures are 'out of sync' with the requirements of the Post Cold War conditions. Moreover, European defence relies too much on territorially based force structure but too little on sustainable firepower ready for where needed. Among EU members, particularly Britain and France allocate a similar ratio of their defence budgets to acquisition, operations and maintenance to that of the US. Hence, the Europeans have to improve the efficiency of their defence spending but a combination of approaches like depiction of force goals, improving budget structures (namely 'input criteria') and pooling key capabilities (called 'mutualisation' by French) such as air transport assets.[375] In the light of this fact, it is stated that Europe's real problem is not spending more, but spending better. In other words, the crux of the matter is that the Europeans get less value for the money they spend. There are two main reasons for this output gap. The first one is the European governments' defence spending on the wrong things due to numerous European armies, they don't allocate enough of their defence budgets to procurement, research or development. Secondly, European defence budgets varies differently with regard on to what the money is spent on. [376]

In response to these debates, alternative ways of increasing efficiency of European defence spending are suggested. A good illustration of this is the pooling. Complementary pressures have been put on European nations to begin pooling some of their force elements. Firstly, pooling provides opportunity to decrease overhead costs and thus allows for the prospect of using released resources to fund new

---

[375] François Heisbourg, 'European Defence Takes a Leap Forward', NATO Review, Spring/Summer 2000, available at http:// www.nato.int/docu/ review/2000/001-03.htm accessed on 29.12.2003

[376] Andreani *et all*., op.cit., p.56

capabilities. Secondly, pooling would render the new enabling capabilities more affordable due to sharing. Thirdly, pooled forces would give impetus for greater interoperability and common doctrine and equipment. As an example of pooling, the Dutch and the Belgians made a joint naval arrangement. Likewise, many things can be pooled. In this respect, the failure of states to pool the Eurofighter force has been one of the missed opportunities. This failure will cause each nation to have high operating costs and achieve less than they could have achieve. However, the politics of pooling major combat capabilities is difficult For the future of the European defence, the pooling of some of force elements can provide building blocks enhancing the European defence contributions. It would give to more effective use of European national defence budgets by removing the cost overhang separate support systems. However, in order to realize above mentioned issues, a European Planning and budgetary system would have to be constructed. Furthermore, there would be a need for a European defence budget. If this system were realized by the EU, EU member states would make contribution to defence either capability or money. Therefore, the problem of free riding would be stopped and EU member states would be prefer to develop their military capabilities, instead of giving money to the employment of industries of other nations [377]

Three reasons are put forward a European common defence budget.

Firstly, a common budget can facilitate funding joint armaments projects such as the A400M transport aircraft. Since the disparities in the levels of defence spending is high in EU member states, common funding for some major procurment or research programmes can help to level out these disparities. Secondly, an EU defence

---

[377] Garden, op.cit., p.10-12

budget could fund EU common operations and therefore each member states would make contribution proportionately. Thirdly, the establishment of an EU defence budget may prompt some EU countries to spend more on military capabilities. With regard to contributions of EU member states, it is advocated that an EU defence budget must be funded directly by national governments like the NATO budget. Therefore, it must be distinct from the normal EU budget, which is funded by the EU's own resources. Since European defence seems to remain mainly intergovernmental concern, rather than EU institutions, EU defence and finance ministers must control any EU defence budget for the foreseeable future. [378]

The other proposal has been the EU member states agreement on convergence criteria for their defence spending or capability contributions. However, this can be realizable if one day there exists more agreement on Common Foreign Policy and less concern about sovereignty issues. Even the crudest of criteria like a minimum percentage of GDP will have their difficulties due to EU member states' different organizations about their defence spending.[379] The problem is matter or comparability including at the most aggregated level. Among the EU members, there are as many national definitions of defence spending as there are nations. Moreover, these differences are not trivial. For example, military pensions are excluded from national defence spending presentation in France while Gendarmeria's expenditure is included in the defence budget. Although there is a certain degree of harmonization in NATO framework, it has two major shortcomings. Firstly, it does not involve non – Allied EU countries and France. Secondly, the level of harmonization is primitive.

---

[378] Andréani *et all* .op.cit., p.51-52

[379] Garden., op.cit., p.14

Therefore, the new ESDP institutions must give priority to provide to the harmonization of EU defence budget presentations to provide a high degree of transparency and comparability over time and from country to country.[380]

Following the Cologne Summit, several governments searched for the prospect for EU's adaptation of ' convergence criteria' in order to boost the Europe's military capabilities. Despite the debate on issues, European governments did not proceed. Some governments did not proceed.,because they feared about the prospect of the EU's direct on their defence effects on their budgets.[381]

---

[380] Heisbourg François (eds), Defence:Making It Work (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2000), pp.95-96

[381] Andréani *et all*., op.cit., p.65

CHAPTER 6

THE EU-NATO RELATIONS IN THE POST-SEPTEMBER 11

ERA

6.1 The September 11 attacks and its impact on the EU and

NATO

Following the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington, the agenda of international politics changed dramatically and the fight against international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction became the dominant issues. In this context, two aspect of these issues deserve special attention for the purpose of our study. First one is the relevancy of NATO in post-September 11 era and the implication of September 11 on the development of the EU's ESDP . Let us dwell on these aspects respectively.

After September 11 incidents, NATO enthusiasts advocated that NATO must take on new mission in a new security environment. They attributed NATO a central role in the fight against terrorism. In the words of Lord Robertson, this idea was articulated as follows: "the world's largest and most effective permanent coalition [NATO], will be central to the collective response of the international community to terrorism, both now and in the long-term" [382]

Concerned to the relevancy of NATO in the post September 11 era, Karl Kaiser argued that NATO did not play an important role in the preparatory or active

---

[382] Quoted in Stanley Sloan& Peter Van Ham, <u>What future for NATO</u>?, (London: CER, 2002) p.35

phases of the US's war against terrorism. According to Kaiser, despite the statements about the global terrorism in NATO's New Strategic Concept of 1999, NATO had not planned for dealing with terrorism. Moreover, its structure was not suitable for this. Except for the activation of Article V, which can be regarded as at most indication of solidarity within the alliance, and the expedition of AWACS, NATO as an organization did not get involved in the fight against terrorism.

Furthermore, Kaiser claimed that NATO's activation of Article V for the first time in its history occurred under different circumstances from those Article V had been created. For Kaiser, the activation of Article V supported actions of national states like in the case of Germany, where the activation of Article V was a necessary for legitimizing the use of military force, rather than the actions of NATO [383]

In contrast to Kaiser, Christian Tuschhoff argued that NATO had been prepared for fight against terrorism both politically and militarily. Therefore, NATO responded swiftly and decisively to September 11 attacks. [384] Tuschhoff challenged NATO arguments that claimed that NATO seemed to be marginalized due to the US unwillingness to take a substantial support and absence of NATO's substantial contribution to the US's war against terrorism. According to Tuschhoff, NATO had been prepared to fight against terrorism since the decision taken in the Washington Summit in April 1999. In this respect, NATO's invocation of Article V in September 12 reflected the managerial effectiveness of NATO and mutual commitment among NATO members.

---

[383] Karl Kaiser, "The New NATO", *Asia-Pacific Review,* Vol 10, No.1, May 2003, pp.66-67

[384] Christian Tuschhoff, "Why NATO is Still Relevant", *International.Politics*, Vol. 40 , 2003, pp.101-102

Moreover, the North Atlantic Council statement for invocation of Article V apparently made a reference to Washington Summit of NATO in 1999 as follows:

> When the Heads of State and Government of NATO met in Washington in 1999…they also recognized the existence of a wide variety of risks to security…More specifically, they condemned terrorism as a serious threat to peace and stability and reaffirmed their determination to combat it in accordance with their *commitments to one another*, their international commitments and national legislation[385].

Tuschhoff argued that NATO proved its purpose and functioning in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks. The attempt for the invocation of Article V arouse from NATO headquarters in Brussels. All NATO's allies participated in NATO's plan.[386]

With regard to debate whether NATO is still relevant September 11 attacks after 9/11, Philip Gordon advocated a middle ground between two contrasting view. According to Gordon, while the invocation of Article 5 presented a symbolic gesture, anti-terrorism campaign affected NATO's character. Anti-terrorism campaign has been important in the sense that it indicated NATO's ongoing validity and provided an opportunity for rearrangement and revival of NATO. Moreover, the meaning of Article 5 was interpreted to include a terrorist attack on NATO allies with the September 11 attacks, though discussed during the Gulf War. [387] Therefore, September 11 attacks did not necessitate a dramatic transformation of NATO's mission or purpose. It indicated a need for new emphases and quickening of NATO's adaptation process. [388]

---

[385] Quoted in Tuschhoff, op.cit., p. 104

[386] Ibid., p.115

[387] Philip H. Gordon, " NATO after 11 September", *Survival* , Vol.43, no.4, Winter 2001-2002, p.92

[388] Ibid., p.100

On the other side, Peter Van Ham brought another perspective on this debate. According to Peter Van Ham, the position of NATO in the post September 11 era has been 'not standing at a crossroads, but rather looking down a dead-end street.' In this respect, the US's decision of not to make full use of NATO's invocation of Article 5 have hampered NATO's mythical status. Therefore, the Article 5 implies a glorified declaration of solidarity without automatic guarantees of the past. He concluded that while September 11 attacks strengthened NATO's pre existing role, it decreased its military function.[389]

