Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

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

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 Three

Conclusions and Recommendations

'Everyone behaves badly, given the chance'.

Ernest Hemingway, The Sun Also Rises, 1926

Chapter 8

Chapter 8. Conclusions

8.1 Security Cooperation in Europe: Permanent Change?

After more than two decades of hope for a better future settled in a multilateral world order and a genuine European security architecture, an often-heard credo has been that a multilateral order and the European security organizations themselves are in crisis. There has been even talk of a new world order where a system of post-multilateralism would rule. Another often-heard indication for an assumed crisis is that the 'Brussels' bureaucracy, of the EU as well as NATO, would not be in touch with the real world and had even damaged the endeavour of building a genuine architecture to cope with threats and insecurity.[1] Although NATO, the EU and the OSCE, as the pillars of the European security architecture, have changed, it has been regularly asserted that they have not managed to adapt enough or correctly to the changed security environment they faced, leading to a possible break-up of the European security architecture and, over and over again, the raison d'être of these organizations has been questioned. This situation was often interpreted as a presumed consequence of the ongoing struggle between the diverging security interests of state actors within the European security architecture or the inability and incompetence of the 'Brussels' institutions.

Simultaneously, ever since the end of the Cold War, the security organizations of the European security architecture survived many of the internal and external crises and adjusted through paths of broadening, widening and deepening, as this research illustrated. In fact, permanent paths of change could be observed in practice. These ongoing dynamics of security cooperation in practice have led to the main question that guided this research: 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?

To answer the research question, the relevant concepts, the theoretical approach and framework for analysing change of security organizations, which were addressed in Chapter 2 and 3, will be summarized in this chapter. Next, the empirical findings that were observed in Chapters 4 to 7 will be addressed. This will be followed by the theoretical explanation of these findings based on the created theoretical framework. Together, these findings will answer the research question that instigated and guided this research. Empirical and theoretical inductions and deductions of the findings will then be formulated. Finally, conclusions together with recommendations for future research will be presented.

1 See: Heisbourg, F., 'War and Peace After the Age of Liberal Globalisation', Survival, Vol. 60, no. 1, Routledge, February-March 2018, p. 211-228; Luce, E., 'The Retreat of Western Liberalism', Atlantic Monthly Press, New York, 2017.

8.2 Analysing European Security Cooperation: Puzzling Form and Function

The aim of this chapter is to summarize the research observations and answer the research question. The phenomenon of this research, the line of analysis and the research approach together with the method of analysis to address the research puzzle will therefore be explained for each preceding chapter.

Chapter 2, at first, presented the theoretical state of the research on (security) organizations, followed by the main concepts that encapsulated the relevant aspects of international security cooperation that were important for the analysis of the paths of change of security cooperation: change, international organization, security cooperation and security organization.

For the analysis of the paths of change of the security organizations, new institutionalism was chosen as the theoretical lens. The research question reflected the theoretical assumption of new institutionalism, which centres around the analysis of the life of organizations. New institutionalism explicitly offers diverse approaches, varying from the more realist to the constructivist sub-approaches, addressing differences in agents and structures causing change of organizations, their world and life cycle. To answer the research question, this dissertation resorted to three approaches within new institutionalism: rational choice, historical and constructivist institutionalism, as they together include schemes of conflict and cooperation, chaos and structure between different actors and mechanisms, possibly driving change in an international environment. The philosophical base for applying the chosen approaches to unravel the puzzles of the world of organizations is the relationship between ontology (i.e., what is the world?) and epistemology (i.e., how can we know the world?). Via the epistemic instruments that these approaches have offered and that encapsulate the possible drivers of change, this research attempted to understand the phenomenon of change as inclusively as possible, meaning the inclusion of all possible drivers, agents and structures, causing change.

The subject of this research was the paths of change of three selected security organizations in the European security architecture. The focus was the analysis of the observed changes in the institutional framework because the institutional setup of an organization is presumed to be more than a static image in this research. Organizations are more than just a black and white projection of a world or the simple outcome of state interest. They are the result of power struggles and varied interests of different actors and, vice versa, they influence, control and constrain behaviour and also support and empower activities of all actors, as each of them struggles for legitimacy and power.

Derived from the various approaches within new institutionalism, the theoretical framework was created to tackle the paths of change. Change then was defined as deepening, broadening and widening, together with an inclusive pallet of possible drivers, agents and structures, to study the paths of change of the security organizations. This research framework fills a gap in the prevailing literature and presents an inclusive theoretical framework, as was elaborated on in Chapter 2. Finally, apart from this comprehensive framework, the research analysed the paths of change through a dual comparison: cross-case, whereby change of the security organizations was analysed within

their paths of change (Chapters 4 to 6), and cross-path, whereby change was analysed between the paths (Chapter 7).

The security organizations that were subject to analysis act in a complex institutional security environment, involving many state and non-state actors, different member- and partnerships and cross-institutional linkages between them. Therefore, to unravel the drivers and mechanisms at play, the method of structured focused comparison and process tracing were applied, as described in Chapter 3. Structured focused comparison and process tracing offered a method, including the criteria, to analyse key moments of change, windows of opportunity and possible game changers influencing the paths of change, which were drawn from the data collection to determine which drivers and interests were at stake. By these methods, the derived assumptions from the selected approaches of new institutionalism could be analysed consistently with the three selected cases - NATO, the EU and the OSCE - and will be explored in detail below.

