

THE EU AS A GLOBAL PEACE ACTOR? A CHALLENGE BETWEEN EU CONFLICT MANAGEMENT AND NATIONAL PATHS

Delphine Deschaux-Beaume

PACTE- Institute for Political Studies (IEP Grenoble)
38040 Grenoble cedex 9, France
Telephone (+33 04) 7682 6024
E-mail delphine.deschaux@wanadoo.fr

Received 2 November, 2011; accepted 7 December, 2011

***Abstract.** This paper raises the question of a policy for conflict in the making for the EU: the European Defense and Security Policy. After a brief presentation of our analytical method, we structure the paper in three axes. First, where does CSDP come from and what are its main objectives? Then, what is European specificity in developing specific crisis management tools, and how do these tools work and socialize the diplomatic and politico-military actors involved? Last but not least, how does CSDP interplay between Brussels and the member states? What does CSDP change for them, and what are its obvious and more pregnant limits up to now? CSDP constitutes a way for the Europeans to exit the world order of the Cold War and aims at providing the EU with a median way of crisis and conflict management between the approaches developed by traditional international organizations as NATO, the UNO or the OSCE. CSDP incarnates also the commitment of the three leading countries in defense and security matters in Europe—France, Great Britain and Germany— to overcome the shock of the Balkans crisis where Europe had been characterized by its division and inability to act effectively to solve the conflict. Therefore the member states had built specific organs, tools and procedures in the framework of CSDP. The originality and added value of the EU with its crisis management policy as the heart of CSDP is to propose an integrated approach combining military and civilian instruments. This however raises several fundamental questions. CSDP still lacks cross-pillar coherence, particularly regarding the financing of CSDP operations.*

This also raises the question of the interplay between Brussels and the member states: deploying troops is still a national sovereign decision and EU states keep on analyzing situations in the light of their national security interest. Yet CSDP combined with the new trends in military socialization since the 80's constitute a strong incentive to reform both the armies and military education. Thus CSDP seems to be a hopeful way of developing a European crisis management policy putting into light the assets of the EU in this area.

Keywords: *European integration, defense, Europeanization, international relations, France- Germany- security policy.*

Introduction

The European Union has long been – and still is for some authors¹ – associated with the image of a civilian or normative power. Back to the 1970's, the IR theory witnessed a debate opposing two trends regarding this subject: the analysts who view the EC-and then EU – as a civilian power² versus the ones that view the EC-EU as a potential superpower³. These two trends underlie two different positions on the role of the European Union in the world and in international affairs. François Duchêne, leader of the « civilian power » analysts, used to analyze the European Community as a civilian power characterized by the use of a *soft power* (in opposition to military *hard power*) anchored in its civilian tools on the benefit of a community of states which have mutually given up the use of military violence among them, and which encourage other states to do as well (this is the idea of normativity)⁴. Duchêne focuses on the idea that a European foreign policy should aim at promoting democracy, human rights and peaceful cooperation. The authors thinking in terms of civilian power⁵ actually draw their analytical inspiration from the German model of foreign policy using mostly economical levers to address some critical international issues as environmental threats and favoring a free and open trade⁶. The notion of civilian power also draws on the idea of “security

-
- 1 Maull, H. Europe and the new balance of global order. *International Affairs*. 2005, 81(4): 775–799; Whitman, R. Muscles from Brussels. The demise of civilian power Europe? In: Elgström, O.; Smith, M. (eds.). *The European Union's Role in International Politics. Concepts and analysis*. London, Routledge: ECPR Studies in European Political Science, 2006.
 - 2 Duchêne, F. La Communauté Européenne et les aléas de l'interdépendance. In: Kohnstamm, M.; Hager, W. *L'Europe avec un grand E*. Paris: Robert Laffont, 1973.
 - 3 Galtung, J. *The European Community, a superpower in the making*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1973.
 - 4 Duchêne, F., *op. cit.*
 - 5 Maull, H. Germany and Japan: the new civilian powers. *Foreign Affairs*. 1990, 69(5): 91–106; Maull, H. Germany and the use of force: still a “civilian power”? *Survival*. 2000, 42(2): 56–80; Smith, K. Beyond the civilian power EU debate. *Politique Européenne*. 2005, 17: 63–82; Linklater, A. A European civilising process? In Hill, Ch.; Smith, M. (eds.). *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
 - 6 Smith, K., *ibid.*

community” issue by Karl Deutsch in the 1950’s⁷: in the frame of a security community the member states do not consider physical power –and by the way military power- as a legitimate means to solve violence and political problems anymore. On the contrary these states rely on mutual communication processes (cybernetic model) between social elites as well as between populations. Karl Deutsch took the example of the role of the European integration process in promoting mutual trust between the French and German populations after WWII. Moreover in Duchêne’s view, nuclear deterrence has *de facto* emptied out military power in Europe and thus given a real added-value to civilian frames of influence and action: the leitmotiv is to invest the economic and political channels to make the EC a normative and civilian power⁸. Other authors recently took advantage of historical sociology –and more precisely Elias’s *Civilizing Process* (1975)- to analyze European integration as an equivalent civilizing process reefing to the development of self-constraint and its diffusion⁹. Robert Kagan also points out new civilizing missions for the EU, rooted in the discovery of perpetual peace by the Europeans¹⁰. On the other hand, a second analytical trend used to analyze the EC as a putative superpower¹¹. And if some authors still considered Europe as a civilian power in 1998 regarding its incapacity to act militarily in the Balkans¹², the evolution of the EU since the end of the Cold War seems to prove him right, the EU developing from 1999 on a common defense policy (CSDP) backed on proper European military and non-military tools. We agree with Karen Smith to analyze the raise of CSDP as the end of the civilian power Europe¹³.

Thus, my paper aims at developing a reflection on the CSDP as a tool for the EU in its external relations and on the international scene. In the globalized world the EU is increasingly facing the question of security, mostly outside its borders. But where does CSDP come from and what are its aims? To what extent does CSDP constitute a Europeanized or “Brusselsized” social configuration and enables us to speak of a European crisis management policy in the making? What are the problems and blockades encountered? We will rely on this set of questions to propose an analysis divided into three parts. Whereas the most part of the literature on CFSP and CSDP relies on integration theories (mostly intergovernmentalism, institutionalism, functionalism) or IR, we chose to rely on policy analysis with a special historical sociological focus. We tend to analyze CSDP as a specific social configuration in the making, which enables to interplay between the macro level of member states and the micro level of the agents (officers, diplomats, politicians). Such an analytical approach is not yet very developed¹⁴

7 Deutsch, K. *Political community in the North-Atlantic area*. Princeton University Press, 1957.

8 Duchêne, F., *supra* note 2, p. 43.

9 Linklater, A., *supra* note 5.

10 Kagan, R. *Of paradise and power: America and Europe in the new world order*. London: Atlantic Books, 2004.

11 Galtung, J., *supra* note 3.

12 Whitman, R., *supra* note 1; Hill, Ch.; Wallace, W. Introduction: actors and actions. In: Hill, Ch. (ed.). *The actors in Europe’s Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge, 1996.

13 Smith, K., *supra* note 5.

14 Buchet de Neuilly, Y. Une Europe sans voix: les conditions du recours à la PESC. In: Helly, D.; Petiteville, F. *L’Union Européenne, acteur international*. Paris: L’Harmattan, 2005; Mérand, F. Dying for the Union?

but still shows good potentialities to analyze European integration more thinly¹⁵. I thus partly rely on social constructivist tools as discourse analysis but my use of these tools is quite instrumental. This special configuration involves socializing processes and weighs on the former social practices of the actors involved, but also interacts with the existing security and defense national configurations, what can explain some of the difficulties of CSDP's development.

The first part of the paper will examine the genesis of CSDP and try to put into light what makes EU's specificity a would-be peace actor in crisis management regarding this genesis. The second will focus on the functioning of the European crisis management in the making as a social configuration implying socializing processes and new practices. The third part of the paper will focus on the challenges encountered by the EU as a peace actor in its interaction with the national security policies.

1. CSDP as a European Way of Exiting the Cold War and Spreading Peace in the World

The end of the Cold War raised the global question of European and world security in a challenged international context. New threats, new forms of conflictuality (most of the conflicts are today intra-state conflicts¹⁶) imply new answers to the evolving security dilemma¹⁷. Security today doesn't only concern the military aspects of conflicts but also economic, cultural and social aspects. Thus the old instruments created in a time of bipolar confrontation, as the North Atlantic Alliance, are not so appropriate to deal with this new form of insecurity and instability in the world. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War in the beginning of the 1990's opened a policy window¹⁸ for the EU to quit its status of "economic giant but political dwarf" so as to work at becoming

Military officers and the creation of a European defence force. *European Societies*. 2003, 5(3): 253–282; Mérand, F. Social representations in the European Security and Defence Policy. *Cooperation and Conflict*. 2006, 41(2): 131–152.

