

EU Involvement in the Afghanistan War:
Progress Toward a Viable EU Foreign and Security Policy

Grace Gaylord

University Honors in International Studies

Advisor: Dr. Maria Green Cowles

Spring 2011

Introduction

Some observers of the European Union's (EU) involvement in the Afghanistan war argue that the EU has made substantial political and economic contributions to the international efforts. The Afghanistan war began in October 2001 in response to the terrorist attacks in the United States (US) on September 11. Immediately following the attacks, the EU and its member states declared solidarity with the US, vowing that the EU "stands firmly and fully behind the US."¹ It was agreed by European leaders that the attacks were not just an aggression toward the US, but toward all democratic states.² Economically, the EU took the lead on the humanitarian mission, becoming the second largest donor to the humanitarian and economic development in Afghanistan.³ Politically, the EU utilized its expertise in multilateralism by playing a critical role in the organization of the crucial international coalition used to find a solution to the crisis. The EU also contributed to the commitment to the rule of law and establishment of good governance by taking over a portion of the police training mission in 2007. Eva Gross, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for European Studies at Vrije Universiteit Brussel, has even gone so far as to say, "the EU has been a key...actor in Afghanistan."⁴

However, a number of critics have argued that these contributions are not substantial and that the EU is not a real player in the efforts in Afghanistan. These critics have focused on shortfalls of the EU's contribution to the international effort. Joanna Buckley, former political advisor for the Office of the Special Representative for the EU for Afghanistan, characterizes EU efforts as "poorly organized" and argues that the EU member states "lack a clear vision of the

¹ Akan Malici. *The Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy: Leaders, Cognitions and Question of Institutional Viability* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 76.

² Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 71.

³ Martin Walker, "What is the EU doing for Afghanistan?" *Europe* 413 (Feb 2002): 33.

⁴ Eva Gross, "Security Sector Reform in Afghanistan: the EU's Contribution," *Occasional Paper* (April 2009): 21.

role they want the European institutions to play.”⁵ Furthermore, Daniel Korski, Senior Policy Fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations, asserts that European support for the Afghan mission is “limited” and cooperation between the biggest EU member states and the European Commission “remains inadequate.”⁶ Korski further criticizes the EU’s military contributions, arguing that most EU countries are “unwilling” to operate in the dangerous areas of southern and eastern Afghanistan where troops are most needed. As a result, the number of troops from EU countries is “completely inadequate” for the need demonstrated.⁷

Similar criticisms were raised against the EU a littler more than a decade ago for its involvement in the Kosovo war (1998-1999). Akan Malici noted that the EU actions were even regarded as “counterproductive” and lacked an overall unified approach.⁸ The EU’s diplomatic strategy did not dissuade Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic from creating a humanitarian crisis that attempted to violently suppress the ethnic Albanian majority’s independence campaign. When NATO finally intervened militarily to stop the ensuing atrocities, the EU itself played no significant role in the military campaign. Javier Solana, the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), later described the Kosovo war by saying, “...we [EU] watched as our neighborhood burned because we had no means of responding to the crisis.”⁹ The EU’s ineffective efforts in the Kosovo war were so evident that the international community could not help but doubt the EU’s future as an international security actor. During

⁵ Joanna Buckley, “Can the EU be more effective in Afghanistan?” *Centre for European Reform* (April 2010): 3.

⁶ Daniel Korski, “The EU is missing in action in Afghanistan,” *Today’s Zaman*, January 28, 2008, accessed March 21, 2011, http://www.todayszaman.com/newsDetail_getNewsById.action?load=detay&link=132932.

⁷ Daniel Korski, “Afghanistan: Europe’s forgotten war,” *European Council on Foreign Relations*, January 21, 2008, 16.

⁸ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 44.

⁹ Javier Solana, “10 years of European Security and Defense Policy,” *Project Syndicate*, October 7, 2009, accessed March 15, 2011, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/solana3/English>.

the war, Richard Holbrooke, US envoy to the Balkans, bitterly concluded, “the fact is that the Europeans are not going to have a common security policy for the foreseeable future.”¹⁰

While critics have charged that the EU has failed to pursue a successful civilian strategy and contribute effective military means in both Kosovo and Afghanistan, this paper challenges this argument. While the criticism of the Kosovo war may be justified, this paper seeks to examine why EU involvement in the Afghanistan war can be considered a success. Success in this case is determined by whether the EU learned from its mistakes in the Kosovo war, acquired new competences as a result of the lessons learned and was able to successfully implement these changes in the Afghanistan war. In other words, success of EU involvement in Afghanistan is analyzed through the lens of the greater evolution and development of EU foreign and security policy. It is not so much whether the EU’s actions are perfectly executed, but whether the EU has improved and showed that it has learned from its mistakes.

This thesis will be examined through three parts. First, the paper highlights the EU’s foreign and security policy competences that it possessed at the start of the Kosovo war that enabled and constrained its actions within the war. The paper does so by highlighting the institutionalization of CFSP, the organized foreign policy of the EU. This first section then outlines the EU involvement in the Kosovo war and addresses the mistakes and opportunities that arose. The second section of the paper will look at the two most significant lessons learned from Kosovo. On the one hand, the EU learned that military efforts must be complemented by civilian efforts in order to come to the most successful conclusion of an international crisis. As an international actor, the EU thus learned that it must not only cultivate its inherent civilian tools, but also redefine its military capabilities to better fits its mission. On the other hand, the EU learned that it has the potential to very effectively deploy civilian power. Thus, it learned that

¹⁰ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 69.

in an international crisis its most valued role is to contribute civilian tools that complement the military actions. And finally, the last section will address how the EU performed in Afghanistan and the extent to which the EU utilized its new (and revitalized) competences to contribute more effectively before, during and after the war.

The Kosovo War and Before

The EU's foreign and security policy competences that existed at the start of the Kosovo war were a result of the long and arduous institutionalization of CFSP that dates back to the 1950s. A common European foreign and security policy is in no way a new idea and has slowly evolved since its origin. Since its very beginning, EU member states strived to establish military competences similar to that of a more traditional military power. However, it was soon realized this was not the trajectory meant for the EU. Instead, the EU directed its energy toward other foreign policy tools and eventually acquired a strong "civilian power" dimension to its CFSP.

The EU is known as a civilian power that carries out its foreign policy through primarily civilian, as opposed to military, means. According to Mario Telò, "a political entity can be termed a civilian power not only if it does not intend, but also if it is not able, for various historical or structural reasons, to become a classic politico-military power and pursues its international peaceful objectives using other methods."¹¹ As Telò further notes, the EU is not seriously expected to become a traditional military power, nor does it aspire to do so.¹² The EU emerged after decades of war and unrest, eventually transforming Europe into a "stable,

¹¹ Mario Telò, *Europe: a Civilian Power?* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 51.

¹² Telò, *Europe: a Civilian Power*, 54.

prosperous and peaceful” region and a union that preferred civilian over military tools.¹³ Karen Smith describes this phenomenon, by saying “this experience [creation of the EU] and philosophy translated into a civilian foreign policy.¹⁴ Telò goes on to outline the nine different civilian tools that the EU possesses. This description includes the three most pertinent tools to this argument: diplomacy through multilateralism, humanitarian aid and the peacekeeping role in the post-conflict reconstruction process.¹⁵ For four decades, the EU developed these competences through the institutionalization of CFSP and attempted to use these civilian tools in its involvement in the Kosovo war.

