Permanent change? the paths of change of the European security organizations

Mengelberg, S.N.

Citation

Mengelberg, S. N. (2021, April 15). *Permanent change? the paths of change of the European security organizations*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3160749

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	[Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)
Downloaded from:	[https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3160749](#)

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

Leiden University
Repository

The handle https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3160749 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Mengelberg, S.N.
Title: Permanent change? the paths of change of the European security organizations
Issue Date: 2021-04-15

Part One
Context, Theories and Methods

'He thought that, unlike most people, he had simply refused to let himself be
brainwashed by newspapers, television, eschatologists and philosophies into believing
that 'in spite of everything' this was an acceptable world simply because it existed. It
would never become acceptable. Beloved maybe, acceptable never'.

Cees Nooteboom, Rituals, 1980

Chapter 1

Part One. Context, Theories and Methods

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 The International Security Cooperation Puzzle

'As spring arrives, and people gather on patios again, Brussels remains a deflated and shabby city, a far cry from its glory days as an important European capital less than two decades ago. Yesterday, on the 1st of April 2031, an article in the newspaper covered the ongoing war between Poland and Hungary, and Great Britain and France's involvement in the conflict. The article highlighted the role of the institutional decoupling of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU), as well as the collapse of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), in precipitating this fragmentation of Europe. What began with a financial crisis in the EU and Brexit was followed by the domino-like disintegration of European security architecture; the efforts of the founding fathers of European multilateralism had been in vain.'

The ugly scenario described above, one of a devastated Europe, is a spectre that haunts political and academic analysis of European security architecture. The idea of cooperation between empires and states is as ancient as it is difficult to bring to fruition. The desire for peace and security can be seen as part of human nature, but so too can be the ongoing struggle for power and independence. The post-Westphalian (1648) interstate order has been characterised by rivalry and conflict between states and the establishment of ad-hoc alliances in response to territorial disputes, trade interests, and nationalist, religious and ideological convictions. Ever since the Westphalian Peace was established, a paradox at the heart of relations between states has existed –for cooperation between states to be successful, states must give up some degree of authority to international institutions, thereby diminishing state sovereignty to some degree.

Originally, the principle of cooperation between states, in an effort to prevent war and create for peace and security, was explicated in the concept of 'indivisibility of security' by Kant in his essay 'Perpetual Peace'.[1] Kant came to the conclusion that a peace alliance based on mutual recognition of the status quo (reciprocity) was required and was a consequence of the natural interdependence between states. According to Kant, a system was needed that would ensure that states that disturb the peace are called to order by a collective of states, coercively if necessary (the concept of collective security).

Nevertheless, up to the twentieth century, bilateral and multilateral cooperation between states was characterised by ad-hoc alliances, regulations and the occasional agreement, including the so-called Concert of Europe: the Vienna Congress of 1814 and 1815. In 1919, during the peace conference in Versailles and at the initiative of the American President, Woodrow Wilson, the League of Nations was founded, one of the

---

1   Kant, I., 'Perpetual Peace', Cosimo Classics, September 2010.

first intergovernmental organizations.[2] This League of Nations was a first step toward institutionalised international cooperation in the field of security. Unfortunately, it did not survive the sway of national interest that would result in the Second World War.

After the Second World War, cooperation between states was deemed necessary to preventing future bloodshed on the scale of what had just taken place. As a result, a second and stronger push for regional and worldwide cooperation arose. The concept of multilateralism emerged after the Second World War in relation to the establishment of the United Nations (UN), NATO, the Western European Union (WEU), the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), and the European integration process.[3] This concept is based on the idea of a global environment in which political, economic and security dependencies are institutionalised. In 1990, Keohane defined multilateralism as '...the practice of coordinating national policies in groups of three or more states'.[4] Ruggie elaborated upon the concept, building on the principles of 'indivisibility' and diffuse reciprocity of international relations as '... an institutional form which coordinates relations among three or more states on the basis of 'generalized' principles of conduct,..., which specify appropriate conduct for a class of actions, without regard to particularistic interests of the parties or the strategic exigencies that may exist in any occurrence'.[5]

In the realm of international relations theory, research on the design of the international bipolar order carried out during the Cold War tended to converge either around the state-centric and balance-of-power theories put forward by Walt[6] and Mearsheimer[7] on the one hand and Mitrany's[8] integration theory and Keohane and Nye's[9] theory of interdependence on the other hand. Theoretical analysis of regional and world orders was, thus, highly subject to the confines of the great debate between realism and liberalism. The empirical design of international cooperation after the Second World War varied in terms of form and degree, but was limited to either intergovernmental or supranational regimes and was approached from a political or legal angle, especially when it came to security and defence.

■

2   The League of Nations was an intergovernmental organization founded by a Covenant on 10 January 1920 as a result of the Paris Peace Conference after the First World War. The principal aim was to maintain world peace, including preventing wars through the concept of collective security and disarmament and settling international disputes through negotiation and arbitration. The League of Nations was dissolved in 1946.

3   Though the concept has become commonly used, the academic discourse on multilateralism has been fragmented, as claimed by Koops. For an elaboration on the development of the concept, see: Koops, J.A., The European Union as an Integrative Power? Assessing the EU's 'Effective Multilateralism' towards NATO and the United Nations', Brussels University Press, 2011, p. 66-78.

4   Keohane, R. O., 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', International Studies Quarterly, 32 (4), December 1988.

5   Ruggie, J. G. (eds.), 'Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form', Columbia University Press, 1993.

6   Walt, S. M., 'The origins of Alliances', Cornell University Press, 1987, p. 199.

7   Mearsheimer, J. J., 'The Tragedy of Great Power Politics', New York: W. W. Norton, 2001.

8   Mitrany, D. 'A working Peace System', in: Nelsen, B. F., Stub, A. (eds.), 'The European Union. Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration', Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2014, p. 105-123.