Chapters 4 to 7 addressed the 'how' and the 'why' questions related to the causes of the observed paths of change, based on the sub-questions derived from the main research question. These chapters presented the case material organized respectively along the paths of change of each organization in terms of level and form and presented a cross-case comparison between the security organizations within each path of change. In Chapter 7, a cross-path comparison was made between deepening, broadening and widening of the paths of change.

Finally, this chapter will summarize the research findings and will address the research question based on the key findings of the observed paths of change in the previous chapters and, as a result, will provide a theoretical explanation of the observations. The combination of the selected approaches of new institutionalism offered the possibility to reveal a unique pattern of dynamics, drivers and mechanisms causing the paths of change.

8.3 Paths of Change of the European Security Organizations: A Never Ending Story

Derived from the analysis in Chapter 4 to 7, where the sub-questions were addressed, the following section will address the 'how' of the main research question by presenting the key findings of the paths of change of the observed security organizations.

At first, in response to the first and second wave of international cooperation from the 1990s, as was introduced in Chapter 1, a third wave of increasing international cooperation and institutionalization in the field of security and defence cooperation was observed, and international (security) organizations have grown extensively ever since in number, but also in tasks, scope of policies, memberships and partnerships, which this research has analysed.

Second, together with a geographical extension, resulting in more or less 'unlimited' organizations, and a broadening of the scope of tasks, the security organizations all showed an increase in differentiated cooperation in level and form. Levels of security cooperation, with regard to authority and autonomy, varied from high to low institutional cooperation together with incremental, bottom-up or top-down approaches and a mixture of intergovernmental and supranational cooperation, initiated either by states, organs

or organizations. The form of security cooperation developed in a wide variety: from regimes to organizations, from formal to informal cooperation, from intergovernmental to supranational cooperation, through inter-organizational cooperation and everything in between in bi- and multilateral modular forms. Furthermore, this resulted in a varied scope of tasks among the security organizations, where the concepts of security organizations, defined as collective defence, collective security and cooperative security, were mixed and exceeded their traditional scope. As a result, organizations became more fluid.[2] In other words, it was observed that change became a constant factor through the paths of broadening, widening and deepening, either positively or negatively.

Third, the paths of change were mutually linked, either positively or negatively. It was observed that the paths of change led to geographical, functional and institutional interconnectedness, interweaving and even interdependence through cross-institutional and cross-organizational linkages: politically, policy-wise as well as operational. The research showed that, as a result of the paths of change, for some aspects of security and defence policy, states and organizations were less capable of functioning without one another. This is illustrated by NATO's integrated approach connection to the EU, the EU's collective defence connection to NATO and the EU's operational link with NATO's command structure. This resulted in an increase of horizontal (tasks) and vertical (in institutional structure) interlinkage and interdependency, and the observation that these organizations to a certain degree have become autonomous processes no longer exclusively controlled by the states. Furthermore, this research found that there has been a great deal of variation in the '...effectiveness and persistence of international institutions...'.[3] For instance, broadening of the scope of one organization's policy could result in a decrease of broadening and deepening in another organization, as the broadening of the EU supported by funds and infrastructure clearly affected the effectiveness of the OSCE.

Finally, along with an increase of institutionalized international cooperation, forms of less formal cooperation emerged, illustrated by ad-hoc cooperation, non-institutionalized contact groups, coalitions of the willing and able and bi- or multilateral cooperation beyond the existing security organizations.

Summing up, the outcome of the findings of Chapter 4 to 7 showed an increase in (complex) security cooperation schemes, within and outside the selected organizations, both in level and form, caused by various drivers. Furthermore, an expansion and even a mix was observed of the traditional concepts of security organizations: collective defence, collective security and cooperative security, questioning the adage of form follows function, which will be discussed below. In other words, this research observed a combination of an increased multilateral cooperative security architecture, together with a more traditional European order built on geopolitics, deterrence, ad-hoc alliances and a system of collective

2 Clegg, S. R., Hardy, C., 'Studying Organisation: Theory and Method', SAGE Publications, 1999, p. 15.

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

defence, excluding states, as a functional aim. This ended up in a peculiar combination of continuing multilateralism on the one hand, based on interlinkage and interdependence and built by states, organizations, organs and mechanisms, together with the battle for power, and ad-hoc alliance building based on self-interest of the state on the other. This observation contrasts with the concept of a security architecture built on multilateralism with a division of labour, or the opposite, namely a non-existing European security architecture replaced by a return of geopolitics.

8.4 Explaining the Paths of Change of the European Security Organizations: Clashing or Compatible Theories

Introduction

Now the time has come to theoretically explain the observed paths of change based on the research framework developed for this purpose. Derived from the analysis in Chapters 4 to 7, where the sub-questions were addressed, the following section will address the 'why' of the main research question by presenting the key findings of the paths of change of the observed security organizations.

One of the assumptions of this research was that the more realist theories are necessary to explain change of organizations acting in the international security and defence domain, but not sufficient. The starting point of this research was that the selected approaches of new institutionalism each explain a particular aspect of the paths of change and only together can explain the totality of the results.

In Chapter 1, it was stated that developments in the security environment and security architecture, caused by both state and non-state actors as well as specific mechanisms, led to changes along the paths of broadening, widening and deepening of the organizations in the European security architecture. It was assumed that the complex security architecture with overlapping members, partners and tasks were linked and interdependent. Acting in a complex institutional security environment necessitated a research framework that included all possible drivers of change.