- 15 Sociological approaches are particularly useful to understand European integration because it helps the analysts look into something which is more than the EU structures: that is a European "sociality". Christiansen, T.; Jorgensen, K. E.; Wiener, A. The social construction of Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 1999, 6(4): 528–544; Georgakakis, D. Construction sociale de l'Europe et sociologie politique européenne: perspectives communes et nouveaux matériaux de recherche. *Regards sociologiques*. 2004, 27/28; Guiraudon, V. L'espace sociopolitique européen: un champ encore en friche? *Cultures et conflits*. 2000, 38/39: 7–37; Guiraudon, V. The EU through European's eyes: political sociology and the EU studies. *EUSA Review*. 2006, 19(1): 1–5.
- 16 Evans, G. Cooperative Security and Intrastate Conflict. *Foreign Policy*. 1994: 3; Hassner, P. *La violence et la paix*. Paris: Seuil, Coll. « Essais », 2000, p. 15.
- 17 This notion has been elaborated by J. Hertz and means that when a state reinforces its security, he will automatically concern other states because of the anarchic and competitive structure of international scene.
- 18 Kingdon, J. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. University of Michigan, Longman, 2003 (1st ed., 1984).

a global player¹⁹, implying a real foreign policy on the long run. As Knud Jorgensen points it, this lead to another world implying another task for Europe's armed forces²⁰.

1.1. Lessons-Learned from the Balkans: Surfing on NATO New Frame of Reference to Enable European Action in World Peace and Security

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, NATO engaged in a strategic reform aiming at two main objectives: enlargement to the Eastern European countries (London Declaration, July 6th 1990) and a new strategic concept (Rome Declaration, November 8th 1990) based on a global security approach and backed by rapid reaction forces composed of multinational military rapidly deployable units²¹. Thus the setting up of the Eurocorps and Euroforces between 1992 and 1996 participate in this global reform context regarding military action in Europe: from now on the governments and military high leaders have started focusing on crisis management in an international system characterized by the coexistence of often competing intergovernmental organizations and new risks linked with political instability in lots of regions in the world. The Petersberg Tasks launched at the WEU summit in summer 1992 also played an important role in the genesis of CSDP as a potential conflict management tool for Europe²²: there was historically no European multilateral crisis management. Most of European states have conducted rescue tasks individually -against hunger in Africa for instance- or under ad hoc coalitions – evacuation tasks²³. Thus- as we will show it later- crisis management in the EU is necessarily strongly dependent on national traditions and practices in this specific area²⁴. The Petersberg Tasks include three types of missions: humanitarian missions; peacekeeping missions; peace enforcement and even armed intervention. The Petersberg Tasks also focus on multilateralism with NATO and the UN. These Tasks provide the EU with a spectrum of action, as they have been included in the Amsterdam Treaty and are now part of the CSDP framework.

1.2. Policy Window and Advocacy Coalitions in the Setting up of CSDP

This global reflection on security and crisis management in Europe engaged within NATO reform combined with the Balkans crisis to make the European governments

19 This aim is particularly materialized in the French term “Europe-puissance”, which belongs to the global representation of the EU as a real power in the world as it shows in French political discourses on the question.

20 Jorgensen, K. E. (ed.). *European approaches to crisis management*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997, p. 3.

21 The document can be consulted on NATO website [interactive]. [accessed 01-10-2011]. <<http://www.nato.int/docu/fonda/b900706a.htm>>.

22 When we employ the term “Europe”, is mostly in the sense of the European Union, and not so much in the geographical dimension of the word.

23 Jorgensen, K. E., *op. cit.*, 20.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 140.

aware of how badly equipped they were to cope with the new emerging security challenges. The Yugoslav crisis then the Balkans wars in the 1990's showed European dependence towards Washington concerning military conflict management²⁵. As Richard Holbrooke, the US Dayton negotiator, noted, Europeans had been "sleeping through the night"²⁶. This opened a policy window for small circles of actors at the top of the states foreign policy administrations, mostly French-German at first, acting as a transnational advocacy coalition²⁷, then relying on the Blair administration in 1998-1999 after the British political changeover which led the Labor party to power in Britain in spring 1997. This advocacy coalition put the question of constructing military instruments for the EU on the European political agenda. Here the use of policy analysis with a more sociological eye enables us to better understand the role of some leading policy actors in France, Germany and Britain. The idea that European foreign policy needs military instruments is not so old: the failure of the European Defense Community in 1954 had put defense matters aside from the European integration process over forty years²⁸. And the competition with NATO on this issue was cleared at the Alliance Summit in Copenhagen in July 1991: for the first time, NATO –which included Washington recognized that the European Community was legitimate to develop a European defense identity by admitting that the Twelve are inclined to make necessary decisions so as to express both a common foreign and security policy and a military role for Europe²⁹. Thus NATO also admitted in Rome in November 1991 that such a process was part of the Alliance's renovation³⁰. There was then a political opportunity for the Europeans to raise the issue of a European instrument for conflict management. Therefore at Maastricht, under a strong French-German impulsion based on the political entrepreneurship³¹ showed by Mitterrand and Kohl³², the European member states issued an entire part of the Treaty dedicated to the European Common Foreign and Security Policy (Title V), including "the definition in the long run of a common defense policy, which could lead, on a suitable time, to a common defense." (Maastricht Treaty, article J.4-1). This opened the way for these coalized French-German-British actors to launch the European Security and Defense Policy later, at the Cologne summit in June 1999. Yet, the chosen

25 Petiteville, F. *La politique internationale de l'Union européenne*. Paris: Presses de Sciences-Po. Peyrouse, S., 2006, p. 71.

26 Jorgensen, K. E., *supra* note 20, p. 4.

27 Sabatier, P.; Jenkins-Smith, H. *Policy change and learning*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1993; Sabatier, P.; Jenkins-Smith, H. The Advocacy Coalition Framework. An assessment. In: Sabatier, P. (ed.). *Theories of the policy process*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1999.

28 Duke, S. *The elusive quest for European Security: From EDC to CFSP*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.

29 Maury, J.-P. *La construction européenne – La sécurité et la défense*. Paris: PUF, Coll. « Politique d'aujourd'hui », 1996, p. 169.

30 Guilhaudis, J.-F. *La réorganisation du système de sécurité occidentale en Europe, La réorganisation du système de sécurité occidentale en Europe*. Grenoble: Université Pierre Mendès-France, Cahiers du CEDSI, 1997, n° 18, p. 73.

31 Kingdon, J., *supra* note 18.

32 The two heads of state made large use of the practice of common letters sent to the other European partners so as to insuflate the reflection on a European foreign and defense policy in 1990-1991. They were particularly three letters before the European Council in Dublin (April 1990), in November 1990 and in October 1991. This last letter opened the way to the creation of the Eurocorps.

formulation –voluntarily vague and conditional- shows how controversial the subject of European defense and security was and still is among the European member states: if France, strongly supported by Germany, had initiated the debate, there where numbers of states accepting it on the principle but in the NATO framework (Britain, Netherlands, Portugal). Some states even refused fundamentally any military competence for the EU out off exclusive dedication to NATO (Denmark) or out of neutrality (Ireland). Thus, the articles of the Maastricht Treaty about European Foreign Policy are a compromise in between: CFSP should respect the commitments resulting from the Washington Treaty for some states and stay compatible with the defense and security policy conducted in the NATO framework. In the beginning of the 1990's, European defense as envisaged into two possible frames, linked by a third organization: the Western European Union. Thus the WEU was both considered as the European pillar of NATO and the military arm of the EU after the Maastricht ICG.

Britain crossed the “European Defense Rubicon” at Saint-Malo in December 1998: overnight, a declaration was written by the close counselors of the French and British Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Head of state and Prime Minister. For the first time, The British have accepted the principle of a European defense capacity autonomous from NATO and the United States. The document mentioned the need for “credible military forces” for the EU, so as to enable the European Community to act in case of international crisis “where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged”³³. This lead in June 1999 at Cologne to the quick Europeanization of the Saint-Malo agreement and the launching of the European Security and Defense Policy³⁴. Thus the EU's nature changed: it was an exclusively civilian power, and with CSDP, the EU has now a potentiality to become a global player: the EU will then have a choice to respond crisis with a plurality of tools, from civilian and normative tools to military management³⁵. CSDP opened the way to an emerging conflict management tool or the European Union.

2. Towards a European Conflict Management Method: is CSDP a “Brusselized” Policy?

CSDP is not, as the Common Agricultural Policy, a top-down methodical approach emanating from the European institutions in Brussels; on the contrary, CSDP is an intergovernmental policy much more based on an inductive process consisting in defining

33 Yet Saint-Malo doesn't mean a total turnaround on the British side: Tony Blair claimed on May, 10th 1999 in the *Financial Times* that NATO remained the cornerstone of any defense capacity and there was no question of a European army. Saint-Malo joint Declaration, in Rutten, M. *De Saint-Malo à Nice: les textes fondateurs de la défense européenne*. Volume I, Cahiers de Chaillot n°47, Paris, Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UE, 2001, p. 11.

34 Gnesotto, N. (dir.). *La PESD. Les cinq premières années. 1999-2004*. Paris: Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UE, 2004, p. 46.

35 Manners, I. Normative power Europe: beyond the crossroads. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2006, 13(2): 182–199.

a have and *a can do* before determining *a will*³⁶. CSDP evolves to generate a conflict management tool for the EU according to the *lessons-learned* and feedbacks from the European operations. The novelty of the European Defense Policy when comparing to the former projects is its search for permanence. Indeed organs and procedures for conflict and crisis management have been created on the European level. That's why we rely on the concept of social configuration here³⁷, where other authors use Bourdieu's notion of field³⁸. The European Defense Policy consists in a rationalization process of creating a specific configuration in the frame of the European construction. This specific security configuration owns its own logics, concurrences and induces some emerging socialization processes for its most committed actors (the French, German, British and Belgian politico-military actors, i.e. diplomats, military officers, political leaders).