9   Keohane, R. O., Nye, J. S., 'Power and Interdependence', Longman 2001.

After the end of the Cold War, institutionalised international cooperation increased in the so-called third wave of cooperation and institutionalisation, and as a result, international organizations have since grown dramatically. This is also the case in the area of security cooperation. From the very beginning, the collapse of the Soviet Union (SU) and the bipolar order resulted in a wealth of initiatives aimed at strengthening multilateralism and a liberal world order as an alternative to the bipolar order.[10]

A commitment to creating a multilateral order was brought to life with the initiation of a European security architecture, first referred to as such by the CSCE at the Paris Summit[11] in 1990[12]. This pledge was followed by the advancement of several concepts by NATO and the CSCE.[13] The intention was to link security matters between the existing security organizations to construct a 'security architecture' based on 'a framework of interlocking institutions'[14] including NATO, the EU, the UN and the CSCE, leading to a division of labour to serve the goal of collaboration and cooperation of international organizations in the field of crisis management.[15] 'Paris' was often compared to the Vienna Congress and the Conference of Versailles, as a result of the momentum that international law, interdependence and multilateralism expressed. The CSCE's 'Charter of Paris for a New Europe' declared the intention of its partners to create a new security order, one based on shared power instead of a balance of power. In other words, mutually reinforcing institutions.[16] Another remarkable aspect of this order that would form its foundation was that it '...explicitly legitimated the interest of participating states in each other's internal affairs'.[17] In particular in the first decade after the end of the Cold War, the dream of a multilateral institutional framework, based on a strengthened transatlantic relationship and division of labour in the OSCE[18] area, came to fruition.

Initiatives to create a wider European security architecture emerged in several states and were forwarded by German politicians, like Genscher, Adenauer and Kohl, who sought *Westbindung* and, simultaneously, *Ostbindung*, alongside political leaders from the US, Russia

---

10 A liberal world order can be defined as an institutional order established in the aftermath of the Second World War. During the Cold War it was comprised of Western states and after the end of the Cold War it became a global order, with some exceptions. According to Ikenberry this order can be characterized as an open and rule-based order built around multilateral institutions, alliances, strategic partners and client states, where decisions are based on consent and organized around agreed rules and institutions that allocate rights and limit the exercise of power, see: Ikenberry, G. J., 'Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order', Princeton University Press, 2012.

11 In general, a summit of an international organizations is defined as a gathering of state and non-state actors of the members or partners of the various organizations.

12 CSCE, 'Charter of Paris For a New Europe' (presented at CSCE Paris Summit, November 1990), 1-29.

13 The development of the European security architecture will be elaborated further in Chapter 5.

14   NATO Strategic Concept 1991, par. 3.

15 The aim of the Vienna Congress was to provide a long-term peace plan for Europe by settling critical issues arising from the French revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (1814-1815). The Conference of Versailles was the peace conference held after the end of World War I to set the peace terms for the defeated powers (1919-1920).

16 CSCE, 'The Challenges of Change', (CSCE Summit of Heads of State or Government 1992, Helsinki, July 1992), par. 23.

17 Garton Ash, T., 'Europe's Endangered Liberal Order', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 77, No. 2, (March/April), p. 64.

18 The CSCE was institutionalised into the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) at the Budapest Summit 'Towards a Genuine Partnership in a New Era' in December 1994. For convenience, the term 'OSCE' will be used in general.

and France who initiated and built a European security architecture. This architecture would have to accommodate the great powers, the US and Russia, and situate Germany within a strengthened European multilateral cooperation structure, not unlike such initiatives after the Second World War. Genscher's efforts were referred to as 'Genscherism', and were based on the idea that 'the task of the OSCE did not come to an end with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain, and the Organization remains a wonderful platform for shaping the future of Europe'.[19] This emphasised the strong belief in the need for a European institutional umbrella for security matters under the auspices of the OSCE. Alongside German initiatives, were the visions of various American presidents, like that of President Bush, that sought to establish a European security architecture that would prevent war, link Eastern and Western Europe and, not least, make it possible for US troops to withdraw from Europe. Bush stated that 'grand strategy ... is based on the concept of containment of communism', and that it was incumbent upon the US to encourage a 'growing community of democracies anchoring international peace and stability, and a dynamic free-market system generating prosperity and progress on a global scale'.[20] These ideas were strengthened and expanded upon by his successor, the so-called 'Globalisation President', President Clinton, who argued that '...the follow up to a doctrine of containment must be a strategy of enlargement, enlargement of the world's free community of market democracies', which defined NATO and EU enlargement programs for the decade that followed.[21]

From that point onward, cooperation within and between security organizations increased and changed, and took various forms at various levels. The security organizations encompassed by the European security architecture changed and broadened their scopes, especially with regard to regional crisis management activities and, eventually, adopting a worldwide perspective. These organizations also grew in terms of membership and network of partners and also deepened their institutional structure. After a single decade of what was seen as a 'new world order', Haftendorn, Keohane and Wallander stated that '...not only have quite a few security institutions persisted, some (such as NATO) have even acquired new functions'.[22] As a result, the regional and world orders and international cooperation structures became much more complex than they were prior to and during the Cold War. Specifically, in the dense, institutionalised structures of the European security architecture, a variegated web of international cooperation existed, in different forms and at different levels. This resulted in the creation of a highly complex institutional security environment. These inter-states and inter-organizational cooperation patterns challenge the traditional dichotomy presented by the realist-liberal debate particularly in relation to the analysis of paths of change of international organizations.

■

19   Genscher H. D., Statement at OSCE Congress, 6 November 2009.

20   US President Bush before the end of the Cold War.

21   US President Clinton Strategy on Foreign Relations, made by the national security advisor Lake, September 1993.

22   Haftendorn, H., Keohane, R. O., Wallander, C. A., 'Imperfect Unions, Security Institutions over Time and Space', Oxford University Press, New York, 1999, p. 5.

The end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries coincided with a period of transition and new challenges. One of the first cracks in the transatlantic relationship was caused by the 'impotence' of the EU in the Balkan wars in the 90s, specifically the NATO Allied Force operation against Serbia, which presented a challenge to solidarity among NATO members.[23] As a result, subsequent interventions in Afghanistan in 2001 and in Iraq in 2003 were built on a framework of coalitions of the willing (and able) and the War on Terror failed to elicit long-lasting solidarity among allied parties.

