

*How to cite?*

Vanhoonacker, Sophie, Hylke Dijkstra and Heidi Maurer. (2010): Introduction: Ten Years of ESDP Bureaucracy, In: Vanhoonacker, Sophie, Hylke Dijkstra and Heidi Maurer (eds). Understanding the Role of Bureaucracy in the European Security and Defence Policy, *European Integration online Papers EIoP*, Special Issue 1, Vol. 14, http://www.eiop.or.at/eiop/pdf/2010-SpecIssue-1_Introduction.pdf.

Introduction: Ten Years of ESDP Bureaucracy

Sophie Vanhoonacker

Maastricht University

E-Mail: s.vanhoonacker@maastrichtuniversity.nl***Hylke Dijkstra***

Maastricht University

E-Mail: h.dijkstra@maastrichtuniversity.nl***Heidi Maurer***

Maastricht University

E-Mail: h.maurer@maastrichtuniversity.nl**Table of Contents:**

1. Studying ESDP: New research avenues.....	1
2. The main findings of the special issue	3
3. Conclusion.....	5

1. Studying ESDP: New research avenues

The academic study of European foreign policy has traditionally concentrated on theoretical questions of how to explain the (lack of) cooperation in this sensitive policy area (Hoffmann 1966; Ginsberg 1989; Moravcsik 1993; Gordon 1997) and what type of international actor the

European Union is (Duchêne 1972; Bull 1982; Allen and Smith 1990; Manners 2002; Sjursen 2006). The study of comparative politics and governance in European Studies since the mid-1990s (Hix 1994 and 1998; Marks et al. 1996; Kohler-Koch 1996; Jachtenfuchs 2001), which provided explanations for European integration distinct from the theories of International Relations, initially did not receive much resonance with scholars of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP).

This was not a surprise. Contrary to regulatory and distributive policies, where decisions were increasingly taken through intensive interaction amongst players operating at different levels, policy making in foreign affairs continued to be the domain of the member states, despite the treaty revisions of Maastricht, Amsterdam and Nice. The role of the European Commission was kept to a minimum and the European Court of Justice, which played a key role in the Community pillar, had no jurisdiction. The day-to-day policy making machinery was run by the six-month rotating Presidency with the help of a small CFSP unit in the Council's General Secretariat. This light institutional structure has to be understood in view of the declaratory character of European foreign policy and the parallel existence of national foreign policies.

The development of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) after the Cologne European Council (1999), which resulted in a plethora of civilian and military crisis management operations around the world, allows for new perspectives to study EU foreign policy making.¹ Its operational character and its need for expert knowledge have added considerably to the institutional complexity and dynamics – in Brussels, the capitals and the chain of command. In *Brussels*, national representatives now meet continuously in intergovernmental committees, such as the Political and Security Committee, the EU Military Committee and the Committee for the Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management. In addition, a whole range of permanent bodies such as the EU Military Staff, the Joint Situation Centre, the Operations Centre and the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability have been established. These were initially located in the Council's General Secretariat, but they are now moving to the European External Action Service (EEAS), another prominent illustration of the ongoing process of institutionalisation.

At the *national* level, ESDP has led to the involvement of several new ministries including those of defence, the interior, justice, and finance. The ministries of foreign affairs, which had previously had a monopoly on European foreign policy, require the expertise of these other ministries as well as the delivery of human and material resources. In the *chain of command*, ESDP missions need well-functioning Operations and Force Headquarters.

The central argument of this special issue is that the development of ESDP contributed to the transformation of the European foreign policy process in such a way that it opens new avenues for research beyond the traditional focus on International Relations.² The central role of bureaucracies in an environment of increasing interaction between the national and European levels makes it appealing to use insights from comparative politics, the governance approach to European Studies, as well as public administration and organization theories

more generally. While conscious of the specific characteristics of foreign policy as a highly sensitive policy area, we consider that the increasing institutional complexity and extended scope of European foreign policy justifies using perspectives from different disciplines. It furthermore creates new opportunities for the sometimes rather closed academic community of CFSP scholars to interact with scholars working on other policy areas, especially traditional first pillar policies. This should especially be welcomed as more and more policy areas from the former first pillar are developing an external dimension, which makes the consistency of EU foreign policy a central concern.