In regard to the EU, as an immediate reaction to the September 11 attacks, the all EU member states supported the US and offered assistance to US-led fight against Al-Qaeda and the Taleban. The US did not want to avail most of the European offers of military assistance. The reasons behind these were the Europeans' insufficient high-tech capabilities and refrainment from working with NATO's organization or the EU countries. However, since the Europeans' armies are good at peacekeeping task, the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF) in Kabul almost entirely has been made up of European peacekeepers. The positive impact of the attacks on the ESDP could be the EU's more engagement with the Balkans. The Bush administration viewed the Balkans as a less of priority and thus expected the EU to assume more responsibility for providing security to Balkans. However, the EU's ESDP have not been changed dramatically. In this regard, the police and judicial cooperation have become the policy area that affected explicitly from September 11 attacks. The influence of the September 11 has been seen in the

---

[389] Sloan& VanHam, op.cit, p.38

EU's emerging policies of asylum, immigration and visas in comparison with police and judicial cooperation. [390]

From the view point of Philip Gordon, two important implications of September 11 can be considered. The first implication would be the prospect of prospect of partial withdrawal of US troops from the Balkans. Although a total US disengagement is not likely, the Europeans, at least, would take on more burden of Balkan peacekeeping compared to before September 11. The second implication is about European capabilities. Despite the fact that the EU member states took important steps for identifying their military deficiencies, the September 11 attacks gave an impetus for reconsideration and fulfillment of these deficiencies. September 11 attacks revealed that insecurity still had the problem of the whole world. [391] On the other side, Howorth asserted that the immediate striking response of European response to September 11 is that "renationalisation of security and defense reflexes". [392]

6.2. The Results of the Convention on the Future of Europe

The Laeken Declaration of the European Council in December 2001 became the catalyst for the European Convention. The Declaration pointed out that the EU faced with new security environment where religious fanaticism, ethnic nationalism, racism and terrorism were the new threats. Thus, the EU must play a significant role in searching for ways for providing stability and promoting democracy, the respect for human rights. The Laeken Declaration gave the mandate for the Convention on

---

[390] For details see Charles Grant, "The Eleventh September and Beyond: The Impact on the European Union" (Oxford: Political Quarterly Publishing, 2002). Pp.135-147
[391] Gordon, op.cit., pp.98-99

[392] Jolyon Howorth, " CESDP After 11 Septmber: From Short Term Confusion tok Long-Term Confusion?", *EUSA ReviewEssay* 15:1, Winter 2002, p.1

the Future of Europe. Valery Giscard d'Estaing, the former French President, became the President of the Convention and Jean-Luc Dehaene and Guliano Amato, the former Italian Prime Minister were the two Vice Presidents. Convention involved 109 members who were the representatives of national governments, national parliaments, the European Parliament, the European Commission and a small number of observers and representatives of candidate states. These members worked for a draft Constitution for the Union. In this regard, according to some observers, the Convention resembled to Philadelphia Convention that drafted the US Constitution. The work of the Convention was made through the working groups and plenary sessions. [393]

The Convention of the Future of Europe was formed in 2002 for dealing with the problems of coherence, effectiveness and legitimacy that would emerge with the accession of ten new members to the EU in 2004. The Convention ended its work in June 2003 and produced a 'Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe'. In its essence, the convention is a kind of exercise for self-definition and institutional reform of the EU. It has focused on the purpose of the EU, the allocation of power within the EU and EU decision making structure. [394] Moreover, the Convention was an instrument for the achievement of more democratic, more transparent and more efficient Union through the simplification and rearrangement of the existing treaties. Additionally, the problems of enlargement of the Union were also held. Thus, the

---

[393] Cameron, Fraser, "The Convention and Common Foreign and Security Policy" EPC Working Paper.,2003, pp.7-9

[394] Everts, Steven and Keohane, Daniel, "The European Convention and EU Foreign Policy: Learning From Failure", *Survival* Vol. 45, No. 3, Autumn 2003, p.167-168.

enlargement of the Union became a catalyst, rather than cause, the Convention's recommendations on external relations.[395]

In order to enhance effectiveness of the ESDP, France and Germany jointly proposed the transformation of the ESDP into 'European Security and Defence Union' in November 2002. Afterwards, France, Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg prepared a proposal to make contribution to the reform debate on the CFSP and the ESDP with an emphasize on flexibility.

As a result of the Convention on the Future of Europe, Working Groups drafted reform proposals in their fields. The final report of the Working group on defence stressed on the flexibility. In the draft Constitutional Treaty the elements of flexibility in ESDP has been stated as follows: According to Article I-40(3), EU member states may make their multinational forces available to the CFSP. Article I-40(5), Article III-211 and Article I-40(1) stated that the Council may give responsibility to the conduct of tasks like crisis management operations to a group of countries. Article I-40(5) and Article III-211 regulated the establishment of a European Armaments and Strategic Research Agency that would be open to the participation of all member states. [396]

During the work of the European Convention in 2002-2003, new proposals intended to "push ESDP closer to a 'real' defence going beyond *ad hoc* cooperation in crisis management". Among the proposals, the development of a 'solidarity' principle, which can be invoked to provide collective assistance against a terrorist

[395] Duke, Simon, "The Convention, the Draft Constitution and External Relations: Effects and Implications for the EU and Its International Role", *Working Paper* (European Institute of Public Administration, 2003/2). ,p.2

[396] Udo Diedrichs and Mathias Jopp, " Flexible Modes of Governance: Making CFSP and ESDP Work", *Interntional Spectator*, Vol.XXXVIII, No.3, 2003, pp.20-24

attack, gained support. The concept of solidarity seemed appropriate due to the fact that it could involve actions in all dimensions of human and functional security.[397]

Concerned to ESDP, the articles that would permit smaller groups of member states to cooperate more closely on military matters caused debates in the Convention. The EU member states agreed on all kinds of military cooperation including mutual defence commitments, headquarters or capabilities cooperation, except for Denmark. The Draft Constitution envisaged the establishment of a new 'capabilities agency' for coordinating defence technology research, the encouragement of harmonization of arms procurement procedures and providing capability of national defence equipment with the EU. The Convention text envisaged the EU's adoption of a 'solidarity clause' that would guarantee mutual assistance in case of a natural disaster or terrorist attack, rather than an attack by external state for internal security. For external security, the Petersberg tasks ranging from humanitarian relief to ending regional conflicts are the determinants of the EU's military missions. [398]

The draft constitution viewed the CSDP as an integral part of the CFSP. Concerned to CSDP, the Petersberg tasks were expanded to involve 'joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks ,conflict prevention and peacekeeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking and post-conflict stabilization'. Article III 210] Thus, the scope of Petersberg tasks reflected employment of both civilian and military means. In this sense, the EU's current military operations of Concordia in the

---

[397] Alyson J.K. Bailes, " The Institutional Reform of ESDP and Post Prague", *International Spectator*, Vol.XXXVIII, No.3, 2003 pp.33-35

[398] Everts and Keohane, op.cit., pp.173-175

former Republic of Macedonia and Artemis in Congo have taken place within the broadened scope of the Peterberg tasks. In the Convention, CSDP's reliance on the coalitions of the willing for future operations did not change. These coalitions of willing demonstrated that only a small number of larger EU member states have the capacity to take part in fulfillment of Petersberg tasks. The political and constitutional concerns of neutral or non aligned EU member states (Austria, Finland, Ireland and Sweden) and Denmark which opted out defence related provisions of the TEU required the formation of coalition of willing. In accordance with existing treaty arrangements, any decisions with military or defence implications necessitated unanimous support of the EU Council. However, the enhanced cooperation is not relevant for cooperation in the defence field. Instead of enhanced cooperation, all member states can participate in closer cooperation.[399] where by 'if one of the member states participating in such cooperation *is* the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other participating states shall give it aid and assistance by all the means in their power, military or other, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter'[400] Moreover, the Convention made a distinction between the 'solidarity clause' and 'mutual defence'. While the former applies to terrorist attacks, natural or man made disasters, the latter refers to traditional territorial defence against armed aggression. During the Convention, the divergence of views became apparent among the Atlanticists, neutral and non-aligned states and Europeanists. The 'Atlanticist' group composed of the United Kingdom, Portugal, the Netherlands and Spain aimed at prevention of undermining the role of NATO. As a result, the statement that foresees 'a common defence *in* the EU and a mutual defence among a

---

[399] Duke, " The Convention, The Draft...," op.cit., p.24

[400] Article 40(7) of the Draft Constitution, quoted in Duke,op.cit., p.24.

group of member states' included. The neutral and non-aligned countries were wary of the extension of the EU's defence role due to the likelihood of negative knock-on effects for the EU support in these countries. The Europeanists advocated an assertive role for the EU in the security and defence realm and supported the further development of European autonomy in these areas. [401]

Taking into account the final results of the Convention and forthcoming Intergovernmental conference, Alyson J.K Bailes stipulated that EU hasn't been mature or united enough to communitarise defence. Even NATO has been so intergovernmental that the activation of mutual defence clause requires each member's national consent. Thus it is unlikely for the EU to jump ahead of a 50-year old alliance.[402] .