A closer analysis shows that the end of the Cold War brought a shift in the balance of power between states and also affected the institutionalized international security cooperation status quo, both in Europe and across the world. On the one hand, the breadth of international governance increased in response to threats that had to be dealt with. From the 1990s onward, many crises and conflicts led to changes in the institutional make-up of the security organizations involved.[24] In line with the idea that 'form follows function', this may account for the observed variation in institutional form produced by responses to security threats.[25] On the other hand, many crises and conflicts simultaneously required a renewal or removal of elements of the existing European security architecture.

Furthermore, in addition to changes in the existing security architecture, this period also saw international security cooperation take place outside the context of institutionalised structures. More than a decade ago, American Secretary of State, Donald Rumsfeld, in his capacity as a representative of Europe's number one security ally, made the now infamous statement, '...it's not the coalition that determines the mission; it's the mission that determines the coalition'.[26] Coalitions of the willing and able, outside of the context of institutionalised cooperation, have been employed as an alternative to traditional alliances and have been seen in international operations in Kosovo(1999), Iraq (2003), Libya (2011) and Syria (2011).

It can thus be argued that the post-Cold War era led not only to building, but also breaking the sought-after European security architecture that would encompass a division of labour between NATO, the OSCE, the EU and the WEU as provided for in 'Paris'. All of these organizations were eager to be tasked with new security activities and roles in an effort to legitimise their existence, as well as their survival. This led each security organization to forge its own variegated path of change and to renew political and legal interaction between itself and other organizations.

As such, the security organizations within the European security architecture have adjusted and adapted their institutional design in response to the post-Cold War situation. In line with Haftendorn, Keohane and Wallander's argument, as mentioned above, one can conclude that the change in tasks and functions has led to strengthening of the

---

■

23   The 1999 NATO operation Allied Force was executed without a UN mandate which led to dissatisfaction among member states.

24   These conflicts and crises are subject matters of this research and will be elaborated in Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

25   Haftendorn, H., Keohane, R. O., Wallander, C. A., 'Imperfect Unions, Security Institutions over Time and Space', Oxford University Press, New York, 1999, p. 7.

26   Rumsfeld, D., Washington Post, 18 October 2001.

organizations. Nevertheless, the 'organizations-in-crisis literature'[27] or the question 'Is the OSCE still alive?'[28] has had its fair share of attention in the press and has not gone unnoticed by policy makers and academics alike.

From the beginning of 2000, some politicians and academics claimed that the EU's path of change had weakened. Political debate intensified and tension increased in response to a failed EU constitution (2005),[29] the direction and extent of future enlargement, economic and budgetary difficulties, the nature of border security and questions about the direction of law enforcement and legal cooperation. These challenges presented themselves against the backdrop of the realisation that the EU's overarching aim of cross-border cooperation could not solve current transnational problems, like migration. Furthermore, the EU's economic integration process did not automatically lead to a political union with a unified foreign and security policy or a European army. Additionally, criticism began to emerge from national political parties within member states,[30] ultimately resulting in a state leaving the EU in the context of Brexit.[31] This existential crisis became somewhat fashionable, as other states and political parties suggested similar options for Greece ('Grexit')[32] and the Netherlands (Nexit).[33]

NATO, likewise, has experienced its own share of tension in dealing with a European capability deficit and disagreement among members on issues of enlargement, vision and missions; in other words, a lack of solidarity among members on many issues. Furthermore, according to critics, the OSCE has also failed to develop into a regional security organization, instead functioning as an umbrella over NATO and former WP states.

Finally, bureaucrats in Brussels were often faulted for this supposed crisis of the security architecture. The aforementioned organizations were said to be divorced from reality and had lost public support along the way, which damaged the endeavour to create a genuine architecture equipped to cope with threats and insecurity.[34] Clegg and Hardy described these trends as early as in 1999; '...on the outside the boundaries that formerly circumscribed the organization are breaking down... in 'chains', 'clusters, 'networks' and 'strategic alliances'. On the inside, the boundaries that formerly delineated the bureaucracy are also breaking down as the traditional hierarchal structure changes leading to new organizational forms'.[35]

∎

27   This statement was derived from; Thies, W. J., 'Why NATO Endures', Cambridge University Press, New York, 2009, p. 3-14.

28   Socor, V., 'Is the OSCE Still Alive?', Wall Street Journal, Nov 5, 2004.

29   The Dutch (1 June 2005) and the French (29 May 2005) voted 'no' in a consultative referendum on the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe.

30   European political doctrine that advocates disengagement from the EU and shows resistance towards the European integration process.

31   Brexit is the blending of British and exit, referring to the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the EU after a referendum in June 2016 in which 51,9 % of the British people voted for leave.

32   Grexit refers to a Greek withdrawal from the Eurozone as a hypothetical scenario as a result of the Greek government-debt crisis in 2012.

33   Nexit refers to a possible scenario in which the Netherlands would leave the EU suggested by some Dutch political parties in 2017.

34   Elaboration in Chapter 5.

35   Clegg, S. R., Hardy, C., 'Studying Organization: Theory and Method', SAGE publications, 1999, p. 15.

Another crack in the European security architecture that appeared at the end of the 1990s was precipitated by new threats emerging from terrorism, ethnic confrontation, human rights violations, cyber-crime and attacks, large-scale immigration, an increase in organised crime, competition for energy resources, climate change and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

Finally, the so-called return of geopolitics, prompted by the Russian invasion of Crimea in 2014, led to the increasingly isolationist stance taken by the US, which damaged the transatlantic relationship and strained the EU integration process as a result of political tension within EU states, between members and between the member states and the EU itself. This will be elaborated upon in what follows. There was even talk of a crisis of multilateralism; that Europe and the world were heading toward a system of fragmentation and the end of the Westphalian system; an era of post-multilateralism marking the end of the liberal world order.[36]

Now, in the second decade of the 21st century, for some, the European security architecture cracked again as a result of the return of state power and geopolitics, which has brought the functioning of the multilateral order into question. Heisbourg states that the opposite of the Kantian world order emerged with the renaissance of the anarchic Hobbesian system, resulting in nationalism, radicalism, polarisation and fragmentation.[37] This not only because some of the bigger states choose to pursue national interest at the expense of institutionalised cooperation, but also because other actors have become important in the realm of international politics, diminishing state power on the battlefield, for example, with the increased prevalence of non-state actors, such as terrorists groups, and at the institutional level, as a result of the increasing influence of corporations, international organizations and their organs in addition to the far-reaching consequences of globalisation.

