Deepening *versus* Widening in the European Integration Process?

An Attempt to reconcile the Debate based on the Example of European Defense Cooperation

Pascal Alscher

S2105217

Master Thesis

Research Master in Political Science and Public Administration

Thesis Supervisor: Prof. Amy Verdun

Second Reader: Dr. Karolina Pomorska

Word count: 10,234 (excluding header)

DATE

Abstract

The "Deepening versus Widening debate" in the European integration process is a reoccurring issue that has not yet been settled in the literature. Whether widening promotes or inhibits deepening has been the subject of several studies with no winner in sight. This study aims to reconcile the debate by analyzing the mechanisms underlying the deepening and widening relationship within the case of European defense cooperation. The theoretical framework is informed by the concept of critical junctures which has also driven the case selection. Beginning with the failed foundation of the European Defence Community in the 1950s and ending with the recent implementation of the Permanent Structured Cooperation, this study analyzes four different critical junctures. The results suggest that widening has not been an obstacle to the deepening of defense cooperation. On the contrary, widening might actually facilitate deepening.

From the EU's early Days until Today

The moment the idea of the 'United States of Europe' was first introduced in 1946 by Winston Churchill (Churchill, 1946), he himself probably had not anticipated that we would ever come as close to a European federal state as we are today (e.g. Verdun, 2016). However, the European integration process has not yet come to an end and even though it might look like a linear one in hindsight, the project suffered from various setbacks. In the early years, the French government vetoed the accession of the United Kingdom (UK), then, member states reduced their integration efforts – today known as the period of eurosclerosis – followed by failed referendums and the euro crises, to only name a few of those setbacks (see Watts, 2008 for an overview).

Despite these events, the European Communities (EC), and later the European Union (EU), has continuously expanded its functional and geographical scope. In addition, the level of centralization within each policy field constantly increased throughout the decades. Nowadays, the ordinary legislative procedure, which puts the European Parliament on an equal footing with the Council, is in almost all policy fields the standard legislative procedure. Besides, the number of member states has increased from the six founding states to currently twenty-eight. In the same period, comprehensive treaty revisions have provided the EU with increasing competences in virtually all policy fields. Key institutions like the European Parliament, the European Commission, the Council of the EU, and the Court of Justice

underwent major reforms and gained more political influence. Many of these reforms were quite extensive and agreement on them was often only achieved after tough negotiations. These achievements are even the more fascinating given the fact that the EU nowadays consists of 28 member states which have disparate preferences for the degree of deepening and widening of integration the EU should be aiming for (Berglof, Burkart, Friebel, & Paltseva, 2008). In their broadest sense, deepening and widening basically refer to the level of centralization and the territorial extension of EU authority respectively.

The extensive and simultaneous deepening and widening of the European integration process up to now is insofar surprising as international organizations (IOs) are usually either widely or deeply integrated (Hooghe & Marks, 2015). In those rare instances in which IOs are both widely and deeply integrated they are most likely very limited in their functional scope, e.g. the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to a lesser degree the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Health Organization (WHO). Hooghe and Marks (2015) argue that as soon as IOs begin to broaden their functional scope, member states traditionally become increasingly hesitant towards the pooling of authority. Their explanation for this is straightforward. The pooling of authority is constrained by the functional scope and the number of member states of an IO. First, IOs with only few members are more amenable to majority voting because they are usually more homogenous in terms of culture, religion and GDP than large IOs. Second, the broader the functional scope of an IO is, the greater is the likelihood that it deals with an issue that would "touch a domestic nerve and produce domestic contestation" (Hooghe & Marks, 2015, p. 312).

Nonetheless, Schimmelfennig, Leuffen, and Rittberger (2015) have claimed that the increase in the number of member states and the related widening has not come at the expense of deepening integration efforts. On the contrary, they argue that the widening of integration has followed roughly the same trajectory as the deepening of integration. Thus, Schimmelfennig et al. (2015) argue against the alleged incompatibility of deepening and widening of integration – and as the literature review shows, they are not alone with this claim.

The existing research points at two different directions and it seems about time to reconcile the debate. Previous attempts have mostly been focused on either deepening or enlargement, or they only dealt with one specific mechanism underlying the deepening and widening relationship while neglecting the broader picture. However, this study intends to bring the two most relevant dimensions of European integration – deepening and widening – together in order to understand their unique roles in the European integration process.

Therefore, the overarching debate to which this study strives to contribute is whether we can speak of deepening *versus* widening or deepening *and* widening in the European integration process. This overarching goal is accompanied by two research questions. The first one aims to establish a level playing field by identifying and describing the mechanisms that underlie the deepening and widening relationship. The second research question introduces the case of European defense cooperation to the debate and is answered through the analysis of four different critical junctures within the field.

For many decades now, the question of the relationship between the deepening and widening of integration has been featured as a major issue in the integration literature. Although some scholars consider it as one of the 'big questions' in the field of European integration (e.g. Kelemen, Menon, & Slapin, 2014a) the issue has remained rather underrepresented in the scholarly output. Nonetheless, the literature it has produced is manifold – which is illustrated by the following literature review – and so are the attempts to explain the different mechanisms underlying the relationship between deepening and widening. In order to prepare the ground for an analysis of this relationship this study makes an effort to give a comprehensive overview of the different mechanisms described in the deepening and widening literature which leads us to the first research question question; *what mechanisms have motivated/inhibited member states to foster the simultaneous deepening and widening of integration?*

Especially in the 2000s, the literature has been separated into two camps – one camp that argues in favor of a positive relationship and one that argues in favor of negative relationship between deepening and widening. However, the literature has fallen short of studies that attempted to reconcile these two positions. Only in the last couple of years have scholars made an increasing effort to bring together the different shapes the relationship between deepening and widening can take, e.g. whether they are complementary or non-complementary to each other. For instance, Schneider (2014) has argued against the conventional wisdom that enlargement does not per se lead to an increase in member states' preference heterogeneity. Instead, Schneider argues that enlargements can affect preference heterogeneity in different ways depending on the aspect of preference heterogeneity one is looking at. Unfortunately, however, there is still no extensive research of the relationship between deepening and widening within a particular policy field. In a recent attempt, Börzel and Risse (2018) have compared the migration crisis and the euro crisis in order to explain how the politicization of a policy field impacts the success or failure of deepening integration efforts. Although their analysis has been very insightful, the issue of widening has been

largely ignored. This research project now investigates the deepening and widening relationship in the realm of European defense cooperation. To my best knowledge, there has been no such analysis on the issue of European defense cooperation. Besides, especially in the last two to three decades security and defense issues gained momentum in the European integration process which makes the defense cooperation in Europe ripe for analysis. Accordingly, the second research question reads as follows; *what does the relationship between deepening and widening look like in the field of European defense cooperation?*

In order to answer these research questions, the remainder of this study proceeds in the following way. First, a literature review on the deepening and widening of integration attempts to identify the mechanisms underlying the relationship of the two. After this, the theoretical considerations implicit in the research questions are discussed. These include (1) the necessity to treat deepening and widening as two independent dimensions of the integration process, and (2) the theoretical framework that informs the case selection. In what follows, the methodological aspects of this study are described. The section on methodology includes a conceptualization of the deepening and widening variable. In the analysis section, four exemplary critical junctures are described and investigated. Finally, the results, limitations and implications of this study are discussed.

