THE MPCC

A historical analysis of its creation

Thijs de Jong
S1874187
Thijs.djng@gmail.com

Thesis European Union Studies
Leiden University
Amount of words: 14949
Date: 29-06-2020

Abstract

This thesis analyses the Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC) which is the European Union's military operational headquarter (OHQ). Authors of articles on the MPCC explain its creation by pointing at recent events and developments, such as the annexation of Crimea and the election of Trump. However, the creation of the MPCC is the culmination of decades worth of European defence cooperation. Its creation can therefore only be fully understood when taking the historical context in mind. This thesis therefore uses an historical approach to solve the gap in knowledge on the creation of the MPCC. It analyses the creation of six predecessors, all established European organisations that are similar to the MPCC as an OHQ, and compares them to each other. In this manner, this thesis argues that European defence cooperation since World War II is the result of the perceived interdependence between European states. Interdependence concerning national defence has led to the creation of the Western Union and the Western European Union. During the 90s, the perceived interdependence changed to focus on the ability for the states to play a significant and sovereign role on the world stage. This led to the creation of the EU Operations Centre, the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability and the option to use national OHQs and OHQs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). Around 2016 the perceived interdependence shifted for a second time, now combining the focus on national defence with the focus on playing a significant and sovereign role on the world stage. This led to agreement among EU member states to develop the EU's military capabilities. The Brexit referendum result provided the window of opportunity to start with these developments and thus to begin creating the MPCC, which was completed in 2017.

Table of contents

Abstract 1

Abbreviations 3

1. Introduction 4

1.1 Research question 5

1.2 Methodology 6

2. Theories, events and developments 9

2.1 Theoretical explanations 9

2.2 Events and developments 11

3. Ensuring national security 14

3.1 Western Union 14

3.2 NATO and the EDC 15

3.3 The Western European Union 17

3.4 Comparison 20

4. A sovereign and significant international role 22

4.1 National and NATO's OHQs 23

4.2 European Union Operations Centre 25

4.3 Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability 26

4.4 Comparison 28

5. The Military Planning and Conduct Capability 29

5.1 The long road towards the MPCC 29

5.2 The third paradigm: halfway in between 31

5.3 Comparison 33

Conclusion 35

Sources 36

Primary sources 36

Secondary sources 37

Abbreviations

CPCC	Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
EDA	European Defence Agency
EDC	European Defence Community
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUMS	European Military Staff
EU OPCEN	European Operations Centre
HR	High Representative
MPCC	Military Planning and Conduct Capability
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
(O)HQ	(Operational) Headquarter
SU	Soviet Union
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States (of America)
WEU	Western European Union
WU	Western Union
WUDO	Western Union Defence Organisation
WWII	World War II

1. Introduction

‘Resolved to co-operate closely with one another as well as with the other United Nations in preserving peace and resisting aggression […]’[1]

The treaty of Dunkirk between the United Kingdom (UK) and France, signed in 1947, started with this sentence. Since then, European states have cooperated on defence issues via international treaties and organisations. Nowadays, member states of the European Union cooperate on defence through its Common Defence and Security Policy (CSDP).[2] This entails for example cooperating on defence projects through the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) and carrying out civil-military missions.[3] Various types of headquarters (HQs) have been established or made available for these organisations and their missions, such as national and NATO HQs and European Union (EU) institutions such as the European Operations Centre (EU OPCEN).[4] In 2017, the EU furthermore established the Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC).[5] This organisation was created to provide the CSDP with a permanent OHQ. The MPCC leads the EU’s non-executive military missions, which are missions that are without combat elements.[6] Since 2019, the MPCC is furthermore authorised to command one executive military operation made up of one battlegroup.[7] Its command is envisioned to grow further, and it is planned to incorporate the EU OPCEN in 2020.[8] Yf Reykers states that ‘this is the closest the EU has ever come to a permanent military

[1] ‘Treat of Alliance and Mutual Assistance’, Dunkirk (1947): 3.
[2] Strategic Communications, ‘The Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP)’, European External Action Service (hereafter EEAS), https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp/431/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp_en (accessed June 14, 2020).
[3] EEAS Press Team, ‘Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) – factsheet’, EEAS, https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-Homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet_en (accessed June 14, 2020); Strategic Communications, ‘Military and Civilian Missions and Operations’, EEAS, https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en (accessed June 14, 2020).
[4] Louis Simón and Alexander Mattelaer, ‘EUnity of Command – The Planning and Conduct of CSDP Operations’ (Egmont Paper 41, Egmont – The Royal Institute for International Relations, Brussels, January, 2011): 7-8 and 19.
[5] Council of the European Union, ‘EU Defence Cooperation: Council Establishes a Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC)’, news release, June 8, 2017.
[6] Council of the European Union, ‘EU Concept for Military Command and Control - Rev 8’ (Working document, EEAS, Brussels, April 23, 2019).
[7] Council of the European Union, ‘EU Defence Cooperation’.
[8] Ibidem.

headquarters'.[9] Most other researchers that have published about the MPCC share this vision.[10]

This is interesting because the EU has never had a proper military OHQ. This shortcoming has impaired its military capabilities. As Louis Simón has noted, there is '[…] a manifest disconnect between the EU's foreign and security policy objectives, its military strategic objectives and its military capabilities, particularly in the area of planning'.[11] The lack of central military planning capabilities has prevented the EU from realising its military strategic objectives. For example, the European Defence Agency (EDA) recognised in 2008 that because of planning inabilities, EU missions might fail in meeting their overall objectives.[12] Consequently, the EU hasn't been able to attain the objectives of its foreign policy. Furthermore, thanks to these shortcomings it hasn't been able to realise its strategic objectives: 'the exercise of global power and a leadership role in promoting security and prosperity in the broader European neighbourhood'.[13] To summarise, the EU's military planning capabilities suffer from significant shortfalls which prevents the EU from attaining its CSDP ambitions.

1.1 Research question

The significant shortfalls identified in the previous paragraph make it logical that member states are attempting to solve this manifest disconnect. However, member states are reluctant to expand the EU's powers and capabilities, because they are afraid that it will have a negative impact on their own sovereign powers. A permanent military OHQ is precisely what some governments have been afraid of, which is why the EU has had the option to use national HQs from member states for the planning and control of its operations. There is thus

[9] Yf Reykers, 'A Permanent Headquarters under Construction? The Military Planning and Conduct Capability as a Proximate Principal', *Journal of European Integration* 41, no. 6 (2019): 783.
[10] Claire Mills, 'European Defence : Where Is It Heading?' (Briefing Paper no. 8216, House of Commons Library, October 30, 2019): 18; Alin Bodescu, 'EU Military Planning and Conduct Capability: Duplication or Complementarity with NATO?', *Strategic Impact*, no. 1 (2017): 16; Aleksandar Chavleski, 'The Military Planning and Conduct Capability of the EU: New Impetus for the Common Security and Defence Policy', *Contemporary Macedonian Defence* 17, no. 33 (2017): 17; Frank Everaert, 'Een Eerste Stap Op Weg Naar Een Volwaardig EU Militair Strategisch Hoofdkwartier?', *Belgisch Militair Tijdschrift / Revue Militaire Belge* 15, (2017): 72; Nicole Koenig and Marie Walter-Franke, 'France and Germany: Spearheading a European Security and Defence Union?' (Policy paper 202, Jacques Delors Institut, Berlin, July 19, 2017): 1. Thierry Tardy is an exception to this, as he is doubtful about this vision: Thierry Tardy, 'MPCC: Towards an EU Military Command' (Issue Brief 17, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris, June, 2017): 3.
[11] Simón and Mattelaer, 'EUnity of Command', 6.
[12] European Defence Agency (hereafter EDA), 'Future trends from the Capability Development Plan, Brussels (2008): 23.
[13] Simón and Mattelaer, 'EUnity of Command', 6.

a contradiction between wanting to solve the EU's manifest disconnect, and not wanting to enhance the EU's powers and capabilities. It is therefore interesting to understand how it was possible to create the MPCC as a solution for this gap in the EU's capabilities. Why did member states cooperate on the creation of this envisioned permanent military HQ? And why did they do so now, and not 50 years ago or 50 years from now? The research question that this thesis therefore tries to answer is why is it possible that the MPCC, as envisioned permanent military HQ, has now been created?

To answer this question, we need to answer three sub questions. In answering the first two – how it was created and why – this thesis demonstrates that the MPCC is a culmination of 70 years of European defence cooperation. In order to understand the MPCC, we need to understand its predecessors, for which this thesis uses a historical approach. When we understand how and why the MPCC was created, we can turn to the third question: why might it now be possible for the EU get a permanent military HQ? The relevance of this thesis lies in these questions, as answering them allows us to fill a gap in the knowledge about the creation of the MPCC and European defence cooperation, and indirectly about the development of European defence capabilities. Understanding this can help EU member states to cooperate with each other on defence issues.

1.2 Methodology

The existence of a gap in knowledge is evident from the fact that up until now, the creation of the MPCC has been explained with recent events and developments, which will be explained in the next chapter. These explanations miss the depth of analysis required to truly understand the MPCC's creation, the timing of its creation, and whether it is unique or not. In order to answer these questions and fill this gap in knowledge, a historical approach is needed. A historical approach allows us to make the past intelligible, to see 'how things fit together', and 'to understand the logic underlying the course of events'.[14] It enables us to understand what came before and during the process of the MPCC's creation and whether there is a longer trajectory, filled with predecessors, that has led to the its creation or not. It furthermore enables us to identify crucial factors in the creation of these predecessors. Knowing these crucial factors allows us to compare them to each other and determine whether there are similarities or differences. Subsequently, understanding the similarities and differences in

[14] Mark Trachtenberg, *The Craft of International History. A Guide to Method* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2009), 23-24, and 27.

crucial factors between the MPCC and its predecessors enables us to understand whether there is a unique factor that explains the creation of the MPCC and the timing of its creation, or whether there are similarities to its predecessors that answer the research question. For this historical approach primary sources are used to analyse what actions and decisions were taken and how they were justified by the European states. Examples of these primary sources are international treaties, minutes of meetings and government reports. This is complemented with secondary sources to understand the context and see how relevant events and developments have been interpreted and how we can interpret it with the knowledge that we have now. These sources consist of, for example, scientific research from historians and political scientists

The thesis has identified six predecessors of the MPCC, different organizations who are manifestations of the same common object, namely European defence cooperation. In order to compare the crucial factors present at the creation of these predecessors, the same questions need to be posed to the MPCC as to each of its predecessors. Thus with each organisation we analyse how it was created, why it was created, and how it relates to the other organisations and the creation of the MPCC. This methodology ensures a deeper analysis than has previously been carried out, because it allows us to understand the deeper lying causes behind European defence cooperation. Thanks to this methodology we can identify crucial factors present at the creation of each predecessor. Understanding whether these crucial factors were continuously present, or were lacking when the MPCC was created, will lead to a better understanding of why it was possible that the MPCC, as envisioned permanent military OHQ, has now been created.