6.3. The Resolution of Berlin Plus Dispute and the EU-NATO Declaration on the ESDP

NATO-EU relations had been characterized as informal and lacking much substance until the end of 1999. Although these two organizations formed the basis of intra-European and Euro-Atlantic relations, they were separate and disconnected from each other. Owing to the dominance of the US in NATO, the EU tried to keep a distance to NATO. Thus, the EU national and international officials wanted to prevent too much US influence into the European Councils.[403]

In the NATO's Washington Summit of 1999, the NATO allies put forward on the 'Berlin-Plus' compromise and pointed out the importance of stronger Europe

---

[401] Duke, op.cit. , "The Convention, The Draft..., op.cit., pp.21-26

[402] Alyson J.K.Bailes, op.cit, p.41

[403] Sloan, NATO and the European..., op.cit., p.179

for the vitality of NATO. In this regard, the Washington Summit Communiqué also stated that:

> On the basis of the above principles and building on the Berlin decisions, we therefore stand ready to define and adopt the necessary arrangements for ready access by the European Union to the collective assets and capabilities of the Alliance, for operations in which the Alliance as a whole is not engaged military as an Alliance. The Council in Permanent Session will approve these arrangements, which will respect the requirements of NATO operations and the coherence of its command structure, and should address:
> a. Assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations;
> b. The presumption of availability to the EU of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU-led operations;
> c. Identification of a range of European command options for EU-led operations, further developing the role of DSACEUR in order for him to assume fully and effectively his European responsibilities;
> d. The further adaptation of NATO's defence planning system to incorporate more comprehensively the availability of forces for EU-led operations.[404]

Berlin Plus consolidated the primacy of NATO concerned to military action and restated that EU would operate solely where NATO forces weren't involved militarily. Despite the fact that NATO endorsed the EU's autonomous action, the meaning of this autonomous action did not clarify.[405]

After NATO's Washington Summit, the evolution of a more formal NATO-EU relationship was slow, partly due to the concerns of certain EU member states, especially France. Having concerned about the prospect of excessive influence of the US on the construction of the ESDP institutions, France articulated the development of the CESDP institutions prior to discussion of the linkage of the EU-NATO decision making process for the first half of 2000. However, the concerns of France wasn't shared by NATO Secretary General Lord Roberson, this progress in the EU-NATO relations was stated as follows:

---

[404] NATO's Washington Summit Communiqué, para.10

[405] Hunter, op.cit., pp.54-55

already, NATO and the EU are working together closely-meeting together to decide on how to share classified information and drawing on NATO's experience to help the EU to flesh out the requirements of its headline goal… Put simply, NATO-friendly European defence is finally taking shape- and it is staking the right shape.

As Robertson pointed out, NATO's North Atlantic Council (NAC) and the EU's Interim Political and Security Committee (COPSI) started to work together to determine the details of NATO-EU Relations in September 2000. Additionally, four EU-NATO working groups were established to work on the issues such as security sensitive information, Berlin Plus, military capabilities and permanent EU-NATO institutional arrangements. [406]

Although, with the arrangements in NATO's Brussels Summit of 1994 and Berlin Summit in 1996, the foundation of WEU-NATO cooperation was formed. However, the development of ESDP beginning from St. Malo brought new dimension to this arrangement. Having observed these European attempts, US put forward three conditions. Among them, the third condition implies no discrimination against non-EU NATO members. Except for Turkey, other non-EU NATO members did not have much concern about discrimination issue. [407]

Turkey's concerns were resulted from its unique position in terms of the ESDP since Turkey has been both EU candidate and Non-EU European Ally. The other countries, which had similar status, like the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary relieved their worries owing to the immediate prospect of EU membership.

---

[406] Sloan, NATO ,European Union..., op.cit., p.177

[407] Jean-Yves Haine, Berlin Plus, available on line at www. iss-eu.org

On the other side other non-EU NATO members namely Norway and Iceland have interests in neither EU membership nor the development of ESDP.[408]

In NATO's Washington Summit, NATO allies emphasized the development of 'effective mutual consultation, cooperation and transparency' based on the existing mechanisms between NATO and WEU. Moreover, it involved promising statements participation of Non-EU NATO members. At the EU's Cologne Summit, the demise of WEU was declared and afterwards, the Helsinki European Council envisaged the participation of non-EU members in an operation with recourse to NATO assets on the condition of EU Council's invitation in EU-led operations. In the Feira European Council, the EU made a distinction between accession candidates and non-EU NATO European Allies. The Nice European Council made a specific arrangement for participation of Non –EU European Allies. [409]

In the operational phase of a crisis, non-EU European NATO members can take part in case of a operation with recourse to NATO assets and capabilities. If the EU prefers not to employ NATO assets, they can be invited to participate in operations on the condition of decision by the Council. This means, non- EU European allies cannot participate operations which EU does not use NATO assets and without invitation by the EU Council. Consequently Non –EU European NATO members have been placed at the "margin where they are entitled only to become involved as consultant".[410] Furthermore, in the Nice Summit, the EU council wanted the formation of "permanent arrangements" from NATO in line with Berlin Plus

---

[408] Cebeci, op.cit. , p. 144

[409] Ibid., pp.155-156

[410] Ramazan Gözen, Turkey's Delicate Position Between NATO and ESDP, (Ankara: Center For Strategic Research Papers, 2003), pp.60-62

agreement in Washington Summit communiqué. However, in its essence, the Achilles heel of the non EU NATO members' participation was that their military participation of the EU led operation did not backed by political participation.[411]

Having been the most affected countries among the six non EU-NATO members, Turkey blocked the Berlin Plus agreement though endorsed NATO-oriented attempts in European Security and wanted to improve participation level of associate members and thus have an opportunity to full participation.[412]

> According to Onur Öymen, the main expectation of Turkey from the EU

> …is the adoption of any necessary provisions that will enable the participation of Non-EU European allies in EU operations (including preparation and planning, political control and strategic direction) if that operation makes use of NATO's assets and capabilities or if and when these countries raise their concerns that the envisaged EU operation is in their geographical proximity or might even have an effect on their own national security interests.[413]

In response to Turkey's demands, EU argued that since ESDP has been a part of European Integration process, only EU members are given the full participation to the ESDP's decision making process. Secondly, ESDP does not have only security and defence aspect; much more than this it has a "European identity" dimension. Due to problems in fulfilling Copenhagen criteria, Turkey is not ready for being a member of EU-led security community, and thus entering EU's security

---

[411] Ibid., pp.66-68

[412] Hüseyin BAĞCI , "Turkey and Europe: Security Issues", in Michael S. Radu (ed.), Dangerous Neighborhood, Contemporary Issues in Turkey's Foreign Relations (New Brunswick, 2003 Transatlantic Publishers), pp.62-63

[413] Onur ÖYMEN, " Turkey and The New Challenges to European Security", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol.6, 2001, p.404

identity. Thirdly, Turkey has been regarded as a "security consumer" country that causes problems, rather than solutions, for EU's security community.[414]

Moreover, Turkey's blockage on the EU's assured access to NATO planning activities assessed differently. According to Missiroli, Turkey made use of its strategic position and NATO membership as an " asset" in Turkey-EU Relations and thus tried to "exploit its leverage in the Alliance (and/or on divided Cyprus) to extract better conditions from the Union both ESDP and the accession process".[415] In the words of Ifantis, Turkey's blockage increased 'the cost to the EU of pursuing ESDP.[416] Similarly, Sunnia Tofte considered Turkey's demand as "the major stumbling block" for the nascent ESDP Project. [417] Yet, these views are not shared by everyone. In contrast to above mentioned views, Kori Schake asserted that Turkey's veto was legitimate, thus it was inappropriate to see Turkish objections only a tactic for the promotion of Turkish accession to the EU. Taking into account the prospect of EU forces in Aegean, Cyprus, Caspian region or in support of Palestinians or Kurds, Turkey's demand for a role in decision making seemed to be plausible. [418]In this respect, pointing out regional power status of Turkey in midst of the Balkans, the Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia, Esra Çayhan stated that " Turkey may be

---

[414] Gözen, op.cit., pp.95-97

[415] Antonio Missiroli , " The EU and its changing neighbourhoods: stabilisation, inegration and partnership", in Batt *et all*, Partners and neighbours: A CFSP for a wider Europe, (Paris: ISS, 2003), Chaillot Paper 64, p.13

[416] Ifantis, op.cit., p.61

[417] Sunniva Tofte, " Non-EU NATO members and The Issue of Discrimination", in Howorth Jolyon and Keeler John T.S.,(eds) Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, (England: Palgrave Macmillan,2003), p.151

[418] Kori Schake, " The United States, ESDP..., op.cit., p.113

too difficult to digest, but it is also too important to be neglected and left alone by Europe." [419]

In order to solve this deadlock, a deal -so called 'Ankara Document' took place between the United States, Britain and Turkey. Being as a British-US joint proposal, Ankara Document has led to the removal of the Turkish veto on the EU's access to NATO assets and capabilities. It provided guarantees to Turkey that the European crisis management capabilities wouldn't be used in the Aegean or Eastern Mediterranean. Besides, EU committed not to intervene in the problems between Turkey and Greece. With the Ankara Document, Turkey accepted EU's assured access to 'some pre-determined' NATO assets. The word 'some pre-determined' must be underlined since the EU has right to an automatic access to only non-strategic NATO assets and capabilities. EU's use of strategic ones will be determined by the NATO Council on a case by case.[420] Additionally, the Ankara document gave the right to "enhanced consultations" during peacetime and "active participation" in operations with recourse to NATO assets. [421]

Ankara Document was not materialized quickly due to Greek opposition. By emphasizing the autonomy of the EU with regard to its decision making process, Greece did not favor a discriminating attitude towards one of the non-EU ally of the NATO. Greece advocated reciprocal guarantees in the sense that Turkey must be given certain assurances in return for EU's guarantees given Turkey. In line with