The Deepening and Widening of European Integration in the Literature

In the beginning decades of the European integration process, the theoretical discourse has been dominated by the neofunctional theory on the one side and the intergovernmental theory on the other side. However, as time has passed and the integration process has moved forward scholars claimed that these two theories are too vague on the dependent variable's definition – namely integration (e.g. Scharpf, 2001; Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2002). Therefore, scholars have increasingly turned to specific aspects of integration. This left us with a large body of literature dealing with the deepening and widening of European integration and how these two interact with each other. However, contemporary studies in the field often crucially differ from earlier studies in terms of their theoretical approach. In principle, we can depict three different generations in the literature.

The first generation is largely impacted by Tsebelis' veto player theory (1995, 2002) and the expectations the research community had about the Eastern enlargement of the EU in 2004. The Eastern enlargement foresaw the accession of ten new member states meaning an

increase from 15 to 25 member states. For the first time, post-communist states would join the EU, and its geographical scope would remarkably be expanded towards the East.

Pollack (2009) acknowledged that the predominant majority of scholars expected the EU to encounter gridlock after the 2004 enlargement. Therefore, the veto player theory has often been a preferred choice to explain the relationship of the deepening and widening of integration in the early 2000s. The usual bottom line of these studies was that widening inhibits deepening. The argument underlying this assumption was that an increase in the number of member states will, ceteris paribus, either decrease the win set of the status quo, i.e. the set of alternatives that would beat the status quo, or leave it the same. As a result, agreement on measures that would promote the deepening of integration would become less likely (e.g. Ahrens, Hoen, & Ohr, 2005; König, 2007; Miles & Redmond, 1996; Steunenberg, 2002; Tsebelis & Yataganas, 2002; Van Brabant, 2001). Moreover, in contexts in which decisions on deeper integration are taken by consensus every new member state constitutes an additional veto player (Mattila & Lane, 2001). Through side payments pro-integrationist member states can still ensure anti-integrationist member states' consent. However, the costs of side payments will increase as the number and heterogeneity of veto players increase (König & Junge, 2009; Selck, 2005).

Ironically, just as much as the expectations about the Eastern enlargement have shaped the first generation, the actual Eastern enlargement heralded a turnaround in the literature. Empirical analyses have shown that the feared gridlock after the enlargement has not come into existence. Settembri (2007), for instance, shows that after the 2004 enlargement the EU is found to approve almost as many legal acts as before the enlargement. Moreover, Golub's (2007) survival analysis has even revealed that from an historical perspective enlargements even have a positive effect on the EU's decision-making speed. Even though decision-making speed might not be the same as the deepening of integration these two are generally assumed to closely correspond to each other. Besides, the EU's Constitutional Treaty has not failed due to any of the new member states. Instead, voters in the Netherlands and in France – both founding states – rejected the treaty. In what followed, scholars increasingly turned to mechanisms that could explain a positive relationship between deepening and widening. These attempts produced a vast literature with a multitude of different mechanisms that could explain a positive relationship.

For instance, Van der Veen (2014) argues that the mechanism of anticipatory deepening is responsible for the positive relationship between deepening and widening. He describes that enlargement episodes have often been preceded by deepening integration

efforts. The reason for this is that current EU member states have expectations about the policy preferences of accession states. If the accession would shift voting balances and the corresponding policy outcomes to the disadvantage of current member states, they are inclined to negotiate deepening outcomes prior to the accession of new states. Moreover, Leuffen and Hertz (2008) borrow from sociological approaches on increased group sizes in order to understand why widening does not necessarily affect deepening negatively. They depict three different mechanisms; (1) oligarchization, (2) formalization, and (3) adaptation. Oligarchization describes the scenario in which only a few group members dominate the group. In such a scenario, the size of the group is less important than the informal power structure. Second, formalization occurs when decision-making processes are rationalized. Third, adaptation expects new members to adjust to the behavior and preferences of old member states.

Another popular argument is that enlargement rounds often necessitate the reform of voting rules in order to keep the EU capable of acting (Bolleyer & Börzel, 2014). These reforms, for instance, include the change from unanimity to qualified majority voting (QMV) in a particular policy field. As a result, finding agreement in certain policy fields might actually become easier after enlargement due to the renegotiation of existing voting rules. Not only can such reforms be negotiated after an enlargement but also prior to an enlargement.

Although all these mechanisms are quite different, they all share the notion that the widening of the European integration leads to some sort of readjustment or maturation of the EU's inter-institutional ties and its decision-making capacity. However, it might also be the case that deepening affects widening.

For instance, some scholars have argued that further economic integration will create negative externalities for outsiders (e.g. Berglof et al., 2008; Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2002). The principle attraction of EU membership is that non-membership is a worse option – especially if member states continue to integrate economically. Therefore, continued deepening integration efforts could force states to join the EU and therefore stimulate the widening of integration.

To sum up, the described mechanisms of the second generation of literature are in stark contrast to the veto player theory in the first generation. Whereas the pre-enlargement literature usually assumed a negative relationship between deepening and widening, the post-enlargement literature sought to find mechanisms that could explain a positive relationship. However, what is missing in the literature is a link between these two generations. The question that remains is under which circumstances can we expect a negative or a positive

relationship between deepening and widening? As mentioned earlier, only in the last couple of years research has been produced that addresses this question and that tries to reconcile the first two generations of literature. I argue that these efforts constitute the beginnings of a third generation.

The third generation finds its origins in the realization that we can hardly make any universally valid claims about the relationship between deepening and widening. Instead, it seems that the relationship very much depends on contextual circumstances. For instance, a reoccurring question in both the first and second generation of literature is whether increases in the EU's membership size affect or do not affect the EU's preference heterogeneity. Schneider (2014) has argued that it is of great importance to distinguish between different preference heterogeneity measures; (1) income heterogeneity, (2) heterogeneity in EU members' anti- or pro-Europe positions, and (3) partisan heterogeneity. She illustrated that the heterogeneity in EU members' integration preferences and the partisan heterogeneity are not affected by membership size. Only income heterogeneity has increased within the EU due to enlargement. Thus, preference heterogeneity does not necessarily change due to enlargement and it remains open for debate whether income heterogeneity has a negative effect on the deepening of integration.