Based on the research observations described above, a theoretical explanation will now be given by means of the arguments of the selected approaches of new institutionalism.

Rational Choice

International cooperation within the security and defence policy domain for creating, mandating and deciding upon change of international organizations has always been a matter for the state. Based on Article 51 of the UN Charter, 'Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence…', states are the sovereign actors in international relations, especially with regard to security and defence cooperation. Following that line of argument, one could say that Article 51 of the UN Charter lies at the heart of the rational choice theorists, where organizations are established by states to promote or protect their interests in a reduction of uncertainty, transaction-cost approach.

It was shown that NATO's change in tasks from collective defence to crisis management, as a response to the Balkan wars, and prioritising collective defence again as a result of the Crimea crisis in 2014 and the resurgence of Russia, had been due to states' decisions in response to these exogenous threats. The member states themselves decided whether to create, participate and support the schemes of international cooperation, which was recently demonstrated by the UK voting for Brexit.[4]

As rational choice theorists argue, the various reasons behind the observed paths of change, either strengthening or weakening organizations, are basically the result of state interest and action as these states deem necessary. These actions can vary from a joint reaction to a mutual crisis, threat or even attack, to a unilateral or bilateral action. An example of the latter was the UK-France initiative in Operation Unified Protector in Libya (2011), which later had implications for NATO and the EU. Or change has been a result of increasing international political, institutionalized and legal cooperation when problems, crises or threats to national interest could not be solved at a national level. This is illustrated by France's fluctuating position towards EU defence cooperation in response to Germany's political and economic dominance in Europe. In other words, France's national security and defence interest was at times better served by strengthening EU security and defence cooperation to maximize its own national utility: the transaction-cost approach.

Nevertheless, it was also observed that change did not only occur in response to the needs and interests of state actors. The question was often raised as to why NATO or the OSCE still existed, while their functions of collective defence, collective security or cooperative security were lost at certain moments in time, which the more realist theories within new institutionalism could not address. Did both organizations change in a sufficient manner to avoid termination by the member states or were there other dynamics in place? Nor can rational choice theorists sufficiently explain the way in which change shifted from top-down to bottom-up and from formal to more informal forms of cooperation, together with differentiated cooperation schemes, all caused by state actors and non-state actors as well.

Furthermore, it was shown in this research that apart from the struggle for interests, state actors were simultaneously inspired or voluntarily constrained by structural conditions of the organizations, as is claimed by other approaches within new institutionalism. These other approaches, which will be elaborated upon below, are advocates of a mixture of actors causing changes and adaptations of traditional institutional logics and decision-making procedures, as claimed by rational choice theorists.

Historical Institutionalism

Historical institutionalism was valuable for the analysis of organizations descending from the end of the Second World War. As a result, the very concept of a security organization could be scrutinized, and its life cycle analysed. This focus on the life cycle of the security

4 At the time this research was written, the final outcome of Brexit and British participation in the EU's CSDP was not yet clear. The possibility is often proposed that the UK keep a link with the EU's CSDP as a logical consequence of the UK membership in NATO and the bi- and multilateral agreements between the UK and other EU members, like France and Poland.

organizations enabled the analysis of the full path of change and the evolution of the security concepts and their specific development within NATO, the EU and the OSCE in this research.

Although historical institutionalists perceive organizations to be inherently resistant to change, if they do change, this is accepted as a natural process based on the concept of a punctuated equilibrium, meaning the basic structure of an organization will remain the same. Indeed, collective defence and additional command structure had always remained the backbone of NATO's existence ever since its creation, and although NATO's mandate broadened, its military structure simply remained an adjusted alliance organization with an additional structure. Furthermore, not all tasks and functions of the three security organizations that were once adopted and politically or legally laid down in treaties and agreements were enhanced or even executed, such as the modular cooperation forms like the NRF and BG concept of both the EU and NATO, but they were never eliminated either.

A valuable contribution of historical institutionalism to address the research question was the analysis of the paths of change over time, which offered the opportunity to explore multiple (un)expected drivers. In other words, this research not only focused on the direct consequences of one catastrophe such as 9/11.

The path-dependent approach of historical institutionalism indicates a need for historical analysis. The case study analysis in Chapters 4 to 7 covered more than 25 years. Tracing cases over time helped to understand the comprehensive paths of the observed organizations. Furthermore, the observed paths of change and conjuncture of the selected organizations and their activities enabled a comparison of the findings, as the security organizations acted in the same security environment with overlapping members, partners and tasks. The comparative analysis of the cases over time enabled the identification of patterns of convergence and divergence within and between the security organizations.

The notion of path dependency emphasised political and policy continuities in the paths of change due to built-in structural dynamics. One example was the observed acceptance of structural conditions and moral expectations, such as solidarity, even when they led to constraint by states when they cooperate in an institutionalised international organization. Simultaneously, the argument of critical juncture stressed gradual but substantial reforms, such as the adoption of new members and tasks, sometimes directly in response to a crisis and sometimes not. Finally, it was shown that institutionalization cannot simply be labelled as an outcome, institutionalization entailed its own dynamics and empowered organizations as actors in their own right.