For some, this period is seen as being the beginning of a post-Western global order.[38] Some others, including political leaders of the greater powers, such as the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lavrov, have been enthusiastic about this prospect.[39] Prominent academics, such as Ikenberry[40], Freedman[41] and Kissinger[42] also agree that the liberal world order, as we know it, is under pressure. This has also been suggested by Mazarr[43] and Kagan: '...history has returned, and the democracies must come together to shape it, or others will shape it for them'.[44] Still others have challenged these statements, like German Chancellor Merkel, who has claimed just the opposite, that today's challenges can only be

■

36   Luce, E., Financial Times, 11 June 2018.

37   Heisbourg, F., 'War and Peace After the Age of Liberal Globalisation', Survival, 60:1, 2018, p. 214.

38   Zarif, M. J., speech to Munich Security Conference, 19 February 2017.

39   Russian minister of foreign affairs, speech to Munich Security Conference, 19 February 2017.

40   Ikenberry, J. G., 'Liberal Leviathan. The origins, crisis and transformation of the American World Order', 2012.

41   Freedman, L., 'The Future of War. A History', London, Allen lane, 2017.

42   Kissinger, H., 'World Order', Penguin Press, 2014.

43   Mazar, M. J., 'Testing the Value of the Post-war International Order', Rand Corporation, January 2018.

44   Kagan, R., 'The Return of History and the End of Dreams', Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2008, p. 86.

overcome by maintaining a multilateral order, which itself necessitates the strengthening of international cooperation.[45]

Regardless of perspective, it is evident that the current state of the European security architecture is nowhere near what was intended at the OSCE Summit in Paris in 1990. After more than three decades of building the European security architecture, many cracks can be found in what has been built, leading some to conclude that the system of multilateralism is in crisis and a system of post-multilateralism is emerging.[46]

At the same time, however, security organizations have survived many crises over the last seventy years. And, since the end of the Cold War, many policy initiatives have led to the broadening of the scope of tasks and a strengthening of the institutional structures of these organizations. There even continues to be debate about the possibility of establishing a European army.[47]

The question is: do the developments reflected on above and the paths of change of the organizations encompassed by the European security architecture prelude the end of institutional cooperation and the end of multilateralism? Or is this the beginning of a new era of international security cooperation, with new forms of cooperation emerging at different levels? The aim of this research project is to discuss these issues and provide answers to the research questions as specified below.

1.2 Research Aim

Since the end of the Cold War, the security arena has been governed by an increasing number of security organizations and agreements between these organizations, both regionally and globally. In addition to increasing in number, these organizations have also seen changes in their design, activities and membership. Research on these paths of change over the past several decades has identified various drivers, processes and mechanisms at work in these paths, resulting in different explanations for change that has been observed. The focus of this research is the description, analysis and explanation of change as it related to European security organizations, as reflected upon above, both at the level of the individual organization and at the level of the European security architecture as a whole in the period between the end of the Cold War and 2016. The analysis starts with the end of the Cold War as a major game changer in terms of cooperative regimes between actors and ends after a period of 25 years. This constitutes a sufficient timeframe in which to study paths of change in relation to the selected security organizations.

■

45   German Federal Chancellor Merkel, speech to Munich Security Conference, 18 February 2017.

46   For instance: Acharya, A., 'The End of the American World Order', Polity Press, 2018.

47   Speech of French president Macron on a visit to the former Western Front in Verdun, 5 November 2018.

The cases selected for the analysis of the paths of change of security organizations are NATO, the EU and the OSCE.[48] These organizations display the highest degree of institutionalization and interaction and have overlapping activities, membership and partnership. Historically, these European security organizations, as cases in point, are politically and legally distinct and, as such, this may limit comparability. Although these organizations have overlapping activities and membership and they all interact, they differ to a certain extent as well in terms of history, mandate, autonomy and authority, legality, degree of institutionalisation, decision-making processes, membership and partnerships, operations and missions. Furthermore, NATO, the EU and the OSCE can all be defined as security organizations, as argued by Haftendorn, Keohane and Wallander.[49] However, while they all encompass aspects of collective defence and/or collective security arrangements, they define and interpret these arrangements differently. Nevertheless, NATO, the EU and the OSCE are security organizations within the European security architecture that resemble each other in terms of form and degree of institutionalization, have overlap in terms of membership and partnerships, interact with other organizations and, finally, have overlap in terms of activities and functions.

Change is the phenomenon that is analysed in this research project. The concept of change is operationalised as different 'paths of change', defined here as trajectories that involve broadening (scope of tasks), widening (enlargement and engagement with states and other organizations) and deepening (institutionalization).[50] The dynamics driving change involve state and non-state actors, which, for the purposes of this project, necessitates a combined research framework. Both state and non-state actors influence processes of change in the security environment and security architecture; mutual influence and specific mechanisms lead to changes in paths –broadening, widening and deepening the selected organizations in the context of the European security architecture. Non-state actors, such as international security organizations, are not regarded as 'empty shells' in this analysis. As is the case with other actors, they are regarded as actors in their own right, in line with Barnett and Finnemore, which will be elaborated in Chapter 2.[51] Therefore, these actors can be subject separately to theoretical and empirical analysis and can be compared to one other, making them interesting subjects from an ontological standpoint.

The rationale behind this research project is the absence of a coherent, theoretically inspired description and analysis of these changes in the existing literature. Though literature exists that has dealt with aspects of this problem (to be discussed in detail in the literature review in Chapter 2), this analysis distinguishes itself not only by treating the individual security organizations separately, but also by comparing them to one another and devoting attention to their mutual interrelationship by means of cross-case comparison, between the organizations on one path of change and cross-path comparison,

■

48 In this research, the UN, the EU, NATO and the OSCE are conceptualised as organizations in which organs are set up, exemplified by the NAC of NATO and the Commission of the EU, as will be elaborated in Chapter 2.