Similarly, Kelemen, Menon, and Slapin (2014b) have tried to reconcile the debate by arguing that enlargement could indeed lead to short-term gridlock while it might provide the impetus for institutional changes that facilitate deepening over the long term. In other words, enlargement might actually create incentives for member states to undertake institutional reforms that could deepen the Union (Bressanelli, 2014; Kelemen et al., 2014b) – even though enlargement might have negative short-term effects. However, what has largely remained a blank spot is the extent to which the circumstances of a particular policy fields moderate the relationship between deepening and widening.

It is this study's goal to address this blank spot, and therefore, to contribute to the advancement of the third generation of literature and to the reconciliation of the first two generations. For this purpose, this study employs a case study analysis on the integration process in European defense cooperation.

Theoretical Framework

As mentioned earlier, the EU has constantly increased its territorial range through stepwise enlargements. Since the 1970s, every decade has brought at least one enlargement round. Accordingly, the European integration process has produced a large body of literature. Whereas the literature has been dominated by neofunctional and intergovernmental theories in its first decades it has become more nuanced in the last two to three decades. Scholars have discredited the established integration theories for being imprecise on the dependent variable's definition. For instance, Börzel (2005) has argued that Ernst Haas' (1958) neofunctionalism primarily focuses on the task expansion – so to say the broadening – of the European integration process. However, throughout the decades the EU has virtually reached the maximum of task expansion. It nowadays deals with all kinds of policy fields, even though to a different degree. As a result, scholars have increasingly turned to the deepening and widening of integration. This shift in focus has produced a completely new body of literature on enlargement rounds (e.g. Bieler, 2002; Mattli & Plümper, 2002; Wallace, 2002) and the deepening of integration (e.g. Ahrens et al., 2005; Dehousse, 2016; Tallberg, 2002).

The established integration theories were unable to address both of these dimensions simultaneously since their application is usually restricted to task expansion in the case of neofunctionalism or to one particular policy area and/or negotiation situation in the integration process in the case of integovernmentalism. However, studying aspects of integration in isolation will leave us impotent in understanding and explaining the integration process as a whole. Thus, the simultaneous study of different dimensions of integration and their interaction has posed a theoretical challenge to the established integration theories (Börzel, 2005). Therefore, the distinction of deepening and widening can help us to better understand the driving factors of European integration.

In order to resolve the dilemma of a Janus-faced deepening and widening relationship it seems necessary to narrow down the research focus. Consequently, the analysis particularly deals with European defense cooperation. Such a case study analysis could contribute to the realignment of the epistemology and the ontology in the deepening and widening literature. Especially the first two generations of the deepening and widening literature give the impression of a 'one-size-fits-it-all' approach as scholars seek to explain the entire bandwidth of European integration with a single mechanism. As a result, a diverse literature on the interplay of deepening and widening has emerged with a multitude of different – and sometimes contradictory – mechanisms. This study now makes the argument that scaling back the research focus to a specific policy field could advance our understanding of the different mechanisms' contextual conditions. In a seminal work, Pawson and Tilley (1997) formulated

their proposition that causal outcomes follow from mechanisms acting in contexts. In the present case, this leads us to expect that the contextual circumstances of a policy field might favor a particular mechanism over another or that the context might even affect a mechanism's mode of action. The mechanisms, in turn, crucially affect the integration outcome.

Especially in the last couple of years, analyses across policy fields have become more popular in the European integration policy (e.g. Börzel & Risse, 2018; Schimmelfennig et al., 2015) – albeit these did not specifically focus on the deepening and widening relationship. Nonetheless, we can draw on these studies in order to formulate some preliminary thoughts on the contextual circumstances that actually do vary across policy fields. For instance, the study of politicization has become an increasingly relied upon tool for explaining differences in the integration of different policy fields. The increasing politicization of European matters has been a creeping process that has been analyzed thoroughly by Hooghe and Marks (2009). Their argument that the European public's permissive consensus has gradually shifted towards a constraining dissensus has been seminal.

Schimmelfennig et al. (2015) have further advanced this argument as they show that the interdependence within a policy field, its politicization and the asymmetry thereof are crucial factors for the integration outcome of a policy field. Their conjecture is that interdependence promotes integration whereas politicization inhibits integration. However, there are also other circumstances that might affect the integration outcome of a particular policy field. For instance, in an introductory article to a special issue, D'Erman and Verdun (2018) have shown that the latest EU crises, i.e. euro crisis, migration crisis, Brexit and the rise of populism, bear the potential to significantly alter previously-intended integration outcomes. Such explanations are primarily directed towards the external circumstances the EU is facing, but we could also think about internal circumstances that affect the integration outcome of a policy field. The applicant states' preference heterogeneity is often described to be a crucial factor (Hale & Koenig-Archibugi, 2016). In addition, the degree to which a policy field is technocratic instead of political could also be decisive for its integration outcome.

These are only preliminary thoughts on the circumstances that might affect the relationship between deepening and widening, and the underlying mechanisms. The analysis further investigates on the contextual conditions of the deepening and widening relationship in European defense coordination. For instance, Bonvicini and Comelli (2009) argue that the relationship between deepening and widening is especially pronounced in the realm of security policies as enlargements necessarily come with an increase of the military resources

available but also with the need to address new security problems. In addition, Smith (2003d) and Sjursen (2011) both argue that the veto player theory might actually be of less relevance in foreign and security policy as the member states usually consolidate each other before they define their preferences. These and other considerations are dealt with in more detail in the analysis.

The selection of situations in which either the deepening or widening of integration has shifted or not is informed by the concept of critical junctures. The concept is a building block in historical institutionalist research and is well tried and tested by scholars in the field. The application of critical junctures to this study comes with certain advantages. First, the concept helps to reduce the vast number of situations that mark potentially relevant shifts in either deepening or widening to a manageable amount. Second, critical junctures are followed by a relatively long period of path-dependency that inhibits new changes. Thus, decisions taken during a critical juncture usually bear long-term implications with the potential to have a lasting effect on the course of political action. Whereas a broad range of possible outcomes of political action is possible before a critical juncture, the range of possible outcomes is considerably narrowed down afterwards. Third, more often than not critical junctures are "moments of structural indeterminism when willful actors [can] shape outcomes in a more voluntarist fashion" (Mahoney, 2001, p. 7). Hence, outcomes of critical junctures are products of deliberate political action. Therefore, actors should be less constrained by anything else than their preferences. A more fine-grained definition of critical junctures, which informs the selection of events, is discussed in the next section.