Institutionalization of CFSP prior to the Kosovo war

The long evolution of CFSP began in the 1950s with many failed and meager developments. During the Cold War the European community’s role as a civilian power was largely dictated by its lack of capabilities to act otherwise. The first concrete attempt at a common European security policy was the European Defense Community (EDC) proposed by France in 1952. The idea was to integrate the national military forces into an institution, subordinate to NATO. While the French president championed EDC, the French parliament worried about German rearmament, how French forces would integrate into to the new Europe and the increasingly dominant America. In the end, it was the French parliament that refused to ratify the treaty in 1954.¹⁶ After this initial failure, French President Charles De Gaulle continued his efforts toward an intergovernmental European Europe with the two Fouchet plans in 1961 and 1962. The first plan was a political action in response to the establishment of the European

¹³ Fabian Krohn, “What kind of power? The EU as an International Actor,” *Atlantic Community*, accessed on March 24, 2011, <http://www.atlantic-community.org/app/webroot/files/articlepdf/Fabian%20Krohn.pdf>, 5.

¹⁴ Karen E. Smith, “Still ‘civilian power EU’?” (paper presented at the CIDEL Workshop, Oslo, Norway, 2004): 1.

¹⁵ Telò, *Europe: a Civilian Power*, 57.

¹⁶ Walter Laqueur, *Europe in Our Time* (New York: Viking, 1992), 122.

Economic Community (EEC) in 1957. The plan intended to create a common foreign and defense policy among the six EEC members (France, Belgium, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Italy) independent of the NATO agenda. However, the Cold War fears and anxieties led leaders to prefer NATO to any other alternative, ultimately ending in the failure of the first Fouchet plan. The second plan in 1962, which embodied even more Gaullist and intergovernmental qualities, also ultimately ended in its demise.¹⁷

The next couple decades saw a time of great political cooperation, but few advances in security policy. The Hague Summit in 1969 saw the initiation of the European Political Cooperation (EPC) program that called for a series of biannual meetings between foreign ministers and senior Foreign Affairs Military officers, ultimately demonstrating to the world that “Europe has a political vocation.”¹⁸ Just one year later the Davignon Report talked of the future foreign policy of the EEC, excluding any talk of defense security. The previously informal intergovernmental summits finally became institutionalized and formalized with the creation of the European Council in 1974. More than a decade later in 1987, the Single European Act institutionalized the EPC. The Act included defense and security issues, in which the member states agreed to “inform and consult each other on any foreign policy matters of general interest.” The overarching goal was to move towards consistency, solidarity and one voice for the European community.¹⁹

After the end of the Cold War, the European Community made its most substantial steps toward a common foreign and security policy. The Maastricht Treaty, which came into action in 1993, formally integrated the CFSP (and replaced the EPC) as one of the pillars in the three-

¹⁷ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 8.

¹⁸ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 9.

¹⁹ Ramses A. Wessel, *The European Union's Foreign and Security Policy: A Legal Institutional Perspective* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1999), 101.

pillar system. Unlike the other two pillars (European Communities and Police & Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters), the CFSP is an intergovernmental structure and therefore requires consensus from all member states in the decision-making process. In contrast to its predecessors, the EPC and the Single European Act, it was agreed by all member states that CFSP declarations would be made not “on behalf of the EU and its member states” but on behalf of the “EU only.”²⁰ The overall intention was to create a European identity on the international scene. Article 11 of the CFSP called to safeguard common interests; reinforce the security of the union; maintain international peace and security; promote international cooperation and reinforce the importance of democracy.

The Amsterdam Treaty followed in 1997 with the formal institutionalization of CFSP. Decisions were now made by qualified majority (as opposed to unanimous) vote and CFSP now included “all questions relating to the security of the Union.”²¹ To further improve the decision-making process, constructive abstention was added (meaning abstention from a vote does not equal a veto). The Amsterdam Treaty had strengthened CFSP, but had not resolved the many remaining foreign and security limitations of the EU. The first time that combat forces are mentioned is in the Petersberg Tasks incorporated in the Amsterdam Treaty. Responsibilities assigned to the EU included “humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.”²² This is the first time “combat forces” are mentioned as a means of military action. However, the security and defense responsibilities for the EU are still assumed by NATO, and within the alliance, by the US. Many have said that what emerged from the Maastricht and Amsterdam treaties was nothing more than

²⁰ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 11.

²¹ Clive Archer, *The European Union*, (New York: Routledge, 2008), 177.

²² Nigel Foster, *Blackstone's EC Legislation 2004-2005*, (Oxford: University Press, 2004), 96.

a political construct that “merely serves the political expediency of the major players and does nothing to actually create a workable European Security and Defense Identity.”²³

Thus, when the Kosovo crisis began to escalate in the mid-1990s, European foreign and security policy still faced many limitations regarding both the structure of CFSP and its military capabilities. The intergovernmental structure impeded the EU’s ability to make quick decisions and produce a one-voice response. The Amsterdam Treaty did implement constructive abstention and vote by qualified majority, but these changes do not make up for the fact that there is no supranational authority that can make decisions on behalf of the EU member states. There is also no face of EU foreign policy, no clear person to call in Europe, which decreases the EU’s legitimacy on the international stage. As a result, the member states still tried to act independently from the EU, even if it was detrimental to the international image and legitimacy of the EU. And finally, the EU still lacked its own security and defense responsibilities autonomous from NATO. Without a permanent military structure, the EU could not act as a military power and therefore its only crisis management tools were civilian in nature. When the EU was faced with the Kosovo crisis, it had to turn to civilian tools as an attempt to prevent the crisis from escalating. However, the aforementioned limitations greatly challenged the EU’s ability to produce a unified and effective civilian response to Milosevic.

EU involvement in the Kosovo war

The Kosovo crisis in the mid-1990s offered the EU an opportunity to demonstrate its ambitions toward a common foreign and security policy. Unfortunately, the persisting limitations of CFSP left after the negotiations concluded on the Amsterdam Treaty impeded the EU’s ability to act effectively in Kosovo. As a result of CFSP’s intergovernmental structure, the EU reaction

²³ Duke, “From Amsterdam to Kosovo,” 9.

to the crisis was slow. The EU struggled to coordinate the opinions of the member states, particularly that of France, Great Britain and Germany. Without a special representative in Kosovo to represent the EU, the Union was ultimately unable to exert a strong EU voice. Moreover, when the EU did act, it did not pursue any military action but sought to create a civilian strategy that consisted of economic tools and policy. Ultimately, this was a civilian strategy that insisted on protracted diplomacy.

Beginning in 1996, the EU took an early lead in the crisis by applying its own civilian strategy. The EU imposed sanctions, nominated special envoys, and produced copious declarations, decisions and Joint Actions calling for a settlement of the crisis.²⁴ However, the EU opposed implementing any severe punitive measures, insisting that the crisis would be resolved diplomatically. The end result, however, was that the protracted European “more carrot, less stick” approach ultimately gave Milosevic more time to continue his atrocities toward the realization of a Greater Serbia. The EU threatened Milosevic with further sanctions and dangled financial aid for vast reconstruction programs as the carrot.²⁵ As the crisis escalated, the EU ran out of means to address it effectively, and ultimately it was left up to the member states to confront the challenge.²⁶ The CFSP’s intergovernmental structure made it very difficult for the member states to quickly come to a consensus and act accordingly. Jörg Monar noted that the difficulties associated with getting fifteen members to arrive at “substantial and timely decisions” under the intergovernmental framework “have been notorious.”²⁷ Even the most minor issues became immensely controversial. The EU’s civilian strategy clearly failed because in November 1997 Milosevic rejected the EU’s offer to “improve diplomatic and trade relations with Belgrade

²⁴ Duke, “From Amsterdam to Kosovo,” 4.