The MPCC is an OHQ that handles the planning and conduct of missions at the strategic level, and there are six comparable predecessors of established OHQs that can be isolated within the historical trajectory of European defence cooperation. The first of these was the Western Union (WU) and its Western Union Defence Organisation (WUDO). This was the first regional defence organisation that was created after World War II (WWII) by a number of Western-European countries. However, WUDO embodies the whole military system of the WU, so we need to specify it to the strategic level. The WUDO's Commanders-in-Chief Committee was its OHQ and can therefore be seen as predecessor.[15] The European Defence Community (EDC) and NATO fall outside our selection of organisations, as they aren't

[15] Office of the Historian, 'Memorandum by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Secretary of Defence (Forrestal)', United States Department of State, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1948v03/d183 (accessed December 3, 2019).

established OHQs at the European level, but they are too significant to be left out. The EDC shall therefore shortly be addressed together with the creation of NATO, whose significant existence is furthermore addressed throughout the thesis. After NATO and the EDC comes the second established organisation, which is the Western European Union (WEU). Its OHQ was provided by NATO during the first 40 years of its existence. It wasn't until 1992 that an OHQ of its own was established in the form of the Planning Cell, and that national OHQs were made available to it.[16] After the analysis of WEU's Planning Cell, we are ready to analyse the European OHQs that were established or made available during the recent three decades. These are the CPCC (the civilian OHQ counterpart of the MPCC), the EU OPCEN (the direct predecessor of the MPCC) and the national and NATO's OHQs.

These six predecessors can be divided into two groups, the first two that were established and that weren't (originally) a part of the EU, and the latter four that were established as a part of the EU or made available to the EU. This divide marks a clear break in time and organisational structure. The structure of this thesis is therefore as follows. The first chapter consists of this introduction, which is followed by the theoretical framework explaining European defence cooperation in Chapter 2. Then, the first group of predecessors are analysed, which is followed by the second group of predecessors in Chapter 4. Subsequently, in chapter five the MPCC and its creation is analysed. This structure enables us to compare crucial factors among the MPCC and its predecessors, and to find out whether there is a unique factor that explains the MPCC's creation and the timing of its creation. Finally, in the conclusion the findings of this thesis are summarised, explaining that the MPCC was created because of a long-standing but developing sense of interdependence between European states, and because the Brexit referendum result provided a window of opportunity in 2016.

[16] Simon Duke, *The Elusive Quest for European Security* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press LTD., 2000), 330-331.

2. Theories, events and developments

Why do European states cooperate on defence issues? As Simon Duke mentions, 'Defence […] was and is intimately linked to the ideas of national defence and ultimately to state sovereignty'.[17] States guard their sovereign powers jealously. After all, isn't sovereign power a part of what defines a state? It is therefore not surprising that it hasn't been easy to establish structural and profound defence cooperation within the EU. Nevertheless, European states have often cooperated on defence issues since WWII, hence the many cases of defence cooperation that this thesis can now analyse. Here we can see an interesting paradox. States don't want to give up power over defence, but they would like to cooperate on defence. The question why European states cooperate on defence issues has therefore unsurprisingly led to a lively debate. There is plenty of literature out there that is focussed on this topic. The primary goal of this thesis is not to contribute to this debate, but as a theoretical framework the debate is helpful for understanding the creation of the MPCC. That is why this chapter provides a short overview of explanations for European defence cooperation.

European defence organisation can be explained through a number of theories. For example, according to realism, states cooperate on defence issues when they perceive cooperation to be in their best interest. However, recent articles in which the MPCC is analysed explain its creation with recent events or developments. Examples of these events are the Brexit referendum and the election of Donald Trump. Both a theoretical framework and the already mentioned events and developments can help us investigate the establishment of the MPCC, which is why they are explained in this chapter.

2.1 Theoretical explanations

There is a wide variety of defence cooperation theories through which European defence cooperation can be explained. Some scholars prefer to stick to realism, institutionalism and constructivism, which is understandable as they can be seen as the main theories through which cooperation is explained.[18] However, the selection of these three theories leaves out intergovernmentalism, and ignores the differences within these theories, such as between

[17] Duke, *The Elusive Quest*, 2.
[18] Roy H. Ginsberg and Susan E. Penksa, *The European Union in Global Security. The Politics of Impact* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Guido Talman, 'European Union: Defence Integration' (Master's thesis, Leiden University, 2016); Kari Möttölä, 'Drivers of defence integration within the European Union' (paper presented at Sixth (SGIR) Pan-European International Relations Conference, Turin, Italy, September 12-15, 2007).

realism and neorealism. To solve these shortcomings, this thesis takes a broader approach to defence cooperation theories.[19] This is primarily based on Louis Simón's overview, complemented with other articles describing theories. We begin with realism, one of International Relations' oldest theories. Realism in general sees states as the primary actors and believes that these states act in pursuit of their own interests. European states are thus willing to cooperate on defence issues when it furthers their own interests.[20] Neorealists argue that member states cooperate because of Europe's relative decline. In a world where the amount of economic centres and continental superpowers increases, Europe is pressured into security cooperation.[21] Neoclassical realists in turn argue that a state's preferences are influenced by domestic interests.[22] Last but not least, structural realists find that European states are cooperating on defence matters in an attempt to balance the power of the US, the so-called 'balance of power theory'.[23]

Liberals however see collective institutions as the primary actors, not states, and argue that these institutions are the drivers for EU defence cooperation. These institutions are pushing for more cooperation through themselves because they are in '[…] a constant struggle for power and influence'.[24] Constructivists on the other hand argue that shared experiences and lessons learned created shared norms and ideas that drive further cooperation.[25] Another argument is given by neofunctionalists, who claim that, because of policy spillover, the EU was bound to integrate further, which will eventually lead to supranational defence cooperation. A different argument is made by intergovernmentalists that argue that there is defence cooperation purely because it is in the interest of Europe's most powerful states. Liberal intergovernmentalism ads a note to this, claiming that the EU's integration is indeed dependent on the preferences of the most powerful states, but that those preferences are based on domestic factors and interests. Last of all, where liberal intergovernmentalists argue that domestic factors have less impact on a state's security policy preferences then on economic policy preferences, according to neoclassical realists, domestic factors do have an important impact.[26]

---

[19] Louis Simón, 'Neorealism, Security Cooperation, and Europe's Relative Gains Dilemma', *Security Studies* 26, no. 2 (2017): 185-192.
[20] Talman, 'European Union', 15.
[21] Simón, 'Neorealism', 186.
[22] Idem, 191.
[23] Barry Posen, 'European Union Security and Defense Policy: Response to Unipolarity?', *Security Studies* 15, no. 2 (2016): 149.
[24] Simón, 'Neorealism', 189-190.
[25] Talman, 'European Union', 16.
[26] Simón, 'Neorealism', 190-192.

2.2 Events and developments

Articles that consider the MPCC explain its creation through recent events and developments.[27] One event is mentioned in all these articles, which is the Brexit.[28] It is argued that some countries, notably the 'big 5' (France, Germany, Italy, Poland and Spain), have been pressing for structured cooperation since at least 2011.[29] The United Kingdom (UK) has always opposed this, but the decision to leave the EU has deleted this obstacle to further developments in the area of defence cooperation.[30] The rest of the events and developments are mentioned only once or twice by different authors. For example, Thierry Tardy points at the November 2016 Council invitation to High Representative (HR) Federica Mogherini to devise plans for establishing 'a permanent operational planning and conduct capability at the strategic level for non-executive military operations' as an event that drove further cooperation.[31]

The US has also been mentioned in relation to the creation of the MPCC, albeit in two ways. First, Aleksander Chavleski links it with demands that NATO's members need to meet the norm of spending at least 2% of their national GDP on defence spending.[32] Second, Nicole Koenig and Marie Walter-Franke link the creation of the MPCC with the election of Donald Trump. They paint the picture that this has 'led many in Europe to question the transatlantic partnership', and that the perceived importance of Europe's own defence structures has grown.[33] Koenig and Walter-Franke furthermore mention a thorough destabilisation of the EU's geopolitical environment, EU citizens that expect the EU to do more, clauses in the Treaty of Lisbon that make it possible to do more, and Macron's very pro-European and pro-German stance that creates opportunities for further EU defence cooperation. They are, however, the only ones mentioning these explanations for the creation of the MPCC.

Other scholars have mentioned different events and developments, that do not contradict what's been said above, but rather demonstrates the complexity of the creation of the MPCC. According to D. G. M. Duijn, what made the creation of the MPCC possible was

[27] These events and developments have previously been summarised in the thesis proposal written for this thesis. The first three paragraphs are therefore fairly identical since it forms the literature review in the proposal: Thijs de Jong, 'Thesis proposal – Thijs de Jong' (Master's thesis research proposal, Leiden University, December 12, 2020).
[28] Chavleski, 'The Military Planning', 11; Bodescu, 'EU Military Planning', 11; Koenig and Walter-Franke, 'France and Germany', 3; Tardy, 'MPCC', 3; Mills, 'European Defence', 5.
[29] Chavleski, 'The Military Planning', 11.
[30] See, for example, Bodescu, 'EU Military Planning', 16.
[31] Citation copied from Tardy, 'MPCC', 1.
[32] Chavleski, 'The Military Planning', 17.
[33] Koenig and Walter-Franke, 'France and Germany', 3.

the establishment of the European Union Global Strategy (EUGS) in 2016. He believes that this made it possible to establish new initiatives in the field of defence cooperation, for example the MPCC.[34] Duijn however doesn't explain why the rotation happened, that made the establishment of the EUGS possible. This could be in relation to Brexit, and this is actually exactly what Reykers implies. He paints the picture that the EUGS was adopted after the Brexit vote because the British heavily opposed it before the result of the referendum.[35] Frank Everaert explains the creation of the MPCC through the EUGS by going a bit further back in time. According to him, there has been an attitude change among member states since in 2013 the European Council endorsed that 'defence matters'.[36] He correlates this with a changing geopolitical context and security situation, for example terrorism, migration, the creation of what he calls an arc of instability, and sobering relations within NATO. Everaerts explains that this created public support and political momentum for further European defence cooperation. This resulted in the EUGS, and he agrees with Duijn that the EUGS made it possible to establish the MPCC.