Methodology

In a seminal work, Grix (2004) described a dilemma of social science research. On the one hand, scholars need to be very rigorous in the formulation of their theoretical framework in order to advance the approach. On the other hand, the framework must not be too specific in order to be broadly applicable. Otherwise, it will fail to benefit the relevant discipline as a whole (in Hogan, 2006, p. 663). Therefore, researchers are left with a little discretion when defining critical concepts. Of course, this discretion must not be abused but used to adjust the relevant concept to the research purpose. In our case, this means that we need to define critical junctures in alignment with existing approaches in the literature but also with some caution in order to not be left empty-handed in the actual case selection. In general, a critical

juncture is understood as "a period in which there is a transition and there are various alternative options from which to choose" (Verdun, 2015, p. 222). In historical institutionalism, it is often described as the counterpart to incremental change (Hogan, 2006). However, change is not a necessary element of a critical juncture (Capoccia & Kelemen, 2007, p. 348). Instead, critical junctures open up new 'possibility space' for political organization (Fisher Onar, Liu, & Woodward, 2014, p. 26). Thus, situations in which political actors deliberately decide to not use the possibility space in order to alter the status quo can also qualify as critical junctures.

Let us now turn to the definition of European defense cooperation in order to identify the field from which we can potentially chose the critical junctures. For the purpose of this study, I treat European defense cooperation to be congruent with the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) in terms of its tasks and the matters its dealing with. What is different is that the CSDP has only been founded in 1999 while this study is interested in defense cooperation since the beginnings of the EC. Therefore, framing the CSDP to be the case of this study would be misleading. Instead, the provisions on the CSDP laid out in the Treaty on the European Union (TEU) are used to define the boundaries of European defense cooperation. Art. 42.1 post-Lisbon TEU (ex TEU Article 17) states that the CSDP is an integral part of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). While the CFSP contains all foreign affairs related policies the CSDP focuses on security and defense issues. The article further states that the CSDP shall provide the 'Union with an operational capacity drawing on civilian and military assets' (European Union, 2007). The Union may use this capacity 'on missions outside the Union for peace-keeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter'. The tasks of the CSDP are further defined in article 43.1 post-Lisbon TEU including 'joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilization'. Based on this definition, four critical junctures were selected and examined in the case study analysis.

A popular definition of a case study is given by Yin (2003, p. 13), who describes it as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident." Thus, case studies are understood to be tailor-made research strategies in order to deal with complex situations in unexplored contexts. But case study analyses also come with several other advantages (Hancké, 2009; Rohlfing, 2012). As mentioned above, scaling back

the research focus has been a deliberative choice in order to understand the role of the policy field in the deepening and widening debate. Moreover, case studies can help to advance the conceptualization of complex terms – in this case the deepening and widening of integration. Eventually, scholars get a very detailed and in-depth analysis of an event or person when they employ the case study method. Hence, this project aims to provide a comprehensive reflection of the integration of European defense cooperation. These qualities can help to formulate novel hypothesis on the role of the policy field, and therefore, help to advance the current theoretical position of the deepening and widening debate. A large-N research design would sit at odds with the inductive method of this research project. In contrast, a case study equips this project with the freedom that is necessary in order to study the idiosyncrasies of the policy field. In order to benefit from these advantages it is all the more important to carefully conceptualize the deepening and widening of integration which are integral to, or even identical with, the process of European integration (Umbach & Hofmann, 2009).

Both the deepening and the widening of integration are popular terms in the literature. Yet, the literature is not always very accurate with regard to what is meant by these terms. The frequent employment of the term deepening in the European integration literature rarely comes with a clear-cut definition. Instead, it is often employed as an umbrella term that refers to a multitude of aspects of the integration process. Nonetheless, studying the deepening literature still provides us with a clearer understanding of what is usually meant by deepening and eventually helps us to conceptualize the deepening of integration for the present study. Let us first deal with *integration*. Ernst Haas (1958, p. 16) defined (supranational) integration as the process "whereby political actors in several, distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations, and political activities toward a new centre, whose institutions posses or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states" (in Wiener & Diez, 2009, p. 2). This definition includes both a political and a social process. In contrast, intergovernmentalists focus more narrowly on the political and negotiation processes between nation states (Wiener & Diez, 2009). In this project, the focus is also on the political process of integration. To be precise, it treats integration as the process through which a competence is moved to a higher level of the EU polity, e.g. (the local), subnational, national, and supranational level. Now, *deepening* of integration describes the process in which a competence moves to the supranational level. This project relies on this notion and therefore understands the deepening of integration as the supranationalization of a competence.

In comparison, the term widening of integration usually comes with a clearer conceptualization. It is understood as the stepwise accession of European states to the

European community. However, we can think of two different strategies when analyzing widening. One strategy would be to only focus on the sheer number of member states and how this number affects the European integration process. Another strategy would be to focus foremost on the differences between member states and accession states, and therefore, the focus would be on the preference heterogeneity. While these two approaches should not be confused with each other, it is hard to use one approach in isolation of the other. Instead, this project brings these two together by focusing on 1) how an increased number of member states affects the deepening of EU integration, and 2) what role the differences in the member states' and accession states' preferences play.

Analysis

According to data collected and provided by Frank Schimmelefnnig (2015), technically the EU has gained competence in defense matters only twice in its entire history. It gained competence in defense matters for the first time in 1993 when the Treaty of Maastricht came into force and the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) has been established, and second, in 2004 after the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) has been founded. For both cases, the analysis is especially interested in the negotiations and events leading to it. That being said, the analysis pays attention to the predecessor of the CFSP, namely the European Political Cooperation (EPC) and the St. Malo declaration which has paved the way for the ESDP. In other situations, deepening as operationalized by this study has been a viable even though not chosen option. A prime example for such a situation is the failure of the European Defence Community (EDC). Eventually, the analysis investigates the implementation of the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO). Although PESCO has not come with a supranationalization of defense policies, it is embedded in the EU's legal framework and it is considered to be a major step forward in European defense cooperation. Moreover, it provides for a good illustration of the deepening and widening relationship.

In what follows the (failed) foundations of the EDC and the CFSP as well as the St. Malo declaration and the implementation of PESCO are analyzed separately in a chronological order. The analysis addresses the following questions; why does this situation qualify as a critical juncture? What actors have been involved? What has been the course of action? And, what mechanism(s) underlying the deepening and widening relationship may or may not be responsible for the outcome?

European Defence Community

In October 1950, the French prime minister René Pleven proposed the Pleven Plan. The plan foresaw the creation of a supranational European army. Less than two years later the Treaty establishing the European Defence Community has been signed by the same six states that have signed the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) – namely, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Italy, Germany, and France. However, in contrast to the Treaty on the ECSC, the Treaty on the EDC has never been ratified. Thus, the EDC never came into existence.