Still, the strength of historical institutionalism is also its weakness. The case study results indicated several deficiencies in the assumptions of historical institutionalism. The focus of historical institutionalism on continuity and stability, as the concept of path dependency and its multiple mechanisms[5] imply, proved to be difficult when explaining the role of

5 Keohane, R. O., 'Observations on the Promise and Pitfalls of Historical Institutionalism in International Relations', p. 326-329, in: Fioretos, O. (eds.), 'International Politics and Institutions in Time', Oxford University Press, United Kingdom, 2017.

outside actors and mechanisms of exogenous and endogenous change or even shocks.[6] It was observed that unexpected situations led to new developments within the paths, illustrated by the adoption of the EU's PESCO by almost all member states, implying more or less supranational cooperation within the defence realm, and the EU's adoption of a mutual defence clause. Another example is the broadening of NATO's backbone, Article 5, together with a renewed emphasis on Article 3 and civil capabilities, combined with the limitation of NATO in its scope of tasks and the necessary claimed linkage to the EU. Not all these observations could be explained by solid and deep historical roots, as claimed by historical institutionalism.

Constructivist Institutionalism

As well as the more historical and realist approaches within new institutionalism, constructivist institutionalism offered the opportunity to frame all actors' behaviour by analysing their norms and values related to the way in which organizations change. Moreover, constructivists claim that institutions influence actors' behaviour and shape their values, norms and interests by enhancing rules and structures and therefore power relationships. This is illustrated in this research by the strengthening of the EU's essence of multilateralism and the creation or enhancing of mechanisms like PESCO and the EDF (2016), together with the EU-NATO 2016 joint agreement, which were all created to prevent competition and implied essential cooperation at times when geopolitics returned after 2014. A return of geopolitics could jeopardize these organizations and make them more and more ad-hoc alliances, cooperating solely in specific policy domains like economic cooperation. The solution to a possible loss of legitimacy was thus the recipe of institutionalization driven by ideas that mattered as lifelines to the existence of the EU and NATO.

Moreover, in their paths of change, according to the constructivist approach, institutions are expected to constantly change and progress and this change can occur on an incremental or revolutionary basis, depending on the stakes at risk of the actors in play. Change became a constant factor because of continuing discussion and the struggle for national or organizational interest, with either positive or negative results. Stability could be disturbed, for instance, because one or more of the actors involved recognized that his or her ideas were not being executed or enhanced through continued participation, illustrated by the withdrawal of Russia as a driver for OSCE strengthening.

The above described approaches of new institutionalism perceive the observed organizations as black boxes. However, besides the state, constructivism accepts organizations as actors in their own right, as discussed in Chapter 2. Therefore, agents, mechanisms and structures that reside within the organization are also accepted as possible drivers of change, which enabled the analysis of bureaucratic processes along the selected paths of change. In this research, therefore, constructivist institutionalism provided the opportunity to analyse the role of the actors within an organization, which

■

6 Mahoney and Thelen have identified the pitfalls in HI and diversified different types of incremental change in: Mahoney, J., Thelen, K., 'Explaining Institutional Change', Cambridge University press, Cambridge University Press, 2010.

illustrated that these actors had the power to address and influence issues that align with values held by the organization, in combination with the organizations' expertise to frame their capabilities to solve problems. These actors are thus supposed to be driven by the struggle for survival and power within their organization.

The number of parties interested in these organizations increased and, as a result, security organizations have become more heterogeneous, leaving inside actors to pursue their own institutional interests.[7] The EU's CSDP, the OSCE and NATO were not merely agreements between states: instead, they have become large organizations composed of many organs and thousands of officials and bureaucrats whose livelihood depends on the organizations' survival. It was illustrated that organizations have become corporate actors as well, with political interests, influencing the political agenda, and perceiving power as a result of expertise and aiming for survival. If survival required the linkage with another organization, then that would become the aim. Officials have attained a degree of autonomy, for instance because of their expertise, that allowed them to pursue goals that helped to keep the organizations alive, and they have become lobbyists for adapting new missions and roles.[8] The NATO Chief of Defence Staff and the EU Military Staff influenced the political doctrine underpinning the behaviour of the EU and NATO in the realm of crisis management and the paths of enlargement and engagement with states and other organizations. Furthermore, with the increased complexity of operations, NATO's secretary-general acquired more power and had become a public figure with agenda-setting powers. This coincided with the involvement of the EU's supranational Commission and Parliament, which even obtained a supranational decision-making role within defence policy, as clarified by the EU's EUGS in 2016.

Finally, although constructivist institutionalism analyses the role of organizations themselves, in contrast to the other two approaches, some unexpected mechanisms surfaced for all three organizations regarding the observed bureaucratic processes.

For example, both broadening and widening within all three security organizations led to a need for building and extending organs, furthering the path of deepening. Political as well as functional spill-over mechanisms were therefore observed within paths of change of the selected organizations, as described in Chapter 7. Broadening of the EU's security and defence mandate started with crisis management tasks, but almost inevitably broadened with a solidarity clause and a collective defence task and deepened with institutional support as a result of the inherent EU integration process. Furthermore, as the EU and NATO mandates both broadened with crisis management, a comprehensive approach, hybrid and cyber mandates together with an overlap in members and partners, it became almost inevitable that they were to be institutionally linked. In addition, as the form and level of cooperation differentiated in one task, an adjacent sector followed. An example is NATO's multinational concepts of CJTF, NRF and VJTF, which were applied to

7 Hofmann, S. C., 'Why institutional Overlap Matters: CSDP in the European Security Architecture', Journal of Common Market Studies, 2011, vol.49, nr.1, 2011, p. 111.