From 1999 on, the member states committed themselves to develop a large panel of management conflict tools in this specific framework combining civilian and military instruments as well as judicial, political and economical means. Every IGC since Cologne aimed at providing the EU with an autonomous capacity to respond to international crisis where off NATO is not engaged and within the principles of the UN Charta (Chapter VII). The major objectives of CSDP are not to militarize the EU but to solve other's conflict and help building a "secure Europe in a better world"³⁹. This all process leads to enormous changes in the EU: what is at stake since Cologne is to go beyond a rhetorical diplomacy.

2.1. CSDP Crisis Management Tools: a European Method in the Making

We chose here to analyze CSDP as a conflict management tool for the EU by asking the question of the specificity of European conflict management in the making.

2.1.1. CSDP Organs and Conflict Management Procedures

There are three main CSDP organs in Brussels: the PSC, the EUMC and the EUMS, which were created at the Nice IGC in 2000 and effectively set up in 2001. The Political and Security Committee (PSC) is the king pin of CSDP and crisis management in the EU: under authority of the Council, the PSC keeps track of CSDP and endorses the political and strategic control of EU military operations and CSDP missions. The PSC works closely with the EU Military Committee (EUMC), which is the highest military institution in the frame of the EU Council. The EUMC provides military advice to

36 Dumoulin, A.; Mathieu, R.; Sarlet, G. *La politique européenne de sécurité et de défense (PESD): de l'opérateur à l'identitaire: genèse, structuration, ambitions, limites*. Préface de Javier Solana, Bruxelles, Bruylant, Coll. « Organisation internationale et relations internationales », 2003, n°54.

37 Elias defines a social configuration as a concrete situation of interdependence between the individuals or the states (Elias, N. *Qu'est-ce que la sociologie?* Paris: Pocket Agora, 1993, p. 158). The flexibility of the concept enables to use it either at a micro level (individuals, and more precisely here soldiers, diplomats and civilian experts) or at a macro level (states, European system, world system, social structure...).

38 Mérand, F., 2003, *supra* note 14; Mérand, F., 2006, *supra* note 14.

39 This is the title of the European Security Strategy announced by EU High Representative Solana on the European Council in Brussels on 12th December 2003. Solana, in Gnesotto, N., *supra* note 34, p. 6.

the PSC and directives to the EU Military Staff (EUMS). Its role is also to provide military expertise to Javier Solana and monitor EU military operations. Both organs are intergovernmental structures. In addition to them, integrated structures are requested to manage crisis in coordination with the PSC and EUMC: these are mostly the High Representative for CFSP (Javier Solana) helped by a Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit (PPEWU) and the EUMS backed by the Politico-Military Group. The EUMC's main function is provided the PSC with strategic planning, early warning and military monitoring. A civil-military cell has more precisely been created within the EUMS in 2005⁴⁰ to insure contingency planning and strategic planning and increase cross-pillar coordination in CSDP. Moreover, the EU took over the WEU military tools as the WEU was merged into the EU framework by the end of 2000. These tools consist of a satellite center (Torrejon), and Institute for Security Studies (Paris), which produces expert reports. In addition to these organs a European Armament Agency has been launched in 2004⁴¹ so as to help the coordination of arm procurements in Europe and a European Security and Defense College working in network originated in 2005, under strong French-German commitment⁴².

These organs generated common conflict and crisis management procedures in Brussels, with a combination of permanent monitoring, a Crisis Management Concept used in time of crisis, and the development of strategic options, evaluations and feedbacks. Concretely, when an operation concept has been agreed between the member states, the main work in terms of European crisis management takes place in the General Secretariat of the EU Council between the EUMS and the GD E VIII (responsible for the military aspects) and/ or the GD E IX (responsible for the civilian aspects). The all configuration is based on permanent contacts between the capitals and Brussels via the PSC and Javier Solana and his team. On an intern level in the member states, the Foreign offices are the ones who decide to participate or not in a European military operation or crisis management task, in close coordination with the Defense ministries and sometime the Head of state according to the constitutional rules in force (in France for instance, the President plays a major role regarding military operation decision-making).

But what does CSDP and its crisis management elements changes? Before CSDP, the decision-making process used exclusively bilateral formats in the sector of military cooperation. With CSDP, the decision-making process takes now place between the actors located in the capital and the permanent delegates of the states and the European actors in Brussels, who share a way of negotiating compromises and solution. Just to give an example, the EU autonomous military operation in Congo in summer 2006 was politically assumed by the diplomatic actors of the Political and Security Comity

40 This cell is part of the Tervuren package, also known as "Chocolate Summit" on April, 29th 2003 between France, Germany, Belgium and Luxemburg. Britain opposed the idea of creating this cell until November 2003 because this was seen in London as a step forward towards EU autonomy in defense matters. The EU cell offers the core of the emerging EU operation center launched in June 2007. Its status "within the EUMS" is interpreted on a twofold principle.

41 Joint Action 2004.551.CFSP.

42 Joint action 2005.757.CFSP on 18.07.2005.

in Brussels, although the troops stay in the hand of the nation-states. We share with Kenneth Glarbo the assumption that “social interaction is emerging as the natural historical product of day-to-day practices of political cooperation. Diplomats and national diplomacies have internalized, in particular, the formal requirements of a Common Security and Foreign Policy”⁴³. Thus one can consider CSDP as a crisis management tool in the making on the EU level as CSDP’s organs and procedural practices play as socializing agents for the military, diplomatic and political actors involved, yet much more for those working in Brussels as for those working in the capitals as we will show later in our paper. CSDP tends to normalize, even if still quite incrementally, diplomatic and politico-military practices in Europe.

2.1.2. European Specificity in Managing Crisis: a Large Panel of Military and No-military Means in CSDP

What is at stake for the EU here is to underline the specificity of European crisis management developed in the framework of CSDP. On the one hand the UN keeps incarnating the Kantian aspiration at equality among the nations; NATO on the other hand -though reformed in a more political way and enlarged to the Eastern European countries in the late 1990’s- symbolizes much more pragmatism and search for efficiency than equality among nations and political civil society. Thus CSDP’s claims lie in between these two positions.

The first EU crisis management exercise took place in 2002 and aimed at testing CSDP’s procedures in this area and coordinate the whole spectrum of military and civilian tools. CSDP consists in providing the EU with a global and coherent capacity to prevent and manage crisis on both military and civilian levels. This large combination of instruments derives from EU’s special civilian nature and offers an added value regarding NATO crisis management frame exclusively based on military elements. EU’s crisis management “package” is inspired by a classical lecture of conflicts: preconflict phase, conflict and post-conflict⁴⁴. This explains a mix of military and civilian tools at disposal in CSDP’s framework.

2.2. Military Tools for Crisis Management in CSDP

Military capacities have quick become a very important aspect of CSDP: at the Helsinki IGC in December 1999 the member states determined a Headline Goal (*Helsinki Headline Goal* or *HHC*): by 2003, the EU should be able to deploy 60 000 soldiers

43 Glarbo, K. Wide-awake diplomacy: reconstructing the common foreign and security policy of the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 1999, 6(4): 649–650; see also Pouliot, V. The Logic of Everyday Practice: The Routinization of Diplomacy in Security Communities. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, California, USA*, 2006.

44 Aligisakis, M. (dir.). *Europe et sortie de conflits*. Genève: Institut Européen de l’Université de Genève, 2005, p. 28.

within 60 days and sustain them over a year; this EU rapid reaction force should be able to accomplish the whole spectrum of the Petersberg Tasks. CSDP's operationality has been officialized at Laeken in December 2001. The Headline Goal 2010 is even more ambitious: the decision to intervene militarily should be taken at the latest 5 days after the approval of a Crisis Management Concept by the member states and the EU Council, so that the operation could be set up under 10 days. But this doesn't mean anyway that the EU member states are willing to set up a European army: deploying troops on a crisis theater is still a national sovereign decision. In June 2004, a further military instrument has been created on the basis of the lessons-learned from operation Artemis in Democratic Republic of Congo in 2003: the *Battle Groups* (or BG)⁴⁵. These Battle Groups are based on multinationality and are composed of 15000 soldiers, aiming at providing the EU with a concrete rapid reaction capacity so as to respond an urgent crisis or intervene under UN Security Council request. These Battle Groups constitute a proactive process in the frame of CSDP and developed in parallel with NATO Response Force (NRF). France proposed 12 000 men, Germany 13 5000 men and Britain 12 500 men⁴⁶. Yet the BGs also raise lots of questions regarding the persisting national analyzes and red lines applied to national troop deployments.

Thus EU already leads several military operations: two were conducted under the Berlin Plus mechanism in Macedonia in 2003 (operation *Concordia*) and in Bosnia in 2004-2005 (operation *Althea*)⁴⁷. But this mechanism constitutes a critical limitation for some authors, as it seems impossible to imagine that NATO would put its capacities at EU's disposal if Washington expresses an opposition⁴⁸: thus Berlin Plus is seen as a means from the USA to limit European autonomy in crisis management and strategic planning⁴⁹. But the two first really European operations not relying on NATO capacities are the operation *Artemis* in 2003⁵⁰ and the operation *EUFOR Congo* in 2006, both taking place in Democratic Republic of Congo. Artemis functioned under the lead-nation framework (France leading the OHQ and FHQ with the concurrence of soldiers from other member states) and was typically a peace enforcement task⁵¹, whereas EUFOR Congo

45 The concept has been launched in June 2004 by a French-British-German initiative and deepened in 2005. The BG are requested to be ready for deployment under 5 to 10 days, stay on the crisis theater at least 3 months and be able to intervene up to 6000 km away from Brussels. They are backed up with naval and air capabilities. From January 2007, they are 13 BGs registered, among which 2 are permanently in alert for 6 months.