49 Haftendorn, H., Keohane, R. O., Wallander, C. A., 'Imperfect Unions, Security Institutions over Time and Space', Oxford University Press, New York, 1999, p. 22.

50 These paths will be elaborated in Chapter 2, section 2.5.

51 Barnett, M., Finnemore, M., 'The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations', International Organization Vol. 53, No. 4, 1999.

between the different paths of change, and with that the European security architecture itself. This thesis forwards the idea that the path of change of one organization can only be understood in the context of a broader comparative analysis of other organizations within the European security architecture: in this case, NATO, the EU and the OSCE.

Hence, the aim of this project is to explain how and why the institutional design of European security organizations has changed over time by analysing paths of change of the European security organizations individually, and in comparison to one another, based on a combined theoretical research framework. It is argued that the phenomenon of change in the selected security organizations cannot be understood without devoting due attention to the setting, and to comparison between security organizations in which the phenomenon is observed. Therefore, to identify the actors and mechanisms at play, the method of structured, focused comparison is applied here. The systematic reconstruction, analysis and comparison of the paths of change of the selected security organizations allows for sound, reliable and valid judgement with respect to whether or not the assumptions made are convincing.

1.3 Research Questions

Despite the range of research that has been done so far on the process of change of both NATO and the EU, and to a lesser extent the OSCE, our theoretical understanding of what drives these changes and what the mechanisms are that account for these changes, both individually and in comparison to each other, remains limited. Therefore, this research project focuses on the paths of change from the end of the Cold War, 1990, to 2016. The aim is to explain the observed variation within and between the selected security organizations over time. As such, the dynamics and events described above lead to the overarching research question: How and why have the European security organizations, namely the EU, the OSCE and NATO, changed in terms of broadening, widening and deepening individually and in comparison to one another as part of the European security architecture between 1990 and 2016?

The research question reflects the theoretical assumption of new institutionalism, as the analytical approach of new institutionalism to stability and change over time has always included formal rules and the institutional structure. This has been at the heart of the institutionalist debate. Furthermore, new institutionalism relies on many theoretical lenses that illuminate the ongoing debate around cooperation and conflict, and chaos and structure of the paths of change of organizations. This research project combines three theoretical lenses within new institutionalism; rational choice, historical institutionalism and constructivist institutionalism. These lenses combined are best equipped to account for the palette of different actors and mechanisms at work in the security and defence domain. A combination of these three lenses does not privilege either agent or structure and includes organizations and even the actors within organizations as autonomous actors, driving change in the national and international contexts.

Finally, as mentioned above, change is defined here in terms of paths that lead to broadening, widening and deepening. These paths of change will be analysed separately and comparatively in the context of the three security organizations, as it is assumed in this research that change in one organization can only be understood in the context of a comparative analysis of other organizations in the European security architecture, given that change yields different results in different contexts, and that there is significant overlap between the organizations in terms of tasks and members. For the purposes of this analysis, this comparative approach will be two pronged. The first analysis is a cross-case comparison, looking at the three security organizations within a singular path, either broadening, widening or deepening. The second involves a cross-path comparison between the three paths of change and the possibility of their being interrelated. As such, the main research question will be divided and will be addressed by answering the following sub-questions for each path of change within NATO, the EU and the OSCE individually and among the three organizations as a group: 1) At what level are the observed paths of change? What form do these paths take? 2) What concrete effects of the paths of change can be discerned? 3) What are the similarities and differences in and between the paths of change among the security organizations? 4) How can variation in the paths of change of the European security organizations be explained? These sub-questions will be answered in succession in Chapters 4 to 7, for each of the following paths of change, broadening (Chapter 4), Widening (Chapter 5), deepening (Chapter 6) and cross-path comparison (Chapter 7).

1.4 Research Strategy

The research questions presented above reflect the theoretical assumptions of institutionalism, as it pertains to political science. Institutionalism emphasises the role of (international) organizations and is characterised by the analysis of the 'world of institutions'. Peters goes so far as to claim that the roots of political science lie in the study of institutions.[52] Institutionalism can be divided into old and new institutionalism. New institutionalism emerged in the 1980s with March and Olsen's seminal article.[53]

Within political science, organizational change has been analysed and debated from different perspectives, varying from new institutionalism to integration theory and, a fairly new approach, inter-organizationalism.[54] Some of these debates are situated in the traditional levels of analysis, ranging from the state level to the international level; however, there are alternative approaches to the more state and structure-centric approaches stemming from realism and liberalism that can be categorised as being offshoots of constructivism.

The ongoing debate with regard to the survival of Cold War organizations, like the OSCE and NATO, after the end of the Cold War has dominated liberal and realist approaches to international relations for decades. For example, on the one hand, the realist understanding has been that NATO was in decline but enjoyed a renaissance after the Crimea crisis of 2014. On the other hand, those with a more liberal approach have argued that NATO has survived even after its raison d'être disappeared because NATO changed from an alliance into a security management institution, a different type of organization than one focused purely on collective defence, as claimed by Haftendorn, Keohane and Wallander.[55] Another explanation of the continued survival of organizations that have outlived their original purpose is that maintaining existing organizations is less costly than creating new ones and it is too expensive to disband them;[56] thus they persist in spite of a changed security environment.[57] This draws attention to drivers of observed paths of change that extend beyond function and form. Furthermore, the theory of (complex) interdependence put forward by Keohane and Nye has presented a challenge to more realist approaches to international relations, stating that, as a result of modernization, the degree and scope of interdependence and transnational linkages between states has increased, making military conflicts between these states less likely. Keohane and Nye argue that, as a result of this, control over these linkages and power have become more important and other important actors have emerged alongside states, including organizations and their

■

52 Peters, B. G., 'Institutional Theory in Political Science. The New Institutionalism', The Continuum International Publishing Group, New York, 2012, p. 1.

53 March, J. G., Olsen, J. P., 'The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life', The American Political Science Review, Vol. 78, Nr. 3, 1984.

54 Inter-organizationalism studies the relationship between international organizations and will be elaborated upon in Chapter 2.

55 Haftendorn, H., Keohane, R. O., Wallander, C. A., 'Imperfect Unions, Security Institutions over Time and Space', Oxford University Press, New York, 1999, p. 22.