Based on the aforementioned, it might indeed be possible that the Brexit has provided a window of opportunity for other member states to push for further cooperation and establish the MPCC. This fits the realist theory in which states are the primary actors: it is possible that the UK didn't see it as beneficial to their own interests to cooperate and enhance the EU's planning capabilities. On the other hand, the willingness to cooperate among the other member states can be explained through the neorealist and structural realist theories. Those member states, such as the big 5, might have cooperated because of Europe's perceived relative decline and because they wanted to balance the power of the US. The EU's geopolitical environment has been destabilised, among others because of the election of Trump, and terrorism and migration issues. However, member states aren't the only drivers behind the MPCC's creation. The liberal theory points us to the actions of collective institutions. and the actions of the European Council and the HR have definitely played a part in the establishment of the MPCC. Could Reykers be right then?

Building on the combination of these theories and explanations through events and developments, this thesis posits the hypothesis that Brexit provided the window of

[34] D.G.M. Duijn, 'De Aarzelende Stapjes Naar Militaire Zelfstandigheid', *Nederlandse Officieren Vereniging*, November 13, 2019, https://www.nederlandseofficierenvereniging.nl/post/de-aarzelende-stapjes-naar-militaire-zelfstandigheid-een-eu-militair-operationeel-hoofdkwartier-ohq.
[35] Reykers, 'A Permanent Headquarters', 785.
[36] Everaert, 'Een eerste stap', 79. For the European Council defence matters credo: European Council, 'European Council Conclusions (19/20 December 2013)', Brussels (2013): art. I.1.

opportunity for certain member states and EU institutions to push for further cooperation and establish the MPCC. This hypothesis provides a solution to the question why it was established now, but it isn't a decisive answer. The UK has cooperated on defence many times before the creation of the MPCC. It was a part of the WU, WEU and the EU and each of the MPCC's predecessors have been established with the approval of the UK. Furthermore, the geopolitical environment has been unsatisfactory before. Terrorism has been on the foreground since 2001 and relations with the US have been strained before, for example over the Iraq intervention in 2003. So even if the explanation above is correct, we still do not completely understand why the UK accepted other defence organisations but not the MPCC, whether there were windows of opportunity before and if so, why they didn't result in the MPCC. That is why we use the historical approach, so we can thoroughly understand how and why the MPCC was created, and why now. This historical analysis starts in the next chapter.

3. Ensuring national security

The analysis starts with the first attempts at European defence cooperation after WWII. We analyse how and why these predecessors were established in order to determine whether there are crucial factors that explain their emergence. In the end this historical approach allows us to understand the MPCC's creation more thoroughly because we can discover whether or not these crucial factors are similar to or different from the establishment of the MPCC and its other predecessors, and how the continuing presence, or lack of these crucial factors influenced the MPCC's creation. We begin this chapter by analysing how and why the Western Union's (WU) OHQ was established. We then briefly address the European Defence Community (EDC) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) before we move on to the Western European Union's (WEU) OHQ. Finally, we compare the analysed OHQs to each other to find out whether there were crucial factors to their creation and whether they were similar or different from each other.

3.1 Western Union

The development of European defence cooperation started in March 1947 when France and the UK signed the Dunkirk Treaty, establishing an alliance and mutual assistance pact between them. According to the Treaty, this was done to protect each other against any possible renewed aggression from Germany.[37] The treaty is interpreted as the UK's first step towards the Brussels Treaty, which was signed one year later by the UK, France and the Benelux countries.[38] This treaty led to the creation of the WU, also known as the Brussels Treaty Organisation, which was created for three reasons. The first was to establish a safety net in case the Germans would once again become a danger to the rest of the European states.[39] The second was cooperation on economic, cultural, social and defence issues, to make these West-European states better able to withstand the growing threat of the Soviet Union (SU), which wanted to exert control over central European states. The third reason was binding American and Canadian support to the recovering continent. The US was only willing

[37] 'Treat of Alliance and Mutual Assistance', 3.
[38] Bert Zeeman, 'Britain and the Cold War: An Alternative Approach. The Treaty of Dunkirk Example', *European History Quarterly* 16 (1986): 349.
[39] Gerhard Bebr, 'The European Defence Community and the Western European Union: An Agonizing Dilemma', *Stanford Law Review* 7, no. 2 (1955): 170.

to support Europe's defence if it got European economic integration and military cooperation from which it could benefit in return.[40]

The WU and its defence section, the Western Union Defence Organisation (WUDO), encompassed significantly more than an OHQ. The part of WUDO that's of importance to us, is its OHQ: the Commanders-in-Chief Committee. This Committee '[…] was charged with the preparation of detailed operational plans for common action in the event of war'.[41] This matches the operational planning responsibilities of the MPCC as the OHQ. The WU created the WUDO and its Committee a month after its own inception in order to carry out the treaty's defence provisions. The WU's OHQ was thus created for the same reasons as the WU itself. In other words, the WU's OHQ was created because European states felt dependent on each other and on their Atlantic allies for their national defence because they felt threatened. Germany was still seen as a threat and so was the SU. The Western-European states were ravaged after WWII and thus incapable to defend themselves if for example the Russians would attack. Defence cooperation through WUDO and its Commanders-in-Chief Committee were thus a safeguard concerning the perceived interdependence for national defence.

3.2 NATO and the EDC

Taking a brief but necessary sidestep from our analysis of the OHQ-predecessors, we turn to the EDC and NATO. They fall outside of our selection of predecessors because they aren't established European defence organisations. However, NATO is a returning factor throughout the thesis because its presence has been significant in the development of European defence cooperation. It has been an important element that has affected the way member states think about European defence organisations and whether they are needed at all, which is why it will be shortly discussed here. In order to summarise the establishment of NATO, we begin at the end of the WU. One of the primary reasons that the Brussels Treaty was signed was to draw the US into a European alliance. The WU was seen as a first step towards a close bond with the US through which could be cooperated on Western Europe's defence.[42] Eventually NATO was created in 1949, to include America into Europe's collective defence arrangements and to

[40] CVCE, 'The origins of WEU: Western Union', University of Luxembourg , https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/d5906df5-4f83-4603-85f7-0cabc24b9fe1/051bd03c-4887-4f53-82eb-0f12e59f8dbd. (Accessed April 11, 2020).
[41] Memorandum, 'Office of the Historian'.
[42] Irwin M. Wall, *The United States and the Making of Postwar France, 1945-1954* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991), 132-133.

safeguard the peace and security in Europe.[43] After NATO's creation, WUDO's chairman Field Marshal Montgomery urged that WUDO should be incorporated into NATO, so as to avoid overlapping effort.[44] This intention of avoiding overlapping effort has made its mark on European defence organisations up until today, as the rest of the predecessors will demonstrate.

In December 1950, the WU Consultative Council agreed that the 'continued existence of the Western Union Defence Organisation in its present form […] no longer [is] necessary' which led to the merger of WUDO into NATO.[45] Western-Europe was left with the American dominated defence organisation that the British and French wanted.[46] Rising Cold War tensions in the meantime led to pressure from the US in 1950 to rearm West-Germany. The perceived interdependence for national defence was thus once again driving defence cooperation. West-Germany however would only become a member of NATO and develop its army if it would become a full member that had equal participation rights. The French government on the other hand wanted to forestall this development and if possible even prevent the establishment of a West-German independent military.[47]

France's Prime Minister René Pleven therefore argued that West-Germany should be rearmed within a European structure. He submitted a plan made by Jean Monnet to his European partners, which became known as the Pleven Plan. This plan laid down the creation of the EDC, originally with a European army and Minister of Defence and with its own budget, but ultimately under the control of NATO. This would allow the safe and controlled establishment of a German army enclosed within the EDC and, indirectly, NATO.[48] During the following years, the plan transformed profoundly for a number of times, even after it was signed by the foreign ministers of the Benelux countries, Italy, West-Germany and France in 1952.[49] The UK wasn't a part of the EDC mainly because it desired to preserve a unique bilateral relationship with the US and it was afraid that joining the EDC could damage this.[50]

[43] North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, 'The North Atlantic Treaty (1949)', Washington D.C. (1949).
[44] Duke, *The Elusive Quest*, 13-14.
[45] United Kingdom Parliament, 'Brussels Treaty Organisation (Resolution)', London (1957).
[46] Irwin M. Wall, 'France in the Cold War', *Journal of European Studies* 38, no. 2 (2008): 123.
[47] Bebr, 'The European Defence Community', 169.
[48] Brian Shaev, 'Estrangement and Reconciliation: French Socialists, German Social Democrats and the Origins of European Integration, 1948-1957' (PHD, University of Pittsburgh, April 3, 2014): 140.
[49] Shaev, 'Estrangement and Reconciliation', 140.
[50] Iris Glockner and Berthold Rittberger, 'The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and European Defence Community (EDC) Treaties', in Finn Laursen (red.), *Designing the European Union. From Paris to Lisbon* (Basingstoke, Pallgrave Macmillan, 2012), 45; Allan Hovey Jr., 'Britain and the Unification of Europe', *International Organization* 9, no. 3 (1955): 328; Duke, *The Elusive Quest*, 19.