46 Petiteville, F., *supra* note 25, p. 87.

47 Berlin Plus is an agreement derived from the debate on the European Security and Defense Identity in the 1990's and the notion of European pillar within NATO. It was agreed on 2002 that the EU could have an access to NATO common planning capacities in the case of an operation where NATO is not engaged. Berlin Plus is a compromise agreement named after the NATO Berlin summit of 1996 which inaugurated the concept of Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) so as to guarantee the automaticity of access to NATO common capacities for the Europeans in order not to reiterate such an impotent situation as in Bosnia.

48 Dumoulin, A.; Mathieu, R.; Sarlet, G., *supra* note 36, p. 294.

49 Gnesotto, N., *supra* note 34, p. 26.

50 Joint Action 2003/423/PESC.

51 Aligisakis, M., *supra* note 44, p. 34.

consisted in supervising the first democratic elections held in Congo⁵². 1500 soldiers from 18 European nations (including Turkey) were sent on the ground. EUFOR can be considered as a première on several levels: it is the first military operation entirely planned from Brussels; it marked the return of the *Bundeswehr* in Africa outside a UN mandate. Even if the forces deployed have been nationally been put at EU's disposal, the PSC was politically responsible for the mission, while the EUMC defined the OHQ⁵³ and FHQ's mandate.

But the added value of European crisis management method is its capacity to combine the multiple facets of international action⁵⁴. Thus several civilian instruments also back CSDP.

2.3. A Civilian Crisis Management Concept: EU's Added-Value?

The member states also decided to develop the civilian aspects of crisis management in four priority areas defined by the Feira European Council in June 2000: police, strengthening of the rule of law, strengthening civilian administration and civil protection⁵⁵. These civilian tools correspond to the historically civilian nature of the EU⁵⁶. The specific capabilities in these four fields could be used in the context of EU-led autonomous missions, or in the context of operations conducted by lead-agencies, such as the UN. The member states should have committed themselves to be capable of carrying out any police operation, from advisory, assistance and training tasks to substituting to local police forces by providing up to 5000 police officers by 2003, of whom up to 1 400 can be deployed in under 30 days. They have also undertaken to provide 200 experts in the area of the rule of law, and up to 2000 experts potentially deployable on the ground to help rebuild an administrative network, set up education systems, etc. The Ministerial Civilian Crisis Management Capability Conference held on 19 November 2002 confirmed that the concrete targets in the four priority areas had been reached and even exceeded through Member States' voluntary commitments⁵⁷. The police area is right now the most developed, aiming at extending the military tool in the post-conflict phase⁵⁸. Police missions as the operation Proxima in Macedonia or the EU Military Police Mission (EUMP) in Bosnia give flesh to these capacities.

52 A UN resolution was adopted on the 25.04.2006, following the request addressed by the UN to the EU on the 27.12.2005. The operation was launched based on the Joint Action 2006/319/PESC on the 27.04.2006.

53 The OHQ was assumed by Germany and located in the *Einsatzführungskommando* in Potsdam under the commandment of General Viereck, while the FHQ in Kinshasa was operated by the French General Damay assisted by the German Admiral Bess.

54 Zorbibe, Ch. *L'avenir de la sécurité internationale*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2004, p. 118.

55 Nowak, A. (dir.). *Civilian crisis management: the EU way*. Cahiers de Chaillot n° 90, Paris, Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UE, 2006, p. 19–23.

56 German foreign minister W. Steinmeier called the EU a "Zivilmacht mit Zähnen", i.e. a civilian power with teeth. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, "Zivilmacht mit Zähnen", *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 8/02/2007.

57 Bagayoko, N.; Kovacs, A. *La gestion interministérielle des sorties de conflit*. Paris: Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la défense, Coll. « Les documents du C2SD », 2007.

58 See the European Police Action Plan adopted at the European Summit in Gothenburg in June 2001. Rutten, M. *De Nice à: les textes fondateurs de la défense européenne*. Volume II, Cahiers de Chaillot n°51, Paris, Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UE, 2002, p. 66–72; Bagayoko, N.; Kovacs, A., *ibid.*, p. 169.

2.3.1. EU Operations and the European Security Strategy: a Way of Implementing the European Integrated and Holistic Method of Conflict Management and Socializing the Actors

According to these whole spectrum of civilian and military capacities set up in the framework of CSDP and implemented through more and more EU operations, one can assert that CSDP effectively constitutes an emerging policy for conflict management for the European Union. The military operations contribute to give reality to the EU as a global international actor⁵⁹, even if these operations are still modest and mostly focused on soft security⁶⁰. These operations and moreover the global frame of CSDP's organs, tools and procedures impels a socializing process for the diplomatic and politico-military actors from the member states in Brussels: one can speak of an emerging "Brusselsization" process⁶¹. One can understand this socializing process as a convergence trend towards some common elements in among the member states concerning crisis management, as one can also observe it in areas such as arms export controls in Europe⁶². Even if the first referent remains national for the officers particularly, the practice of the CSDP configuration in Brussels joints another kind of socialization for the soldiers: the socializing effect of European operations of crisis management⁶³ as multinationality lies at the heart of European crisis management approach. This kind of socializing processes enable the emergence of an embryonic European strategic culture incarnated in the European Security Strategy (ESS) issued by Solana on December 12th 2003 and entitled "A secure Europe in a better world": the ESS proposes an holistic, multilateral and integrated approach for EU crisis management, thus responding to the ad hoc or *à la carte* American multilateralism under Bush administration⁶⁴. This document has become a reference in the European discourse on security and a cognitive tool identifying global EU objectives in the long run and the corresponding set of tools the EU has at its disposal to solve the upcoming regional crisis. The focus on multilateralism and integration expresses the EU's world view and how the EU sees itself

59 Howorth, J. From security to defense: the evolution of the CFSP. In: Hill Ch.; Smith, M. (eds.). *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 192.

60 Hill, Ch.; Smith, M. Acting for Europe: reassessing the European Union's place in international relations. In: Hill, Ch.; Smith, M. (eds.). *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 402.

61 Bagayoko, N. *Les officiers français et la construction européenne: l'europanisation du point de vue des acteurs de la défense*. Paris: Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la défense, Coll. « Les documents du C2SD », 2005, n° 77; Bagayoko, N. L'europanisation des militaires français: socialisation institutionnelle et culture stratégique. *Revue Française de Science politique*. 2006, 56(1): 49–78.

62 Bauer, S.; Remacle, E. Theory and practice of multi-level foreign policy: the European Union's policy in the field of arms export controls. In: Tonra, B.; Christiansen, T. (eds.). *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

63 Pajon, Ch. L'Europe de la défense et la transformation des identités militaires: quelle europanisation? Le cas des acteurs militaires britannique, allemand et français. *Politique Européenne*. 2003, 10: 148–171.

64 Biscop, S. La Stratégie européenne de sécurité: mettre en œuvre l'approche holistique. In: L'Europe de la défense: acteurs, enjeux, processus. *Les Champs de Mars*. Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la Défense. n°19, janvier 2008.

in international relations⁶⁵. This integrated approach plays as a joker for the EU on the international scene as it combines unilateral, bilateral and multilateral strategies in EU's foreign policy with a differentiated approach depending on the sector: European crisis management can be military help, trade, economic sanctions, administrative and legal advice, etc. But building a real capacity of crisis management and conflict resolution in the EU also raises the question of the interplay between Brussels and the member states. What role do various foreign policy strategies of EU member states play in shaping the content of CSDP? What are the driving forces of different approaches? If socializing processes helps us understand the development of a European Defense configuration, the concept is also interesting to clarify the still quite diverging interpretations of the European Defense project by the different states, both on macro and micro level.

3. A Europeanized Way of Working out Peace? Between Coherence Problems and National Reflexes

CSDP and the European crisis management instruments keep evolving through compromises between the various foreign policy and military traditions of the member states that confront in Brussels in the EU intergovernmental organs as the Council or the EU Military Comity, the EU Military Staff and the Political and Security Comity. These organs play a role of interface between Brussels and the capitals in the incremental elaboration of a European foreign and security policy. And yet one can not say that European security interests have replaced national interests: it is more of an incremental process through which members states adjust some marginal parts of their foreign policies but keep a high hand on the deep core of these policies. What they delegate to the CSDP's organs in Brussels is soft security and not hard security: defense policies and troops deployment are still fundamentally national. The nation-state is an "obstinate" actor⁶⁶. As Sven Biscop notes: "If the member states deploy their troops, there still is no consensus on the deployment under the EU flag in the crisis management area."⁶⁷

3.1. A Recurring Leadership Problem

First of all, European crisis management approach via CSDP still suffers from important lacks and coherence problems⁶⁸. The absence of cross-pillar synergy appears to be of particular importance as it shows in the speech that we obtained by the actors –both military and diplomatic actors in Brussels- which we interviewed between

65 Jorgensen, K. E. A multilateralist role for the EU? In: Elgström, O.; Smith, M. (eds.). *The European Union's Role in International Politics. Concepts and analysis*. London, Routledge: ECPR Studies in European Political Science, 2006.