The first half of the 1950s has been characterized by indecision and fear (Walton, 1953), which gave way to a sense of urgency. The consequences of the second world war were still visible and at the same time the Korean conflict gathered pace. All actors agreed that the primary goal has to be to prevent the outbreak of another war on the European continent. In order to achieve the goal of lasting peace on the continent many different options were debated. A reoccurring question was whether the continent is ready for a rearmed Germany, and if so, in what way Germany should be rearmed (Fleischer, 2012; House, 2011; Rolin et al., 1952; Walton, 1953). What makes this event a critical juncture is the fact that Western Europe has been at a crossroad and politicians were confronted with different options, all of which would have a lasting impact on European defense cooperation. The most relevant actors in the negotiation process were the six signatory states (especially Germany and France), and the US and the UK, who have both been occupying powers and important actors in NATO.

During the negotiations, France encouraged the UK and other states to join the pact in order to secure a counterweight to German dominance (House, 2011). However, France's persuasion attempts failed, and no more than the previously mentioned six states signed the treaty. In the aftermath, France failed to secure domestic approval and the ratification of the treaty.

In the 1950s, the widening of integration has been on a very low level with no more than six states actively participating in the integration process. Nonetheless, agreement on the supranationalization of certain defense matters could not be reached. Instead, defense remained an exclusively national competence. In the end, the pact failed due to the diverging interests of the two most relevant actors – Germany and France. While Germany hoped to regain sovereignty and therefore requested full equality for all members, France wanted to take a leading role in order to prevent an uncontrolled rearmament of Germany. Another

reason why the EDC failed might be its ambitiousness. House (2011) argues that the EDC would have accelerated the development of the EU by several decades. It was clear that the prevailing circumstances would require a large-scale (re-)action. Finally, the fact that the UK would not have been a member of the EDC might have caused French parliamentarians to refuse their approval. The French were convinced that a wider group of states would be more capable of preventing the dominance of one particular state (in this case Germany) than a smaller group. Partly as a result of the EDC's failure, the same actors plus the UK founded the Western European Union (WEU) by modifying the Treaty of Brussels. It seems thus as if the width of the EDC did not match the depth of it.

Common Foreign and Security Policy

The remainder of the 1950s and the 1960s were largely dominated by economic integration while political integration has not been on the agenda. In 1970, the then EC member states' foreign ministers drafted the Luxembourg report which created the EPC – an informal and intergovernmental consultation mechanism on foreign affairs (Smith, 2003c). The EPC has neither been based on any legal arrangement nor did it contain any specific provision for security and defense. However, after its foundation in 1970, EPC actions have grown in number from 8 between 1970 and 1974 to 26 between 1985 and 1989 (Smith, 2003b) and it increasingly touched upon security matters. Only a few years after the Single European Act (SEA) formalized the EPC, Europe was confronted with an unprecedented set of challenges due to the end of the cold war (Smith, 2003e). After the Community failed to prevent the war in former Yugoslavia, the notion of integrating European defense matters gained momentum again. As a result, the Treaty of Maastricht replaced the EPC with the CFSP.

By the time the CFSP has been drafted and the Treaty of Maastricht has been signed, the EU had 12 member states. Similar to the negotiations in the EDC and the EPC, France, Germany and the UK played leading roles in the negotiations. The sudden events of the 1989-91 period with the fall of the Berlin wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia caught the EU off guard (Smith, 2003e). Not only did these events cause reform demands in the EC, but also in the WEU, NATO and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). Consequently, article J.4.1 of the Treaty of Maastricht equipped the CFSP with the mandate to address "all questions related to the security of the Union, including the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time lead to a common defence" (European Communities, 1992). Accordingly, the treaty empowered the EU to initiate joint actions that touch upon defense matters. In contrast to other aspects of the

CFSP, QMV did not apply at all when defense matters were at stake. The only state which negotiated an opt-out was Denmark. Therefore, Denmark is excluded from any foreign policy discussions that bear implications for defense matters. The Treaty of Maastricht offered many different options for the institutionalization of the EPC. In the end, the EPC has been abolished and the CFSP has been founded in its place. This and the fact that it provided the EU for the first time with legal competences in defensive matters make the foundation of the CFSP a critical juncture.

During the negotiations, France and Germany formed the vehicle for a deepened integration within defensive matters. While French president François Mitterrand hoped that the CFSP would help to constrain the recently reunited Germany in a more comprehensive political structure, German chancellor Helmut Kohl attempted to manifest his EU-integrationist credentials (Smith, 2003e). In addition and similar to the foundation of the EPC, the prospect of accession of three previously neutral states led member states to believe that coordination in defense matters would become indispensable. It thus resembles the anticipatory deepening mechanism. Despite acknowledging that the unanimity requirement might be an obstacle to a common defense policy, Hurd (1994) has argued that it is rare that a member state withholds agreement completely and that the unanimity requirement rather encourages actors to find common ground between them. In sum, it seems that the widening of integration has rather facilitated than inhibited the foundation of the CFSP.

St. Malo Declaration

In 1999, the WEU's European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) has been transferred to the EU, and transformed into the ESDP[1]. Some scholars even called the creation of the ESDP 'Europe's military revolution' (Andréani, Bertram, & Grant, 2001). Despite Denmark, all other 14 member states of the EU participated in the ESDP.

However, the groundwork for the ESDP has been done at a summit in 1998 in St. Malo in France, which was attended by the then two main security actors in the EU – France and the UK. After decade long resistance, France finally persuaded the UK to support an independent EU military force. At the end of the summit, British prime minister Tony Blair and French president Jacques Chirac signed the St. Malo declaration which included a request to equip the EU with the capacity for autonomous action backed up by military forces (Deighton, 2002). However, the UK did not only agree to bolster the EU's military capacities

---

[1] With the Treaty of Lisbon entering into force in 2009, the ESDP was renamed into CSDP.

thanks to Jacques Chirac's persuasion efforts. Instead, the armed conflict in Kosovo in the late 1990s and the EU's repeated failure to intervene in order to stop the conflict, revived demands for greater military cooperation. The plan had been approved by the other member states in 1999 and forces have been deployed for the first time in 2003. The abrupt and drastic change of the UK's position and the far-reaching consequences thereof make the St. Malo declaration and its aftermath a critical juncture worth investigating more closely.

Before the first deployment of EU troops to North Macedonia in 2003, Belgian foreign minister Louis Michel announced in 2001 that the EU would provide up to 4,000 troops for the peacekeeping force in Afghanistan (Smith, 2003a). Yet, in a quick response France, Germany and the UK denied the announcement and troops were deployed for the first time only two years later. While agreeing in their disagreement with the Belgian foreign minister, the three major member states substantially diverged in their opinion on the key functional role of the ESDP. Although the St. Malo declaration was very clear on the fact that the EU should be provided with the necessary military capacity for autonomous action, they had different solutions for the ESDP in mind. Whereas the UK viewed it as a support arm for NATO, France thought of it as an independent EU force, and Germany preferred a peacekeeping/humanitarian force (Smith, 2003a). Thus, in accordance with the previous critical junctures, France, the UK and Germany not only remained the most important actors in the integration process but also held diverging preferences. Moreover, the Eastern enlargement already casted its shadow. The 2004 enlargement brought an unprecedented territorial expansion that crucially redefined the EU's security strategy. Not least because of the enlargement, member states were incentivized to form an effective European army. Thus, the stepwise widening of European defense cooperation until the St. Malo declaration did not prevent the deepening of defense and security matters. This was mostly due to the fact that the integration process was still dominated by the same two to three actors as decades before. In addition, the prospect of further enlargement apparently even facilitated deepening measures.