---

[419] Esra Çayhan, " Towards a European Security and Defence Policy: With or Without Turkey?", *Turkish Studies* Vol. 4, No 1, Spring 2003, p.46

[420] Hüseyin Bağcı& Ali Yıldız, " Turkey and European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP): From Confrontational to Co-operative Relationship", in Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu and Seyfi Taşhan (eds), The Europeanization of Turkey's Security Policy: Turkey's Security policy: Prospects and Pitfalls, (Ankara: Foreign policy Institute, 2004) ,.pp.94

[421] Gozen, op.cit., p.21

these arguments, Greece vetoed full operationalization of the ESDP in Laeken and Sevilla European Council in 2001 and 2002 respectively.[422]

The implication of subsequent Turkey and Greek vetoes delayed the final security arrangement between NATO and the EU. In this regard, the end of 2002 passed away with intensive diplomatic bargaining to satisfy both Turkey and Greece on this issue.[423]

However, with the adoption of Ankara Document in the EU context of at the Brussels European Council in October 2002, the way for the easing impasse was opened. Therefore, the guidelines for the implementation of Nice provisions regarding the involvement of non-EU NATO members to both operational and institutional dimensions of the ESDP in compliance with the Ankara Document were set out.[424]

In accordance with the Annex II of the Copenhagen European Council Presidency Conclusions,

> …'Berlin Plus' arrangements and the implementation thereof will apply only to those EU member states which are also either NATO members or parties to the ' partnership for peace' and which have consequently concluded bilateral security arrangements with NATO
> …Cyprus and Malta will not take part in EU military operations conducted using NATO assets once they have been become members of the EU will not, within the limits of the EU Security Regulations, affect the right of their representatives to participate and vote in EU institutions and bodies, including COPS, with regard to decisions which do not concern the implementation of such operations.

---

[422] Bağci& Yıldız, op.cit, p.94

[423] Çayhan, op.cit., pp.47-48

[424] Bağci&Yıldız, op.cit., pp.94-95

Shortly after the Copenhagen EU Council, EU and NATO agreed on the declaration on ESDP in December 2002. The declaration pointed out the strategic partnership between EU and NATO in crisis management and some of the added the main principles of this relationship as follows: partnership, which implies mutually reinforcing activities of NATO and EU on crisis management despite the different nature of them, effective mutual consultation, dialogue, cooperation and transparency, equality and due with respect to decision making autonomy and the interests of the EU and NATO [425]

6.4. Operation of Concordia: The first test of operationalization of the EU-NATO Relations

In 2003, the EU began to take part in operations which have been the stepping stones for the development of full-fledged ESDP. Since January 2003, the EU involved in three missions in Bosnia Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Democratic Republic of Congo. In this regard, the European Police Mission in Bosnia Herzegovina marked the EU's first civilian crisis management operation under ESDP. Secondly, The Operation Artemis which was started in June 2003 in order to stabilize the situation in Bunia in Congo represented the first autonomous EU operation and the first ESDP operation outside the Europe Thirdly, launched on March 2004; Operation Concordia represented the first EU-led military operation with recourse to the NATO assets. [426]For the limits of this study, we dwell for a moment on the Operation Concordia.

---

[425] For the details of the EU-NATO Declaration on the ESDP, see appendix

[426] Antonio Missiroli, " ESDP-Post Iraq. Building a European Security and Defence Policy: what are the priorities?", Lecture given at the International Seminar for Experts on 12-13 June 2003, available on line at www.cicerofoundation.org

The main aim of the Operation was to contribute achievement of a stable, secure environment for effective implementation of the August 2001 Ohrid Framework. Macedonia, known as FYROM (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), gained its indolence without a military conflict in 2001.However, in February 2001 members of Macedonian National Liberation Army (KLA) entered from Kosovo to the northern part of Macedonia, where the Albanians were the majority of population. The Macedonian KLA was mostly arranged by Albanian extremists and had the aim of halting the delicate political dialogue between ethnic groups in Macedonia to moderate Albanians support for the 'liberation.' The armed conflict between Albanian guerrilla forces and Macedonia security forces which started in February 2001 reached the north western part of Macedonia by the middle of March 2001. Afterwards, the parties agreed on peaceful settlement of conflict and Ohrid peace agreement was realized under the auspices of the EU. In Macedonia, NATO carried out several operations. The first operation was named Operation 'Essential Harvest' and took place from 22 August to 23 September in 2001. The aim of the mission was to disarm ethnic Albanian groups and destroy their weapons. The second operation was the Operation Amber Fox occurred between 23 December 2001 to 15 December 2002. The operation had a specific mandate of contributing to the protection of international monitors. Operation Allied Harmony was carried out from 16 December to 31 Mart 2003. In this respect, NATO's operational elements gave support for the international monitors and its advisory elements helped government to take ownership of security in the country. North Atlantic Council agreed to end the operation by 31 March. Meanwhile the EU Council decided to start an operation in the FYROM following the European Council of Copenhagen 2002. In accordance

146

with NATO-EU arrangements, Concordia has made use of NATO assets and capabilities. Admiral Rainer Feist (Germany) has been the Operation commander and General Pierre Maral (France) has become the force commander. A total of 350 military personnel from 14 non-EU members and 13 EU members (all except Ireland and Denmark) participated in this operation. [427]

On the launch of the Concordia, Javier Solana, the EU High Representative for the CFSP stated that:

> …today's transfer of authority from NATO to the EU for the field operation is an important demonstration of our reinforced partnership. For our two organizations the key message today is not "EU in and NATO out"- but that by working together, we are both stronger, here and wherever else such cooperation may be in demand.[428]

In this connection, being as the first EU-led military operation with the recourse to the NATO' assets and capabilities, Operation Concordia was regarded as a model for procedural arrangements both with the EU and with respect to the EU-NATO strategic partnership. Furthermore, Operation Concordia considered as a 'test-run' for the future EU operations. Concordia has put into practice ESDP procedures, mechanisms and thus provided a depth experience and a future point of reference. Besides, it has made contribution to the improvement of the ESDP's *modus operandi.*[429]

---

[427] Alexander B. Abele, " The EU Rapid Reaction Force and the Operation Concordia in Macedonia," available on line at: www.juridicum.at/forschung/abele/macedonia.pdf

[428] Speech by Javier Solana on the launch of the EU led-military operation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, March 31, 2003, Brussels.

[429] Hajnalka Vincze, " Beyond Symbolism: the EU's first military operation seen in its context", available on line at www.weltpolitik.net/texte/policy/concordia/beyond_symbolism.pdf. Accessed on 11.05.2004

According to Giovanna Bono, Concordia indicated the start of a new strategic partnership based on two assumptions. First, it would be stepping stones for the EU to become an equal partner with the US in external security, and secondly, it would make contribution to strengthening of ESDP and CFSP. Nevertheless, Bono stipulated that Operation Concordia is unlikely to be a model for the ESDP's future for the short term. Even though, it showed how a strategic partnership might work, due to the maximum flexibility provided to both EU and NATO, the modalities of EU-NATO operation have to be worked out on a case-by-case basis. [430]

Operation Concordia was finished on the December 15, 2003 and was replaced by an EU police mission called Proxima. The initial assessment of the operation expressed that Berlin Plus worked well and operation became successful. Therefore, Berlin Plus was validated by Concordia. [431]

---

[430] Giovanna Bono, " Operation Concordia: the first step towards a new strategic partnership EU-NATO relationship?", available on line at www.weltpolitik.net/policy-forum/article/1638.html accessed on 11.03.2004

[431] NATO Notes, no.8, December 2003.,Vol.*5,* available on lie at www.iss-eu.org

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In an attempt to answer whether the EU and the NATO cohabitate separate from each other, we mainly deal with what kind of a relation does exist between the EU and NATO in Post Cold War European Security Context. On the beneath this attempt, we try to find out interface between European Integration and Atlantic Alliance. Having considered the evolving and dynamic relationship, we refrain from making conclusion on this relationship. Rather than concluding, we prefer to write an epilogue that reflect our concluding points which can be summarized as follows.

Firstly, despite the fact that EU-NATO interaction commenced in early 1990s, the legacy of the Cold War should be taken into account in order to understand this relationship. In this respect, having experienced the failure of EDC initiative in 1950s, the EC left delicate issues of defence and security outside the European Integration and thus aimed to enhance welfare of member states. While the EC was engaged in furthering its economic integration, NATO was held responsible for collective defence of members of the Atlantic Alliance against Soviet threat. The Cold War left legacy of limited scope of functions and missions to both institutions. As a result, both NATO and the EU performed their functions and missions separately from each other in the Cold War. In the light of these points, we infer that

due to divergence of their actions no interaction took place between the EC and NATO

Yet, with the end of the Cold War, the EU and NATO were forced to rethink their functions and missions. Having succeeded in the phases of economic integration, the EU searched for spilling over the success of economic integration to political area. On the other side, NATO faced with questioning of its raison d'etre and tried to assume new mission in order to maintain its existence. Consequently, both institutions employed new mechanisms in order to adjust themselves Post Cold War context. While the EU started to involve in foreign and security matters to be an effective and credible international actor, NATO tried to go beyond the collective defence mission and took on new responsibilities in crisis management, peacekeeping etc. In this regard, London Summit of NATO constituted starting point of adaptation process by presenting a vision of free and united Europe. The London Summit was succeeded by NATO's new strategic concept in Rome Summit. NATO's new strategic concept broadened the concept of security to include political, economic and social aspects and stressed on multidimensional risks, rather than threats. Furthermore, it pointed out importance of interlocking instititutions in Europe. In line with NATO's adjustment to new European order, the EC transformed into the EU. At this point, our second interference is that the EU's and NATO's adaptation processes did not take place independent from each other; conversely these processes were in parallel with each other.