66 Hoffmann, S. Obstinate or obsolete? The Fate of Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe. *Daedalus*. 1966, 95: 862–915.

67 Our translation. Biscop, S., *supra* note 64, p. 35.

68 Bagayoko, N.; Kovacs, A., *supra* note 57; Hacker, V. Javier Solana, chef diplomate de l'Union Européenne. In: *Les Champs de Mars*. Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la Défense, n°18, juin 2007.

2005 and 2007 (over 120 interviews). CSDP still stays very fragmented: the dialogue between the Council and the Commission is far from evident and this lies mostly in the lack of a unique authority in the area of European foreign policy. CSDP's structural framework even tends to encourage some administrative rivalries in crisis management on a European level: until CSDP was effectively launched between 1999 and 2001, the EU has no crisis management and strategic culture at all; Thus the organs we presented earlier and which are the core of European crisis management mechanisms within CSDP –the PSC, the EUMC and the EUMS- had largely been derived from the existing NATO model of organization and illustrate a *stock and pipe* approach which favors a relative airtightness between military and civilians: the political directors of the foreign ministries are used to the experimented NATO model and have imported it into the EU without questioning its validity for an exclusively civilian organization. The UN model with a General Secretariat exercising its authority on every dimensions of UN action may have probably best suited EU's nature⁶⁹. Just an example her will make are words clearer: the EUMC for instance tends to consider itself not as a forum to exchange pieces of advice about multinational military actions among the member states, but much more as a organ in confrontation with a political organ, the PSC: this illustrates a typical logic of struggle between institutional territories⁷⁰ as it exists in the functioning of “comitology” in the first pillar policies. One can even speak of “symbolic struggles” between the different kind of actors⁷¹ (The division of labor in CSDP doesn't allow real coordination between the Council and the Commission, which are both responsible for the coherence of EU's external action and relations. The Lisbon Treaty didn't solve this concurrence, although it aims at creating a European external action service⁷². This problem is more and more acute regarding the growing commitments of the EU in conflict management and rebuilding. Yet, some efforts have been made by the member states to enhance coherence in European crisis management: a first step in that direction consists in the nomination of two Commission representatives within the civil-military cell, core of the future European OHQ in Brussels. What is innovating in this effort is that these two representatives are not under the authority of GD Relex; but this

69 Interview in the GD E VIII, General Secretariat of the Council, Brussels, 15/11/2005.

70 More generally for CFSP, see Buchet de Neuilly, Y. La Politique Etrangère et de Sécurité Commune: dynamique d'un système d'action. *Politix*. 1999, 46: 127–146; Buchet de Neuilly, Y. L'irrésistible ascension du HR pour la PESC. Une solution institutionnelle dans une pluralité d'espaces d'actions européens. *Politique Européenne*. 2002, 8: 13–30; Buchet de Neuilly, Y. *L'Europe de la politique étrangère*. Paris: Economica, 2005; Buchet de Neuilly, Y., *supra* note 14.

71 Deschaux-Beaume, D. Looking at European Security and Defence Policy with a historical sociological lens: The case of the French-German military cooperation in the sociogenesis of the CSDP. *Paper presented at the Conference on New Approaches to Europeanization and European Integration: Social Capital, European Elites, Constructivism, University of Copenhagen, 26-28 April 2007*; Mérand, F. L'Europe des diplomates, l'Alliance des militaires. La PESD comme enjeu de lutes symboliques. In: *L'Europe de la défense: acteurs, enjeux, processus. Les Champs de Mars*. Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la Défense, n°19, janvier 2008.

72 The Lisbon Treaty proposes the nomination of an EU High Representative for foreign affairs and security policy who would also be vice-president of the Commission. This should enhance the coherence and visibility of EU external action if the Treaty is ratified and enforced.

of the EUMS⁷³. Another tool has been created to help develop cross-pillar coherence: a civil-military coordination concept (CMCO) exists since 2003 and was generated by the PSC, the EUMS and the politico-military group so as to coordinate the European actors involved in crisis management procedures. This concept aims both at increasing cross pillar coordination as well as coherence within the second pillar (CFSP)⁷⁴. Coherence also means a need for synergy with other international organizations as NATO or the UN. Therefore the British European Presidency developed in 2005 a project entitled “*Comprehensive Planning*” so as to better use the civil-military cell. There still are lots of doubts concerning these adjustments.

Behind this question of synergy between the Council and Commission, the question raised by CSDP and a European way of managing conflict is the one of the democratic control over European Defense Policy⁷⁵: as long as CSDP stays outside the control of the European Parliament, it can not be closer coordinated with the Commission action which is accountable before the European Parliament. The opposition between the most supranational or “pro-Commission” states as Germany and the most intergovernmentalist or “pro-Council” states as France and Britain does not help to solve the problem.

Another important question meeting the lack of coherence is financing CSDP’s operation. Civil crisis management operations are financed by the CFSP budget (102,6 millions Euros in 2006), which is part of the Community budget run by the Commission. But the use of this budget line has to be decided by the Council because CFSP –from which CSDP is the militarized dimension- is ruled by the intergovernmental principle. Military operations cannot be financed by any line of Community budget. There the principle is the same as within NATO: costs lie where they fall. Only a part of the costs involved by EU military operations are pooled; since 2004 the ATHENA mechanism consists in a common financing of the common costs of EU military operations under the rule of unanimity among the member states: this offers a case by case possibility of handbrake for the states not wanting to take part in some operations. Thus one does not pay for an operation one does not want to launch.

This global lack of synergy also put into the light a lack of leadership in the EU in the foreign policy area: it is quite clear here that the theoretic concept of Europeanization is of limited use to analyze CSDP⁷⁶. The French-German partnership is therefore particularly interesting in security and defense matters, as the French-German friendship has long been considered as the cornerstone of the whole process of European

73 Interview, EUMS, Brussels, 8/12/2005.

74 Bagayoko, N.; Kovacs, A., *supra* note 57, p. 181.

75 Wagner, W. *Für Europa sterben ? Die demokratische Legitimität der Europäischen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik*. Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK), Report 3, 2004; Wagner, W. *The democratic legitimacy of CSDP*. Occasional Paper 57, ISS-EU, Paris, 2005; Wagner, W. *The democratic control of military power Europe*. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2006, 13(2): 200–216; Wessels, W. (dir.). *The Parliamentary Dimension of CFSP/CSDP. Options for the European Convention*. Study submitted for the European Parliament, Directorate-General for Research, Brussels, TEPSA, 2002.

76 Irondelle, B. *Quelle européanisation de la sécurité au sein de l’Union Européenne?* In: *L’Europe de la défense: acteurs, enjeux, processus. Les Champs de Mars*. Cahiers du Centre d’Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la Défense, n°19, janvier 2008.

integration. The two countries try to provide a directional leadership in the EU, but are still characterized by diverging conceptions of crisis management, foreign policy and the international role of the EU. Thus the American leadership goes on dominating *de facto* in the management of international conflicts. This leads us to a second aspect of the interplay between Brussels and the member states in the area of crisis management and moreover within CSDP.

3.2. A Tension between European Crisis Management and National Security Analyzes

Even if one can underline some trends to “Brusselsization” in the social practices of the soldiers and diplomats involved in CSDP as we said it earlier with the term of socializing process, there still are very pregnant national security interests analyzes. The development of a European way of managing crisis in the 21st century combines with former trend inherited from the transformation of the armies since the 1970’s accelerated by the end of the Cold War. Defense budget have globally declined in the European countries who want to benefit from the “peace dividends”. The structure of the budget has also evolved in favor of means to accomplish the Petersberg Tasks. Almost every European country (except Germany) has now a professional army and mass conventional armies have been replaced by professionalized, deployable armies⁷⁷. Military education also evolved in order to better fit the new officers generation with the imperatives of multinationality and European crisis management⁷⁸.

Building a European crisis management approach also incrementally shapes the decision-making processes. It is true that the PSC took a decisive step in the European crisis management decision-making: as a consensus maker between the Twenty-Seven, the PSC induces some incremental changes in the national decision-making processes. Before its creation all the negotiations in this specific area took place bilaterally or multilaterally between the capitals with a strong impulse of the embassies, whereas today the action moves to Brussels where more and more crisis are directly managed among the members of the permanent representations of the states. CSDP and the emergence of a European way of crisis management involves a changing power logic: the PSC counselors have a double task of assisting the national representative by the PSC and negotiate in the first rank within the working groups⁷⁹. Soldiers, diplomats and

77 Buffotot, P. *Europe des armées ou Europe désarmée?* Paris: Ed. Michalon, Coll. « Ligne d’horizon », 2005; Boëne, B. La professionnalisation des armées: contexte et raisons, impact fonctionnel et sociopolitique. *Revue Française de Sociologie*. « Profession: militaire. Etudes Réunies et présentées par François Gerstlé ». 2003, 44(4): 647–694.

78 Boëne, B.; Haddad, S.; Nogues, T. *A missions nouvelles des armées, formations nouvelles des officiers des armes?* Paris: Centre d’Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la défense, Coll. « Les documents du C2SD », 2001, n° 46; Vennesson, P. (dir.). *Politiques de défense: institutions, innovations, européanisation*. Paris: L’Harmattan, Coll. « Logiques politiques », 2000; Vennesson, P. (dir.). *Innovations et conduite du changement dans les armées*. Recueil du cycle 2000-2001 des conférences du C2SD, Paris, C2SD, Coll. « Les forums du C2SD », 2002.