Permanent Structured Cooperation

PESCO has first been initiated by the EU's Constitutional Treaty, which was rejected by Dutch and French voters in 2005. Afterwards, it was salvaged from the treaty's remnants and absorbed largely unchanged by the Treaty of Lisbon. However, it remained unused until December 2017 when 25 EU member states established PESCO with the aim of improving their defense capabilities and the deployability of their forces. 34 projects have been launched so far in which different groupings of member states work together. The difference to

previous forms of cooperation is that PESCO requires participating states to make legally binding commitments in the areas of capability development, operational readiness and defense investment (Nováky, 2018). It thus marks a crucial step forward in the deepening of European defense cooperation. Yet, an implementation of PESCO anytime soon had been considered very unlikely just weeks before the participating member states agreed to actually bring PESCO into existence (Kellner, 2018). The quick and unexpected implementation more than eight years after the Treaty of Lisbon – and with it the provisions on PESCO – came into force, make PESCO a critical juncture.

Initially 23 EU member states signed an agreement to activate PESCO on 13 November 2007. Less than a month later Portugal and Ireland joined the agreement leaving Denmark, the UK and Malta to be the only EU member states not to join PESCO. Although PESCO now resembles a very inclusive instrument, the negotiations leading to its establishment were again dominated by France and Germany, and to a lesser degree the UK as its withdrawal gave hope of success for PESCO. Whereas France favored a small and ambitious group of states Germany preferred an inclusive defense structure that would be accessible by every EU member state (Billon-Galland & Quencez, 2017). In its current form, PESCO is the result of a compromise between Germany and France. It does have the ambition to deepen European defense cooperation on a broad range of issues but it is now open to virtually all EU member states. This has been accomplished by setting the terms and conditions for participation to a rather low level. Consequently, participating states will need to do more than the required minimum in order "to keep the freshly awoken Sleeping Beauty from snoozing" (Nováky, 2018, p. 100). As it seems now, widening efforts (Berlin) have again prevailed over deepening efforts (Paris).

To sum up, France, Germany – and this time to a lesser degree the UK – again dominated the talks and negotiations leading to the implementation of PESCO. Although the EU has now grown in size to 28 member states, it is still the same small group of member states which dominate the decision-making process. Thus, it does not seem that the enlarged EU has been an obstacle to the implementation of PESCO. In addition, PESCO itself is designed in a way that every EU member state can participate if it wishes do to so. It is thus widely integrated. Whether it will also deepen European defense cooperation remains to be seen. What seems already clear is that the compromise between Germany and France favors widening over deepening – at least for now. Several factors and mechanisms could explain this. First, PESCO is a show of unity after UK's decision to leave the EU (Shalal & Emmot, 2017). If only an exclusive group of states would have moved forward with PESCO divisive

sentiments in the EU might have been accelerated. Second, by widening the scope of PESCO, participating member states will benefit from economies of scale. Especially the research and development costs will decrease the more states participate (Chappell & Petrov, 2012). In a report from 2013, the European Parliament concluded that the shortcomings in European defense cooperation cause approximately €26 billon annually which could increase to €130 billion if the EU's security context worsens (Kellner, 2018).

Conclusion

The treatment of these critical junctures is of course rather subjective and it must be mentioned that the mechanisms do not always show easily. Nonetheless, it is possible to identify similarities and differences between the four critical junctures.

All of the four discussed critical junctures are cornerstones of the efforts to integrate defense matters on the European continent. While the EDC and EPC failed to provide the EU with legal competence in defense matters, the CFSP, the CSDP and to some degree PESCO provided the EU with formal defense capabilities. During this period, the EU has grown from its originally six founding states to 28 member states. With the exception of Denmark (and the UK and Malta in the case of PESCO), all EU member states – even those that joined during the Eastern enlargement – participated in the integration of defense matters. From these recognitions, it appears indeed to be true that widening has at least not been an obstacle to the deepening of European defense cooperation.

The probably only time that a veto of one state has led to the failure of integration is France's rejection of the EDC. However, as discussed it seems that the French refusal has been caused by the decision of the UK to not join the pact. Thus, it seems as if the failure of the EDC has not been due to too many actors being involved but rather because not enough actors were involved. This is underlined by the French desire to invite more states to the EDC in order to counterweigh a potential German dominance. In two of the other three critical junctures, enlargement has cast its shadows and we can find hints for an anticipatory deepening mechanism. Eventually, all events under scrutiny were at least in part triggered by external events. They usually provided for an excuse to debate security or defense matters, but they did not dictate the particular outcome (Smith, 2003a).

The analysis has vividly illustrated that the widening of the European integration process has never really been an obstacle to the deepening of integration within the field of security and defense. On the contrary, in some instances it seems that widening has actually made deepening possible. Moreover, the analysis also gives us indications for the mechanisms

underlying the deepening and widening relationship and their explanatory factors, of which some are specific to the field of security and defense.

First, a popular argument of first generation scholars is that the higher the number of actors is, the higher is the preference heterogeneity which makes it more difficult to find common ground. In the case of security and defense policy, however, the preference heterogeneity has already been very high on the outset of European defense cooperation in the 1950s. This is mainly due to the unique positions of France, Germany and the UK which represent a broad and diverse coalition of interests within Europe (Andréani et al., 2001). Second, contextual conditions and exogenous factors have often outweighed ideological debates (Smith, 2003a). Thus, measures taken towards deepening were often a product of a shared sense of urgency. Consequently, national sensitivities played an inferior role, which belittled the significance of widening as an obstacle to deepening. Third, during the negotiations leading to the foundation of the EPC, the CFSP and the ESDP enlargements have casted their shadow. Accordingly, deepening efforts were often designed to prepare the EU for enlargement. This factor very much resembles Van der Veen's (2014) anticipatory deepening mechanisms. As explained, the anticipatory deepening describes the effect of member states being inclined to lock-in their preferences if voting majorities would shift to their disadvantage after accession. However, anticipatory deepening could also prevent the EU from encountering gridlock. Thus, this analysis suggests that members states might also pursue anticipatory deepening – even though it actually runs counter to their primary preference – if their least preferred option is to encounter gridlock. Fourth, sitting a little at odds with the findings of Schimmelfennig et al. (2015) it does not appear from this analysis that interdependence and politicization have played a major role, especially as both remained on a rather low level. Instead, it seems that competiveness or rivalry are more important factors in defense cooperation suggesting that relative gains are of greater importance than absolute gains. Accordingly, a widened club of participating states might actually be a condition for deepening within European defense cooperation.