Beginning from the Maastricht Treaty, the EU started to develop foreign and security issues together and emphasized on the development of CFSP within the EU. While NATO endorsed the establishment of the CFSP, it put forward the

strengthening of the European pillar of NATO through the ESDI. Although the ESDI was envisaged as a project within the NATO, it turned out to be the policy of the EU in the late 1990s. The impact of Yugoslav crisis together with European military incapabilities and the US's concerns about engaging with instabilities in European Security played important role in the emergence of ESDP as a political project of the EU. The reasons for the development of the ESDP can be explained as follows: firstly, ESDP has been seen as a significant contribution to the EU's quest for a being an effective international actor. Secondly, it provides the EU with the employment of certain instruments that reinforce 'security provider' feature of the EU. Hence; the EU can active role in European Security problems ranging from ethnic conflicts to peacekeeping operations. Thirdly, the ESDP gives an important opportunity to fade widely-used cliché of the EU as a 'economically giant, politically dwarf' away. Given the growing military and institutional capacities of the ESDP, the EU can make its voice heard better and counterbalance its economic weight. Fourthly, it is a means for fostering EU member states' collaboration in defence matters. Fifthly, it appears to be a significant building block on the way to the political integration. Sixthly, it allows the EU to emancipate European Security from the dominance of the US. Taking into account all these factors, we can state that ESDP marks furthering of European Integration process to the defence realm, which had been a taboo subject for along time. Besides, it refers to the EU's aspiration to take over more responsibility for the regional security matters through the deployment of a range of instruments including military ones. Therefore, the EU has been seeking autonomous decision making and implementation in defence matters through the ESDP.

In the late 1990s, the EU's efforts for the development of ESDP gained pace with the convergence of British and French interests, which were embedded in the St. Malo Declaration. By referring to the prospect for an autonomous action, it constituted significant building block on the way to security actorness of the EU. However, Kosovo war became the real driving force for the EU to take tangible steps for the ESDP. The war revealed military deficiencies of the EU member states and indicated how they relied on the US for providing security in their neighborhood. Subsequently, EU member states decided to give substance to the ESDP. Beginning from Helsinki EU Council, the EU made a gradual progress to develop its military capabilities and improve their decision making structure on defence. Therefore, the ESDI that initially started for strengthening the European pillar of Atlantic Alliance in the mid 1990s turned out to be the evolving policy of the EU in 2000s. In this way, the EU has expanded its activities into security realm and transcended its civilian power feature. Consequently, the activities of the EU started to coincide with that of NATO. At this point, the crux of the matter is to understand what kind of relationship exists between the EU and NATO.

For this end, we examine the political aspect of the EU and NATO relations by analyzing approaches of US and major European powers regarding to ongoing and the future of the EU-NATO relations. In the case of US, in the early 1990s, the US emphasized on burden and responsibility sharing with the alliance and called for strengthening the European pillar. Although it endorsed the EU's effort for taking over greater responsibility for its security and defence, it underlined the predominance of NATO as a main security institution of Europe. The US supported the development of ESDI within NATO and suspected about the EU's security

initiatives due to their implications for undermining primacy of NATO in Europe. After the St.Malo declaration, the US put forward three conditions for the EU's movement towards autonomous defence. According to the ' three D's' of Madeline Albright, the EU's development of military capabilities shouldn't duplicate existing NATO capabilities, EU's defence efforts should not decouple Europe from NATO and finally EU should not make a discrimination against non -EU NATO members. Although 'three D's' were asserted in the Clinton administration era, these conditions has retained its validity in US approach to the EU-NATO relations. In this regard, the US attitude towards the ESDP has not changed substantially. Moreover, having seen the EU's movement toward autonomous defence such as the establishment of European Rapid Reaction Force, institutionalization of ESDP, the US has insisted on *'NATO's right of first refusal'*, which means the EU would intervene conflict or crisis if NATO decide not to engage. Hence, the US has supported the EU's desire of autonomous action concerned to regional defence and security of the Europe, provided that Europeans respect 'NATO's first principle'. Given the conditional support of the US towards the EU-NATO relations, our interference is that the US is unlikely to permit the EU to compete with NATO. Although, the US has endorsed the EU's assured access to NATO's assets and capabilities, it has underlined continuation of NATO and cautioned against the prospect of the new transatlantic division that duplicate NATO efforts.

On the other side of Atlantic, the major actors of the EU namely France, Britain and Germany have been decisive for the direction of the EU-NATO relations. However, they cannot reach a consensus on this issue. On the contrary, they have mainly been divided into factions; Atlanticists and Europeanists. While Britain

153

represents the Atlanticist view and advocates the maintenance of primacy of NATO since it historically gives utmost importance to the US engagement with Europe, France endorses fortress Europe and stresses on the autonomy of the European Defence. From the diverging views of major European powers, we infer that major powers are not able to assert a common attitude towards the EU-NATO relations. While Britain prefers to subordination of the EU to NATO on security matters, France argues for an autonomous EU which can act independently. Therefore, the lack of unified position among EU major powers complicates the establishment of the appropriate relation between the EU and NATO.

The problematic areas for the EU-NATO relations indicate the challenges for the evolution of the EU and NATO relations. Military capabilities gap between NATO and the EU has been one of the major problems that needs to be solved. In comparison with the EU, NATO has an extensive military infrastructure of command, control, surveillance and communication and therefore significant advantages. Despite the EU's plans for improvement in military capabilities, the EU has not succeeded in increasing its military capabilities substantially. Thus, superiority of NATO over the EU in terms of military capabilities has caused the EU to rely on NATO's military strength and undermine the possibility of complementary relationship. Secondly, the problem of financial constraints is related with the defence spending level of EU member states. There are two contrasting views on this issue. While some observers pointed out that defence spending level of EU member states is not sufficient for acquisition of enabling capabilities and the achievement of headline goals. On the other side, some underlines the importance of efficiency in defence spending. In this regard, rather than increasing money allocates to defence spending,

the improvement of efficiency in defence spending is required to overcome financial constraints problem. Thirdly, the twin enlargement of the EU and NATO poses another challenge in terms of non-EU NATO members and non-NATO EU members for the future of the EU-NATO relations. Hence, twin enlargement of the EU and NATO has brought new dynamism and opportunities; it may cause obstacles for the development of EU-NATO relations.

While above-mentioned obstacles for the development of mutually reinforcing and complementary and effective EU-NATO attacks have persisted, the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington brought new dimensions to this relationship. The terrorist attacks affected the US engagement with the rest of the world and caused people to consider security issues once again. The fight against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction came to the agenda of international politics. As an implication of this context in the EU, security and defence issues became at the top agenda of the EU and development of the ESDP gained importance. On the other side, NATO invoked Article V for the first time in response to these attacks. However, the activation of collective defence clause did not prevent debate on the relevancy of NATO after September 11. If we leave these discussions aside, it can be said that the new challenges posed by September 11 attacks help the acceleration of efforts for improving the EU-NATO relations. Specifically, the Berlin Plus dispute by which the EU can access to NATO assets has been resolved in the post September 11 era. Therefore, the EU and NATO agreed on joint declaration that pointed out their strategic partnership in December 2002. Despite the promising statement of strategic partnership, the issue of whether the EU and NATO cooperate or compete with each other retains its importance.

Recently, the first EU led military operation with recourse to NATO assets took place in Macedonia in 2003. The operation, so-called Concordia, has been identified as test for the EU-NATO Accord on Berlin Plus. The Concordia was conducted in order to facilitate the achievement of a stable, secure environment for effective implementation of the August 2001 Ohrid framework. However, it can be regarded as the indicator of taking off the Berlin plus agreement; it does not provide a sufficient evidence for the presence of the EU-NATO strategic partnership.

In the light of these points, my final interference is that evolving and dynamic nature of the EU and NATO relations does not allow for a giving a clear answer to whether the EU and NATO cohabitate or separate. The answer to this question is closely dependent on the political will of major powers and the overcoming obstacles for effective NATO-EU relationship. However, given the insecure environment of the post September 11 period and the new challenges like threat of terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the EU and NATO should strive for cohabiting and working together in a complementary and harmonious way to tackle with these challenges.