56 Stated by historical institutionalism.

57 Peters, B. G., 'Institutional Theory in Political Science. The New Institutionalism', The Continuum International Publishing Group, New York, 2012, p. 77-82.

organs.[58] Constructivist approaches also acknowledge the increasingly important role of actors other than states as drivers of change in the international arena.[59]

This research adopts new institutionalism as its theoretical lens and uses it to guide its overall approach to the analysis. The greater theory has developed into several approaches varying from historical institutionalism, which accounts for the most extensive body of empirical work within new institutionalism, to rational choice institutionalism and constructivism. New institutionalism can be considered a '...broad, if variegated, approach to politics...' where '...institutions are the variable that explain most of political life, and they are also the factors that require explanation'.[60]

In part as a result of an increase in the sheer number of international organizations, research on the international organizations as autonomous actors has been at the heart of the institutionalist debate.[61] According to Djelic, institutionalism is not only about national institutions, but also concerns the international and inter-organizational levels.[62] In light of this, 'the dominance of a single model' for one organization is no longer sufficient. Instead, a 'multilevel and multilayered historical process' is at play, characterized by 'competing and conflicting actors involved in negotiating and the emergence of novel forms'.[63]

The analytical approach of new institutionalism has always been stability, crisis and chaos and included rules and institutionalisation. This research project focuses on formal institutions or explicit agreements that specify the rights and obligations of governments and other actors.[64] The formal institutions that are analysed in this research project include the institutional setup of the European security architecture. For the purposes of this analysis, institutional setup and functioning is seen as more than a still photo taken at a specific moment in time. If we were to analyse an institutional setup as we would a photograph, there would be significant incongruity between the image as it appears and the developments taking place and choices being made in the background, or not, remain unseen. Organizations are more than just a simple projection of a rule-based order or rationally made choices. They are shaped by drivers and their interests. Indeed, organizations are both the result of power struggles and varied interests and are themselves involved in struggles for influence and power. As Keohane states, '...institutions do not merely reflect the preferences and power of the units constituting them; the institutions themselves shape those preferences and that power. Institutions are therefore constitutive

---

58 Keohane, R. O., Nye, J.S., 'Power and Interdependence', Longman 2001.

59 Barnett, M., Finnemore, M., 'The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations', International Organization Vol. 53, No. 4, 1999.

60 Peters, B. G., 'Institutional Theory in Political Science. The New Institutionalism', The Continuum International Publishing Group, New York, 2012, p. 150.

61 Barnett, M. N., Finnemore, M., 'Rules for the World. International Organizations in Global Politics', Cornell University Press, 2004, p. 6.

62 Scott, W. R., 'Institutions and Organizations. Ideas, Interests, and Identities', Sage Publications, 2012, p. 130.

63 Ibid, p. 131.

64 The definition of institutions ranging from formal to informal will be elaborated upon in Chapter 2.

of actors as well as vice versa'.[65] And in that struggle, international organizations are no different than national organizations. Organizations have power in the sense that they possess, to a greater or lesser degree, resources and capabilities and are more or less institutionalised and subject to related rules. They seek authorisation and legitimisation and, at the same time, aim to control and constrain behaviour and simultaneously support and empower activities and actors. Organizations are made up of people, groups, states and other actors and it is their interaction that influences or is influenced by the shape of the institutions under study. In other words, organizations create scope and structure, but they concurrently support and empower the scope of the different actors involved. The function of organizations is to provide stability and order, but they are simultaneously subject to processes of change, which is the phenomenon of interest here.

Hence, the ways in which various organizations are created and change, the way they may differ or come to resemble each other, extends far beyond the explanation a static picture could provide. The structures and functions of an organization speak volumes; they reveal the different drivers at work. Moreover, they influence and constitute these drivers, as well. The question is: which phenomenon is at play when we analyse their paths of change? Which is explained differently by various scholars in the new institutionalist literature.

The focus of the research presented here is the analysis of paths of change of security organizations in which the selected organizations are the main units of analysis. The various approaches within new institutionalism provide guidance and enable the analysis of change in organizations by linking past and present developments and treating various agents and structures as possible drivers of change. These new institutionalist approaches each put forward specific assumptions pertaining to the analysis of organizations; still, it is the 'world of institutions' that is the mantra that links these different approaches. All three perspectives focus on institutional and political structures that are of importance in analysing change in organizations and the possible outcomes of this change. As such, the analytical focus here is on organizations as the central components of the 'world of politics'. As Peters claims, '...the basic argument is that institutions do matter, and that they matter more than anything else that could be used to explain political decisions'.[66] The research presented here is based on that literature and derives its main concepts from a combination of different approaches within institutionalism. The choice was made to address rational choice, historical institutionalism and constructivist institutionalism, three of the mainstream approaches of new institutionalism to explain organizational change. As was mentioned earlier, these theoretical lenses illuminate the ongoing debate on cooperation and conflict, chaos and structure and the relative importance of different actors and mechanisms, including actors within organizations, in the context of driving change in national and international environments.

■

65   Keohane, R. O., 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', International Studies Quarterly, 32 (4), December 1988.

66   Peters, B. G., 'Institutional Theory in Political Science. The New Institutionalism', The Continuum International Publishing Group, New York, 2012, p. 184.

The intention is not to 'test' whether or not rational choice theory explains change in security organizations better than historical institutionalism, for instance. The intention is to combine the different aspects of these approaches to deal with the emergence of a complex institutional architecture in the security environment in which organizations broadened, widened and deepened in terms of activities, structure, membership and partnerships. With this in mind, the objective is to engage in academic bridge-building between opposing approaches by building a theoretical framework made up of different theoretical frameworks. Inspired by Streeck and Thelen, among others, the assumption here is that a combined analysis of organizational change is necessary.[67] This need for a combination of approaches was already identified by Roth in 1987, '...the several approaches should be viewed more as complementary rather than competitive explanations for political phenomena'.[68] Furthermore, Peters stated that '...none of these approaches can fully explain all political actions, and perhaps none should attempt to do so'.[69] Lowndes even explains that the strength of new institutionalism lies within its multi-theoretic character.[70] Hence, the different approaches within new institutionalism can be viewed as being more complementary than competitive.[71] Relying on a combination of different lenses for the purposes of this analysis of change allows for a more complete understanding of the characteristics of different actors and interaction between these actors, and observed mechanisms than could be achieved by adhering to a strict division between the different lenses. Theoretical pluralism can strengthen new institutionalism, as each lens can benefit from interaction with another approach; each approach has something unique to offer in the analysis of paths of change of the selected security organizations.