To sum up, all of the four analyzed critical junctures suggest a rather positive relationship between deepening and widening. Especially the effect of widening on deepening seems to be of great importance, i.e. the supranationalization of competencies becomes more likely the more states join the European integration process (anticipatory deepening and the competitiveness/rivalry mechanism). However, the analysis also shows that the relationship between deepening and widening might not be as strong as previously assumed. First, external circumstances forestalled deliberate decisions based on ideological debates, and

second, preference heterogeneity seems to be affected much less than expected. With regard to these findings, the main contribution of this study to the deepening versus widening debate is that 1) there is no single mechanism that is capable of describing the entirety of the deepening and widening relationship, 2) the deepening and widening relationship might actually be weaker than often postulated, and 3) within the field of European defense cooperation it seems that deepening and widening have a rather positive effect on each other.

Of course, this study comes with certain limitations. As mentioned already, the identification and categorization of the mechanisms is rather subjective and not all mechanisms show easily. It could well be that the study of other critical junctures or the analysis of other forms of evidence might have pointed this study to a different relationship between deepening and widening. Yet, all four critical junctures in this analysis together make a strong argument against a negative relationship, at least. Another limitation is the availability of sources. The analysis could be performed best if transcripts or memos of negotiations would form the evidence. Yet, this study had to rely on secondary literature.

Eventually, I would like to echo recent calls for further research. One of the major tasks will be to further advance the reconciliation of the first and second generation of literature in the deepening and widening debate. Furthermore, future research should not only investigate the deepening and widening relationship but also make an effort to further improve the conceptualization of the terms deepening and widening.

References

Ahrens, J., Hoen, H. W., & Ohr, R. (2005). Deepening Integration in an Enlarged EU: A Club–theoretical Perspective. *Journal of European Integration, 27*(4), 417-439. doi:10.1080/07036330500367366

Andréani, G., Bertram, C., & Grant, C. (2001). *Europe's Military Revolution*.

Berglof, E., Burkart, M., Friebel, G., & Paltseva, E. (2008). Widening and Deepening: Reforming the European Union. *American Economic Review, 98*(2), 133-137. doi:10.1257/aer.98.2.133

Bieler, A. (2002). The struggle over EU enlargement: a historical materialist analysis of European integration. *Journal of European Public Policy, 9*(4), 575-597. doi:10.1080/13501760210152448

Billon-Galland, A., & Quencez, M. (2017). *Can France and Germany Make PESCO Work as a Process Toward EU Defense?* Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep18774

Bolleyer, N., & Börzel, T. A. (2014). Balancing integration and flexibility in the European Union: Constitutional dispositions and dynamics of coordination. *Comparative European Politics, 12*(4-5), 384. doi:10.1057/cep.2014.8

Bonvicini, G., & Comelli, M. (2009). *Deepening and Widening in European Foreign and Security Policy*. Retrieved from Instituto Affari Internazionali: https://www.iai.it/en/pubblicazioni/deepening-and-widening-european-foreign-and-security-policy

Börzel, T. A. (2005). Mind the gap! European integration between level and scope. *Journal of European Public Policy, 12*(2), 217-236. doi:10.1080/13501760500043860

Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2018). From the euro to the Schengen crises: European integration theories, politicization, and identity politics. *Journal of European Public Policy, 25*(1), 83-108. doi:10.1080/13501763.2017.1310281

Bressanelli, E. (2014). Necessary deepening? How political groups in the European Parliament adapt to enlargement. *Journal of European Public Policy, 21*(5), 776-792. doi:10.1080/13501763.2014.897741

Capoccia, G., & Kelemen, R. D. (2007). The study of critical junctures: Theory, narrative, and counterfactuals in historical institutionalism. *World Politics, 59*(3), 341-369. doi:doi:10.1017/S0043887100020852

Chappell, L., & Petrov, P. (2012). The European Defence Agency and Permanent Structured Cooperation: Are We Heading Towards Another Missed Opportunity? *Defence Studies, 12*(1), 44-66. doi:10.1080/14702436.2012.683973

Churchill, W. (1946). Speech to the academic youth. University of Zurich.

D'Erman, V., & Verdun, A. C. (2018). Introduction: Integration Through Crises. *Review ofEuropean and Russian Affairs (RERA), 12*(Special Issue on the theme'Crises ofthe EU and their Impact on European Integration'), 1-16.

Dehousse, R. (2016). Why has EU macroeconomic governance become more supranational? *Journal of European Integration, 38*(5), 617-631. doi:10.1080/07036337.2016.1180826

Deighton, A. (2002). The European Security and Defence Policy. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 40*(4), 719-741. doi:10.1111/1468-5965.00395

Treaty on European Union, (1992).

Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union, (2007).

Fisher Onar, N., Liu, J. H., & Woodward, M. (2014). Critical junctures? Complexity and the post-colonial nation-state. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 43*, 22-34. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.08.009

Fleischer, B. (2012). Negotiating the European Defence Community. *European Political Science, 12*(1), 64. doi:10.1057/eps.2012.10

Golub, J. (2007). Survival Analysis and European Union Decision-making. *European Union Politics, 8*(2), 155-179. doi:10.1177/1465116507076428

Grix, J. (2004). *The foundations of research* (Palgrave study guides 266579361 ed.): Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haas, E. B. (1958). *The uniting of Europe: political, social, and economic forces, 1950-1957*: Stanford University Press.

Hale, T., & Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2016). Are Europeans ready for a more democratic European Union? New evidence on preference heterogeneity, polarisation and crosscuttingness. *European Journal of Political Research, 55*(2), 225-245. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.12136

Hancké, B. (2009). *Intelligent Research Design A Guide for Beginning Researchers in the Social Sciences*: Oxford : OUP Oxford.

Hogan, J. (2006). Remoulding the Critical Junctures Approach. *Canadian Journal of Political Science, 39*(3), 657-679. doi:10.1017/S0008423906060203

Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2009). A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus. *British Journal of Political Science, 39*(1), 1-23. doi:10.1017/S0007123408000409

Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2015). Delegation and pooling in international organizations.(Report). *The Review of International Organizations, 10*(3), 305. doi:10.1007/s11558-014-9194-4

House, J. M. (2011). *The European Defense Community* (Vol. 64).

Hurd, D. (1994). DEVELOPING THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY. *Int. Aff., 70*(3), 421-428.