APPENDIX A

EU NATO DECLARATION ON ESDP, 16 DECEMBER 2002

The European Union and The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

-Welcome the strategic partnership established between the European Union and NATO in crisis management, founded on our shared values, the indivisibility of our security and our determination to tackle the challenges of the new Century;

-Welcome the continued important role of NATO in crisis management and conflict prevention, and reaffirm that NATO remains the foundation of the collective defence of its members;

-Welcome the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), whose purpose is to add to the range of instruments already at the European Unions disposal for crisis management and conflict prevention in support of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, the capacity to conduct EU-led crisis management operations, including military operations where NATO as a whole is not engaged;

-Reaffirm that a stronger European role will help contribute to the vitality of the Alliance, specifically in the field of crisis management;

-Reaffirm their determination to strengthen their capabilities;

Declare that the relationship between the European Union and NATO will be founded on the following principles:

-Partnership: ensuring that the crisis management activities of the two organisations are mutually reinforcing, while recognising that the European Union and NATO are organisations of a different nature;

-Effective mutual consultation, dialogue, cooperation and transparency;

-Equality and due regard for the decision-making autonomy and interests of the European Union and NATO;

-Respect for the interests of the Member States of the European Union and NATO;

-Respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which underlie the Treaty on European Union and the Washington Treaty, in order to provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable Euro-Atlantic security environment, based on the commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes, in which no country would be

able to intimidate or coerce any other through the threat or use of force, and also based on respect for treaty rights and obligations as well as refraining from unilateral actions;

-Coherent, transparent and mutually reinforcing development of the military capability requirements common to the two organisations;

To this end:

-The European Union is ensuring the fullest possible involvement of non-EU European members of NATO within ESDP, implementing the relevant Nice arrangements, as set out in the letter from the EU High Representative on 13 December 2002;

-NATO is supporting ESDP in accordance with the relevant Washington Summit decisions, and is giving the European Union, inter alia and in particular, assured access to NATO's planning capabilities, as set out in the NAC decisions on 13 December 2002;

-Both organisations have recognised the need for arrangements to ensure the coherent, transparent and mutually reinforcing development of the capability requirements common to the two organisations, with a spirit of openness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Andréani, Gilles, et all, <u>Europe's Military Revolution</u>, (London: CER Publishing, 2001).

Archer, Clive, " What Security? What Order?", in <u>Uncertain Europe: Building a new European order</u>?, Martin A.Smith, Graham Timmins (eds), (London: Routledge, 2001).

Asmus, Ronald " *Double Enlargement: Redefining the Atlantic Partnership after the Cold War*", in David C. Gombert and Stephen Larrabee, (eds), <u>America and Europe-A partnership for a new era</u>-, (RAND: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Aybet, Gülnur, <u>A European Security Architecture after the Cold War</u>, (NewYork: St.Martin's Press, 2000).

Bağcı Hüseyin and Ali Yıldız , "Turkey and European Security and Defence Policy: From Confrontational to Cooperative Relationship", in. A.Karaosmanoğlu and Seyfi Taşhan (eds) <u>the Europeanization of Turkey's Security Policy: The Prospects and PitFalls</u>, (Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute,2004)

Bağcı Hüseyin, "Turkey and Europe: Security Issues", in Michael S. Radu (ed.), <u>Dangerous Neighborhood, Contemporary Issues in Turkey's Foreign Relations</u> (New Brunswick, 2003 Transatlantic Publishers)

Bağcı, Hüseyin, "Türkiye ve AGSK: Beklentiler ve Endişeler" in İdris Bal (ed.), *21. Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Tü rk Dış Politikası* (İstanbul: Alfa, 2001).

Bilcik, Vladimir, 'ESDP and the Security Policy Priorities and Perspectives of Central European EU Countries, in Joachim Krause, Andreas Wenger, Lisa Watanabe (eds) <u>Unraveling the European Security and Defence Policy Conundrum</u>, (Bern et al:Loc: Peter Lang, 2003).

Bluth, Christoph, <u>Germany and the Future of European Security</u>, (Britain: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000).

Bohen, Johannes, "Germany" in Call Cavanagh Hodge (ed), <u>Redefining European Security</u>. (Newyork: Garland Pusblishing, 1999).

Bono, Giovanna, "Implementing the Headline Goals: The Institutional Dimension" in in Joachim Krause, Andreas Wenger, Lisa Watanabe (eds) <u>Unraveling the European Security and Defence Policy Conundrum</u>, (Bern et al:Loc: Peter Lang, 2003).

Boyer, Yves, " France and the European project: Internal and External Issues", in Kjell Eliassen (ed), <u>Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union</u>, (London: Sage Publications, 1998).

Bozo, Frédéric, "The effects of Kosovo and The Limits of European Autonomy", Howorth Jolyon and Keeler John T.S., (eds) <u>Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy</u>, (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Brenner, Michael, <u>Terms of Engagement</u>, (Washington: Praeger Publishers,1998), CSIS Washington Papers/176.

Bretherton, Charlotte and Vogler, John, <u>The European Union as a Global Actor</u> (London: Routledge, 1999).

Cameron, Fraser, "The Convention and Common Foreign and Security Policy" EPC Working Paper.

Carr Fergus and Kostas Ifantis, <u>NATO in the New European Order</u>; (Britain: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1996)

Carr Fergus and Callan, Theresa, <u>Managing Conflict in The New Europe</u>, (NewYork: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

Cebeci, Münevver, "CESDP: A Turkish Perspective", in Peter G.Xuereb (ed), <u>Euro-Mediterranean Integration</u>, (Malta:EDRC,2002) available on line http://<u>home.um.edu.mt/edrc/publications/documents/chapter7/.pdf</u>

Chacko, Tania M., "Implementing Headline Goal, The military aspect", in Joachim Krause, Andreas Wenger, Lisa Watanabe (eds) <u>Unraveling the European Security and Defence Policy Conundrum</u>, (Bern et al:Loc: Peter Lang, 2003).

Clarke, Michael, "British Security Policy", in Kjell Eliassen (ed), <u>Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union</u>, (London: Sage Publications, 1998).

Cogan, Charles G. <u>Third Option: The Emancipation of European Defense, 1989-2000</u>, (Westport, CT, USA: Greenwood Publishing, 2001).

Cottey, Andrew, " The European Dimension of Defence Reform: From the WEU to the EU's New Defence Role" in Gyarnati,I., Winkler T., (eds), <u>Post Cold War Defence Reform Lessons Learned in Europe and United States</u>, (Washington: Brassey's Inc., 2002.

Dedman, Martin J., <u>The Origin and Development of the European Union 1945-95</u> (New York: Routledge, 1996).

Di Scala, Spencer M., <u>Twentieth Century Europe</u>, (Newyork: McGraw-Hill,2004).

Dinan, Desmond, <u>Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration</u>, (Boulder, Colo : L.Rienner Publishers, 1999).

Duke Simon, <u>The Elusive Quest for European Security, From EDC to CFSP</u>, (Britain: Macmillan Press, 2000)

Duke, Simon, "The Convention, the Draft Constitution and External Relations: Effects and Implications for the EU and Its International Role", *Working Paper* (European Institute of Public Administration, 2003/2).

Duke, Simon, <u>The New European Security Disorder</u>, (Britain: Macmillan Press, 1994).

Everts, Steven, "Shaping a Credible EU Foreign Policy", *CER Publications*, (February, 2002)

Everts, Steven, "Why the EU Needs a Security Strategy", Briefing Note, CER. http://www.cer.org.uk.

Gann, L.H and Duignan, Peter <u>Contemporary Europe and the Atlantic Alliance ; a Political History</u>, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998).

Gartner,H, and Hyde-Price A and Reiter ,E. , <u>Europe's New Security Challenges</u>, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2001)

Ginsberg, Roy H., <u>The European Union in International Politics: Baptism By Fire</u> (USA: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2001).

Giovanna Bono, "Operation Concordia: the first step towards a new strategic partnership EU-NATO relationship?", available on line at www.weltpolitik.net/policy-forum/article/1638.html accessed on 11.03.2004

Gnesotto, Nicole and Kaiser, Karl, " European- American Interaction" in Heisbourg François (eds), <u>Defence:Making It Work</u> (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2000).

Gnesotto, Nicole, "European Security and Defence Policy: A European View", in European Security and Defence Policy: Taking Stock, CEPS-IISS European Security Forum, *Working Paper*, (No. 8, September 2002).

Gordon, Stuart, "The United Kingdom: between a rock adn a soft place", in Martin A. Smith, Graham Timmins (eds)<u>Uncertain Europe : Building a new European Security Order</u>, , (New York: Routledge, 2001).

Gözen Ramazan , <u>Turkey's Delicate Position Between NATO and ESDP</u>, (Ankara: Center For Strategic Research Papers, 2003)

Grant, Charles, "A Stronger European Foreign and Defence Policy", in Edward Bannerman <u>et.al.</u> (eds.), <u>Europe After September 11th</u> (London: CER, December 2001).

Grant, Charles, "The Eleventh September and Beyond: The Impact on the European Union" (Oxford: Political Quarterly Publishing, 2002).

Gummett, Philip ' Foreign, Defence and Security Policy', in M. Rhoades, P. Heywood and V. Wright (eds.), <u>Developments in West European Politics</u> (United Kingdom: Macmillan Press, 1997).

Hagman Hans-Christian<u>, European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities</u>, (Oxford: International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 353, 2002)

Ham, Peter Van, <u>Europe's New Defence Ambitions: Implicationd for NATO, The US and Russia</u>, (Garmish-Partenkirchen, Germany: George Marshall European Center for Secuirty Studies, April 2000).

Heisbourg François (eds), <u>Defence:Making It Work</u> (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2000)

Howorth Jolyon and Keeler John T.S., (eds) <u>Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy</u>, (England: Palgrave Macmillan,2003)

Howorth, Jolyon, ' National defence and European Security integration: an illusion inside a chimera' in <u>The European Union and National Policy</u>, Howorth, Jolyon & Menon Anand (eds), (London: Routledge,1997)

Howorth, Jolyon, <u>European Integration and defence: the Ultimate Challenge?</u>, (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2000)

Hunter, Robert E., <u>The European Security and Defence Policy: NATO's Companion or Competitor?,</u> (RAND Publications, 2002)

Hyde-Price, Adrian G.V, "Beware of Jabberwock:Security Studies in the Twenty-First Century", <u>in Europe's new Security Challenges</u>, Gartner , Heinz <u>et all. (eds)</u>, (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001).