79 About CFSP generally, see Buchet de Neuilly, Y. Construire les instruments de la politique étrangère européenne. Les hauts fonctionnaires nationaux au cœur des processus bruxellois. In: Dreyfus, F.; Eymeri, J.-M. *Science politique de l’administration. Une approche comparative*. Paris: Economica, 2006.

civil counselors that we interviewed admit shaping instructions because they can best assess their room to maneuver as they know better the positions of the other national delegations on the Brussels ground as the agents working in the national ministries⁸⁰. One can use the image of *double-edge diplomacy*⁸¹, even if this “Brusselsization” remains still incremental: the Europeanization phenomenon keeps evolving quite marginally in the defense sector. Defense remains a strong attribute of state sovereignty, and as some authors note, CSDP will long remain intergovernmental⁸² European “crisis management policy is best understood as a fast co-ordination game in which member states react to international crises under tight time pressure. From this perspective, agreements are self-enforcing and strong institutions are not required.”⁸³ Others prefer to speak of transgovernmentalism so as to integrate both the centrality of intergovernmental practices leaving an important room for national analyzes of security interests and the development of socializing processes in Brussels which weigh on the actors practices and involve incremental changes⁸⁴. We’re more convinced by this kind of approach, even if in our view the added-value of our policy analysis in terms of historical sociology offers a way of linking even closer both macro and micro levels, that is both levels of structure and actor. We are closer to an analysis in terms of role as Lisbeth Aggestam proposes: a state foreign policy is actually strongly influenced by its national conception of its international role and this conception has been interiorized by its diplomatic and politico-military actors⁸⁵. The role constitute a link between the actor and the structure putting into light both organizational factors and internationality (we prefer the concept of national habitus⁸⁶ or socialization) in foreign policy decision-making. We won’t develop further this reflection here as the space for our purpose is limited.

What we want to point out here is that one can not say that European security interests have replaced national interests: it is more of an incremental process through which members states adjust some marginal parts of their foreign policies but keep a high hand

-
- 80 Most of the interviews we lead between fall 2005 and winter 2007 by French and German soldiers and diplomats in Brussels, Paris and Berlin tend to converge on this point.
- 81 Putnam, R.; Evans, P. B.; Jacobson, H. K. (eds.). *Double-edged diplomacy: international bargaining and domestic politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- 82 Wagner, W. Why EU’s foreign and security policy will remain intergovernmental rationalist institutional choice analysis of European crisis management policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2003, 10(4): 576–595.
- 83 *Ibid.*, p. 576.
- 84 Hill, Ch.; Wallace, W., *supra* note 12, p. 12; Wallace, H.; Wallace, W. Overview: the European Union politics and policy-making. In: Jorgensen, K. E.; Pollack, M. A.; Rosamond, B. (eds.). *Handbook of European Union Politics*. London: Sage Editions, 2006, p. 351; Winn, N. European Crisis Management in the 1980’s. In: Jorgensen, K. E. (ed.). *European approaches to crisis management*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997.
- 85 Aggestam, L. Role identity and the Europeanization of foreign policy: a political-cultural approach. In: Tonra, B.; Christiansen, T. (eds.). *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004; Aggestam, L. Role theory and European foreign policy. In: Elgström, O.; Smith, M. (eds.). *The European Union’s Role in International Politics. Concepts and analysis*. London, Routledge: ECPR Studies in European Political Science, 2006.
- 86 Elias, N., *supra* note 37; Devin, G. Norbert Elias et l’analyse des relations internationales. *Revue Française de Science Politique*. 1995, 45(2): 305–327.

on the deep core of these policies. There a historical sociological lens combined with historical institutionalism helps us understanding the difficulties encountered by CSDP and the path dependency phenomenon in the states' analysis of their security interests. The member states tend to act collectively in crisis management when their interests are congruent, what favors more a case by case action and underlines the still very reactive nature of CSDP as the Political Foreign Cooperation already was in the 1970's-1980's: "The crisis over, most government hesitate to make additional commitment to achieve the solidarity for which they call"⁸⁷. Our comparative study on French and Germans diplomats, soldiers and civil counselors daily involved in CSDP (backed by others comparative studies involving Britain⁸⁸ (show that even if these actors are conscious to be part of a same security community, they still keep having strong national red lines and confer slightly different signification to CSDP and a European crisis management way, which underlines a divergence of conception of EU's role in the world. There is a strong dependence to the foreign policy path and conceptions developed earlier⁸⁹. To illustrate our French-German case study, schematically, the European Defense Policy represents a means of counter-weighting the American unilateralism in the French diplomats and officers' representation. It is an opportunity of creating a European leadership pole in security matters and thus bring the EU integration process further towards a global political entity with leadership potentialities in the long run. What is at stake is not so much to compete with the Atlantic Alliance than to reach a real autonomy for European crisis management policy, so as to enable EU to intervene in the world as a global actor, mostly when American interests do not incite the Americans to act (as in the Balkans in the 1990's). That is why the French actors push forward in favor to the creation of European planning and military structures. CSDP seen by the German diplomats, officers and political leaders seems more seen as a way of regaining a status of normality for Germany and enable the Federal Republic to assume its international engagements in security matters. But every single discourse –both official and informal- underlines the vital necessity to stay clearly in good standing and terms with NATO. Enforcing a European crisis management policy would enable the Europeans to become attractive in the eyes of the American partner and to show Washington their reliability. For Britain, a European crisis management policy and moreover CSDP is seen as a good way to exert a leadership in the EU in an area not risking to strong integration, which is also a means of bringing closer Washington and NATO in a division of labor concerning conflict management in the world.

But one of the most diverging questions between Europeans is the question of the relationship between EU and NATO, and the question of military operations. French politico-military actors tend to advocate a strict differentiation between the EU and NATO, arguing that NATO is a strictly military organization, whereas German and

87 Winn, N., *supra* note 84, p. 125.

88 Aggestam, L., 2004, *supra* note 85; Mérand, F., 2006, *supra* note 14.

89 Pierson, P. Increasing returns, path dependence and the study of politics. *EU/RSC, Jean Monnet Chair Paper*. 1997, 44: 251–267; Pierson, P. *Politics in time. History, institutions and social analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

British actors tend to be much more in favor of a more political dimension of the Alliance and a division of labor between the EU and NATO. Concerning EU military operations, the French actors tend to be very pushing for these operations, whereas the German actors show still reluctance for operations other than humanitarian or peace support. The big difference between them is the question of the use of force. “CSDP is a shay focal point that brings together different political representations of the role of a state in international security”⁹⁰. A good example for this is the EUFOR operation in the Democratic Republic of Congo in summer 2006: to focus only on the French German case, the interpretations on what to do regarding the Congo case diverged for a while because of the pregnant weight of national traditions of conflict management and security interests. Similarly, the European states have lived strong discord over the Iraq conflict in 2003. This also raises the question of how European operations and crisis management are nationally legitimated in front of the national public opinion⁹¹. Thus one can note that the actors and states involved in CSDP still tend to consider it as a strategic game on a more or less self-interested way: the socializing processes differ from state to state. And the strategic use of European crisis management (for instance in Africa for France) is enabled by the lack of clear European strategic objectives: the ESS is a good step towards such a definition but is still to vague and leave the states a room of interpreting the text in their own view⁹².

Concluding Remarks

As we shown in this paper, the EU is since several years developing a European Defense Policy (CSDP) which mostly aims at managing others’ crisis. This European crisis management policy offers a first step towards the emergence of a European strategic culture, as the ESS illustrates this trend even if this document remains most symbolic⁹³. The ESS offers a very global frame enabling the member states to draw from it only the elements which enter into congruence with their own interests, both on a macro level and on a micro organizational level⁹⁴. CSDP and its European crisis management aspect raises several important questions as the relationship between EU and NATO; the lack of cross pillar-coherence; the persisting national analysis of foreign policy and security interests; the organizational and symbolic struggles among the organs and plurality of actors involved. Thus European crisis management is today more a reactive mechanism than a real proactive policy: EU has not yet demonstrated

90 Mérand, F., 2006, *supra* note 14, p. 136.

91 Jorgensen, K. E., *supra* note 20, p. 8.

92 Aggestam, L., 2005, *supra* note 85; Biscop, S., *supra* note 64.

93 It was published after the discord over Iraq among the European states: Wallace, W. Foreign and security policy. The painful path from shadow to substance. In: Wallace, H.; Wallace, W.; Pollack, M. (eds.). *Policy Making in the European Union*. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 451.