²⁵ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 44.

²⁶ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 144.

²⁷ Duke, “From Amsterdam to Kosovo,” 6.

and support its reentry into international institutions,” as long as Milosevic would accept beginning negotiations for a peace agreement.²⁸ Open conflict in the country began just a few months later.

Once the EU realized its civilian strategy was not successful when pursued on its own, the EU turned to another civilian tool: multilateralism. EU officials helped create an international coalition, the Contact Group, that included France, Great Britain, Germany, the US, Russia and Italy. Despite the EU’s ambitions to become a legitimate actor on the international stage, the coalition did not include the EU as a single actor. Instead, European representatives in the coalition consisted of the Big Three of Europe (France, Great Britain and Germany) and Italy. There was no commitment to the EU, but rather Europe’s Big Three saw themselves as individual actors and did not act in accordance to the implications that followed as being a member of the Union. The British leadership was the most hawkish European state, insisting that a conflict approach was the only solution and that a peaceful resolution was not possible. The French believed that a political solution might be possible, but in the end, seemingly paradoxically, aimed to impose the solution through military means. The Germans, in stark contrast to the others, were committed to a political solution and were willing to work toward it through diplomatic means.²⁹ In the end, the division among the member states prevented the EU from speaking as *one* and negatively impacted the impression of Europe’s institutional ambitions toward a common foreign and security policy.

In addition to the EU member states’ own struggle to work effectively together toward a common goal, the Contact Group struggled to be effective in light of the wide range of views within the group. One observer remarked, the “decision to rely on consensus within the Contact

²⁸ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 44.

²⁹ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 47.

Group inevitably resulted in least common denominator policies, hardly the kind of approach necessary to convince Belgrade to change course.”³⁰ Ultimately, in a final initiative by the international coalition, the Contact Group summoned representatives of the Kosovo Albanians and the Serb Government to the Rambouillet peace negotiations in France. These negotiations ended with the Rambouillet Agreement, which Yugoslavia refused to accept. At this point, at the end of 1998, the EU had attempted to pursue a civilian strategy both on its own and then involved the international community and failed both times.

Once the final attempt made by the Contact Group in late 1998 to resolve the war diplomatically failed, the international community, specifically NATO, realized that the Kosovo conflict was only going to be resolved militarily. NATO-led airstrikes began in early 1999 and lasted two months until Milosevic finally agreed on a settlement. The EU was not only unable to contribute its civilian tools, but once it turned into a military affair, the EU was ill-equipped to contribute effective collective military forces. Some member states were able to contribute forces, and others were not. Ultimately, the EU did not show a presence in the military efforts and it turned into a NATO affair led by the US.

Immediately following the conclusion of the bombings, the EU was finally able to contribute effectively to the post-conflict reconstruction process led by the United Nations (UN). The EU participated in the negotiations over the establishment of an interim administration in Kosovo. Through the UN negotiations, the EU agreed on the establishment of an international interim administration, the creation of a police force, the holding of free elections and the deployment of international military forces to guarantee the safety of the population. In addition, the EU announced 250 million Euros in aid for humanitarian support.³¹ As a result, roughly

³⁰ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 43.

³¹ Duke, “From Amsterdam to Kosovo,” 4.

750,000 refugees were able to return to their homes. The EU also set up its own long-term initiative, called the Stability Pact for the Balkans. This initiative coupled short-term stabilization measures with the long-term prospect of EU membership.³² Even though the EU was finally able to demonstrate worthwhile contributions to the Kosovo war in the reconstruction stage, these efforts were overlooked and the conclusion of the atrocities were seen as a “remarkable testament to the success of US and NATO policy.”³³ The end of the Kosovo war was seen as a US and NATO effort, with no mention of the EU.

While the EU may have contributed effectively to the post-conflict reconstruction process, it shared a lot of responsibility for the inability to stop the humanitarian crisis that played out in Kosovo. The conclusion of the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997, with its emphasis on crisis management and peacemaking, led the international observer to have expected a more coherent EU approach.³⁴ The EU may have finally pulled a common response together after the military mission was over, but it was clearly embarrassed by its actions that preceded the end of the war. Duke noted that, “If there is a positive outcome from the Kosovo catastrophe it will be that, out of humiliation and perhaps even some guilt, the EU is forced to make a real commitment to the security and defense of the member states and their neighbors.”³⁵ The EU was ashamed of its actions and vowed to do better in the future.

Lessons Learned and Changes Implemented

³² Jeremy Richardson, *European Union: Power and Policy-Making* (London: Routledge, 2006), 301.

³³ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 68.

³⁴ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 143.

³⁵ Duke, “From Amsterdam to Kosovo,” 13.

In the aftermath of the Kosovo war, the EU had learned many lessons about its role in international crises and as a result made several changes to its foreign and security policy. The events in Kosovo highlighted the EU's limitations and ultimately accelerated formal and informal changes toward a more viable common foreign and security policy. The overarching lesson the EU learned focuses on two key issues: on the one hand, the need for both military and civilian tools to solve an international crisis; and on the other hand, the EU's most effective contribution to international crises is civilian power. In an international crisis such as Kosovo, where the aggressor is using force against civilians, the EU learned that civilian tools alone are not enough to bring an end to the crisis. Instead, the most effective strategy is to use civilian tools in conjunction with military tools. The EU has learned to appreciate the value of civilian power and the complementary role that a civilian actor has in today's world. High Representative Solana recognizes, "Today's conflicts demonstrate more clearly than ever that a military solution is neither the sole nor the best option, particularly during the stabilization of a crisis..."³⁶ By the same token, as an international actor the EU recognized that it could not rely solely on strengthening its civilian tools. After the NATO-led military intervention in Kosovo had begun, it became "painfully apparent that it is completely beyond the EU's capabilities to mount military operations of the size and nature witnessed."³⁷ This was a wake-up call for the EU and its member states to redefine EU military capabilities within its own foreign policy trajectory. This new enthusiasm was later developed with the revelation that the EU could offer peacekeeping services instead of the traditional military services offered by NATO.³⁸ These new developments about military capabilities were not with the goal to become a military power like

³⁶ Solana, "10 years."

³⁷ Duke, "From Amsterdam to Kosovo," 6.

³⁸ Eva Gross and Ana Juncos, eds., *EU Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management: Roles, Institutions and Policies* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 34.

the US, but rather to complement its civilian instruments. Once the EU's military capabilities were redefined for its own purposes, the EU was able to work toward implementing its second lesson learned: in an international crisis where the US takes the lead in the military mission, the EU realized its most valued contribution to the allied efforts is through civilian tools. Telò recognizes that the concept of civilian power is an "original contribution to twenty first century international relations" and one that is not synonymous with "weakness and lack of capacity."³⁹ Given this newfound confidence in the EU's potential to most successfully deploy civilian power, the EU took great strides toward strengthening preexisting tools and developing new tools.

Lesson Learned: Redefining EU Military Capabilities

Immediately following the end of the Kosovo war, the EU member states were determined to bolster EU military capabilities that did not depend on NATO involvement. The NATO-led bombings that ended the war showed the EU that sometimes force is absolutely necessary to get the message across. The EU considered NATO's intervention in Kosovo to be "necessary and justified."⁴⁰ The crisis in Kosovo demonstrated that Milosevic understood the language of diplomacy backed by force. However, the pre-Amsterdam CFSP lacked the structures and the will to combine diplomacy with the threat or use of credible force. This greatly reduced the effectiveness of the EU member states' bargaining power since it insisted on pursuing its own protracted diplomacy. And thus, without the military assistance from NATO, a good deal less would have been accomplished if the European allies had been left to their own devices.