8 Keohane, R. O., 'International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory', Boulder, CO: Westview, 1989, p. 101.

crisis management as well as Article 5 operations. An emerging automatism of increasing cooperation between EU and NATO organs was also observed as a result of the linkages of their enlargement and engagement programmes, and finally their command structures as a result of interdependent operations.

On the negative side, unintended consequences also occurred. First, due to retaining Turkey's EU membership, Turkey now and then paralysed the EU's CSDP development, made possible as a result of the linkage between NATO and the EU. Second, although the reasoning behind enlargement and engagement had been stability, it also led to crises, such as those in Georgia and Ukraine, with negative consequences for NATO, the EU and the OSCE alike.

These bureaucratic processes were not only observed within the paths of change of the security organizations, but also between the organizations; positively as well as negatively. The EU's security and defence pillar was created with a broad mandate, which influenced NATO's path of broadening. On the other hand, the diminishing enthusiasm for NATO's enlargement, diminished likewise the EU's path of enlargement, and for both organizations the enlargement programmes were replaced by less formal alliances and partnerships, or even postponed or simply rejected.

In other words, several mechanisms of the neo-functionalist concept of spill-over as a result of institutionalization together with a conviction of norms and values, institutional interweaving, interdependence and interconnectedness, but likewise disintegrative mechanisms within (from one policy to another and likewise from one path to another) and between the organizations, were observed. These mechanisms lack the bureaucratic processes that constructivist institutionalism offers, leaving possible drivers of change untouched by not incorporating these dynamics of the system.[9] This research labels these mechanisms as a new form of cross-organizational spill-over, and not only within the EU's path of integration, which could contribute to the approach of constructivist institutionalism to explain the bureaucratic processes in more depth.

Based on the empirical findings of the case, cross-case and cross-path analysis of the paths of change, table 8.1 outlines elements of each of the three approaches explaining the causation of the observed paths of change of the security organizations.

9 Wijk, R., 'NATO on the Brink of the New Millennium. The Battle for Consensus', Brassey's, London, 1997.

Causes of Change	NATO	EU	OSCE
Broadening	**Crisis management** States Events Lack of OSCE/EU/UN capabilities Presence capabilities Organs Survival/legitimacy Widening **Comprehensive approach** States Events/operations EU spill-over Organs Survival/legitimacy Path dependency crisis management tasks **Collective defence** States Events Widening Lack of OSCE dialogue Path dependency	**Crisis management** States Events End WEU Lack of NATO/OSCE capabilities Organs Survival/legitimacy Presence resources Path dependency EU integration process Widening NATO/EU cooperation **Comprehensive approach** States Events/operations EU spill-over NATO spill-over Organs Widening **Common defence** States Events NATO spill-over EU path dependency integration process Widening	**Crisis management** States Events End WP/SU Lack of UN capabilities Path-dependent development of security architecture Organs OSCE/EU cooperation
Widening	**Members** End WP/SU States EU/OSCE spill-over Organs **Partners** States Events Closed-door enlargement Organs **Inter-organizational** cooperation Organs States Spill-over EU NATO/EU cooperation	**Members** End WP/SU States NATO/OSCE spill-over Organs **Partners** States Events Closed-door enlargement Organs **Inter-organizational** cooperation Organs States Spill-over NATO EU/NATO cooperation	**Partners (Members)** End WP/SU States OSCE path dependency **Partners** States Events **Inter-organizational** cooperation States Lack of capabilities Widening EU/NATO

Deepening	**Level** States Organs Operations EU spill-over Widening/broadening **Form** States Organs Operations Spill-over EU NATO path dependency Widening/broadening	**Level** States Organs Missions/operations NATO spill-over Widening/broadening **Form** States Organs Missions/operations Spill-over NATO EU path dependency Widening/broadening	**Level** States Organs Missions Widening/broadening **Form** States Organs Missions Widening/broadening

Table 8.1 Causes of the paths of change of the European security organizations drawn from empirical and theoretical findings.

After the end of the Cold War, the European security arena became more and more complex in both agents and structures. Change involved many different actors, which resulted in complex institutional structures, within and between organizations. This was a result of an increase in state and non-state actors, a complex institutional design of organizations combined with an increase of authority and autonomy among the organizations, organs and staff, an overlap and differentiation in tasks and members between the organizations and simultaneously more interaction between the security organizations. The described paths of change thus showed that the developments in the European security architecture were caused by both state and non-state actors as well as specific mechanisms, as was argued in Chapter 1.

Approaching the paths of change of the security organizations from different theoretical perspectives, derived from the selected approaches of new institutionalism, proved to be complementary rather than competitive or substitutive. As suggested in Chapter 1, the prominent features of each theory were indeed salient. This includes rational choice focus on national interests and preferences, and national governments' role in the paths of change via debates, compromises and decisions. At the same time, historical institutionalism explored the heritages from the past into the present, and the outcomes observed were circumscribed by a certain number of the effects of path dependency. Finally, as well as state actors, other actors and mechanisms were likewise under scrutiny in this research. In contrast with rational choice and historical institutionalists, institutions are not only comprised of structures. They are also seen as actors, where dynamics are at play through which individuals and organs achieve goals. These goals can be variable and less stable and could even be conflictive, which is in contrast with the approaches of rational choice and historical institutionalists, who argue that the end goal of an organization is stability. As a result, according to constructivism the ideas of stability, but also survival, can be an agency of change within existing structures that were fixed or, its opposite, obsolete.