2. The main findings of the special issue

Given the relatively recent character of ESDP/CSDP and taking into account that not all readers may be familiar with the ins and outs of the emerging institutional structures, this volume starts with an introductory article *Understanding the Role of Bureaucracy in ESDP: The State of the Art*. It gives a brief historical overview of the first 10 years (1999-2009) and outlines the main actors involved in ESDP, emphasising the bureaucratic level. Subsequently, it examines the state of the art of the academic study on the role of ESDP bureaucracies, highlighting what has been done so far and suggesting topics for further research. It refers to empirical questions of who the players are and how they interact, and it addresses theoretical and normative questions about their impact and democratic accountability.

The core of the special issue is organized around three clusters, studying ESDP administrative players and their mutual interaction (Mérand, Hofmann and Irondelle; Justaert and Keukeleire; Juncos and Pomorska), processes of institutionalisation with particular attention to the strategic and operational level (Petrov; Mattelaer; Norheim-Martinsen) and questions of democratic legitimacy and accountability (Stie; Peters, Wagner and Deitelhoff; Bátorá).

Emphasizing the growing interaction between an increasing number of players at all levels of policy making, Mérand *et al.* as well as Keukeleire and Justaert examine ESDP actors from a governance perspective. The social network analysis by Mérand, Hofmann and Irondelle empirically examines to which extent ESDP has moved beyond intergovernmental policy making towards a transgovernmental form of governance. The patterns of cross-national and inter-level interaction, which they reveal, provides a nuanced picture. State actors remain crucial in ESDP, but at the same time the research identifies two core groups operating across boundaries and organized along functional lines: the Brussels-based crisis management operators in the Council Secretariat and the Political and Security Committee, and a Franco-German group of national civil servants based in Paris and Berlin. Of particular interest to this special issue, the analysis of these groups also reveals the dominant role of the administrative level in the day-to-day policy making process.

The case study of Justaert and Keukeleire on Security Sector Reform (SSR) in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) examines the interaction amongst institutional players in the implementation of crisis management. It shows how the complexity of the policy making process and the high number of actors involved in the implementation on the ground require cooperation beyond the formal channels, giving rise to informal practices of negotiation and coordination.

Juncos and Pomorska provide an ‘insiders’ perspective into the day-to-day functioning of ESDP through a detailed analysis of the Council's General Secretariat. Building on role theory, they compare how officials and diplomats based in various units conceive their individual role and that of their institution. As the analysis shows, role perceptions differ depending on where individuals are based. For example, those working at DG External Relations emphasize their supportive role and those in the Policy Unit stress their role as policy entrepreneurs. At the same time, however, all those interviewed agree that, overall, their institution performs the four roles of secretariat, facilitator, policy entrepreneur and implementation agent.

The second group of contributors looks into the emerging ESDP governance structures with particular attention to the strategic and operational level. Drawing on insights of institutionalism, Petrov illustrates how the two first military missions Concordia and Artemis played an important role in the development of new practices and procedures, which were then successively formalized and used as a frame of reference for later missions. This, however, did not mean that everything was written in stone. While the choices made provided an important direction for the future, there remained scope for further adaptation and integration of the ‘lessons learned’.

The contributions by Mattelaer on mission planning and by Norheim-Martinsen on civil-military relations principally deal with the operational dimension of ESDP. Both emphasize the incremental character of the institutionalisation process and identify strong isomorphic tendencies with the EU, heavily drawing on the models provided by NATO, even for civilian crisis management. Mattelaer singles out the continuing gap between political ambitions and the operational reality as one of the main challenges for the future. Focusing specifically on the question of civil-military integration, Norheim-Martinsen compares the EU model with the two ideal strategic models developed respectively by Huntington and Janowitz. Despite the EU's emphasis on a so-called comprehensive approach and a culture of coordination of the civil-military interface, he illustrates that the Huntingtonian stovepipe model, which separates civilians from the military, has so far dominated. Integration is limited to the politico-strategic level and ignores the operational-tactical level.

The final section of this volume concentrates on questions of legitimacy and accountability. Member states' participation in civilian and military operations bears the risk of casualties, and the heavy reliance on bureaucratic organizations for the preparation and implementation of the decisions raises new questions in terms of democratic control. The contributors to this

section all refute the often cited argument that the sensitive nature of foreign policy justifies more relaxed standards in terms of controlling the executive than domestic policies. Analysing the existing instruments for democratic control, they are very critical of the scope for democratic scrutiny in European foreign policy and argue that the increasing Brusselisation and bureaucratization only aggravates the problem.