94 Diplomatic versus military ethos: Mérand, F., *supra* note 71.

its ability to answer rapidly and efficiently a international exogenous shock⁹⁵. This addresses the more general question of this conference about the EU in international affairs. The EU aims at becoming a global player in a globalized world challenged by the still very pregnant foreign and defense policies of its member states. Some authors have defined four criteria to recognize the status of international actor: an effective legal recognition of his status by other states, a legal authority able to act internationally, a relative autonomous decision-making and a coherent set of management of its external relations. This criteria are ideal-types which the EU of course does not fulfill right now but tendentially takes as long term objectives. The EU has not until lately traditionally been an international actor with well-defined interests⁹⁶ and this helps understanding the still important blockades CSDP and the European crisis management method encounters. Socialization also plays a major role in defining states and actors preferences in foreign policy: one tends to follow –of course with incremental adjustments- the path adopted earlier because of the increasing returns it generates. Thus Washington still plays a major role in international conflict management. But whatever difficulties CSDP encounters in making EU an international actor able to answer crisis, it incarnates the historical finality of European integration: the search for stability and peace. By developing its own way, the EU “serves peace which serves the [international] institutions”⁹⁷. As Washington uses force massively to solve conflicts, the European method in the making is much more one of an indirect approach aiming at limiting violence⁹⁸. This all quest for international identity raises theoretical challenges for the social scientists, which encourages us to cross the disciplinary borders to adopt an approach mixing IR theory, policy analysis and political science.

References

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Aggestam, L. Role identity and the Europeanization of foreign policy: a political-cultural approach. In: Tonra, B.; Christiansen, T. (eds.). <i>Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy</i>. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.</p> <p>Aggestam, L. Role theory and European foreign policy. In: Elgström, O.; Smith, M. (eds.). <i>The European Union's Role in International</i></p> | <p><i>Politics. Concepts and analysis</i>. London, Routledge: ECPR Studies in European Political Science, 2006.</p> <p>Aligisakis, M. (dir.). <i>Europe et sortie de conflits</i>. Genève: Institut Européen de l'Université de Genève, 2005.</p> <p>Bagayoko, N. <i>Les officiers français et la construction européenne: l'europanisation du point de vue des acteurs de la défense</i>.</p> |
|--|--|

-
- 95 Charillon, F. La politique étrangère de l'UE à l'épreuve des normes américaines. *Cultures & Conflits*. 2002, 44.
- 96 Lucarelli, S. Europe's Response to the Yugoslav Imbroglia. In: Jorgensen, K. E. (ed.). *European approaches to crisis management*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997.
- 97 Our translation. Devin, G. Fluctuat nec mergitur! Ces institutions internationales qui font la paix qui fait les institutions... In: Devin, G. (dir.). *Faire la paix, Paris, Ed. Pepper*. Coll. « Chaos International », 2005, p. 21.
- 98 Vennesson, P. Les Etats-Unis et l'Europe face à la guerre: perceptions et divergences dans l'emploi de la force armée. *Etudes internationales*. 2005, 36(4): 545.

- Paris: Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la défense, Coll. « Les documents du C2SD », 2005, n° 77.
- Bagayoko, N. L'europanisation des militaires français: socialisation institutionnelle et culture stratégique. *Revue Française de Science politique*. 2006, 56(1): 49–78.
- Bagayoko, N.; Kovacs, A. *La gestion interministérielle des sorties de conflit*. Paris: Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la défense, Coll. « Les documents du C2SD », 2007.
- Bauer, S.; Remacle, E. Theory and practice of multi-level foreign policy: the European Union's policy in the field of arms export controls. In: Tonra, B.; Christiansen, T. (eds.). *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Biscop, S. La Stratégie européenne de sécurité: mettre en œuvre l'approche holistique. In: L'Europe de la défense: acteurs, enjeux, processus. *Les Champs de Mars*. Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la Défense. n°19, janvier 2008.
- Boëne, B.; Haddad, S.; Nogues, T. *A missions nouvelles des armées, formations nouvelles des officiers des armes?* Paris: Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la défense, Coll. « Les documents du C2SD », 2001, n° 46.
- Boëne, B. La professionnalisation des armées: contexte et raisons, impact fonctionnel et sociopolitique. *Revue Française de Sociologie*. « Profession: militaire. Etudes Réunies et présentées par François Gerstlé ». 2003, 44(4): 647–694.
- Buchet de Neuilly, Y. La Politique Etrangère et de Sécurité Commune: dynamique d'un système d'action. *Politix*. 1999, 46: 127–146.
- Buchet de Neuilly, Y. « L'irrésistible ascension du HR pour la PESC. Une solution institutionnelle dans une pluralité d'espaces d'actions européens. ». *Politique Européenne*. 2002, 8: 13–30.
- Buchet de Neuilly, Y. Une Europe sans voix: les conditions du recours à la PESC. In: Helly, D.; Petiteville, F. *L'Union Européenne, acteur international*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2005.
- Buchet de Neuilly, Y. *L'Europe de la politique étrangère*. Paris: Economica, 2005.
- Buchet de Neuilly, Y. Construire les instruments de la politique étrangère européenne. Les hauts fonctionnaires nationaux au cœur des processus bruxellois. In: Dreyfus, F.; Eymeri, J.-M. *Science politique de l'administration. Une approche comparative*. Paris: Economica, 2006.
- Buffotot, P. *Europe des armées ou Europe désarmée?* Paris: Ed. Michalon, Coll. « Ligne d'horizon », 2005.
- Charillon, F. La politique étrangère de l'UE à l'épreuve des normes américaines. *Cultures & Conflicts*. 2002, 44.
- Christiansen, T.; Jorgensen, K. E.; Wiener, A. The social construction of Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 1999, 6(4): 528–544.
- Deschaux-Beaume, D. Looking at European Security and Defence Policy with a historical sociological lens: The case of the French-German military cooperation in the sociogenesis of the CSDP. *Paper presented at the Conference on New Approaches to Europeanization and European Integration: Social Capital, European Elites, Constructivism, University of Copenhagen, 26-28 April 2007*.
- Deutsch, K. *Political community in the North-Atlantic area*. Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Devin, G. Norbert Elias et l'analyse des relations internationales. *Revue Française de Science Politique*. 1995, 45(2): 305–327.
- Devin, G. Fluctuat nec mergitur! Ces institutions internationales qui font la paix qui fait les institutions... In: Devin, G. (dir.). *Faire la paix, Paris, Ed. Pepper*. Coll. « Chaos International », 2005.
- Duchêne, F. La Communauté Européenne et les aléas de l'interdépendance. In: Kohnstamm, M.; Hager, W. *L'Europe avec un grand E*. Paris: Robert Laffont, 1973.

- Dumoulin, A.; Mathieu, R.; Sarlet, G. *La politique européenne de sécurité et de défense (PESD): de l'opérateur à l'identitaire: genèse, structuration, ambitions, limites*. Préface de Javier Solana, Bruxelles, Bruylant, Coll. "Organisation internationale et relations internationales", 2003, n°54.
- Duke, S. *The elusive quest for European Security: From EDC to CFSP*. Bakingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.
- Elias, N. *La dynamique de l'Occident*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1975 (1^{ère} éd. Allemande, 1939).
- Elias, N. *Qu'est-ce que la sociologie?* Paris: Pocket Agora, 1993.
- Evans, G. Cooperative Security and Intrastate Conflict. *Foreign Policy*. 1994: 3–20.
- Galtung, J. *The European Community, a superpower in the making*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1973.
- Georgakakis, D. Construction sociale de l'Europe et sociologie politique européenne: perspectives communes et nouveaux matériaux de recherche. *Regards sociologiques*. 2004, 27/28.
- Guiraudon, V. L'espace sociopolitique européen: un champ encore en friche? *Cultures et conflits*. 2000, 38/39: 7–37.
- Guiraudon, V. The EU through European's eyes: political sociology and the EU studies. *EUSA Review*. 2006, 19(1): 1–5.
- Glarbo, K. Wide-awake diplomacy: reconstructing the common foreign and security policy of the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 1999, 6(4): 634–651.
- Gnesotto, N. *La puissance et l'Europe*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, Coll. « Bibliothèque du citoyen », 1998.
- Gnesotto, N. (dir.). *La PESD. Les cinq premières années. 1999-2004*. Paris: Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UE, 2004.
- Guilhaudis, J.-F. *La réorganisation du système de sécurité occidentale en Europe, La réorganisation du système de sécurité occidentale en Europe*. Grenoble: Université Pierre Mendès-France, Cahiers du CEDSI, 1997, n° 18.
- Guilhaudis, J.-F. *L'Europe en transition - L'esquisse du nouvel ordre européen*. 2^{ème} éd. Paris: Montchrestien, Coll. « Clefs Politique », 1998 (1^{ère} éd., 1993).
- Hacker, V. Javier Solana, chef diplomate de l'Union Européenne. In: *Les Champs de Mars*. Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la Défense, n°18, juin 2007.
- Hamelin, F. Le combattant et le technocrate. La formation des officiers à l'aune du modèle des élites civiles. *Revue Française de Science Politique*. 2003, 53(3): 435–463.
- Hassner, P. *La violence et la paix*. Paris: Seuil, Coll. « Essais », 2000.
- Hill, Ch.; Wallace, W. Introduction: actors and actions. In: Hill, Ch. (ed.). *The actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hill, Ch.; Smith, M. Acting for Europe: reassessing the European Union's place in international relations. In: Hill, Ch.; Smith, M. (eds.). *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Hoffmann, S. Obstinate or obsolete? The Fate of Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe. *Daedalus*. 1966, 95: 862–915.
- Howorth, J. From security to defense: the evolution of the CFSP. In: Hill Ch.; Smith, M. (eds.). *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Irondelle, B. Europeanization without the European Union? French Military Reforms, 1991-1996. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2003, 10(2): 208–226.
- Irondelle, B. Quelle européenisation de la sécurité au sein de l'Union Européenne? In: *L'Europe de la défense: acteurs, enjeux, processus*. *Les Champs de Mars*. Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la Défense, n°19, janvier 2008.
- Jorgensen, K. E. (ed.). *European approaches to crisis management*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997.