The signatures of the six countries' foreign ministers weren't enough to implement the plan, it also needed the ratification of the national parliaments. This is where it went awry, as the French Parliament, which needed to ratify the EDC Treaty, rejected it on 30 August, 1954.[51] The opposing politicians rejected the Treaty for a number of reasons. Rearming West-Germany so shortly after WWII went too far and came too quickly for some. Furthermore, France was suffering military defeats in Indo-China and handing over battalions to a European army would further hamper its military capabilities there. Moreover, Stalin's death and the end of the Korean War in 1953 heralded in a period of détente for the French, which made the EDC appear less urgent.[52] And, last but not least, opposing politicians believed the EDC to be too federal and supranational, even though it was already less supranational than originally intended.[53]

3.3 The Western European Union

The aforementioned rising tensions of the Cold War led to the wish among NATO members to rearm West-Germany, so that it could help in the defence of Western Europe in case of Soviet military aggression.[54] The EDC was no longer an option for the rearmament and the French were still against rearming West-Germany through NATO, which is why a new option was needed.[55] This came in the form of the WEU, the second European defence organisation that was established. It was created to build a more integrated Europe and to bind West-Germany to the West, while diverting it from the SU.[56] Moreover, a major component of West-Europe's defence was West-Germany. The WEU was another attempt at building-up its army within a European structure, so that it could help in the case of Soviet military aggression.[57]

The WEU was established by modifying the Brussels Treaty, by which the WU had been founded in 1948. What remained of the WU was transformed into the WEU in 1954, and joining the original 5 signees were West-Germany and Italy. Since the EDC had failed in part because it was perceived to be too supranational, the WEU was created more along traditional

[51] CVCE, 'The refusal to ratify the EDC Treaty', University of Luxembourg, https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/803b2430-7d1c-4e7b-9101-47415702fc8e/c23dd653-ba51-4f7e-9bf1-2c33b347d339 (Accessed on April 9, 2020).
[52] CVCE, 'The refusal to ratify'.
[53] Duke, *The Elusive Quest*, 28 and 36.
[54] Bebr, The European Defence Community, 171.
[55] Seth G. Jones, 'The European Union and the Security Dilemma', *Security Studies* 12, no. 3 (2003): 126.
[56] CVCE, Introduction.
[57] Bebr, The European Defence Community, 171 and 186.

lines of intergovernmental cooperation.[58] Like the WU, it gained powers on social, economic, cultural and defence issues. At the same time, overlap with other organisations, such as NATO and the by now created European Coal and Steel Community, was carefully avoided, a principle that had already been stressed by Montgomery 6 years earlier.[59]

As with WUDO, the WEU was more than just an OHQ. At the WEU's creation, the only thing that could provide it with an OHQ was NATO, as the WEU would rely '[…] on the appropriate military authorities of NATO'.[60] This meant that any force created under the WEU would keep national armies intact, while being under control of NATO's Supreme Commander.[61] NATO overshadowed the WEU and was thus the main focus as regards to European defence. The WEU was therefore of minimum importance from the outset, and its importance was especially at a low during the 50s and 60s.[62] Furthermore, in trying to prevent a duplication of effort, many of the WEU's tasks were transferred to other, sometimes newer, institutions, such as the European Political Cooperation, which later on became the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP).[63]

For some, such as the Dutch and English foreign ministers, respectively Joseph Luns and Anthony Eden, American dominance of NATO wasn't an issue of importance.[64] For others however, it was an issue, as was voiced for example by West-Germany's Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in 1956 and by French General Charles de Gaulle in 1958.[65] Those against American domination felt the need for some kind of European defence framework, in order to attain the WEU's goal of building a more integrated Europe.[66] It took until the 70s before the WEU's members began thinking about reawakening the organisation, and until the mid-80s before any actual reforms were put in place, such as a revived Ministerial Council and reaffirmed commitment to the WEU by its member states.[67] In the end, it wasn't until October 1992 before the WEU established its own OHQ in the form of the Planning Cell.[68] This

[58] Bebr, The European Defence Community, 170.
[59] CVCE, 'Introduction', University of Luxembourg, https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/d5906df5-4f83-4603-85f7-0cabc24b9fe1/50269d99-87d4-4634-8780-c5558c585488 (Accessed on April 10, 2020).
[60] Western European Union (hereafter WEU), 'Protocol modifying and completing the Brussels Treaty', Paris (1954): art. 4.
[61] Bebr, The European Defence Community, 181.
[62] Duke, *The Elusive Quest*, 55-56.
[63] Idem, 72-73 and 112.
[64] William D. E. Mallinson, Dutch Foreign Policy, 1948-1954: From Neutrality to Commitment' (PHD, London School of Economics and Political Science, 1990): 283-284.
[65] Duke, *The Elusive Quest*, 43-44.
[66] Idem, 43; Wall, 'France in the Cold War', 129.
[67] Idem, 72-75.
[68] Idem, 111.

permanent OHQ had as its tasks 'the preparation of contingency plans for the deployment of forces under the aegis of WEU; the preparation of recommendations on the necessary arrangement for command, operations and communications […]'.[69] Thus, where the MPCC is an OHQ that handles both the planning and the conduct of missions, the WEU's Planning Cell only handles the planning part. The conduct part was handled by HQs that each member state had to make available to the WEU.[70]

So why was the Planning Cell created while the WEU could rely on NATO when it needed an OHQ? On the one hand, the Planning Cell was created because the WEU became more active around 1990, for example by joining a number of operations in the Balkans. In order to contribute to these operations, it needed stronger operational capabilities, and the Planning Cell was established to deliver this.[71] On the other hand, a battle for geopolitical-influence and direction took place behind the scenes. On the one side were the Atlanticists, such as the UK. They wanted the Planning Cell in order to make the WEU more capable so that the WEU could provide NATO with a stronger European pillar. On the other side were the Europeanists, such as France, that were focussed on Europe and the European Union which was established with the signing of the Treaty on European Union in February 1992. The Europeanists wanted to grow the WEU into the EU's defence arm.[72]

Here we find a crucial difference between the British who focussed on the Atlantic, and the French who changed into advocates of a more independent European approach that wasn't dominated by the US during the mid-1950s. This change stems from the overriding US pressure on the Suez canal operation, which angered Mollet and Adenauer, and led to a subsequent rapprochement towards France by Adenauer.[73] This is a crucial divide between Atlanticists and Europeanists which has had an impact on European defence cooperation ever since, as the rest of the predecessors will demonstrate. To come to a conclusion, the prime reason for the creation of the WEU had been the national defence of its member states. In contrast, the Planning Cell was created because member states wanted to improve the WEU's defence capabilities. That the development of improving the defence capabilities resulted

[69] Arie Bloed and Ramses A. Wessel (red.), *The Changing Functions of the Western European Union (WEU): Introduction and basic documents* (Dordrecht, Nijhoff, 1994), XXII.
[70] Bloed and Wessel, *The Changing Functions*, 142.
[71] CVCE, 'The development of WEU', University of Luxembourg, https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/d5906df5-4f83-4603-85f7-0cabc24b9fe1/dfe9eac4-4fe8-4ae1-af1e-3060f8031126 (Accessed on April 11, 2020); WEU Council of Ministers, 'Petersberg Declaration', Bonn (1992): art. II, pt. 9.
[72] Duke, *The Elusive Quest*, 109.
[73] Idem, 43; Wall, 'France in the Cold War', 129.

specifically in the form of the Planning Cell, stems from the debate between the Atlanticists and the Europeanists.

3.4 Comparison

In the previous paragraphs we discovered that the WUDO's Committee was Europe's first permanent OHQ. Later on NATO provided the WEU with an OHQ if it needed one. In 1992 the WEU created its own planning capability in the form of the Planning Cell, while in the meantime relying on national OHQs for the conduct of operations. These OHQs were created and made available primarily because of the perceived interdependence for the national defence of the European member states. The idea that these states needed each other, and if possible also the US, encouraged their cooperation on defence issues and led to the establishment of these OHQs. This development matches the neorealist view that states cooperate because of Europe's relative decline, which was, at least right after WWII, clearly visible. Furthermore, throughout the decades the UK and France appear to be the primary drivers behind European defence cooperation, which corresponds with the intergovernmentalist view that defence cooperation in Europe is driven by the most powerful states. That West-Germany is not present amongst the UK and France as most powerful countries driving European defence integration can be explained by the fact that it only regained its sovereignty in 1954.[74] Afterwards, its foreign policy was marked by an active *Ostpolitik*, a policy of détente with the countries from the Soviet bloc, that lasted throughout the Cold War .[75] This prevented them from actively pursuing deeper defence cooperation with Western European states, as it could antagonise the Soviet bloc countries.

Three factors complicated the development of European defence capabilities during these roughly first four decades. The first factor is the divide between supranationalism and intergovernmentalism. Not all countries have been willing to cede the important sovereign tasks of security and defence, and the control over armies, to international organisations. This is one of the reasons why the EDC was rejected and why the WUDO and WEU didn't get enough capabilities and power to truly be of significance. The second factor is the conflict between an Atlantic focussed defence organisation, and a European focussed defence

[74] Thomas Banchoff, *The German Problem Transformed. Institutions, Politics, and Foreign Policy, 1945-1995* (Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 2002), 23.
[75] Banchoff, *The German Problem*, 23 and 131; The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 'Ostpolitik. West German Foreign Policy', Encyclopaedia Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/event/Ostpolitik (accessed on June 18, 2020).

organisation, that came up after the mid 1950's. The first had the support of the UK and America, but suffered from American dominance. The second had the support from countries such as France but was widely seen as being too weak to provide for Europe's defence, as it lacked American support. The third complicating factor for Europe's old OHQs was that there was a strong will to prevent the duplication of efforts. Thus, WUDO became a part of NATO and the WEU was long not allowed to have an OHQ of its own. The last two factors have continuously played a part in the in the EU's development of its defence organisations as the next two chapters demonstrate. We now turn to chapter four, in which the second set of predecessors is analysed.

4. A sovereign and significant international role

This chapter analyses how and why the EU OPCEN and the CPCC were created, and how and why national and NATO's OHQs were made available to the EU, to discover the crucial factors enabling their creation or availability. Afterwards, we compare these crucial factors with each other and with those belonging to the preceding established European OHQs. This is similar to the previous chapter and it allows us to understand the MPCC's creation more thoroughly because we can discover whether or not there are crucial factors that explain these forms of defence cooperation, and how the continuing presence or lack of these crucial factors influenced the MPCC's creation. Before we do so however, we'll explain how and why the WEU ceased to exist.