³⁹ Telò, *Europe: a Civilian Power*, 207.

⁴⁰ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 68.

Just a few months after the end of the Kosovo war in 1999, EU member states began to redefine EU military capabilities. Following the end of the Kosovo War and the ratification of the Amsterdam Treaty, many informal and formal multilateral European Summits focused on furthering CFSP ambitions. Most notably was the Franco-British St. Malo Summit in December 1998. This marked a founding step for European defense policy. British involvement and enthusiasm for the summit marked a reversal of traditional British hesitation toward the European project.⁴¹ At the beginning of the summit, British Prime Minister Tony Blair and French President Jacques Chirac made a joint statement, calling for the Amsterdam Treaty to be made a reality and endow the Union with “the capacity for autonomous action, backed by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises without prejudice to actions by NATO.”⁴² The St. Malo declaration addressed the idea of a credible and autonomous EU military capacity; a supranational decision structure; prevention of conflicts and management of crises; linking a political aspect to the CFSP; and the EU relationship with NATO.

The St. Malo Declaration served as momentum for the creation of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) in 1999. The ESDP is an integral component of the CFSP, creating a mechanism by which members of the EU can take joint military action to respond to crisis with combined military and civilian power. Additionally, Javier Solana is appointed the High Representative for the CFSP. This marks the first time that one person is given particular responsibilities within the EU. In the Helsinki Summit at the end of 1999, the European Council took further steps to underline the intention to develop the Union’s military and non-military crisis management capability. The EU’s involvement in the negotiations to establish a new

⁴¹ Alistair Shepherd, “The European Union’s Security and Defense Policy: A Policy without Substance?” *European Security* 12 (March 2003), 40.

⁴² “Franco-British St. Malo Declaration,” European Navigator, accessed March 14, 2011, <http://www.ena.lu/>.

interim administration in Kosovo recommitted the EU to the rule of law and the new avenue of peacekeeping and peace building.

The commitment to move towards civilian crisis management began with the implementation of the Petersberg Tasks in the Amsterdam Treaty. As previously mentioned, the Petersberg Tasks addressed humanitarian rescue, but it also addressed the need for peacekeeping and the utilization of combat forces in crisis management and peacemaking. The concept of Civilian Crisis Management first officially appeared in the Helsinki European Council meeting in December 1999. It was here that the European Council emphasized the need for four non-military areas of ESDP: policing, rule of law, civilian administration and civil protection. Thus, there was a dedication to develop capabilities for deploying civilians in post-conflict situations from the very beginning of ESDP. It was not until June 2002 that the EU established the Committee for the Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management.⁴³ Then two more areas were added in 2004: monitoring and supporting EU Special Representatives. The EU began deploying civilian missions under the auspices of ESDP in 2003, and has conducted a total of 13 missions since.

As a result of the lessons learned in Kosovo, the EU was able to redefine its military capabilities. In 2000 High Representative Solana argued in reference to the EU's military capabilities, "We are not talking about collective defense. Nor are we talking about building a European army or 'militarizing' the EU. But we cannot continue to publicly espouse values and principles while calling on others to defend them."⁴⁴ Through the St. Malo Declaration the EU established military capabilities autonomous from NATO and the creation of ESDP allowed for birth of EU civilian missions to help with peacekeeping and peace building. The EU had

⁴³ Anand Menon and Ulrich Sedelmeier, "Instruments and Intentionality: Civilian Crisis Management and Enlargement Conditionality in EU Security Policy," *West European Politics* 33 (January 2010): 83.

⁴⁴ Larsen, "The EU: A Global," 290-291.

redefined its military capabilities, establishing the precedent that EU forces would be able to act independently to help restore peace and rebuild institutions after a conflict.

Lesson Learned: Strengthening the EU's Civilian Power

Once the EU had redefined its military capabilities, the EU put its energy into establishing itself as a strong civilian power that its allies could rely on for civilian power support. In 2000, Romano Prodi, President of the European Commission from 1999-2004, declared, “we must aim to become a global civil power...”⁴⁵ As a result, the EU strived to develop its civilian capabilities to accompany its redefined military capabilities and foster a multi-faceted approach that complemented the broader allied efforts. In fact, it can even be said that the EU has a comparative advantage to NATO or the UN when it comes to civilian missions. On the one hand, the EU approach allows for a greater aggregation of resources in cases where needs are large or no single state is able to send staff in large numbers.⁴⁶ Additionally, the EU can sometimes offer an attractive alternative when NATO or the UN is not viable options for political reasons. There is also the consideration that the inherent multilateral nature of the EU prepares it better for civilian work when compared to NATO, whose missions are historically military in nature. Even if NATO were able to undertake civilian work in crisis zones, “the EU would still have a comparative advantage, given that it will never develop military capabilities on par with NATO.”⁴⁷

The EU learned through its successful participation in the post-conflict reconstruction process in Kosovo that this is an area where the EU could strengthen and take on a leadership

⁴⁵ “Romano Prodi – 2000-2005: Shaping the New Europe,” EUROPA Press Releases, accessed March 28, 2011, <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/00/41&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>.

⁴⁶ Christopher Chivvis, “EU Civilian Crisis Management: The Record So Far,” *RAND Corporation* (2010): 46.

⁴⁷ Chivvis, “EU Civilian Crisis Management,” 1.

role in future crises. There are three stages in the post-conflict reconstruction process. The first phase, the “initial response,” immediately follows the end of widespread violence and is characterized by the provision of humanitarian services, stability and military interventions. The next phase, the “transition phase,” is a period in which attention is focused on supporting the legitimization of local capacities in order to restart the economy, establishing functional structures for government and judicial processes, etc. The final phase is a time where recovery efforts are consolidated and the military actors withdraw and the society begins to “normalize.”⁴⁸ It is important to note that these phases tend to overlap and are not always consistent.

Through its involvement in the Kosovo war, the EU learned that it could be the one to provide substantial humanitarian aid before, during and after a crisis. The failure to use its economic strength to make a difference during the Kosovo war was an embarrassment to the EU and served as one of many lessons learned. The EU bore a lot of the responsibility for the international community’s inability to stop the humanitarian crisis that occurred in Kosovo. Following the end of the war, the EU formally institutionalized its humanitarian goals with the entry into force of the Amsterdam Treaty in 1999. The treaty officially incorporated the Petersberg Tasks, which included a particular emphasis on formulating humanitarian and rescue tasks. The official incorporation of the Petersberg Tasks and the humiliation the EU carried from the failure in Kosovo are likely to be the stimulation that drove the EU to become devoted to the post-conflict humanitarian mission. During the phases of post-conflict reconstruction, the EU was able to successfully contribute to the mission. Despite the criticism that this aid came too little too late, the success of this contribution gave the EU the confidence to do more of this in the future.

⁴⁸ Sanam Anderlini and Judy El-Bushra, “Post-Conflict Reconstruction,” *Inclusive Security, Sustainable Peace: A Toolkit for Advocacy and Action* (2004), 51.