- Jorgensen, K. E. A multilateralist role for the EU? In: Elgström, O.; Smith, M. (eds.). *The European Union's Role in International Politics. Concepts and analysis*. London, Routledge: ECPR Studies in European Political Science, 2006.
- Kagan, R. *Of paradise and power: America and Europe in the new world order*. London: Atlantic Books, 2004.
- Kingdon, J. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. University of Michigan, Longman, 2003 (1st ed., 1984).
- Linklater, A. A European civilising process? In Hill, Ch.; Smith, M. (eds.). *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Lucarelli, S. Europe's Response to the Yugoslav Imbroglia. In: Jorgensen, K. E. (ed.). *European approaches to crisis management*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997.
- Maull, H. Germany and Japan: the new civilian powers. *Foreign Affairs*. 1990, 69(5): 91–106.
- Maull, H. Germany and the use of force: still a "civilian power"? *Survival*. 2000, 42(2): 56–80.
- Maull, H. Europe and the new balance of global order. *International Affairs*. 2005, 81(4): 775–799.
- Maury, J.-P. *La construction européenne – La sécurité et la défense*. Paris: PUF, Coll. « Politique d'aujourd'hui », 1996.
- Manners, I. Normative power Europe: beyond the crossroads. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2006, 13(2): 182–199.
- Mérand, F. Dying for the Union? Military officers and the creation of a European defence force. *European Societies*. 2003, 5(3): 253–282.
- Mérand, F. Social representations in the European Security and Defence Policy. *Cooperation and Conflict*. 2006, 41(2): 131–152.
- Mérand, F. L'Europe des diplomates, l'Alliance des militaires. La PESD comme enjeu de luttes symboliques. In: L'Europe de la défense: acteurs, enjeux, processus. *Les Champs de Mars*. Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales de la Défense, n°19, janvier 2008.
- Nowak, A. (dir.). *Civilian crisis management: the EU way*. Cahiers de Chaillot n° 90, Paris, Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UE, 2006.
- Pajon, Ch. L'Europe de la défense et la transformation des identités militaires: quelle européanisation? Le cas des acteurs militaires britannique, allemand et français. *Politique Européenne*. 2003, 10: 148–171.
- Petiteville, F. *La politique internationale de l'Union européenne*. Paris: Presses de Sciences-Po. Peyrouse, S., 2006.
- Pierson, P. Increasing returns, path dependence and the study of politics. *EUI/RSC, Jean Monnet Chair Paper*. 1997, 44: 251–267.
- Pierson, P. *Politics in time. History, institutions and social analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Pouliot, V. The Logic of Everyday Practice: The Routinization of Diplomacy in Security Communities. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, California, USA*, 2006.
- Putnam, R.; Evans, P. B.; Jacobson, H. K. (eds.). *Double-edged diplomacy: international bargaining and domestic politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Rutten, M. *De Saint-Malo à Nice: les textes fondateurs de la défense européenne*. Volume I, Cahiers de Chaillot n°47, Paris, Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UE, 2001.
- Rutten, M. *De Nice à : les textes fondateurs de la défense européenne*. Volume II, Cahiers de Chaillot n°51, Paris, Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UE, 2002.
- Sabatier, P.; Jenkins-Smith, H. *Policy change and learning*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1993.
- Sabatier, P.; Jenkins-Smith, H. The Advocacy Coalition Framework. An assessment. In: Sabatier, P. (ed.). *Theories of the policy process*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1999.

- Smith, K. Beyond the civilian power EU debate. *Politique Européenne*. 2005, 17: 63–82.
- Vennesson, P. (dir.). *Politiques de défense: institutions, innovations, européanisation*. Paris: L'Harmattan, Coll. « Logiques politiques », 2000.
- Vennesson, P. (dir.). *Innovations et conduite du changement dans les armées*. Recueil du cycle 2000-2001 des conférences du C2SD, Paris, C2SD, Coll. « Les forums du C2SD », 2002.
- Vennesson, P. Les Etats-Unis et l'Europe face à la guerre: perceptions et divergences dans l'emploi de la force armée. *Etudes internationales*. 2005, 36(4): 527–548.
- Wallace, H.; Wallace, W. Overview: the European Union politics and policy making. In: Jorgensen, K. E.; Pollack, M. A.; Rosamond, B. (eds.). *Handbook of European Union Politics*. London: Sage Editions, 2006.
- Wallace, W. Foreign and security policy. The painful path from shadow to substance. In: Wallace, H.; Wallace, W.; Pollack, M. (eds.). *Policy-Making in the European Union*. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Wagner, W. Why EU's foreign and security policy will remain intergovernmental rationalist institutional choice analysis of European crisis management policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2003, 10(4): 576–595.
- Wagner, W. *Für Europa sterben? Die demokratische Legitimität der Europäischen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik*. Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK), Report 3, 2004.
- Wagner, W. *The democratic legitimacy of CSDP*. Occasional Paper 57, ISS-EU, Paris, 2005.
- Wagner, W. The democratic control of military power Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2006, 13(2): 200–216.
- Wessels, W. (dir.). *The Parliamentary Dimension of CFSP/CSDP. Options for the European Convention*. Study submitted for the European Parliament, Directorate General for Research, Brussels, TEPSA, 2002.
- Winn, N. European Crisis Management in the 1980's. In: Jorgensen, K. E. (ed.). *European approaches to crisis management*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997.
- Whitman, R. Muscles from Brussels. The demise of civilian power Europe? In: Elgström, O.; Smith, M. (eds.). *The European Union's Role in International Politics. Concepts and analysis*. London, Routledge: ECPR Studies in European Political Science, 2006.
- Zorgbibe, Ch. *L'avenir de la sécurité internationale*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2004.

ES – GLOBALIOS TAIKOS VEIKSNYS? SANDŪROS TARP ES KONFLIKTŲ SPRENDIMO IR NACIOLINIŲ VEIKLOS KRYPČIŲ

Delphine Deschaux-Beaume

Grenoblio politikos mokslų institutas, Prancūzija

Santrauka. Straipsnyje siekiama apžvelgti konfliktų sprendimo strategijos įtaką Europos Sąjungos strategijos ir Europos gynybos ir saugumo politikos formavimuisi (EGSP). Pateikus trumpą analitinio metodo apžvalgą siekiama atsakyti į šiuos klausimus: kokia EGSP kilmė ir kokie jos pagrindiniai tikslai?; kokių europinius ypatumus atspindi siūlomi krizių valdymo metodai?; kaip šie metodai veikia ir kaip jie telkia į konfliktą įtrauktus diploma-

tinius ir politinius karinius veikėjus? Dar vienas ne mažiau aktualus klausimas – EGSP formavimas Briuselio ir šalių narių santykiuose? Kokius pokyčius ši politika įneša į jų egzistavimą ir kokie šiuo metu akivaizdūs ir spęstini pokyčių ribojimo veiksniai? EGSP – tai europiečių būdas išvengti šaltojo karo pasaulio suskirstymo; ES krizių ir konfliktų valdymo būdas, tarpinis tarp strategijų, kuriomis vadovaujasi tradicinės tarptautinės organizacijos, kaip, pavyzdžiui, NATO, JTO ar ESBO. EGSP taip pat įkūnija trijų didžiųjų Europos Sąjungos šalių – Prancūzijos, Didžiosios Britanijos ir Vokietijos, išipareigojimus Europos gynybai ir saugumui, siekiant atsigausti po Balkanų krizės, kai Europa liko susiskaidžiusi, negebanti žengti ryžtingų konflikto sprendimo žingsnių. Dėl šios priežasties šalys narės sukūrė specialius EGSP įgyvendinimo organus, įrankius ir procedūras. ES krizių valdymo būdų, kurie sudaro EGSP šerdį, išskirtinumas – originalumas ir pridėtinės vertės suponavimas. Siūloma taikyti integruotą karinių ir civilinių įrankių visumą. Tačiau čia kyla esminių klausimų. EGSP vis dar nesukūrė atskirus politinius ramsčius siejančio mechanizmo, ypač kai kalbama apie EGSP operacijų finansavimą. Vėl kyla klausimas dėl Briuselio ir šalių narių bendradarbiavimo, t. y. karinių dalinių dislokavimas lieka nacionalinio suverenumo prioritetu, ir ES šalys analizuoja susidarantį situacijas atsižvelgdamos į nacionalinio saugumo interesus. Karinio bendrabavimo padarinys – siekis reformuoti armijas ir karinį švietimą. EGSP teikia vilties, kad Europos krizių valdymo strategijos raida sustiprins ES vertybes, įgytas šioje veikloje.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: *Europos integracija, gynyba, europeizacija, tarptautiniai santykiai, Prancūzijos-Vokietijos gynybos politika.*

Delphine Deschaux-Beaume, Grenoblio politikos mokslų instituto tyrėja, politikos mokslų daktarė. Mokslinių tyrimų kryptys: Europos integracija, gynyba, europeizacija, tarptautiniai santykiai.

Delphine Deschaux-Beaume, PACTE – Institute for Political Studies (IEP Grenoble), Associate Research Fellow, Doctor in Political Sciences. Research interests: European integration, defense, Europeanization, international relations.