Combined, it has been proven that they presented a more complete framework to explain the observed paths of change, and their strengths and weaknesses complemented

one another and therefore increased the explanatory leverage of the research. So there were differences, but also links between the approaches; knowing how organizations were created and designed (historical institutionalism) provided valuable insights into the interests of state actors and their responses towards these organizations (rational choice) and other actors (constructivist institutionalism).

Finally, the adopted method of process tracing, emphasising critical sequences, provided the possibility to analyse key moments of the paths of change in time together with path dependency, providing an essential historical lens, which enabled the accomplishment of a comparative research over time.

In summary, the research framework and method of analysis uncovered various linkages and interdependences between the organizations, either positive or negative, that could not be analysed by a singular theoretical approach alone. In other words, the chosen comparative method and research analysis was important to analyse the paths of change of the selected organizations in the European security and defence realm. This research can therefore be seen as a plea for academic bridge-building between different perspectives, as was so often claimed by Keohane, Mahoney and Thelen, discussed in Chapter 2. Applying separate lenses - and the sometimes inflexible arguments of the separate worlds within new institutionalism - to a complex organizational structure like the European security architecture does not always achieve the desired effect. In other words, focusing on one type of driver causing change and thereby creating artificial dividing lines between the different paths in which change takes place does not account for the world of organizations these last decades in the third wave of international cooperation schemes after the Cold War. All selected approaches of new institutionalism together provided useful epistemic lenses and conceptual tools to understand and unravel the paths of change of the selected security organizations.

It can be concluded that states are the sovereign actors promoting and protecting their interests in the security and defence domain to reduce uncertainty for which the rational choice approach proved to be a valuable one, substantiated by historical institutionalism, as these organizations were built from the fifties onwards, which left its marks on the paths of change. However, precisely due to the increase of different actors, complex institutional structures, driven on norms and values in the European security architecture, constructivist institutionalism offered a more comprehensive approach to analyse the how and why question of change of these highly institutionalized security organizations and their functional and dysfunctional paths.

8.5 Change of Security Cooperation and Organizations: Two Worlds Apart-together

After the debate of the research question above, the assumptions that have steered this research will be further scrutinized below. The case studies of this research presented a mixture of the traditional division between pure intergovernmental and supranational cooperation in the security and defence area had been observed as a result of an

increasingly complex institutional security structure including many drivers of change. Over the last 25 years, it was observed that multilateralism had been strengthened. At the same time, state sovereignty prevailed together with an increased defence of state interest and geopolitics. In other words, a combination of national autonomy and striving for sovereignty together with regional and worldwide cooperation and interdependence was observed. This resulted in increasingly complex security institutional structures, in level and form, and an increase in cross-organizational cooperation coinciding with non-institutional cooperation and disintegrative cooperation; two sides of the same coin. The economist Rodrik conceptualised this as the trilemma of the world system; '…democracy, national sovereignty and global economic integration are mutually incompatible: we can combine any two of the three, but never have all three simultaneously and in full'. To a certain extent, this trilemma is applicable to the world of international security cooperation. What was observed was not a European security architecture with complementary organizations where the OSCE would function as a hierarchical umbrella over the residing security organizations, as was the aim in the 1990s. Given the various illustrations of competition and rivalry, together with interlinkage between the organizations, a more fluid environment of organizational cooperation was observed reacting differently (or similarly) to external, internal and inter-organizational drivers of change. What was observed was a hybrid security architecture, as a result of blended security cooperation in form and function, illustrated by the EU's and NATO's combination of multilateralism together with common defence. Not a division of labour, but a competitive and simultaneously complementary architecture: a linkage of labour. This tendency approaches Kant's idea of international cooperation, by interlocking cooperation and interdependence; this was not only observed positively, however, but also negatively, as discussed earlier.

The conclusions of this research have an impact on the selected concepts that were scrutinized: change and security cooperation and organization, which will be elaborated on below.

First, for some of the approaches of new institutionalism, organizations are perceived as the opposite of change and are created to provide stability and promote peace in a world of chaos. Organizations are there for structure and stability; not change, illustrated by the approach of historical institutionalism. However, it can be concluded that change is here to stay and cannot only be explained by historical paths: change has become permanent and almost inevitable. Change occurs as a result of events, crises or conflicts, (un)broadening, widening and deepening of the organization or other organizations and actors in the field, integrative and disintegrative mechanisms and the ending of other related organizations, such as the WEU and the WP. Either way, the actors in this environment are subject to ever-changing conditions. So is the nature of these organizations and their development, where the modus of change has become a combination of a certain amount of path dependency combined with norms and values, mechanisms of spill-over and inter-organizational influence through broadening, widening and deepening which, to a certain extent, have become autonomous processes. Theorising along the traditional dichotomy of either a

bipolar, a multipolar or a fragmented world order does not cover all aspects of international security cooperation. Cooperation schemes have become blurred, neither including a supposed end-state of the European integration process, nor a NATO organization that will solely be a collective defence organization or primarily a crisis management organization. As a result, when analysing international security cooperation, the corresponding levels of analysis can no longer be divided between either individual, state or the international level. Nowadays, these levels blur, blend and overstretch these categorisations, which leads inevitably to interlocking organizations in a positive and negative way.