By implementing formal changes to improve the EU's legitimacy on the international stage, the EU was able to strengthen its ability to effectively utilize political mediation throughout all stages of war. The EU established itself from its origin as an advocate for multilateralism and diplomatic solutions, and its diplomatic failures in Kosovo only increased the dedication to these civilian tools. However, this dedication to diplomacy did not always end as planned. During the Kosovo crisis, the EU was unable to successfully negotiate with the Milosevic government before it was too late and contributed to the formation of the underperforming Contact Group. A few formal improvements have been made since the Kosovo war with the goal to improve the EU's ability to successfully follow through with political mediation. For example, with the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997 came the appointment of Javier Solana as the High Representative and was thus given explicit responsibility for the CFSP, including "the formulation, preparation and implementation of policy decisions, and, when appropriate, acting on behalf of the [European] Council at the request of the Presidency."⁴⁹ As previously mentioned, this is the first time that particular responsibilities are given to one person in the EU structure. The appointment of Javier Solana gives more political legitimacy to EU foreign policy and the presence of the EU on the international stage.

Despite the lessons learned that the intergovernmental structure of CFSP impedes the EU's ability to act quickly and with one voice, few and meager institutional changes were made during and after the ratification of the Amsterdam Treaty. This stems largely from the skepticism towards a process referred to as the "Brusselization" of European foreign and security policy. This concept refers to skepticism toward the common foreign and security policy being put under supranational control. This is because the EU is not a sovereign actor in the same manner as

⁴⁹ "Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the WEU," European Parliament, accessed March 5, 2011, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/6_1_3_en.htm.

member states, and therefore it is hard to measure the extent to which the EU should and is able to exercise credible and authoritative foreign policy.⁵⁰ As of 2001, national decision-making still remained important as a result. Although common institutions of the EU often articulate CFSP ambitions of EU member states, at the end of the day they are intergovernmental in character. Therefore, the EU does not possess any sovereignty by which it could implement or enforce any institutional goals. CFSP ambitions, therefore, rely on the voluntary national decisions and contributions. In a speech in 2000, the EU's External Commissioner Chris Patten exerted, "The member states have not given the [European] Commission a sole right of initiative; nor, in general have they agreed to abide by majority votes; nor do they accept that Europe has occupied the space reducing national freedom of action. It is important to understand this...Foreign policy remains primarily a matter for democratically elected member state governments."⁵¹ As a result, the decision-making process is slow, since decisions require unanimity from all of the member states, and may lead to timid, "least common denominator" results.⁵²

Ultimately, the EU learned from its mistakes in Kosovo and was able to respond to crisis in Afghanistan much more effectively and with a stronger set of tools that it had before. The EU reestablished itself as an advocate for multilateralism and the value of diplomacy in solving an international crisis. Additionally, the EU realized its value as an economic powerhouse and its potential to take the lead in a humanitarian before, during and after a crisis. The EU was also able to redefine its military capabilities, developing capabilities to deploy civilian missions with the goal to assist in peacemaking and peace building. The EU had learned a lot from its mistakes,

⁵⁰ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 14.

⁵¹ "Commissioner Patten's Speech on Iraq at the EP," European Union at the United Nations, accessed March 5, 2011, http://www.europa-eu-un.net/articles/es/article_2110_es.htm.

⁵² Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 13.

but all success, in the Kosovo war. The Afghanistan war that followed gave the EU the opportunity to prove that it had internalized these lessons and implemented long-term changes.

EU Involvement in Afghanistan

When the Afghanistan war began in 2001, as a result of lessons learned in the Kosovo war and changes thus made to CFSP, the EU had evolved into a unique civilian power that was prepared to complement the allied efforts. It was understood clearly by the EU that military efforts were necessary to respond to the attacks, but they were not enough to resolve the crisis. High Representative Solana later affirmed, “Afghanistan won’t only be resolved militarily” and that “a military solution is neither the sole nor the best option, particularly during the stabilization of a crisis.”⁵³ The EU and its member states brought to the table substantial collective and national assets, ultimately encouraging a “holistic” approach to the overall mission.⁵⁴ The EU made clear from the beginning its intention was to predominately contribute civilian instruments, but would also contribute military forces within its capabilities. The European Security Strategy, later released in 2003, demonstrated the EU’s commitment to using civilian tools by, “Spreading good governance, supporting social and political reform, dealing with corruption and abuse of power, establishing the rule of law and protecting human rights...”⁵⁵

Within hours after the attacks, the EU showed the international community it was going to act differently than it did in Kosovo. The EU was able to respond more quickly and with a more unified response than anyone had seen before, even though this was one of the areas that

⁵³ Solana, “10 years.”

⁵⁴ Steve Marsh and Hans Mackenstein, *The International Relations of the European Union* (Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2005), 95.

⁵⁵ “European Security Strategy,” European Union External Action, accessed March 6, 2011, <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showpage.aspx?id=266&lang=EN>.10.

saw the least amount of improvements. Through recommitments to its most natural and strongest assets, the EU proved to be a great leader in diplomacy and humanitarian aid to the Afghan people. And finally, thanks to the EU's redefinition of its military capabilities, the EU was able to contribute to the US-led military mission and large police training mission.

A Quick, One-Voice Response to 9/11: The EU Surprised Us All

The EU reaction to the 9/11 attacks proved to be a stark contrast from the highly criticized protracted EU response to the Kosovo crisis. Former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger once posed the question in the 1970s: "If I want to call Europe, what phone number do I use?" He implied that the EU lacked the necessary coherence to be a viable presence in international relations. Thirty years later, the consolidation of CFSP in the Amsterdam Treaty and the appointment of Javier Solana as the High Representative of CFSP have given the EU more credibility on the international stage. However, CFSP still maintains an intergovernmental governing structure and the limitations that come with it. Therefore, there was still little faith from the international community that the EU had the capability to respond quickly and as one unit.

Contrary to expectations, the EU shocked the international community and demonstrated a coherence and swiftness that it had been lacking too often in the past. Kissinger's accusations were finally challenged in the aftermath of the September terrorist attacks. Within thirty-six hours of the attacks, formal statements were made by High Representative Javier Solana, EU Commission President Roman Prodi, the President of the European Parliament Nicole Fontaine, External Relations Commissioner Chris Patten and the General Affairs Council. Perhaps the most important was Javier Solana's declaration that "the EU stands firmly and fully behind the

US.”⁵⁶ Just days after the attacks, the US leadership expressed their surprise in the speediness of the cross-pillar EU response. As US Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs Charles P. Ries commented, “for old EU hands, the EU’s response was breathtaking in its speed and ambition.”⁵⁷

Within two weeks after the attacks, the EU had made serious moves toward the implementation of antiterrorism policies and developed a comprehensive action plan. The action plan called for the EU to concentrate on various issues, including the enhancement of police cooperation, the development of international legal instruments, the strengthening of air security and the coordination of the EU’s global action with an emphasis on enhanced cooperation between the EU and other countries.⁵⁸ The action plan was comprised of seventy-nine measures to help combat terrorism. Among the most important initiatives was the introduction of a common EU-wide arrest warrant that would be enacted no later than January 2004.⁵⁹ Later on September 20, an EU-US ministerial meeting was held in Washington and a day later the European Council convened for an extraordinary meeting to analyze the international situation. The Council members emphasized they would be in “total solidarity with the US,” reasoning that the “attacks were an assault on our open, democratic, tolerant and multicultural societies.”⁶⁰ The Council also recognized the legitimacy of any forthcoming military retaliation and indicated that the member states would assist within the realm of their abilities. Following the first retaliatory attacks launched in October, the Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt (who at the time held the EU presidency) declared, “The EU wished to...reaffirm its entire solidarity with the US, the

⁵⁶ Steven Erlanger, “A day of terror: the world’s reaction,” *New York Times*, September 12, 2001, accessed March 5, 2011, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C07EFDC1238F931A2575AC0A9679C8B63>.