After 1992, where we left of in the previous chapter, the EU continued to develop its defence capabilities and defence organisations. It established, among others, the CFSP in 1991, and the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in 1999.[76] A new Labour government in the UK, the introduction of the Euro, the debate about NATO's future and an economic imperative to amalgamate European defence industries led to a growing conviction among member states that the EU should be able to act independently. This resulted in the creation of institutions such as the Military Committee that were tasked with implementing the ESDP.[77] This conviction furthermore led to enhanced cooperation between the WEU and the EU, which in turn led to the incorporating of the first into the latter.[78] Eventually, the WEU's mutual defence clause was surpassed by the clause in the Lisbon Treaty in 2007. By that time the EU had taken over the WEU's tasks, which made the WEU redundant. It was therefore decided in 2010 that the WEU would be terminated, which was completed in the beginning of 2011.[79] By this time, new institutions and possibilities were created to improve the EU's defence capabilities. We now turn to the OHQ's that the EU had made available for itself during these two decades. These are analysed in chronological order, before we turn to the MPCC's creation in the next chapter.

---

[76] General Secretariat of the Council, 'Timeline: EU cooperation on security and defence', European Council, https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/defence-security/defence-security-timeline/ (Accessed on April 15, 2020).

[77] Maartje Rutten, 'From St-Malo to Nice. European defence: core documents', (Paris, EUISS, 2001): 8-9; Benjamin Pohl, *"But We Have To Do Something": the drivers behind EU crisis management* (Leiden, Leiden University, 2012): 46; Margarita Mathiopoulos and István Gyarmati, 'Saint Malo and beyond: Toward European defense', *Washington Quarterly* 22, no. 4 (1999): 66-68.

[78] Western European Union, 'WEU today', (Brochure, WEU Secretariat-General, Brussels, January, 2000): 21.

[79] WEU, 'Statement of the Presidency of the Permanent Council of the WEU on behalf of the High Contracting Parties', Brussels (2010); WEU, 'Decision of the Council of the Western European Union of the residual rights and obligations of the WEU', Brussels (2011).

4.1 National and NATO's OHQs

During the 90s and the 2000s, besides the incorporation of the WEU, the EU made important steps in developing its defence capabilities. These steps included the possibility to use national and NATO's OHQs. The first option had been made possible with the WEU's Petersberg Declaration in 1992. The declaration stated that 'All WEU member States will soon designate which of their military […] headquarters they would be willing to make available […]'.[80] It furthermore articulated the kinds of missions the WEU was prepared to set-up. These included missions such as peacekeeping and conflict-prevention, and were called the Petersberg tasks.[81]

The next important event in the development of EU defence cooperation came as the Saint-Malo declaration of 1998. France and the UK met in Saint-Malo because they were disappointed about the EU's inability to conduct air combat during the Kosovo War that erupted in 1998, and that instead they had to rely on the US to end the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.[82] Furthermore, according to Daniel Keohane, they learned that the EU needed to be able to use NATO's assets and that the EU's and NATO's capability plans needed to be compatible.[83] France and the UK therefore declared that the EU needed to be able to act independently, '[…] backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises'.[84] This crucial moment signifies a rare agreement between the French and British on the evolvement of the EU's defence component since the creation of NATO, and it was later adopted by all the member states during the June 1999 European Council meeting in Cologne. The member states furthermore agreed that the EU's defence capabilities needed to develop further. They concluded that in order to do so, '[…] institutional arrangements for the analysis, planning and conduct of military operations […]' needed to be created. This led to the signing of the Berlin Plus agreement at the end of 2002, which made NATO's OHQs available for EU missions.[85]

---

[80] WEU Council of Ministers, 'Petersberg Declaration', Bonn (1992): art. II, pt. 7.
[81] WEU Council of Ministers, 'Petersberg Declaration', art. I.2.
[82] Ginsberg and Penksa, *The European Union*, 20-21.
[83] Daniel Keohane, 'ESDP and NATO', in Giovanni Grevi, Damien Helly and Daniel Keohane (red.), *European Security and Defence Policy. The First 10 Years (1999-2009)* (Paris, European Union Institute For Security Studies, 2009), 127-128.
[84] Rutten, 'From St-Malo to Nice, 8.
[85] Strategic Communications, 'Shaping of a Common Security and Defence Policy', EEAS, https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp/5388/shaping-of-a-common-security-and-defence-policy-_en (Accessed on 17 April, 2020).

The Saint-Malo declaration and subsequent Cologne Council meeting were crucial events in the development of the EU's defence capabilities. As Ginsberg and Penksa formulate it, '[…] the historic meeting at St. Malo [was] a meeting that changed the course of EU foreign policy'.[86] A vital consensus between Atlanticists and Europeanists was established which was the result of a shared feeling that a common defence policy was needed if the EU wanted to play an important role on the world stage.[87] Furthermore, according to Gerrard Quille, it was now accepted '[…] that no European state could act alone in meeting the new global security challenges […] and that no major European power was facing a standing military threat'.[88] The EU member states thus felt the need to take action if they wanted to safeguard their international role.

This signifies a crucial shift in the feeling of interdependence between EU member states. Present since the end of WWII, the feeling of interdependence had been focussed on national defence because European states felt threatened by the Soviet bloc. This changed around the 1990s because the Cold War came to an end, causing European countries to feel less threatened which made national defence less of a priority. Around the same time, the Yugoslavia Wars proved that the EU's economic and diplomatic foreign policy instruments were not enough if the EU wanted to achieve results and that military capabilities therefore needed to be developed.[89] Furthermore, as the next paragraph will demonstrate in more detail, the US was seen as becoming a less reliable partner, which is why EU member states wanted to increase their autonomy from the US in case it disengaged with Europe. This all caused the focus of the perceived interdependence to shift during the 90s, from national defence, towards playing a significant and sovereign role on the global stage. The Saint-Malo declaration and the subsequent adoption at the Cologne Council signified this important change, and the opinions formed there lie at the base of the development of all the organisations analysed in this chapter.

[86] Ginsberg and Penksa, *The European Union*, 21.
[87] CVCE, 'Joint Declaration on European Defence', University of Luxembourg, https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2008/3/31/f3cd16fb-fc37-4d52-936f-c8e9bc80f24f/publishable_en.pdf (Accessed on April 15, 2020); Möttölä, 'Drivers of defence integration', 3.
[88] Gerrard Quille, 'The European Security and Defence Policy: from the Helsinki Headline Goal to the EU Battlegroups', (Note, European Parliament, Brussel, September 12, 2006): 5.
[89] Ginsberg and Penksa, *The European Union*, 18-19.

4.2 European Union Operations Centre

After the declaration of Saint-Malo and the Cologne European Council, the next important step came with the Helsinki European Council at the end of 1999. Here the decision was taken that, in order for the EU to carry out its Petersberg tasks, it would need to develop its ESDP decision-making structures.[90] This led to the creation of the EU Military Staff (EUMS), which was established in 2001 to, in a nutshell, '[…] provide military expertise and support ESDP'.[91] Two years later, in 2003, the emphasis had shifted from decision-making capabilities to operational capabilities. France, Belgium, Germany and Luxembourg came together and proposed the establishment of an EU OHQ in Tervuren. This would provide the EU with an OHQ of its own, which meant that it would no longer have to resort to using national or NATO's OHQs. Keep in mind that, at the time, the European Convention was in its final phase, and that these countries had just been the fiercest EU opponents against the US intervention in Iraq.[92] They seized the moment to use the EU's built up momentum concerning prospective reforms and ensure that the EU wasn't dependent on NATO's OHQs when relations were stressed.

Other member states, such as the UK and the Netherlands, opposed this because they were afraid it would lead to a duplication of effort from national and NATO assets. Furthermore, they feared that it would weaken the transatlantic link. According to Keohane, 'the US and those EU governments which supported the Iraq war […] saw it as a direct attempt to undermine NATO'.[93] In 2003, the prevention of a duplication of effort and the Atlantic versus Europe divide was thus once again present, as it had been with WUDO and the WEU's Planning Cell. Eventually, at the end of that year, the conflict was resolved through a proposal by France, the UK and Germany. According to Ginsberg and Penksa, this proposal '[…] was a compromise solution between the UK, which rejected a military OHQ, and France, which favoured a military OHQ for CSDP operations'.[94] The three countries proposed, only after reaffirming that NATO was the primary choice when Europe was in need of operational capabilities, that as a compromise liaison cells would be set up in the EUMS and SHAPE, NATO's European HQ.[95] Furthermore, a Civil-Military Cell was established

[90] Quille, 'The European Security', 9.
[91] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', in Grevi et. al. (red.), *European Security*, 40.
[92] Antonio Missiroli, 'From Copenhagen to Brussels. European Defence: core documents Volume IV' (Paris, EUISS, 2003): 76-80.
[93] Keohane, 'ESDP and NATO', in Grevi et. al. (red.), *European Security*, 130.
[94] Ginsberg and Penksa, *The European Union*, 77.
[95] Missiroli, 'From Copenhagen to Brussels', 322-323.

within the EUMS. This Cell would supply the core of the EU Operations Centre (EU OPCEN), an EU ad hoc OHQ. The strength of this EU OPCEN was that it could be used to direct joint civilian-military operations.[96] It took four years before the EU was capable of activating the EU OPCEN, but this did provide the EU with its own OHQ when necessary, although only when the national or NATO's OHQs were unavailable.[97]

Since WWII, Europe had been pre-occupied with its own defence. The steps in the development of its defence capabilities were taken in light of the understanding that the European states were dependent on each other (and the US) for their own safety. As explained above, the Saint-Malo declaration was a turning point where the perceived interdependence changed to being able to play an important role on the world stage. The Cologne and Helsinki Council meetings and the 2003 Tervuren declaration were subsequent confirmations of this new focus in the perceived interdependence. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the analysis of the EU OPCEN furthermore shows us that some EU member states wanted the EU to have its own OHQ when relations with the US were stressed, for example because of the US Iraq intervention. This corresponds to conclusions from neorealists, as summarised by Haroche, that the US' commitment to the EU has become less reliable and predictable since the Cold War. Moreover, EU member states started to cooperate more with each other to increase their autonomy from the US if it disengaged with Europe. This increased cooperation is seen as an attempt to balance the US' power by increasing the EU's sway over American policy. It is furthermore seen by some as a form of bandwagoning as it tries to keep the US close, which corresponds with the creation of the liaison cells.[98]

4.3 Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability

The abovementioned new focus in interdependence remained at the foreground during the next few years. The EDA was created in 2004 and reiterated this feeling in 2008 for example.[99] The next big step concerning the EU's OHQs came in August 2008 when the CPCC was created as a part of the Council's General Secretariat. With the establishment of the European External Action Service (EEAS) in 2010, the CPCC was transferred from the

[96] Ginsberg and Penksa, *The European Union*, 24.
[97] Giovanni Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', in Grevi et. al. (red.), *European Security*, 41.
[98] Pierre Haroche, 'Interdependence, asymmetric crises, and European defence cooperation', *European Security* 26, no. 2 (2017): 228.
[99] EDA, 'Future Trends', 23.