In conclusion, the focus of this research project is change in the context of the European security architecture and the analysis presented here is guided by different approaches in an effort to capture the effects of various drivers and both the intended and unintended consequences of actions. This strategy extends beyond the general approach, which tends to focus on individual (security) organizations, using a single theoretical approach. With this multi-perspective strategy, the aim is to fill gaps in our understanding of organizational change. This will be elaborated upon in Chapter 2.

The research strategy comprises a multiple case study of three international security organizations. The analysis encapsulates the key or critical moments of change, which are listed in the corresponding treaties, strategies, operational texts, and political declarations and agreements.

---

67   Streeck, W., Thelen, K., 'Beyond Continuity. Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies', Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 3.

68   Roth, P. A., 'Meaning and Method in the Social Sciences: A Case for Methodological Pluralism', Cornell University Press, New York, 1989, p. 125.

69   Peters, B. G., 'Institutional Theory in Political Science. The New Institutionalism', The Continuum International Publishing Group, New York, 2012, p. 2.

70   Lowndes, V., 'Institutionalism', in: Marsh, D., Stoker, G., 'Theory and Methods in Political Science', Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. p. 108.

71   In Chapter 2 an elaboration will be given on the complementary aspects of the different approaches within new institutionalism.

The thesis will proceed with an overview of research on international (security) cooperation and organizations in relation to the concept of change. This is followed by a selection of the major concepts and processes of change in security organizations, the research subject, that will be described, analysed and explained. To this end, the following topics will be discussed: international cooperation and organization, international security cooperation and, finally, international security organization.

Subsequently, on the basis of this overview of concepts, a conceptual and analytical framework will be distilled that will guide, order and structure the description and explanation. The independent variables selected allow for explanation of the variation in paths of change, defined here in terms of deepening, broadening and widening. This framework highlights the major drivers that produce variation in the institutional design precipitated by different actors and events emerging from/taking place within and outside the security organizations.

The paths of broadening, widening and deepening that encapsulate the major processes of change observed will be analysed comparatively among three interrelated security organizations (the selected cases). While the security organizations that have been selected differ to a certain extent, they share similarities and overlap in activities and membership, and act in the same security environment. As such, an analysis of change that is fundamentally comparative allows for the identification of patterns of convergence and divergence among the selected security organizations. This will be elaborated upon in Chapter 3. As discussed previously, change in one organization can only be understood in the context of a comparative analysis of organizations in the European security architecture, namely NATO, the EU and the OSCE. The comparative angle will be approached from two sides. The analysis will include a cross-case comparison, comparing the paths of change of the three, selected security organizations within a singular path either broadening, widening or deepening (i.e. Chapters 4, 5 and 6). The second comparison includes a cross-path comparison of the key findings related to the three paths of change and their (potentially mutually-reinforcing) relationship (i.e. Chapter 7).

1.5 Research Objectives and Relevance

Objectives

The objectives of this project are both theoretical and empirical. The research presented here deals with change in European security organizations acting in a complex environment, both at the level of the individual organization and in comparison to other organizations based on a multi-perspective analytical framework. The aim in choosing indicators of change, level and form respectively, is to provide an overview, based on key moments, with which to analyse change. The aforementioned analysis entails a particular focus on systematic comparison of the development of these security organizations and, thus, asks the how, when and why questions related to their paths of change. The purpose of this combined research framework is fourfold.

First, the framework allows for the analysis of the chosen paths of change of European security organizations (broadening, widening and deepening), comparison of these paths individually and in relation to one another and for the analysis of possible interlinkages between these paths. This comparative aspect is what serves to address the gap in the literature, as will be described in the research overview in Chapter 2, which deals with the analysis of international organizations in general and security organizations in the European security architecture in particular.

A second purpose is to make a contribution to the institutionalist literature by presenting a theory-driven research framework based on a combination of theories within new institutionalism that can explain change elicited by multiple drivers, e.g. state and non-state actors and mechanism-focused drivers. Some scholars have already suggested the need for a compilation of different approaches as opposed to the rigid, sometimes artificial, boundary that is set between more realist and liberal approaches to institutionalism. Because the European institutional security architecture is so complex and involves both state and non-state actors, a framework is needed that can account for a multiplicity of agents and structures that drive paths of change of international security organizations.

Third, the framework allows for the observation of the complete empirical lifecycle – creation, change and possible emergence of counter-movements or even demise – of the selected European security organizations; it allows us to look more closely at their existence, development, survival and the design of the European security architecture.

The fourth and final purpose is to assess whether or not the use of this combined research framework to analyse paths of change of security organizations is justified and fruitful in terms of building institutional theory.

In conclusion, the following main assumptions which will guide the data gathering and analysis of the paths of change of the selected security organizations are presented below:

1. The path of change of one organization can only be understood in the context of a broader comparative analysis of other organizations within the European security architecture, as it is assumed that they are positively as well as negatively linked.

2. Non-state actors, such as international security organizations, are not 'empty shells', but regarded as actors in their own right as they own capacities and power to influence paths of change in their struggle for legitimacy and survival.

3. The dynamics driving change involve state and non-state actors, which necessitates a combined research framework to account for the palette of different actors and mechanisms at work in the security and defence domain.

A final remark entails the remark that attention has to be paid to some of the limitations of the research framework. This analysis is not focused on the study of (security) policy issues and events within the setting of international cooperation. It is focused on the how and why questions related to the paths of change of security organizations, distilled

from the key moments of change, and to explain variation between the paths of highly institutionalised organizations that act in the same environment and bear similarities and differences in terms of their development.