⁵⁷ Marsh and Mackenstein, *The International Relations*, 96.

⁵⁸ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 78.

⁵⁹ Marsh and Mackenstein, *The International Relations*, 94.

⁶⁰ Jean De Ruyt and Joanne Myers, “The European Response to Terrorism,” *Carnegie Council*, September 26, 2001, accessed February 25, 2011, <http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/transcripts/705.html>.

UK and other countries engaged in these operations.”⁶¹ European Commission president Romano Prodi also declared, ‘We [the EU] are united and will remain united in this struggle against those who attack the very foundations of civilization.’⁶²

In the midst of the successful EU reaction to the crisis, there was a moment of fear for EU coherence when Europe’s Big Three (France, Great Britain and Germany) met twice as a secluded group. Their first summit, attended by President Jacques Chirac, Prime Minister Tony Blair and Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, came just one day before the official EU Summit on October 20. After the meeting, the leaders were bombarded with much criticism from other European governments who felt unjustifiably excluded from their deliberations. It thus came at a surprise that on November 4, about two weeks after the first meeting, Blair again invited Chirac and Schroeder for another mini-summit in London. When international criticism mounted anew, Blair conceded to the criticism and also invited High Representative Javier Solana, the Belgian prime minister, as well as the Italian, Spanish and Dutch leaders.⁶³ French politician Pierre Moscovici, who at the time was the Minister of European Affairs in the French government, argued in support of the Big Three meetings saying that France, Great Britain and Germany would have direct military commitment and that it was thus normal to hold technical consultations regarding the military aspects of their commitments.⁶⁴ Regardless, it shows progress that the Big Three acknowledged the criticism and ultimately decided the response to the attacks must be an EU action.

The EU was able to move past this obstacle and further proved EU coherence by appointing Klaus-Peter Klaiber as the EU’s Special Representative to Afghanistan (EUSR) on

⁶¹ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 78.

⁶² “International Leaders React to Attacks,” PBS, October 7, 2001, accessed February 25, 2011, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/updates/october01/international_10-7.html.

⁶³ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 78.

⁶⁴ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 84.

December 10. The EUSR has a small team of advisors and is to act as the EU's face and voice in Afghanistan. The mandate is to contribute to the integrity and full implementation of the EU-Afghanistan Joint Declaration, encourage positive contributions from regional actors and support the role played by the UN and the work of the High Representative Javier Solana.⁶⁵ Francesc Vendrell then replaced Klaiber in 2002. The current EUSR, Ettore Sequi, has been in office since 2008. Through the appointment of the EUSR and the swift cross-pillar response to the attacks, the EU was able to contest the international community's hesitant expectations of EU capabilities. Even in the face of structural limitations, the EU was able to learn from its mistakes in Kosovo and made great progress toward a viable EU actor on the international stage.

Diplomacy in Afghanistan: The EU as a Natural Multilateralist

The EU's failed attempts at effective diplomacy in the Kosovo war renewed the EU's commitment to pursuing multilateral solutions in the Afghanistan war. The lessons from the indecisive Contact Group reminded the EU of the important role that diplomacy can play in resolving an international crisis. High Representative Javier Solana later asserted, the "solution to any crisis, emergency or conflict, must always be political..."⁶⁶ Thus, the EU's intuitive reaction to the terrorist attacks was to pursue a multilateral approach to resolve the crisis. The European Security Strategy explicitly states these tendencies in 2003: "There are few if any problems we can deal with on our own. The threats described [including terrorism] are common threats, shared with all our closest partners. International cooperation is a necessity. We need to pursue our objectives both through multilateral cooperation in international organizations and

⁶⁵ Eva Gross, "The EU in Afghanistan: Growing Engagement in Turbulent Times," *Heinrich Boll Foundation* (August 2008), 1.

⁶⁶ Solana, "10 years."

through partnerships with key actors.”⁶⁷ This increased political legitimacy on the international stage and led to a more successful EU actor in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan, the EU utilizes mediation, conferences and negotiations for the greater goal of supporting institution-building and good governance during the conflict and also during the post-conflict reconstruction process.

While the US was occupied with the initial stages of the military mission, the EU played a crucial role in the creation of an international coalition. These efforts began with the EU-Russia Summit on October 3, then the EU-Canada Summit on October 18, a meeting with East European countries in Brussels on October 20 (this was before the addition of several East European countries in the 2004 EU enlargement), another meeting with the twelve members of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership on November 5 and finally the EU-India Summit on November 23. Leaders of the CFSP also engaged in extensive shuttle diplomacy in key countries in the Middle East. For example, the External Relations Commissioner Chris Patten, High Representative Javier Solana, Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs Louis Michel and Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs Josep Piqué undertook a ten-day tour of principal Islamic capitals. The message was of reassurance that the response to September 11 would not be targeted at Islam.⁶⁸ The efforts of this international coalition, spearheaded by the EU, were largely considered a success. The Taliban was overthrown and was followed by the advances made by the Bonn Conference.

The EU-led international coalition efforts were tested at the Bonn Conference in November 2001. Hosted by the German capital Bonn, the UN-sponsored conference was attended by the international coalition members and representatives from the main Afghan ethnic groups. The drastically different groups eventually agreed to the creation of a temporary

⁶⁷ “European Security Strategy,” 13.

⁶⁸ Marsh and Mackenstein, *The International Relations*, 95.

transitional government and more generally the establishment of a process for the political, social and economic reconstruction of the war torn country. The Bonn Accords were officially signed on December 5, establishing an interim government led by Hamid Karzai and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). This was followed by the adoption of a new constitution in 2003, a presidential election in 2004 and National Assembly elections in 2005.⁶⁹ The Bonn Conference was not only a very proud moment for Germany, but for the EU as a whole. Unlike the Kosovo war when the conclusion of the conflict was attributed to the success of NATO and the US working together, according to Akan Malici, the Bonn Conference was seen as “one of those telling moments of Europe and America coming together.”⁷⁰

Following the completion of the political transition process set out in the Bonn Agreement, the EU-Afghanistan Joint Declaration was signed in 2005. The Joint Declaration committed the EU to formalized bilateral cooperation and commitments with Afghanistan leaders. Key priorities for Afghanistan’s transition process identified in the Joint Declaration included “consolidating a democratic political system, establishing responsible and accountable government institutions, strengthening the rule of law, and safeguarding human rights (including the rights of women) and the development of civil society.”⁷¹

Through the creation of the international coalition, the crucial role played in the Bonn Conference and the EU-Afghanistan Joint Declaration, the EU made a clear commitment to diplomacy as an effective instrument. Moreover, these multilateral efforts coupled with the new confidence of the EU as an international actor renewed the EU’s confidence in the EU taking the lead in specific areas of a larger mission.

⁶⁹ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 99.

⁷⁰ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 99.

⁷¹ Gross, “Security Sector Reform,” 21.