Secretariat to this new service.[100] The CPCC is tasked with the operational planning, support, and command and control of the EU's civilian missions.[101] Besides these tasks, it is also concerned with '[…] matters such as input to the civilian capabilities development process, training issues, civilian crisis management exercises and the collection and analysis of lessons identified […]'.[102] In short, the CPCC is the EU's OHQ for all its missions that do not contain an executive (military) element.[103]

In order to find out why it was created, we return to 1992. As we've seen above, it was then that the Petersberg Declaration laid out the WEU's ambitions concerning defence and security missions. By 1999, the member states agreed that the EU was in need of better planning and conduct capabilities to carry out these missions. This led to the 2002 Berlin Plus agreement, and by then there were even some member states that were already convinced that the EU needed its own planning and conduct capabilities. [104] By 2005, member states and EU officials had learned, through an internal review, that the planning and management of ESDP missions needed to be improved. This led to a proposal by HR Javier Solana, first mentioned at a 2005 informal meeting between heads of state and government in Hampton Court, and then altered at the European Council Summit in 2006, that the ESDP's decision making structure needed to be improved. This became known as the Hampton Court initiative, which led to the establishment of the CPCC, the EU's OHQ for civilian missions.[105] It was not yet the all-encompassing '[…] nucleus collective capability for planning and conducting operations for the European Union' as proposed in the 2003 Tervuren declaration, but it was the EU's first permanent OHQ for civilian missions.[106]

The explanation for why the CPCC was created is answered by scholars in a superficial manner. According to them, it was created to solve shortcomings in the EU's ability to plan, support and conduct its civilian missions. This was demanded because there was a growing number of those missions that were carried out under the ESDP.[107] However,

[100] Council of the European Union, 'Council decision of 26 July 2010 establishing the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service', Brussels (2010): art. 4, pt. 3a.
[101] Giovanni Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', in Grevi et. al. (red.), *European Security*, 39 and 44.
[102] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', in Grevi et. al. (red.), *European Security*, 45-46.
[103] CPCC Secretariat, 'The Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC)', EEAS, https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en/5438/The%20Civilian%20Planning%20and%20Conduct%20Capability%20(CPCC) (Accessed on 15 April, 2020).
[104] Missiroli, 'From Copenhagen to Brussels', 79.
[105] Ginsberg and Penksa, *The European Union*, 78.
[106] Missiroli, 'From Copenhagen to Brussels', 79.
[107] Grevi, 'ESDP institutions', in Grevi et. al. (red.), *European Security*, 45; Ginsberg and Penksa, *The European Union*, 78.

this explanation ignores the deeper lying cause of why the member states wanted to be able to conduct missions under the competence of the EU in the first place. The real reason explaining the creation of the CPCC can be found in the predecessors discussed above. The historical analysis of these predecessors has shown that EU member states believed that if they wanted to play a significant role on the world stage, it needed better defence capabilities. Moreover, this would allow them to play a more independent role from America, which was no longer seen as a reliable ally.

4.4 Comparison

Comparing the old OHQs with the new EU OHQs shows both an important similarity and difference between them. The major similarity is that the OHQs were created or made available because of the perceived interdependence between European states. This crucial factor is present since the end of WWII. The major difference is what the perceived interdependence focussed on. The key argument here is that the old OHQs were created because of the perceived interdependence for national defence, while the new EU OHQs were created because of the perceived interdependence for playing a significant and sovereign role on the world stage.

Two divides that were present with the old cases were no longer or less present during the creation of these new cases. The supranationalism-intergovernmentalism clash that played an important role in the demise of the EDC no longer seemed to be of significance in the development of the EU's OHQs. Furthermore the divide among member states between Atlanticists and Europeanists became less important. It remained present during the development of the EU's defence capabilities, but from time to time this divide was reconciled, most notably at the Saint-Malo declaration, the Cologne Council meeting and the 2003 compromise between France, the UK and Germany.

5. The Military Planning and Conduct Capability

This chapter begins with analysing how and why the MPCC was created, before we compare it to its predecessors. There will be overlap with the developments explained in the last chapter, because those developments also led to the creation of the MPCC. However, this merely proves that an understanding of the history of the EU developing its OHQs is necessary if we want to understand the creation of the MPCC.

5.1 The long road towards the MPCC

The process of developing European OHQs began as early as 1948 with the Brussels Treaty. This evolved into NATO which had SHAPE as its European OHQ and, after long being dormant, the WEU developed in 1992 its own OHQ in the form of the Planning Cell. Then, in 1998, the Saint-Malo declaration put the EU on the road to establishing its own OHQs. This crucial moment is of significance because it was the first time since the Brussels Treaty that the French and the British agreed on what road EU defence cooperation should take. Up until then, the Atlanticists and the Europeanists had been divided about whether the EU should develop its own defence capabilities or whether it should rely on NATO. The impact of this agreement between the two camps is clearly visible in the difference between the slow development of the WEU versus the relatively fast developments in EU defence capabilities after the declaration. To summarise briefly, it signalled the start of increased cooperation between the WEU and the EU and the eventual integration of the former within the latter, the establishment of the EUMS in 2001, the signing of the Berlin Plus agreement in 2002, the Tervuren declaration and the establishment of the EU OPCEN in 2003, the creation of the EDA in 2004 and the creation of the CPCC in 2007.

From 2007 onwards, it took six years before the next important step was taken in the development of the EU's defence capabilities. This is understandable because between 2008 and 2013, the EU had a '[…] period of introversion […] because it had its hands full with the Economic-crisis and the Euro-crisis.[108] Nevertheless, already in 2009 an official from the UK's Ministry of Defence admitted that the EU needed a permanent OHQ for its military missions if the ESDP was to be effective. The plans were in the drawer for when the time was right, but at that point domestic political constraints still worked against it. The decades old opposition from Atlanticists such as the UK, Denmark and the Netherlands, once again

[108] Simon Duke, *Europe as a Stronger Global Actor. Challenges and Strategic Responses* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 72.

hampered the development of the EU's capabilities because they continued to fear that such a development would weaken the transatlantic alliance. Furthermore, an unnecessary duplication of NATO's efforts continued to be unpropitious in their minds.[109]

That same year the Treaty of Lisbon came into effect renaming the ESDP into the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). After that, it wasn't until 2013 before the European Council conducted a thematic debate about the EU's defence. In its conclusions the Council started with the two-word statement proclaiming that 'Defence matters.'[110] The Council concluded that if the EU and its Member States '[…] wanted to contribute to maintaining peace and security […]' then it would need to enhance '[…] the development of [its defence] capabilities […]'.[111] In 2014, a new Commission and HR were installed, which gave a fresh start to these defence ambitions. Furthermore, the annexation of Crimea and developments in the Syrian war convinced a number of member states that the EU should be able to follow a strategic approach in its external actions.[112] These recent events are important to keep in mind for the context. They are however insufficient to explain why member states wanted to cooperate on defence issues through the EU, instead of individually, bilaterally or through NATO. This is explained in the next paragraph, but first we return to the developments in these years.

The new HR, Federica Mogherini, set out to develop a new strategy for the EU's security and defence policies. This resulted in a proposal titled 'A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign And Security Policy', in short the European Union Global Strategy (EUGS), presented in June 2016. The EUGS proclaimed that the EU was in danger and should therefore be made stronger. One of the necessary actions to attain this goal was developing defence capabilities and encouraging cooperation.[113] The EUGS states that '[…] greater coherence in defence planning and capability development' was needed, as well as strengthening '[…] operational planning and conduct structures, and build[ing] closer connections between civilian and military structures and missions'.[114] Mogherini then presented the Implementation Plan on Security and Defence to the Council of the European Union during its meeting in November. This plan proposed that member states should explore

[109] Ginsberg and Penksa, *The European Union*, 76-77; Bernhard Stahl et. al., 'Understanding the Atlanticist-Europeanist Divide in the CFSP: Comparing Denmark, France, Germany and the Netherlands', *European Foreign Affairs Review* 9 (2004): 423.
[110] European Council, 'European Council Conclusions (19/20 December 2013)', art. I.1.
[111] The European Council, 'European Council Conclusions', art. I.2 and I.4.
[112] Duke, *Europe as a Stronger Global Actor*, 72.
[113] Frederica Mogherini, 'A global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign And Security Policy (hereafter EUGS)', Brussels (2016): 7 and 11.
[114] Mogherini, EUGS, 46 and 47-48.

structural defence cooperation between them, which resulted in the creation of PESCO in December 2017. It furthermore proposed a review of the planning and conduct capabilities of CSDP mission.[115] The Council welcomed these proposals and invited Mogherini to come up with proposals for '[…] a permanent operational planning and conduct capability […]'.[116] This invitation was also adopted by the European Council a month later.[117] On March 6, 2017, the name of the MPCC was formulated for the first time in published official documents. A Foreign Affairs Council meeting endorsed a concept note which contained the measure of establishing the Military Planning and Conduct Capability, and it set out the very basic tasks and organisational structure.[118] This was reaffirmed with little elaboration by a general meeting of the Council eleven days later.[119]

Then, on the 8th of June 2017, the Council announced through a press release that it had adopted the creation of the MPCC.[120] It was initially tasked with commanding the EU's non-executive missions and in November 2018 the Council recognised the positive contribution that the MPCC had made. It therefore decided that the EU OPCEN would be integrated into the MPCC which would give the MPCC the ability to take responsibility of one executive military mission by the end of 2020.[121] This left the EU with NATO and national OHQs, the CPCC and the MPCC as its available OHQs.