Relevance
By addressing and answering the research questions, the aim of this analysis is to make a theoretical and empirical contribution to the academic debate on security organizations in general and the selected organizations within the security architecture of Europe, NATO, the EU and the OSCE. European and transatlantic security organizations and the inter-organizational webs that have emerged between them have experienced important changes and have had to deal with the accompanying challenges over the past three decades. In answering the research question as to how and why security organizations have changed over time and in conducting an analysis of the European security architecture more generally, this thesis covers important ground in the field of European security and organizational security studies.

Policy Relevance
The focus of this research project is the European security architecture, though the term 'European' is becoming less and less specific as the Netherlands and other European states increasingly have to deal with an elaborate web of global institutionalized cooperation.[72] Within this wider security architecture, NATO, the EU and to a lesser extent the OSCE, are the most important security organizations in terms of foreign, security and defence policy in Europe and the Netherlands. In most European states, NATO is still seen as a successful and important alliance and the EU's CSDP is becoming more important in the Dutch context. And while the OSCE has seemingly declined in importance, its continued relevance was proven in the aftermath of the MH17 crash[73] and the prospect of there being an alternative for non-NATO and EU members is unlikely in the near future.[74] The development of these organizations has taken place alongside a virtually continuous process of internal change, crises and the emergence of new external threats and other actors. This is highly relevant in light of current uncertainties at the national, regional and international levels. Hopefully, the findings of this research can help policy-makers create tools for assessing, and maybe even predicting, major turning points and drivers of change that can have significant consequences in terms of the design and adaptation of organizations.

Furthermore, the proposed research is relevant to the European and Dutch armed forces, as these armed forces are engaged in the conduct of civilian and military missions

∎

72   'Veiligheid in een wereld van verbindingen. Een strategische visie op het defensiebeleid', WRR rapport, Den Haag, 2017, hoofdstuk; 'Strategische Monitor 2017/2018', HCSS/Clingendael.

73   The MH17 crash In Ukraine on the 17th of July 2014. Already on the 18th of July the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission pre-positioned in Donetsk and the OSCE remained involved as a mediator between the different parties.

74   'Wereldwijd voor een veilig Nederland - Geïntegreerde Buitenland- en Veiligheidsstrategie, 2018-2022', Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 20 maart 2018.

and operations, under the auspices of NATO, the EU and/or coalitions of willing and able executed under NATO or EU flag.

Academic Relevance

The aim of this research project is to create and use a combined research framework based on different institutionalist approaches to analyse paths of change of the selected security organizations, both at the individual (organizational) level and comparatively. The reasoning behind this is that a combination of theories is best suited to solve the research puzzle and identify factors that cause or contribute to change. Change in the specific security organizations, especially when it comes to NATO and even more so the OSCE, at the individual level and at the inter-organizational level, and the related interaction between organizations remain under-theorised, as will be argued in Chapter 2. Furthermore, exogenous shocks like wars or crises, identified by some as the primary causes of change, are combined in a complex institutional security environment. As will be discussed in Chapter 2, in this environment, the distinction between what constitutes internal versus external security is somewhat blurry. This combined with the involvement of both state and non-state actors and the increasingly complex institutional design of organizations demands a framework for analysis that can cope with a variety of agents and structures that may drive change. As such, paths of change are analysed using a comparative method, cross-case and cross-path, to account for the fact that these organizations interact with one another. By accommodating the inclusion in the analysis of an array of different drivers (actors, structures and mechanisms that cause change), the black box between the different approaches of institutionalism will be opened and explored.

This analysis will contribute to the institutionalist literature in several ways. First of all, the findings presented here will increase our understanding of paths of change of security organizations within the European security architecture by analysing empirical data in the context of a research framework drawn from different approaches within institutionalism. Second, this research contributes to the development of different approaches within institutionalism by identifying complementary arguments and including agents (including non-state actors; agency is not seen as being limited to states), structures and mechanism as causes of change. Third, by using an institutionalist lens, this research extends beyond state-centric approaches to the analysis of paths of change in the area of international security cooperation. Finally, this research contributes to theories of institutional change and adaptation and approaches to the study of change specifically by developing a combined research framework with which to analyse change in different (security) organizations operating in the same policy and operational field.

An additional aim of this research project is to assess what the empirical cases of the paths of change of the EU, NATO and the OSCE can tell us about paths of change of international (security) organizations more generally. In being widely generalizable, these findings of this study make a theoretical contribution to challenging traditional conceptualizations of security organizations, based on collective defence and collective security.

Methodological Relevance

In addition to its policy and academic relevance, there are novel aspects of this study's methodological approach to analysing change in security organizations.

First, this study relies on a combined theoretical research framework, described above, based on the synthesis of three approaches to institutionalism in one framework. This framework is applied to three cases, individually and in comparison to one another, cross-case and cross-path. The benefit of comparative research is that it allows for the identification of patterns of convergence and divergence between security organizations that act in a shared security environment with overlapping (and divergent) activities, membership and partnerships and paths of institutionalization.

Second, the results of change are described, analysed and explained, after which the possible drivers are analysed. These findings are structured along the lines of the theory-based assumptions and are analysed using the method of structured focused comparison and process tracing. The method of structured focused comparison was selected as it is well-suited to research that involves comparative case studies analysed over time (sequences), as opposed to a single moment in time.

Finally, as was mentioned previously, this study is not intended to be a 'test' of whether or not rational choice theory explains change in security organizations better than, for instance, historical institutionalism. The intention is to combine the different, but complementary aspects of the approaches within new institutionalism.

1.6 Research Outline

The first step toward answering the research question is the presentation of the theoretical state of research on change in (security) organizations and different forms of security cooperation. For the analysis of paths of change of security organizations, the choice was made to rely mainly on institutionalist approaches. On the basis of these approaches, a theoretical framework has been designed to study change in the selected security organizations by way of paths leading to the deepening, broadening and widening of the institutional design of security organizations. This will be presented in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3, the methodology will be discussed in further detail. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 will present the case material organized according to the paths of change operationalized as broadening, widening and deepening, concluding with a cross-case comparison within each path of change using process tracing. Additionally, in Chapter 7, the findings of a cross-path comparison of the security organizations will be presented. Finally, in Chapter 8, the theoretical explanations will be addressed, structured along the lines of the assumptions drawn from the theoretical framework that has guided this analysis. The research questions will also be answered, and the theoretical and policy implications of the study will be outlined.