Humanitarian Aid: Before, During and After the War

In response to the EU's humiliation to prevent the humanitarian crisis in Kosovo, the EU learned its lesson and took the lead in the humanitarian mission in Afghanistan. The EU humanitarian efforts in Afghanistan began a decade before the war. Before 2001, the EU Commission committed roughly \$500 million in aid to Afghanistan. Before the terrorist attacks in 2001, the EU was the main supporter of Afghan refugees. EU programs have built and financed the only system of rural health clinics in the country and provided clean water for more than 5 million people. Some say the humanitarian mission in Afghanistan is fueled by self-interest, in other words most of the heroin on European streets comes from Afghanistan. Through humanitarian aid, the EU can break the chain of opium harvesting and help the Afghan people grow alternative crops and find alternative markets.⁷² Despite this criticism, humanitarian aid to the EU is more than just building roads, but it is about making an investment in sustainable development. In 1999 Chris Patten, the European External Affairs Commissioner, stated, "the investment we make in sustainable development is as much a part of our global security as the investment we make in our armed forces."⁷³

The EU's renewed dedication to a sustainable humanitarian mission is evident in Afghanistan. In 2001 and 2002, EU Commission and the member states combined committed over 250 million Euro. After September 11, money has been allocated to such areas as food stocks and medical supplies, and particularly to the efforts of demining Afghanistan, the country that is thought to have the largest concentration of landmines anywhere on earth.⁷⁴ As a result of the EU's dedication to the humanitarian efforts, the EU has established itself as the second largest donor to Afghanistan (second only to the US). In November 2001, the Big Three of

⁷² Walker, "EU doing for Afghanistan?" 33.

⁷³ Walker, "EU doing for Afghanistan?" 33.

⁷⁴ Walker, "EU doing for Afghanistan?" 33.

Europe issued a joint statement on behalf of the EU member states to President Bush, stating that Europe stood firm with the US but insisted that the response to terrorism had to include a “massive humanitarian effort” for Afghanistan and “a revitalized Middle East Process.”⁷⁵ The EU realized that the US was devoting the majority of its resources to the military campaign, and therefore the Europeans saw the opportunity to take the lead in the humanitarian crisis. In the period of 2002-2006, the European Commission and EU member states contributed 3.7 billion Euros in aid to Afghanistan.⁷⁶ From 2007-2010, the European Commission provided 610 million additional Euros. The package focused primarily on three key priorities, to which 90% of the funding was allocated: reform of the justice sector (40%), rural development (30%) and health (20%). An additional 420 million Euros is expected to be allocated in the 2011-2013 period. In total, the EU and its member states have honored their commitments to the humanitarian mission, providing over 4.5 billion Euros in aid since 2001.⁷⁷

Military Contributions: Success in the Face of Great Limitations

Despite the fact that the EU does not have its own permanent military structure, the EU recognized the need for forces in the military mission in Afghanistan and was able to successfully contribute within its means. The EU had learned from Kosovo that its strengths lie in civilian tools, but it also learned that military instruments must complement civilian tools. Through the St. Malo Declaration and the creation of the ESDP, the EU had not only made formal improvements, but there was also an informal increase in solidarity among member states to strengthen the EU’s ability to aggregate military resources. After the September 11 attacks, the EU recognized the legitimacy of a military mission and the enormity of the military mission

⁷⁵ Walker, “EU doing for Afghanistan?” 33.

⁷⁶ Gross, “The EU in Afghanistan,” 1.

⁷⁷ Gross, “The EU in Afghanistan,” 2.

ahead, one that not even the US could handle on its own. The EU may not have a permanent military structure, but it does have access to many substantial national forces. British Prime Minister Tony Blair recognized, “After the US and Russia there are not many countries that are on par with the EU’s collective forces.”⁷⁸ The EU vowed to contribute military forces within its means, but this does not discount the unique civilian identity of the EU. Hanns Maull notes “recourse to military means does not invalidate the notion of civilian power Europe...”⁷⁹

Since the EU possesses no authority by which it could enforce any military decision, military success in Afghanistan is determined by whether EU member states act militarily in a way that supports the aspirations of the EU. In terms of military capabilities, ambitions toward EU commonality depend on voluntary participation by member states toward a given security challenge. A common European approach therefore requires coordination, alignment and cooperation with the broader EU mission. The question leading up to the military invasion in Afghanistan was whether the key EU military states – Great Britain, France and Germany – would act separately or together in the name of the EU.

EU commitment to the military mission in Afghanistan began at the EU-US ministerial on September 20. The European Council recognized the legitimacy of any forthcoming military retaliation and indicated that the members of the Union would assist “within the realm of their possibilities.”⁸⁰ The day after the first retaliatory attacks were made on October 7, the EU again gave a strong backing for the military action. Therefore, it was clear that the goal of the EU was to stand by the US and assisted in the military action through the contributions of its member states. Great Britain contributed as expected; France was at first hesitant, but made an effective

⁷⁸ Robert Cooper, *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the 21st Century* (London: Atlantic Books, 2003), 156.

⁷⁹ Maull, “Germany and Japan.”

⁸⁰ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 77.

contribution in the end; and Germany surprised everyone by moving past its military taboo and contributed forces.

British commitment to the EU call for military engagement was as to be expected considering its close ties with the US. In anticipation that Britain would be engaged in the military campaign, the Blair government provided reassurance for the necessity of the retaliatory strikes. Prime Minister Blair alluded to the eminent commitment to stand by the US militarily, stating, “We stand shoulder to shoulder with our American friends in this hour of tragedy, and we, like them, will not rest until this evil is driven from our world.”⁸¹ The US and Britain agreed to closely coordinate their military actions and when the first air strikes were made, it was done by US and British forces. Shortly after the initial invasion, American and British military planners met to coordinate a ground deployment. By the end of October, a total of 4,200 British troops had been assigned to the operations in Afghanistan.⁸² After the capital was captured on November 13, Prime Minister Blair was quick to stress that despite this success, “the military job is not yet done.”⁸³ On December 20, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1368, authorizing the establishment of a multinational force to ensure peace and stability in Afghanistan. It was announced that Britain would take the first lead of the multinational military force.⁸⁴ Overall, Great Britain proved great solidarity to the US military actions and devotion to the EU declarations of solidarity with the US.

France, despite a show of hesitancy at the beginning, was able to move past its traditional unwillingness to be entangled in US-led military operations and ultimately committed to the EU military declaration. At the beginning of October, after a US request for military aid, President

⁸¹ “Blair’s Statement in Full,” BBC News, September 11, 2001, accessed February 16, 2011, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/1538551.stm.

⁸² Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 90.

⁸³ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 93.

⁸⁴ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 93.

Chirac evaluated the request with top members of his government. They were satisfied with Washington's provision of evidence, and thus France agreed to allow the US to use its airspace and assist US warships stationed in the Indian Ocean. However, this initial contribution was quite modest in comparison to British contributions. On October 6, President Chirac extended the French commitment and pledged that French troops would participate in the US-led military offensive in a "spirit of solidarity and responsibility."⁸⁵ Even though French troops were not involved in the initial air strikes, French Defense Minister Alain Richard acknowledged that French intelligence forces were already on the ground and that within a matter of days the French "level of capacity for intervention" would be "comparable to that of Britain."⁸⁶ Later on October 17, Defense Minister Richard declared that French soldiers would take part in US-led operations. On November 6, France deployed an infantry company to assist US and British forces and committed contributing more troops for aerial, naval and ground forces. France continued to send more troops, aircraft, helicopters, etc. Overall, the initial French contribution was hesitant and meek, but France was able to prove its allegiance to EU desires through more of a military contribution than expected.

German involvement in the military operation was an unexpected surprise considering the taboo that still persisted on German involvement in combat missions. Before the beginning of the military mission, President Bush issued a military request to Germany, asking the chancellor for the deployment of some NATO aircraft to the US that would, in turn, free US planes for the mission in Afghanistan. The US request was modest and assured that German forces would not be committed to any combat missions. German Chancellor Schroeder avoided the subject for as

⁸⁵ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 83.