Peters, Wagner and Deitelhoff address the question of democratic control from a parliamentary perspective, building upon the notion of a multilevel parliamentary field (Fossum and Crum 2008). They show how the role of national parliaments varies widely and how that of the European Parliament and transnational assemblies such as the WEU assembly is still limited. Stie, even more critical, takes a deliberative democracy approach and examines the procedural qualities of CFSP/ESDP. She concludes that settings where the politicians are discussing and justifying their choices are largely absent and that there is a lack of information and little transparency about how decisions are taken.

Bátora extends the accountability debate to the European External Action Service (EEAS), the emerging EU foreign service. Based on three models of EU democracy (Eriksen and Fossum 2007) he presents different scenarios for the establishment of accountability relations. In line with the other contributions of this special issue by Stie and Peters *et al.*, he examines the possible contributions of national parliaments, the supranational EP and parliamentary assemblies, as well as civic groups both inside and outside the EU. None of the contributions labour under the illusion that there are ready-made answers. They all recognize that there is more than one way to achieve accountability. Given the complexity of the policy making process, they are in the first place interested in how different approaches can complement each other.

3. Conclusion

The first ten years of ESDP have given the development and institutionalisation of European foreign policy structures a tremendous boost. This process is still ongoing today with the creation of the External Action Service. Interaction in European foreign policy has become much more ‘bureaucratic’ than merely ‘diplomatic’ (cf. Puchala 1972). Processes of interaction are increasingly institutionalised and, through the growing involvement of transnational and supranational actors, it becomes increasingly difficult to describe European foreign policy as a form of intergovernmental cooperation. Struggling with the limits of International Relations theory to understand the dynamics of this newly emerging foreign policy system, the contributors to this special issue have begun using alternative approaches. Building on analytical instruments and insights from the governance approach in European Studies, comparative politics and public administration, they have formulated new kinds of empirical, theoretical and normative questions related to the day-to-day functioning of ESDP. Although it is too early to come to general conclusions, the results of this special issue show

that recent developments make it increasingly relevant to build bridges between the broader academic debate on European integration in order to see what we can learn from concepts and frameworks that were not initially developed for foreign policy.

References

Allen, David and Michael Smith (1990). Western Europe's presence in the contemporary international arena. *Review of International Studies* 16(1): 19-37.

Bull, Hedley (1982). Civilian Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 21(2): 149-64.

Duchêne, François (1972). Europe's role in world peace. In *Europe tomorrow: sixteen Europeans look ahead*, edited by Richard Mayne, 32-47. London: Fontana.

Eriksen, Erik and John Fossum (2007). Europe in transformation: How to reconstitute democracy? *RECON Online Working Paper* 2007/01. Oslo: Arena.

Fossum, John, and Ben Crum (2009). The Multilevel Parliamentary Field. A Framework for Theorising Representative Democracy in the EU. *European Political Science Review*, 1(2): 249-271.

Ginsberg, Roy (1989). *Foreign Policy Actions of the European Community: The Politics of Scale*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Gordon, Philip (1997). Europe's Uncommon Foreign Policy. *International Security* 22(3): 74-100.

Hix, Simon (1994). The Study of the European Community: The Challenge to Comparative Politics. *West European Politics* 17(1): 1-30

Hix, Simon (1998). The Study of the European Union II: The 'New Governance' Agenda and Its Rival. *Journal of European Public Policy* 5(1): 38-65.

Hoffmann, Stanley (1966). 'Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation State and the Case of Western Europe. *Daedalus* 95(3): 862-915.

Jachtenfuchs, Markus (2001). The Governance Approach to European Integration. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39(2): 245-264.

Kohler-Koch, Beate (1996). Catching up with change: The transformation of governance in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy* 3(3): 359-380.

Manners, Ian (2002). Normative power Europe: a contradiction in terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (2), 235-258.

Marks, Gary, Liesbet Hooghe and Kermit Blank (1996). European Integration in the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multi-level Governance. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34(3): 341-378.

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

Puchala, Donald (1972). Of Blind Men, Elephants, and International Integration. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 10(3): 267-84.

Sjursen, Helen (2006). The EU as a 'normative' power: how can this be? *Journal of European Public Policy* 13(2): 235-251.

Endnotes

¹ The Lisbon Treaty renamed ESDP to CSDP (Common Security and Defence Policy).

² These contributions were first discussed at a workshop at Maastricht University, The Netherlands (18-19 June 2009). We thank all the contributors, discussants and chairs for their enthusiastic participation, and the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG) for their financial support through the Research Activation Grant.