5.2 The third paradigm: halfway in between

According to the EEAS, the MPCC was established to strengthen civil and military cooperation, while working closely with its civilian counterparts, the CPCC and Joint Support Coordination Cell, and contributing to the coherence and unity among the military actions of the EU.[122] The immediate reasons were thus the development of the EU's planning and conduct capabilities for its CSDP missions. However, as we've seen above, we need to look

[115] Frederica Mogherini, 'Implementation Plan on Security and Defence', Brussels (2016): art. 7 and 12.
[116] Council of the European Union, 'Council conclusions on implementing the EU Global Strategy in the area of Security and Defence', Brussels (2016): art. 16, pt. a.(i).
[117] European Council, 'European Council meeting (15 December 2016) – Conclusions', Brussels (2016): art. 11.
[118] Council of the European Union, 'Outcome of the Council Meeting. 3525th Council meeting Foreign Affairs', Brussels (2017): 19-20.
[119] Council of the European Union, 'Council conclusions on Security and Defence in the context of the EU Global Strategy', Brussels (2017): art. 4-7.
[120] Council of the European Union, 'EU defence cooperation: Council establishes a Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC)', Brussels (2017).
[121] Council of the European Union, 'Council conclusions on Security and Defence in the context of the EU Global Strategy', Brussels (2018): art. 4-5.
[122] EEAS, 'The Military Planning'. For a view of the MPCC's position in the EU's organisational structure, see: Strategic Communications, 'HQ Organisation chart', EEAS, https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/2020-01-05-eeas-2.0_orgchart.pdf (Accessed May 20, 2020).

deeper than the EU's explanation of capability development. Why did the EU want to develop such an advanced form of defence cooperation in the form of the MPCC as its military OHQ? To find the answer we return to the EUGS. In this document, the HR acknowledged that the EU's security was threatened. Because of this heightened threat, the defence of the EU member states became a bigger priority. At the same time, playing a significant and sovereign role on the global stage was still a high proiority. This view was subsequently endorsed by the June 2016 European Council meeting.[123] In this view from the EUGS we find the second crucial shift in how the interdependence between member states was perceived. The European member states no longer perceived their interdependence focussed purely on the wish to play an significant and sovereign role on the world stage. It returned somewhat to focus on national defence, as can also be seen from the EUGS in which Mogherini declared that the EU was in danger and that we needed a stronger EU.[124] However, the perceived interdependence did not return to being focussed primarily on national defence either. In fact, the EUGS marks the point in time where the perceived interdependence became a combination of the previous two, which ultimately resulted in the creation of the MPCC.

The EU could in principle put more faith in and attention on NATO again, instead of developing its own military capabilities. Let us not forget that NATO's OHQs were already available to the EU thanks to the Berlin Plus agreement.[125] Instead, the EU member states decided to focus on building the EU's defence capabilities. There are multiple possible explanations for this choice. First of all, a week before the EUGS was presented, the Brexit referendum resulted into a vote to leave. This corresponds with Reykers argument, as mentioned in chapter two, that the adoption of the EUGS and the creation of the MPCC became possible because the UK stopped opposing it.[126] Although the MPCC was merely a proposal in the EUGS, it is possible that Mogherini indeed saw her chance after the Brexit referendum and included this proposal into the EUGS now that the British were going to leave. After all, the British had always been the champions of the Atlanticists member states. Tangible steps in the development of EU defence capabilities had predominantly occurred at times when the British agreed to it, the Saint-Malo declaration being the prime example of this. The second explanation for choosing the EU can be found in the fact that since the 1990s the US was perceived to be less reliable. Trumps election as president of the US, a couple of

[123] European Parliamentary Research Service, 'Foreign policy briefing', Brussels, (2019): 6.
[124] Mogherini, 'EUGS', 7.
[125] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 'Funding NATO', North Atlantic Treaty Organization, https://www.nato.int/cps/ro/natohq/topics_67655.htm (Accessed on May 21, 2020).
[126] Reykers, 'A Permanent Headquarters', 785.

months after the presentation of the EUGS, was another confirmation of this. After all, already during his election campaign it had become clear that Trump was no enthusiast of NATO or the EU.[127] The pivot away from the US and NATO, towards a focus on more independent European defence is thus understandable.

Up until then, the EU member states could always rely on NATO for their own security, even in times when the member states weren't truly threatened themselves. In the meantime they had build-up the EU's security and defence capabilities so that they could carry out CSDP missions wherever necessary. However, even though OHQ's were made available for military missions, and departments such as the EUMS were established, the focus lay on civilian missions, which is why the CPCC was established but not the MPCC. After 2016 however, with the turn away from the US and with a greater felt threat to national security, the development of truly military capabilities became more important. This led to the EUGS, the adoptions and proclamations from the Council and European Council meetings and the implementation plan on security and defence, and the establishment of the MPCC in 2017.

5.3 Comparison

In our final comparison, this time between the MPCC and its predecessors, we can identify the crucial factor that has been present throughout the history of European defence cooperation, but also the unique elements to the creation of the MPCC. This crucial factor is the perceived interdependence between European states. This is the first of the thesis's two main arguments, and answers why the MPCC was created. Since WWII the perceived interdependence has brought European states together and convinced them to cooperate on defence issues. It has led to the creation of the WU and the WEU, and with a different focus also to the availability of national and NATO's OHQs and the creation of the EU OPCEN and the CPCC. Where the perceived interdependence was first focussed on national defence, this was later turned to being able to play a significant and sovereign role on the world stage. After the inward-faced period of the Economic crisis and Euro crisis, new threats, such as Russian aggression in Crimea and the escalating war in Syria, led to a second shift in focus.

[127] Clemens Wergin, 'For Europe, Trump's Election Is a Terrifying Disaster', The New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/11/opinion/for-europe-trumps-election-is-a-terrifying-disaster.html (Accessed May 21, 2020); Sam Levin, 'Donald Trump backs Brexit, saying UK would be 'better off' without EU', The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/may/05/donald-trump-brexit-uk-leaving-european-union (Accessed May 21, 2020).

This time the perceived interdependence manifested between the previous two, combining national defence with playing an significant and sovereign role on the world stage, which is the first of the two main arguments this thesis makes.

As explained in section 2.2, the explanations by researchers given thus far consists of recent events and developments, which aren't profound enough to explain why the MPCC was now created. The election of Trump for example has indeed been an important event, but it doesn't explain the creation of the MPCC. The US is perceived as becoming less reliable since the 90s so Trumps election doesn't explain why the MPCC wasn't created ten or twenty years earlier. It has however influenced the perceived interdependence between the European states, as aggression from Russia and the rise of China have done as well. There is one unique event however that is a crucial factor which differentiates the creation of the MPCC from the rest of the cases and explains the timing of its creation. That is the Brexit referendum result, and it forms the second of this thesis' two main arguments because it explains why now. Thanks to this vote, the UK became disentangled from European defence for the first time since decades. Of course it remains an important NATO member, but this is a defining difference in the context of the MPCC's creation compared to the context of the creation of its predecessors, as the UK always played a role in their creation. The signal of the UK's future departure, which had been the leading proponent of building on the Atlantic alliance, gave room to the Europeanists to seize the moment and propagate the creation of an institute that in time can be developed into the EU's very own permanent military HQ. This proves the value of historic research for it has shown that the disengagement of the UK is the crucial differentiating factor between the cases that explains the timing of the MPCC's creation.

Conclusion

With our analysis complete, we now address our main question: why is it possible that the MPCC, as envisioned permanent military HQ, has now been created? At first, European states cooperated on defence issues because they perceived themselves to be interdependent for their national defence. During the 90s, the perceived interdependence shifted to being able to play a significant and sovereign role on the world stage. Then, around 2016, the perceived interdependence shifted for a second time, becoming a combination of the previous two. This happened because new threats to Europe's safety appeared, such as Russian aggression, and because the US was perceived to be less reliable. EU member states now perceived themselves to be interdependent for both their national defence and for being able to play a significant and sovereign role on the world stage. The creation of the MPCC was driven by this new focus in the perceived interdependence which answers why the MPCC was created.

To answer why it was created now and not earlier, we turn to the origin of the MPCC's creation, which can be traced back to the presentation in 2016 of the EU Global Strategy. The MPCC could be created then because shortly before the presentation of the EU Global Strategy, the result of the Brexit referendum signalled the end of the UK's longstanding opposition to developing a EU military OHQ. This was the start of reinvigorated attempts by European-focussed member states to develop the EU's military planning and conduct capabilities, which led to the creation of the MPCC in 2017 and the possibility that the MPCC will grow into a proper permanent EU military HQ. The thesis's hypothesis that Brexit provided the window of opportunity to establish the MPCC has thus been proven to be right. In short, the historical analysis has shown that it was now possible to create the MPCC because of the long-standing but developing sense of interdependence between member states, and because the Brexit result provided a window of opportunity in 2016.

Sources

Primary sources

Council of the European Union. 'Council conclusions on implementing the EU Global Strategy in the area of Security and Defence'. Brussels (2016).

Council of the European Union. 'Council conclusions on Security and Defence in the context of the EU Global Strategy'. Brussels (2017).

Council of the European Union. 'Council conclusions on Security and Defence in the context of the EU Global Strategy'. Brussels (2018).

Council of the European Union. 'Council decision of 26 July 2010 establishing the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service'. Brussels (2010).

Council of the European Union. 'EU defence cooperation: Council establishes a Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC)'. Brussels (2017).

Council of the European Union. 'Outcome of the Council Meeting. 3525th Council meeting Foreign Affairs'. Brussels (2017).

European Council. 'European Council Conclusions (19/20 December 2013)'. Brussels (2013).

European Council. 'European Council meeting (15 December 2016) – Conclusions'. Brussels (2016).

European Defence Agency. 'Future Trends from the Capability Development Plan'. Brussels (2008).

European Parliamentary Research Service. 'Foreign policy briefing'. Brussels, (2019).

Missiroli, Antonio. 'From Copenhagen to Brussels. European Defence: core documents Volume IV' (Paris, European Union Institute for Security Studies, 2003).

Mogherini, Frederica. 'A global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign And Security Policy'. Brussels (2016).

Mogherini, Frederica. 'Implementation Plan on Security and Defence'. Brussels (2016).

Rutten, Maartje. 'From St-Malo to Nice. European defence: core documents'. (Paris, European Union Institute for Security Studies, 2001).

'Treat of Alliance and Mutual Assistence'. Dunkirk (1947).

United Kingdom Parliament. 'Brussels Treaty Organisation (Resolution)'. London (1957).

Western European Union Council of Ministers. 'Petersberg Declaration'. Bonn (1992).