Furthermore, it was observed that change not only evolved as a logical consequence of alleged game changers such as 9/11, as stated by the realist approaches. Findings of the research showed that change of the organizations was also driven by the inherent consequences of either broadening, widening or deepening to one another, a certain amount of path dependency and spill-over mechanisms. This can be illustrated by the adoption of the mutual defence concept by the EU, yet most of the EU member states were under the NATO umbrella.

Second, the categorisation and definition of security organizations used in this research have become questionable. Questionable because, the analysed paths of change of the security organizations show both differences and similarities in tasks and functions and vary in drivers, which conflicts with Keohane's adage of 'form follows function'. As a result of intended and unintended consequences of dynamisms of change, like spill-over, within and between the different paths of change and between the organizations, a distinct relationship between the form of an organization and its function weakened. For one, form does not only follows function, or the reverse, solely as a result of the will and interest of the state, but likewise as a result of other drivers. Furthermore, the problem is that both form and function have become hybrid. Hybrid in form, as cooperation schemes vary from intergovernmental to supranational, and everything in between, from high to low institutionalization to informal cooperation and from bi- to multilateral cooperation schemes within and outside the security organization. Likewise, the analysed security organizations have become hybrid in function and tasks, as a result of broadening, and interaction, linkage or competition between the organizations or even take-over of tasks by other organizations. Hence the fact that the 'form follows function' adage needs debate and scrutiny within the security and defence realm.

Third, the strict traditional division of security organizations into the concepts of collective defence, collective security or cooperative security with which this research commenced has become problematic.
Traditionally, concepts that are based on the more Kantian concept of multilateralism clash inherently with concepts of collective defence, as NATO traditionally embodies. However, practice has shown an evolved mixture of these concepts through geographical and organizational widening and broadening, which resulted in a mixture of collective defence, collective security and cooperative security tasks of an organization, especially in the case of NATO and the EU. In other words, a contrast is observed between war and the primary

task of alliances (NATO's Article 5) and, to a certain degree, the tasks of widening and crisis management and response operations and the integrated approach of the selected security organizations as they developed. Likewise, the concept of a cooperative security organization which originally executes no tasks beyond its territorial reach contrasts with the observed organizations that geographically developed into organizations with a worldwide reach as a result of their paths of broadening and widening.
The developments observed bear consequences for the tasks, form and functions of the security organizations as well as for the national security providers, such as the armed forces. Although both sides of the traditional dichotomy between the more realist and constructivist approaches within new institutionalism address security cooperation, it became inherent to the way security cooperation developed that a contradiction emerged. What was observed was the domination of state sovereignty in the domain of high politics versus an automatism of varied cooperation schemes in level and form which led to institution building and strengthening of cooperation, interdependence and mutual linkages between the organizations. Simultaneously, this led to non-institutionalized cooperation, which did not always strengthen the states altogether in reverse as an automatism in the security and defence domain, contrasting the realist approaches.
In sum, as a result of broadening of tasks and widening with members and partners, tasks and territory of interest crosscut traditional dividing lines of the concepts of collective defence and collective security with cooperative security.

8.6 Conclusion

The conclusion of this study is that by analysing the development of the paths of change of the European security organizations, individually and in comparison with each other, it was established and theoretically explained that, as a result of multiple actors and complex security cooperation schemes, change has become a permanent factor and a nearly self-sustaining concept. In more practical terms, the results indicate increasing but varied international cooperation, in form and level, and institutionalization through the paths of broadening, widening and deepening, both positively and negatively.

Theoretically, the results of this study support the case for the need to combine theoretical approaches of new institutionalism to analyse the complex world of security cooperation. In the security domain, not only the more traditional approaches need to be consulted, the results also demand an inclusion of other, sometimes unexpected, approaches in the security and defence domain. Hence the fact that not only the research has shown that multiple drivers influence the paths of change, but likewise, that multiple theories are useful to explain the paths of change.

Methodologically, the research method of process tracing provided the possibility to analyse the key moments of the paths of change individually and in comparison, which has proven to be essential for the cases selected, as the interlinkage between them was thus proven. Furthermore, the analytical differentiation of the operationalisation of the concept of change, by broadening, widening and deepening, has been helpful. Level and form of change also varied according to the pace and direction of change induced by these paths, which can potentially influence or hamper developments in other areas (spill-over effect). Without recognising such a distinction between tasks, mandates, members etc., together

with a comparison of their development and their possible linkage, whether that be a positive or negative comparison, general observations on the interrelation between the paths would be difficult to make.

8.7 Recommendations for Future Research

In 2019, NATO celebrated its 70th anniversary. The process of European integration has also been ongoing for almost 70 years and cooperation on security and defence matters within the wider Europe has continued for nearly 50 years. Nevertheless, the end of the European security organizations and the security architecture has, since their founding, also been predicted. Over the last decades, the 'NATO-in-crisis syndrome' and similar claims of the EU and the OSCE being in crisis are so often stated that it has maybe become 'a harmless cliché' or even an exaggerated proclamation. Again, since 2014, due to assumed geopolitical changes and cracks in the established multilateral institutional framework, fragmentation, implosion or even ending of these organizations has been predicted. If so, the question is, will this be a one-way journey into chaos, or will new forms of cooperation emerge? And will the debate on security cooperation be dominated by neo-realism again, predicting the end of NATO and so on, or will the debate take a U-turn this time and not exclude other theories?