Ifantis Kostas, <u>NATO and the New Security Paradigm: Power Strategy, Order and the Transatlantic Link</u>, (London: Frank Cass- Asam, Ankara Papers 4, 2002)

Kempin Ronja, 'The New NATO Response Force: Challenges for and Reactions from Europe', Copri Publications, available online at www.copri.dk/ publications/ workingpapers.htm

Kennedy, Robert, 'Current Security Arrangements and Models for THA Future: An American View', in NATO Defence College ,ed., Cooperative Security Arrangements in Europe, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang Gmbh,1997).

Kissinger, Henry, Diplomacy, (NewYork:Touchstone, 1994).

Kupchan Charles, 'Reconstructing the West: The Case for an Atlantic Union' in Atlantic Security-Contending Visions , Kupchan A.Charles (eds), (US: A Council on Foreign Relations Book, 1998

Larrabee, F. Stephen, NATO's Eastern Agenda in a New Strategic Era, (RAND: 2003).

Leites, Nathan and de la Malene, Christian, " Paris from EDC to WEU", *World Politics*, Vol.9, No.2, (Jan., 1957), available on line at www.jstor.org.

Lindley-French, Julian, 'Dilemmas of NATO Enlargement', in Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy, Howorth Jolyon; Keeler John T.S (eds), (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Lord Robertson, " Rebalancing NATO for a Strong Europe", remarks at tha Defence Week Conference, 31 January 2000.

Lutz, Rachel Anne, The European Secuirity and Defence Policy: Rebalancing The Transatlantic Security Realtionship, (DUPI: Copenhagen, 2001), Report 2001/4.

Martin Ortega, Military Intervention and The European Union, (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2001)

McCalla, Robert B., NATO's Persistence after the Cold War, *International Organization*, Vol.50, No.3 (Summer, 1996), available on line at www.jstor.org.

Meimeth, Michael, " France and the Organization of Security in Post-Cold Europe", ,in Call Cavanagh Hodge (ed), Redefining European Security. (Newyork: garland Pusblishing, 1999).

Menon Anand, ' Why ESDP is Misguided and Dangerous for the Alliance' in Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, Howorth Jolyon; Keeler

Menon, Anand, France, NATO and the Limits of Independence 1981-1997, (Britain: Macmillan Press, 2000).

Menon, Anond, "Enhancing The Effectiveness of the EU's Foreign and Defence Policies", *CEPS Policy Brief*, No. 29, December 2002.

Miskimmon, A.J " Recasting THA Security Bargains: Germany, European Security Policy adn THA Trasnatlantic Relationship" in Douglas Weber (ed), New Europe,New Germany, Old Foreign Policy, (Britain: Frank Cass, 2001

Missiroli Antonio, Euros for ESDP: Financing EU Operations, (Paris:the European Union The Institute for Security Studies Publications, Occasional Papers 45, 2003)

Missiroli, Antonio, CFSP, defence and flexibility, *Chaillot Papers*, no. 38, (Paris, Institute for Strategic Studies, February 2000).

Moens, Alexander, " ESDP, the United States and the Atlantic Alliance" in Howorth Jolyon and Keeler John T.S., (eds) Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, (England: Palgrave Macmillan,2003).

Nugent, Neill, The Government and Politics of the European Union, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003).

Nuttall, Simon J., European Foreign Policy (United States: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Ortega, Martin, Military Intervention and The European Union, (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2001).

165

Rees, Wyn, "The Eliminating The Mıddle Man", Martin A. Smith, Graham Timmins (eds))in Uncertain Europe : Building a new European Security Order, , (New York: Routledge, 2001).

Schake, Kori, "The United States, ESDP and Constructive Duplication", in Jolyon and Keeler John T.S., (eds) Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, (England: Palgrave Macmillan,2003).

Schake, Kori; Laine, Amaya Bloch and Grant, Charles, "Building A European Defence Capability", Survival (Vol. 41, No. 1, Spring 1999).

Schmidt, Peter In the Midst of Change: on the development of West European Security, (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1992).

Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union, (London: Sage Publications, 1998).

Sloan Stanley, The United States and European Defence, (Paris:The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union Publications, 2000)

Sloan, Stanley & Ham, Peter Van, What future for NATO?, (London: CER, 2002).

Sloan, Stanley, NATO, The European Union, and the Atlantic Community, (US: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers, 2003).

Smith Hazel , European Union Foreign Policy, What it is and What it Does, (England: Pluto Press 2002).,

Smith, Martin A. and Timmins, Graham, Building a Bigger Europe: EU and NATO Enlargement in Comparative Perspective, England:Ashgate Publishing, 2000).

Smith, Martin, Timmins Graham, Building a Bigger Europe, (England : Ashgate, 2000).

Sperling, James, " TheUnited States: Strategic Vision or Tactical posturing?" in Uncertain Europe : Building a new European Security Order, Martin A. Smith, Graham Timmins, (New York: Routledge, 2001).

Spofford, Charles M. "Toward Atlantic Security", *International Affairs*,Vol.27., No.4, October 1951.

Sloan Stanley & Peter Van Ham, What future for NATO?, (London: CER, 2002)

Terriff, Terry, "The CJTF Concept and the Limits of European Autonomy" in Howorth Jolyon and Keeler John T.S., (eds) Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy, (England: Palgrave Macmillan,2003).

Thomas, James, The military Challenges of Transatlantic Coalitions, Adelphi paper 333, London: Oxford Press for the ISSS, 2000.

Türkeş Mustafa "Doksanlı Yıllarda NATO'nun Öncelikleri ve Türkiye", in En Uzun Onyıl, Gencer Özcan, Şule Kut (eds), (İstanbul: Boyut Kitapları, 1998),

Utley, R.E., " France: willing the means to the end?", in in Uncertain Europe : Building a new European Security Order, Martin A. Smith, Graham Timmins, (New York: Routledge, 2001).

Wessel, Ramses A., The European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, A Legal Institutional Perspective, (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1999).

White, Brian Understanding European Foreign Policy , (New York: Palgrave, 2001).

Wyatt-Walter, Holly, The European Community and Security Dilemma,1979-1992 (Macmillan Press: London, 1997).

Articles

Abele Alexander B. " The EU Rapid Reaction Force and the Operation Concordiain Macedonia," available on line at: www.juridicum.at/forschung/abele/macedonia.pdf

Açıkmeşe, Sinem Akgül "Has the period of EU's civilian power period come to an end?", *Ankara Review of European Studie*s, Vol.2, No.3, Fall 2002.

Alexander Michael and Garden Timothy, ' The Arithmetic of Defence Policy', *International Affairs,* Vol.77(3),2001,pp.509-529

Alistair, Shepherd, J., K., "Top-Down or Bottom-Up: Is Security and Defence Policy in the EU a Question of Political Will or Military Capability", *European Security* ,Vol.9, No. 2, Summer 2000.

Andreani, Gilles, "Why Institutions Matter", *Survival*, Vol. 42, No. 2, Summer 2000.

Bailes, Alyson J.K., "The Institutional Reform of ESDP and Post Prague", *International Spectator*, Vol.XXXVIII, No.3, 2003

Barry Charles, "NATO's CJTF in Theory and Practice", Survival, Vol.38,No.1, Spring 1996

Binnendjik, Hans and Kugler, Richard, "Transforming European Forces", *Survival*, Vol.44, No.3, 2002.

Biscop Sven, 'In Search of a Strategic Concept for the ESDP', *European Foreign Affairs Review 7*, 2002, pp.473-490

Bono, Giovanna, "European Security and Defence Policy: theoretical approaches, the Nice Summit and Hot issues", Research and Training Network: Bridging the Accountability GAP in ESDP/ Democracy, February 2002

Carlsen Per, "NATO and the EU: Assessing prospects and options for genuine co-operation", (Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies Report 2003/2, 2003)

Chalmers Malcolm, 'The Atlantic Burden Sharing Debate-widening or fragmenting?',*International Affairs*, Vol. 77(3), 2001, pp.569-585

Christian Tuschhoff, "Why NATO is Still Relevant", *International.Politics*, Vol. 40 , 2003

Chuter, David, "The United Kingdom", in Howorth and Memon (eds), <u>The European Union and National Defence Policy,</u> (London: Routledge,1997).

Cimbala, Stephen J., "Security in Europe After The Cold War", *European Security*, Vol.2, No.2, (Summer 1993).

Cornish Paul, Clarke Michael, 'The European Defence Project and the Prague Summit', *International Affairs*, Vol.78, No. 4, 2002

Cornish Paul, Edwards Geoffrey, 'Beyond the EU/ NATO Dichotomy: the beginnings of a European strategic culture, *International Affairs,* Vo. 77.No.3, 2001, pp. 587-603

Cornish, Paul, "European Security: The end of architecture and The new NATO", *International Affairs*, Vol.72, No.4, 1996.

Çayhan Esra, " Towards a European Security and Defence Policy: With or Without Turkey?", *Turkish Studies* Vol. 4, No 1, Spring 2003, p.46

Daaelder, Ivo and Goldgeier, James M., "Putting Europe First", S*urvival*, Vol.43, No.1, Spring 2001.

Daalder, Ivo H., " A US View of ESDP", available on line at http: // www.brook.edu./views/ articles/ Daaelder /20011ecadpt.htm, accessed on 08.12.2003.