Kelemen, R. D., Menon, A., & Slapin, J. (2014a). The European Union: wider and deeper? *Journal of European Public Policy, 21*(5), 643-646. doi:10.1080/13501763.2014.899115

Kelemen, R. D., Menon, A., & Slapin, J. (2014b). Wider and deeper? Enlargement and integration in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy, 21*(5), 647-663. doi:10.1080/13501763.2014.897745

Kellner, A. (2018). Condemned to Succeed? The EU Security and Defence Policy one Year After the Global Strategy. *Zeitschrift für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, 11*(1), 1-11. doi:10.1007/s12399-017-0687-0

König, T. (2007). Divergence or convergence? From ever-growing to ever-slowing European legislative decision making. *European Journal of Political Research, 46*(3), 417-444. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2006.00648.x-i1

König, T., & Junge, D. (2009). Why Don't Veto Players Use Their Power? *European Union Politics, 10*(4), 507-534. doi:10.1177/1465116509346780

Mahoney, J. (2001). *The Legacies of liberalism path dependence and political regimes in Central America*: Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mattila, M., & Lane, J.-E. (2001). Why Unanimity in the Council?: A Roll Call Analysis of Council Voting. *European Union Politics, 2*(1), 31-52. doi:10.1177/1465116501002001002

Mattli, W., & Plümper, T. (2002). The demand-side politics of EU enlargement: democracy and the application for EU membership. *Journal of European Public Policy, 9*(4), 550-574. doi:10.1080/13501760210152439

Miles, L., & Redmond, J. (1996). Enlarging the European Union: the erosion of federalism? *Cooperation and conflict, 31*, 285-309.

Nováky, N. (2018). The EU's Permanent Structured Cooperation in defence: Keeping Sleeping Beauty from snoozing. *European View, 17*(1), 97-104. doi:10.1177/1781685818764813

Pawson, R., & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic Evaluation*: SAGE Publications.

Rohlfing, I. (2012). Case, Case Study, and Causation: Core Concepts and Fundamentals. In I. Rohlfing (Ed.), *Case Studies and Causal Inference: An Integrative Framework* (pp. 23-60). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Rolin, H., Boeg, N. V., Jaffe, A., de Pinna, L. A., Picarda, P. A., Adamkiewicz, W., . . . Spens, P. (1952). The European Defence Community. *Transactions of the Grotius Society, 38*, 4-24.

Schimmelefnnig, F. (2015). *Vertical and Horizontal Integration in the EU*.

Schimmelfennig, F., Leuffen, D., & Rittberger, B. (2015). The European Union as a system of differentiated integration: interdependence, politicization and differentiation. *Journal of European Public Policy, 22*(6), 1-19. doi:10.1080/13501763.2015.1020835

Schimmelfennig, F., & Sedelmeier, U. (2002). Theorizing EU enlargement: research focus, hypotheses, and the state of research. *Journal of European Public Policy, 9*(4), 500-528. doi:10.1080/13501760210152411

Schneider, C. J. (2014). Domestic politics and the widening–deepening trade-off in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy, 21*(5), 699-712. doi:10.1080/13501763.2014.897740

Selck, T. J. (2005). Explaining the Absence of Inertia in European Union Legislative Decision-making*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 43*(5), 1055-1070. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5965.2005.00608.x

Settembri, P. (2007). *The surgery succeeded. Has the patient died? The impact of enlargement on the European Union.* NYU School of Law.

Shalal, A., & Emmot, R. (2017). EU to sign joint defense pact in show of post-Brexit unity.

Sjursen, H. (2011). Not so intergovernmental after all? On democracy and integration in European Foreign and Security Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy, 18*(8), 1078-1095. doi:10.1080/13501763.2011.615194

Smith, M. E. (2003a). Conclusion: beyond the CFSP: institutions, defense, and the European identity. In M. E. Smith (Ed.), *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutionalization of Cooperation* (pp. 239-263). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, M. E. (2003b). Institutions and European foreign policy cooperation: the empirical link. In M. E. Smith (Ed.), *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutionalization of Cooperation* (pp. 37-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, M. E. (2003c). Origins: intergovernmentalism and European Political Cooperation. In M. E. Smith (Ed.), *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutionalization of Cooperation* (pp. 63-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, M. E. (2003d). Toward a theory of EU foreign policy-making: multi-level governance, domestic politics, and national adaptation to Europe's common foreign and security policy. *Journal of European Public Policy, 11*(4), 740-758. doi:10.1080/1350176042000248124

Smith, M. E. (2003e). Toward governance: the Common Foreign and Security Policy. In M. E. Smith (Ed.), *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutionalization of Cooperation* (pp. 176-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steunenberg, B. (2002). The Effects of Enlargement on EU Decisionmaking. In B. Steunenberg (Ed.), *Widening the European Union: the politics of institutional change and reform*: London [etc.]: Routledge.

Tallberg, J. (2002). Delegation to Supranational Institutions: Why, How, and with What Consequences? *West European Politics, 25*(1), 23-46. doi:10.1080/713601584

Treaty on Euroopean Union. (1993). art. J.4.1.

Tsebelis, G. (1995). Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism and Multipartyism. *British Journal of Political Science, 25*(3), 289-325. doi:10.1017/S0007123400007225

Tsebelis, G. (2002). *Veto players how political institutions work*: Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Tsebelis, G., & Yataganas, X. (2002). Veto Players and Decision-making in the EU After Nice. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 40*(2), 283-307. doi:10.1111/1468-5965.00355

Umbach, G., & Hofmann, A. (2009). *Towards a theoretical link between EU widening and deepening*. Retrieved from http://aei.pitt.edu/33151/

Van Brabant, J. (2001). EU Widening and Deepening – Are these goals reconcilable? *MOST: Economic Policy in Transitional Economies, 11*(2), 113-141. doi:10.1023/A:1012210509779

Van der Veen, A. M. (2014). Enlargement and the anticipatory deepening of European integration. *Journal of European Public Policy, 21*(5), 761-775. doi:10.1080/13501763.2014.897747

Verdun, A. (2015). A historical institutionalist explanation of the EU's responses to the euro area financial crisis. *Journal of European Public Policy, 22*(2), 219-237. doi:10.1080/13501763.2014.994023

Verdun, A. (2016). The Federal Features of the EU: Lessons from Canada. *Politics and Governance, 4*(3), 100. doi:10.17645/pag.v4i3.598

Wallace, H. (2002). Enlarging the European Union: reflections on the challenge of analysis. *Journal of European Public Policy, 9*(4), 658-665. doi:10.1080/13501760210152484

Walton, C. C. (1953). Background for the European Defense Community. *Political Science Quarterly, 68*(1), 42-69. doi:10.2307/2145750

Watts, D. (2008). Section One: History *The European Union*. Edingburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wiener, A., & Diez, T. (2009). Introducing the Mosaic of Integration Theory. In A. Wiener & T. Diez (Eds.), *European Integration Theory* (2nd edition.. ed.): Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*: SAGE Publications.