Western European Union. 'Decision of the Council of the Western European Union of the

residual rights and obligations of the WEU'. Brussels, (2011).

Western European Union. 'Protocol modifying and completing the Brussels Treaty'. Paris (1954).

Western European Union. 'Statement of the Presidency of the Permanent Council of the WEU on behalf of the High Contracting Parties'. Brussels (2010).

Secondary sources

Banchoff, Thomas. *The German Problem Transformed. Institutions, Politics, and Foreign Policy, 1945-1995* (Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 2002).

Bebr, Gerhard. 'The European Defence Community and the Western European Union: An Agonizing Dilemma'. *Stanford Law Review* 7, no. 2 (1955): 169-236.

Bloed, Arie and Ramses A. Wessel (red.). *The Changing Functions of the Western European Union (WEU): Introduction and basic documents* (Dordrecht, Nijhoff, 1994).

Bodescu, Alin. 'EU Military Planning and Conduct Capability: Duplication or Complementarity with NATO?'. *Strategic Impact*, no. 1 (2017): 10-17.

Chavleski, Aleksandar. 'The Military Planning and Conduct Capability of the EU: New Impetus for the Common Security and Defence Policy'. *Contemporary Macedonian Defence* 17, no. 33 (2017): 11-20.

Council of the European Union. 'EU Concept for Military Command and Control - Rev 8' (Working document, European External Action Service, Brussels, April 23, 2019).

Council of the European Union. 'EU Defence Cooperation: Council Establishes a Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC)'. news release. June 8, 2017.

CPCC Secretariat. 'The Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC)'. European External Action Service. https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en/5438/The%20Civilian%20Planning%20and%20Conduct%20Capability%20(CPCC) (Accessed on 15 April, 2020).

CVCE. 'Introduction'. University of Luxembourg. https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/d5906df5-4f83-4603-85f7-0cabc24b9fe1/50269d99-87d4-4634-8780-c5558c585488 (Accessed on April 10, 2020).

CVCE. 'Joint Declaration on European Defence'. University of Luxembourg.

https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2008/3/31/f3cd16fb-fc37-4d52-936f-c8e9bc80f24f/publishable_en.pdf (Accessed on April 15, 2020).

CVCE. 'The development of WEU'. University of Luxembourg. https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/d5906df5-4f83-4603-85f7-0cabc24b9fe1/dfe9eac4-4fe8-4ae1-af1e-3060f8031126 (Accessed on April 11, 2020).

CVCE. 'The origins of WEU: Western Union'. University of Luxembourg. https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/d5906df5-4f83-4603-85f7-0cabc24b9fe1/051bd03c-4887-4f53-82eb-0f12e59f8dbd (Accessed April 11, 2020).

CVCE. 'The refusal to ratify the EDC Treaty'. University of Luxembourg. https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/803b2430-7d1c-4e7b-9101-47415702fc8e/c23dd653-ba51-4f7e-9bf1-2c33b347d339 (Accessed on April 9, 2020).

CVCE. 'Western European Union'. University of Luxembourg. https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/9059327f-7f8a-4a74-ac7e-5a0f3247bcd3/Resources#73277207-d250-41c5-8960-1d8bce9f11aa_en&overlay (Accessed May 25, 2020).

Duijn, D.G.M. 'De Aarzelende Stapjes Naar Militaire Zelfstandigheid'. Nederlandse Officieren Vereniging. https://www.nederlandseofficierenvereniging.nl/post/de-aarzelende-stapjes-naar-militaire-zelfstandigheid-een-eu-militair-operationeel-hoofdkwartier-ohq (Accessed May 25, 2020).

Duke, Simon. *The Elusive Quest for European Security* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press LTD., 2000).

European External Action Service. 'The Military Planning and Conduct Capability – MPCC'. Brussels (2018).

European External Action Service Press Team. 'Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) – factsheet'. European External Action Service. https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-Homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet_en (Accessed June 14, 2020).

Everaert, Frank. 'Een Eerste Stap Op Weg Naar Een Volwaardig EU Militair Strategisch Hoofdkwartier?'. *Belgisch Militair Tijdschrift / Revue Militaire Belge* 15, (2017): 71-80.

General Secretariat of the Council. 'Timeline: EU cooperation on security and defence'. European Council. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/defence-security/defence-security-timeline/ (Accessed on April 15, 2020).

Ginsberg, Roy H. and Susan E. Penksa. *The European Union in Global Security. The Politics*

of Impact (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Glockner, Iris and Berthold Rittberger. 'The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and European Defence Community (EDC) Treaties'. In Finn Laursen (red.). *Designing the European Union. From Paris to Lisbon* (Basingstoke, Pallgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Grevi, Giovanni. 'ESDP institutions'. In Giovanni Grevi, Damien Helly and Daniel Keohane (red.). *European Security and Defence Policy. The First 10 Years (1999-2009)* (Paris, European Union Institute For Security Studies, 2009), 19-68.

Haroche, Pierre. 'Interdependence, asymmetric crises, and European defence cooperation'. *European Security* 26, no. 2 (2017): 226-252.

Hovey Jr., Allan. 'Britain and the Unification of Europe'. International Organization 9, no. 3 (1955): 323-337.

Jones, Seth G. 'The European Union and the Security Dilemma', *Security Studies* 12, no. 3 (2003): 114-156.

Keohane, Daniel. 'ESDP and NATO'. In Giovanni Grevi, Damien Helly and Daniel Keohane (red.). *European Security and Defence Policy. The First 10 Years (1999-2009)* (Paris, European Union Institute For Security Studies, 2009), 127-138.

Koenig, Nicole and Marie Walter-Franke. 'France and Germany: Spearheading a European Security and Defence Union?' (Policy paper 202, Jacques Delors Institut, Berlin, July 19, 2017).

Levin, Sam. 'Donald Trump backs Brexit, saying UK would be 'better off' without EU'. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/may/05/donald-trump-brexit-uk-leaving-european-union (Accessed May 21, 2020).

Mathiopoulos, Margarita and István Gyarmati. 'Saint Malo and beyond: Toward European defense'. *Washington Quarterly* 22, no. 4 (1999): 66-76.

Mills, Claire. 'European Defence : Where Is It Heading?' (Briefing Paper no. 8216, House of Commons Library, October 30, 2019).

Ministry of Defence of the Netherlands. 'Joint Doctrine Publication 5: Command and Control'. Ministry of Defence of the Netherlands. https://www.defensie.nl/documenten/publicaties/2012/03/16/joint-doctrine-publication-5-command-and-control-en (Accessed May 25, 2020).

Möttölä, Kari. 'Drivers of defece integration within the European Union' (paper presented at Sixth (SGIR) Pan-European International Relations Conference, Turin, Italy, September 12-15, 2007).

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 'Funding NATO'. North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

https://www.nato.int/cps/ro/natohq/topics_67655.htm (Accessed on May 21, 2020).

Office of the Historian. 'Memorandum by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Secretary of Defence (Forrestal)'. United States Department of State. https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1948v03/d183 (Accessed December 3, 2019).

Pohl, Benjamin. *"But We Have To Do Something": the drivers behind EU crisis management* (Leiden, Leiden University, 2012).

Posen, Barry. 'European Union Security and Defence Policy: Response to Unipolarity?'. *Security Studies* 15, no. 2 (2016): 149-186.

Quille, Gerrard. 'The European Security and Defence Policy: from the Helsinki Headline Goal to the EU Battlegroups'. (Note, European Parliament, Brussel, September 12, 2006).

Reykers, Yf. 'A Permanent Headquarters under Construction? The Military Planning and Conduct Capability as a Proximate Principal'. *Journal of European Integration* 41, no. 6 (2019): 783-799.

Shaev, Brian. 'Estrangement and Reconciliation: French Socialists, German Social Democrats and the Origins of European Integration, 1948-1957 (PHD, University of Pittsburgh, April 3, 2014).

Simón, Louis and Alexander Mattelaer. 'EUnity of Command – The Planning and Conduct of CSDP Operations' (Egmont Paper 41, Egmont – The Royal Institute for International Relations, Brussels, January, 2011).

Simón, Louis. 'Neorealism, Security Cooperation, and Europe's Relative Gains Dilemma'. *Security Studies* 26, no. 2 (2017): 185-212.

Stahl, Bernhard, Henning Boekle, Jörg Nadoll and Anna Jóhannesdóttir. 'Understanding the Atlanticist-Europeanist Divide in the CFSP: Comparing Denmark, France, Germany and the Netherlands'. *European Foreign Affairs Review* 9 (2004): 417-441.

Strategic Communications. 'HQ Organisation chart'. European External Action Service. https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/2020-01-05-eeas-2.0_orgchart.pdf (Accessed May 20, 2020).

Strategic Communications. 'Military and Civilian Missions and Operations'. External Action Service. https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en (Accessed June 14, 2020).

Strategic Communications. 'Shaping of a Common Security and Defence Policy'. European

External Action Service. https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp/5388/shaping-of-a-common-security-and-defence-policy-_en (Accessed on 17 April, 2020).

Strategic Communications. 'The Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP)'. European External Action Service. https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp/431/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp_en (Accessed June 14, 2020).

Talman, Guido. 'European Union: Defence Integration' (Master's thesis, Leiden University, 2016).

Tardy, Thierry. 'MPCC: Towards an EU Military Command' (Issue Brief 17, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris, June, 2017).

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. 'Ostpolitik. West German Foreign Policy'. Encyclopaedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/event/Ostpolitik (Accessed on June 18, 2020).

Thijs de Jong. 'Thesis proposal – Thijs de Jong' (Master's thesis research proposal, Leiden University, December 12, 2020).

Trachtenberg, Mark. *The Craft of International History. A Guide to Method* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2009).

Wall, Irwin M. *The United States and the Making of Postwar France, 1945-1954* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Wall, Irwin M. 'France in the Cold War'. *Journal of European Studies* 38, no. 2 (2008): 121-139.

Wergin, Clemens. 'For Europe, Trump's Election Is a Terrifying Disaster'. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/11/opinion/for-europe-trumps-election-is-a-terrifying-disaster.html (Accessed May 21, 2020).

Western European Union, 'WEU today', (Brochure, WEU Secretariat-General, Brussels, January, 2000).

Zeeman, Bert. 'Britain and the Cold War: An Alternative Approach. The Treaty of Dunkirk Example'. *European History Quarterly* 16 (1986): 343-367.