Daalder, Ivo, H., "The End of Atlanticism", *Survival* (Vol.45, No. 2, Summer 2003).

Deighton, Anne, The European Security and Defence Policy, *Journal of Common Mar*ket *Studies*, Vol.40, No.4, 2002.

Diedrichs, Udo and Jopp, Mathias, " Flexible Modes of Governance: Making CFSP and ESDP Work", *International Spectator*, Vol.XXXVIII, No.3., 2003

Duffield, John S., NATO' s Functions after the Cold War, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol.109, No.5 (Winter 1994-1995).

Duke Simon, 'The Second Death or the Second Coming of WEU', *Journal of Common Market Studies,* Vol.32 (2), 1996, pp. 14-28

Duke, Simon, "CESDP and the EU Response to 11 September: Identifying the Weakest Link", *European Foreign Affairs Review* (No. 7, 2002

Duke, Simon, "The Second Death (or the Second Coming?) of the WEU", *Journal of Common Market Studies* (Vol. 34, No. 2 ,June 1996).

Dwan, Renata, "Jean Monnet and the European Defence Community, 1950-54", *Cold War History,* Vol. 1, No. 1, August 2000.

Everts, Steven and Keohane, Daniel, "The European Convention and EU Foreign Policy: Learning From Failure", *Survival* Vol. 45, No. 3, Autumn 2003.

François Heisbourg, 'European Defence Takes a Leap Forward', *NATO Review*, Spring/Summer 2000, available at http:// www.nato.int/docu/ review/2000/001-03.htm accessed on 29.12.2003

Garden, Timoty, "The Future of ESDP- Defence Capabilities For Europe", *The International Spectator*, Vol XXXVIII, No.3, 2003.

Gardner, Anthony Laurence, A New Era in US-EU Relations?, (England: Ashgate, 1997).

Gartner Heinz, 'European Security: The End of Territorial Defence',*The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 9., No.2, Winter/ Spring 2003, pp. 135-147

Gnesotto Nicole, 'ESDP: The Way Forward', *Military Technology,* December 2002

Gordon H. Philip, 'Their Own Army? Making European Defence Work', *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2000, pp.12-17

Gordon, Philip H., "NATO after 11 September*", Survival* , Vol.43, no.4.

Grant, Charles, "Resolving the Rows over ESDP", *Opinion*, CER. http://www.cer.org.uk.

Grant, Robert P., "France's New Relationship with NATO"*, Survival*, Vol.38, No.1, 1996.

Guay Terrence and Callum Robert, 'The Transformation and future prospects of Europe's defence Industry'*, International Affairs*, Vol.78 (4), 2002, pp.757-776

Hajnalka Vincze, "Beyond Symbolism: the EU's first military operation seen in its context",availableonlineatwww.weltpolitik.net/texte/policy/concordia/beyond_symbolism.pdf. Accessed on 11.05.2004

Ham, Peter Van, ' The Prospects for a European Security and Defence Identity' , *European Security*, vol.4, No.4, Winter 1995, pp.523-545

Ham, Peter Van, "Europe's Precarious Centre: Franco-German Co-operation and the CFSP", *European Security* Vol.8, No. 4, Winter 1999.

Ham, Peter Van, "The Prospects for a European Security and Defence Identity", *European Security,* Vol. 4, No. 4, Winter 1995

Hans Binnendjik and Richard Kugler, "Transforming European Forces", *Survival*, Vol.44

Heisbourg F, and Wijk de R., 'Is the Fundamental Nature of the Transatlantic Security Relationship Changing?, *NATO Review*, Spring 2001, Vol 39 (1)

Heisbourg, François 'European Defence Takes a Leap Forward', NATO Review, Spring/Summer 2000, available at http:// www.nato.int/docu/ review/2000/001-03.htm accessed on 29.12.2003.

Heisbourg, François, "Europe's Strategic Ambitions: The Limits of Ambiguity", *Survival* (Vol. 42, No. 2, summer 2000).

Howorth Jolyon, 'Britain, France and European Defence Initiative', *Survival*, Vol.10 (2), 2000, pp.33-55

Howorth Jolyon, 'Britain, NATO and CESDP: Fixed Strategy, Changing Tactics', *European Foreign Affairs Review* 5, 2000, pp.377-396

Howorth Jolyon, 'European Defence and the Changing Politics of Europe, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.39 (4), 2001, pp.56-78

Howorth Jolyon, 'ESDP and NATO Wedlock or Deadlock?', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol.38 ,No.3, 2003, pp. 235-254

Howorth, Jolyon, "Britain, NATO and CESDP: Fixed Strategy, Changing Tactics", *European Foreign Affairs Review,* Vol.39, No.4, 2001

Howorth, Jolyon, "Britain, France and the European Initiative", *Survival* Vol. 42, No. 2, Summer 2000.

Howorth, Jolyon, "CESDP After 11 September: From Short-term Confusion to Long-term Cohesion?", *EUSA Review Essay* ,Vol. 15, No. 1, Winter 2002.

İnan, Yüksel and Yusuf, İslam, "New European Security Identity and Turkey", *Turkish Yearbook of International Relations* No. 29, 1999.

Kaiser, Karl, "the New NATO", *Asia-Pacific Review* Vol10, No.1, May 2003.

Kaplan, Lawrence, S. "NATO and Adenauer's Germany: Uneasy Partnership", *International Organization*, Vol.15, no.4, Autumn 1961.

Keohane Daniel, 'The European Defence Plans: Filling the Transatlantic Gaps' *International Spectator*, Vol. 38 (3), 2003, pp. 61-77

Keohane, Daniel, "Time For Mr. ESDP?" *CER Bulletin*, (Isis. 26, October, November 2002)

Larsen, Henrik, "The EU: A Global Military Actor?", *Cooperation and Conflict,:* Vol. 37, No. 3, 2002.

Maull, Hanns W., Germany and The Use of force: Still a 'Civilian Power'?" *Surviva*l, Vol.42, 2000.

Menon, Anand, "From Independence to Cooperation: France, NATO and European Security", *International Affairs*, Vol. 71, No.1.

Missiroli, Antonio, "EU Enlargement and CFSP/ ESDP", *European Integration*, Vol.25, 2003.

Missiroli, Antonio "ESDP-Post Iraq. Building a European Security and Defence Policy: what are the priorities?", Lecture given at the International Seminar for Experts on 12-13 June 2003, available on line at www.cicerofoundation.org

Missiroli, Antonio, "European Security Policy: The Challenge of Coherence", *European Foreign Affairs Review* No. 6, 2001

Onur ÖYMEN, "Turkey and The New Challenges to European Security", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol.6, 2001

Pensksa Susan., Mason L. Warren., 'EU Security Cooperation and the Transatlantic Relationship' *Cooperation and Conflict* Vol.38(3), 2003.

Riggio Daniele, 'EU-NATO Cooperation and Complementarity between the Rapid Reaction Forces', *International Spectator* Vol 38 (3), 2003, pp.47-60

Rummel Reinhardt, 'From Weakness to Power with the ESDP', *European Foreign Affairs Review 7*,2002,pp.453-471

Rynning, Sten, "Why Not NATO? Military Planning in the European Union", *The Journal of Strategic Studies* (Vol. 26, No. 1, March 2003).

Sakellariou, Jannis and Keating, Tamara, "Safeguarding Multilateralism: The Urgency of European Defence", *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* (Vol. IX, Iss. 2, Winter/Spring 2003)

Schweiss Christina, 'Sharing Hegemony The Future of Transatlantic Security', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 38, No.3; 2003, pp. 211-234)

Shepherd, Alistair, J., K., "Top-Down or Bottom-Up: Is Security and Defence Policy in the EU a Question of Political Will or Military Capability", *European Security*, Vol.9, No. 2, Summer 2000,

Smith Karen, 'The end of Civilian Power Europe: A Welcome Demise or Cause Concern?' *International Spectator*, Vol. 35(2), 2000, pp. 25-48

Smith Martin, Timmins Graham, 'The EU, NATO, and the Extension of Institutional Order in Europe', *World Affairs*, 2000

Stepherd, Alistair J.K, 'Top-Down or Bottom Up: Is Security and Defence Policy in the EU a Question of Political Will or Military Capability?' *European Security*, Vol.9. No.2, Summer 2000, pp. 13-30 (1998)

Taylor, Trevor, "West European Security and Defence Cooperation: Maastricht and Beyond", *International Affairs*, Vol.70, No.1, 1994.

Timoty Garden, "The Future of ESDP- Defence Capabilities For Europe", *The International Spectator*, Vol XXXVIII, No.3, 2003

Tofte Sunniva, "Non-EU NATO members and The Issue of Discrimination", in Howorth Jolyon and Keeler John T.S., (eds) <u>Defending Europe The EU, NATO and the Quest For European Autonomy</u>, (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003),

Tuschhoff, Christian, "Why NATO is Still Relevant", *International.Politics*, Vol 40, 2003.

Winn, Neil, "CFSP, ESDP and the Future of European Security: Whither NATO", *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* (Vol. IX, Iss. 2, Winter/Spring 2003).

Vincze, Hajnalka "Beyond Symbolism: the EU's first military operation seen in its context", availableonlineatwww.weltpolitik.net/texte/policy/concordia/beyond_symbolism.pdf. Accessed on 11.05.2004

Yost, David S., "The NATO Capabilities Gap and the European Union", *Survival* (Vol. 42, No. 2, Winter 2000-2001).