This research has been a doctoral study, but also an attempt to probe the paths of change of the security organizations more deeply empirically and scrutinize the chosen theoretical approaches. Some theoretical, policy and methodological recommendations for further research on the concept of change and security organizations will therefore be suggested below.

Forms and Levels of Cooperation

This research exposed changes in schemes and models of (security) cooperation since the end of the Cold War. The pre-eminently sovereign domain of high politics proved to be more flexible than was foreseen. Schemes of multilateral cooperation were observed, combined with bilateral cooperation within and outside institutionalized structures, accompanied by inter-organizational cooperation. It has been proven that these trends have had an impact on traditional cooperation schemes in the security and defence domain. The question is whether modular cooperation and flexibilization are building or breaking the scope of policy and the institutional framework of the security organizations. Furthermore, as inter-organizational relations have become a complex interaction of dynamics and mechanisms and include different actors, interaction should be analysed not only as two-way traffic, but also including more directions. If the EU acts, some actions cannot be executed without the interpretation of the actions by other actors states as well as organizations. Finally, where are the paths of change heading? For instance, is the path of widening going to end in a closed-door policy or even a complete shutdown or will partnership and alignment take over?

Life Cycle of Security Cooperation
In this research, 'only' 25 years of analysis of the paths of change of the European security organizations were covered. Considering the ongoing debate about the liberal world order and the assumed expiry date of the scrutinized organizations, it would be of interest to enrich the findings in time and space and to take this research a step further and analyse the security organizations for the next five to ten years to observe whether the assumed breaking or implosion does indeed occur.

With regard to the life cycle of security organizations in general, it would be of further interest to include not only paths of change (as was the focus of this research), but also to include more emphasis on creation. Its opposite, the termination of international security cooperation, needs to be addressed as well. If NATO, the OSCE or the EU increase in strength, or the opposite (implode or even collapse), does this coincide or are these separate paths? And if so, are there differences or consistencies between these paths of change and is this comparable to the abolition of the WEU and the WP? And are ending paths simply the reverse of the analysed paths of broadening, widening and deepening and drivers or are other forces and mechanisms at stake? In other words, do the organizations change or do the drivers change; which will be first, the chicken or the egg, and does this generate other assumptions?

Expiry Date of the Security Concepts
A subsequent line of inquiry advancing the findings of this research would be the exposed mixture with regard to the security concepts of collective defence, collective security and cooperative security, especially in the case of NATO and the EU. A continuing analysis of the development of the tasks of the security organizations is recommended: will collective defence be replaced or complemented by other NATO tasks or will they all remain prominent? And, in addition, can a difference between collective defence, collective security and cooperative security still be made, theoretically as well as empirically?

From singular to linked Security Organizations
In addition, this research showed that decisions and actions that are taken in one organization have an impact on 'the other', either through broadening, widening or deepening or their opposites. Overlapping members and tasks increased, with both positive and negative consequences. This tendency did not create stand-alone organizations, quite the opposite! When analysing the development of NATO, the EU or the OSCE as separate organizations, therefore, including inter-organizational linkage has become almost inevitable. These findings also relate to the foreign, security and defence policy of member states, such as Dutch security and defence policy, which should not choose between the EU or NATO, the 'either-or' scenario, but should opt for both.

A Constructive Theoretical and Methodological Pandora's Box
With regard to the theoretical framework, the choice was made to apply three approaches of new institutionalism, with the aim of combining lenses that enable us to see the varied actors and mechanisms as possible drivers of change. In terms of broadening the scope of the findings, it would likewise be of interest to strengthen some of the selected approaches,

for instance by including other methods of data gathering, such as interviews, especially in the case of constructivist institutionalism.

Furthermore, including other approaches of new institutionalism to contribute to a more complete picture of the analysis of change is recommended, as every approach yields shortcomings as a result of the observed (un)intended mechanisms at play. This is illustrated by the added values of neo-functionalism. Through the observed mechanisms of spill-over in broadening, widening and deepening, it was made clear that the neo-functionalist's theory could also be applied to non-EU organizations and enrich the bureaucratic angle of constructivist institutionalism. Moreover, the analysis of inter-organizational cooperation proved a necessity for opening the box of varied academic approaches. Necessary because of the increase in multiple actors with influence involved in building and breaking the European security architecture. Academic bridge-building is therefore recommended when analysing inter-organizational cooperation, in contrast to specialisation or isolation amongst theories, which could contribute to inter-organizational research.

Additionally, the focus of this research has been on the European security architecture and its inhabitants. Needless to say, it would also be interesting to analyse the paths of change of other security organizations.

Finally, comparison enabled the identification of patterns of divergence and convergence. However, a general methodological problem of at least the dyadic comparative analysis of organizations is that organizations will always differ to some extent. The point of departure for the analysis of organizations therefore has to incorporate the fact that organizations always change in tasks, form and level, which could increase or decrease their diversity and should be taken into account when they are compared. Nevertheless, combining comparative research with structured focused comparison and process tracing in time and space has proven to be of added value.