⁸⁶ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 84.

long as possible, putting his focus on the diplomatic aspects of the mission.⁸⁷ However, he knew that he would not be able to avoid responding more positively to the US military request without jeopardizing the state of the transatlantic alliance and the prospects for a viable European foreign and security policy. Aware of these risks, Chancellor Schroeder set out to overcome the taboo on German involvement in military operations that had been present since the end of WWII. He declared that the country had a “new responsibility in international operations aimed at securing a safe and just world order.”⁸⁸ He also made it clear to the parliamentarians that German “solidarity must be more than mere lip-service. Let there be no mistake, this expressly includes participation in military operations to defend freedom and human rights, and to establish stability and security.”⁸⁹ Just one week after the first coalition attacks, Chancellor Schroeder announced to the German public that the country would soon be called upon to provide more substantive military help. In the beginning of November Chancellor Schroeder convened with his security council and announced publicly that Germany would provide what Washington requested militarily.⁹⁰ This marked an important moment in German history, one that marked Germany’s abandonment of its postwar ambivalence toward the use of military force in international conflicts. Chancellor Schroeder called it an “important and historic” decision.⁹¹ Germany subsequently prepared to send the largest German combat to serve overseas since 1945. Then on November 20 Germany contributed to the international coalition: Transall flights, cargo haulers with supplies, 500 aircrew personnel, two frigates and an Airbus MEDVAC.⁹² This truly sent an important message to Germany’s allies, signaling a new conception of German foreign policy.

⁸⁷ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 96.

⁸⁸ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 96.

⁸⁹ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 96.

⁹⁰ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 97.

⁹¹ Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 97.

⁹² Malici, *Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy*, 98.

Even amidst the constructive military contributions made by the Big Three, the limitations of EU military capabilities still persisted in the Afghan mission. A decrease in public support for the war in Afghanistan has resulted in member states unwilling to commit extra combat troops. Great Britain, the second largest contributor to NATO forces behind the US, has said it cannot do more and demands “fairer burden-sharing of responsibilities,” particularly in more difficult areas such as the volatile southern province of Helmand.⁹³ There is a great deployability gap, in other words there is a large difference between what European countries have deployed and what they could deploy. The Netherlands and Great Britain, along with several of the eastern European countries, contribute a significant amount of troops. Countries such as Belgium and Hungary have made significant contributions, but could do better. And then there are countries like France and Austria that have made minimal deployments that are well below their capabilities.⁹⁴ In addition, European national governments have implemented restrictions (“national caveats”) on when, where and how their troops can be deployed. There are at least 60 such caveats on European troops.⁹⁵ There has been frequent criticism that this limits the overall operational capability and ability to accomplish the mission.⁹⁶ Apart from the Dutch and British soldiers, no other EU nations are willing to operate in the insurgency-ridden southern and eastern parts of the country.⁹⁷ In November 2006, the US pressured the EU member states to remove many of these restrictions and increase their troop contributions. The member states agreed, however little has been done since.⁹⁸

It is evident that military contributions by EU member states have not been executed perfectly, but this does not discount the larger EU success in responding militarily. Immediately

⁹³ Shada Islam and Eva Gross, “Afghanistan: Europe’s Credibility Test,” *European Policy Centre* (March 2009).

⁹⁴ Korski, “Europe’s forgotten war,” 17.

⁹⁵ Korski “EU is missing.”

⁹⁶ Islam and Gross, “Europe’s Credibility Test.”

⁹⁷ Korski, “Europe’s forgotten war,” 16.

⁹⁸ Korski, “Europe’s forgotten war,” 16.

following the attacks, the EU declared that member states would contribute within their means to the US-led military operation. Both France and Germany engaged all three branches of their armed forces. Germany made great progress toward normalizing its foreign and security policy by removing the taboo on the use of military force and establishing it as a legitimate instrument of foreign policy. These military contributions have been made in addition to the lead the EU has taken on humanitarian aid and diplomacy in the Afghanistan war.

EU Police Mission in Afghanistan: Commitment to the Rule of Law

The EU's inherent commitment to the rule of law led to an EU-led police training mission created in 2007 during the transition phase of post-conflict reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan. In 2003 the EU established the ability to deploy four different kinds of civilian missions in order to pursue peacemaking and peace building. EU civilian missions are largely dependent on pre-existing military operations. Staff for the civilian missions come from EU member states and costs are shared between member states and the overall EU budget. Most EU missions are advisory rather than executive nature, and are under the authority of the intergovernmental EU Council.⁹⁹ Unlike Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) that are supplied by European national governments, EU civilian missions usually do not deploy in conflict zones, which makes the mission in Afghanistan more intriguing to examine.¹⁰⁰ Police missions, one of the four civilian missions, are considered the most important and numerous EU civilian missions to date.

Police reform has proven to be one of the most difficult ventures by the EU in Afghanistan. The unstable Afghanistan police force dates much farther back than the

⁹⁹ Chivvis, "EU Civilian Crisis Management," 5.

¹⁰⁰ Chivvis, "EU Civilian Crisis Management," 10.

Afghanistan war and as a result is one of the biggest challenges in the conflict stabilization and reconstruction effort. For more than twenty years prior to 2001, Afghanistan had been without a functioning civilian police force.¹⁰¹ The police force that existed was a quasi-military force in which the officers were “untrained, ill-equipped, illiterate, and owing their allegiance to local warlords and militia commanders rather than to the central government.” The police force was regarded as a coercive instrument of the state rather than a national civilian police force. As a result, much of the Afghan public was “distrustful of state security organs.”¹⁰² Once the international community entered Afghanistan, they were faced with multiple hurdles when it came to police reform. The hurdles included establishing institutional structures and training procedures and effectively training a large number of police officers.

In November 2001 Germany agreed to take the lead role in Afghan police reform, however the ineffective mission was turned over to the EU in 2007. The German effort lacked the resources to make the mission a success. As a result, the US started the Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan (CSTC-A) mission in 2005. Later that year, the resources contributed from the German effort were much less than that of the US. This deprived the German mission of its legitimacy and political authority.¹⁰³ The US began to pressure the EU to put the police mission under EU control. At the time, Germany held the EU presidency, and ultimately decided the best next step would be to hand the mission over to the EU.¹⁰⁴ Thus, EUPOL Afghanistan was launched in June 2007 with a three-year mandate. Some may say that this late start is seen as a failure for the EU. However, it is a testament to the EU commitment to Afghanistan that it did not let the mission be taken over by NATO or another allied force.

¹⁰¹ Chivvis, “EU Civilian Crisis Management,” 18.

¹⁰² Gross, “Security Sector Reform,” 25.

¹⁰³ Chivvis, “EU Civilian Crisis Management,” 18.

¹⁰⁴ Gross, “Security Sector Reform,” 27.

The purpose of the EUPOL Afghanistan mission is to assist in establishing an effective Afghan civilian police force under Afghan ownership. For much of 2007 and 2008, EUPOL continued with the basic approach and size of the German mission. By mid-2009, the mission, headquartered in Kabul, had trained roughly 7,000 police officers and had roughly 260 international staff from 19 EU member states, plus Canada, Croatia, New Zealand and Norway, as well as 123 local staff. Two-thirds of the EUPOL staff are deployed in Kabul, with the remainder in 15 provinces. The EUPOL staff in the provinces are deployed to PRTs led by the country of origin of the EU staff.¹⁰⁵ Like the German mission, EUPOL's focus is largely on mentoring and advising senior level staff. However, unlike the German mission, since the fall of 2008 the EUPOL mission began training staff in addition to mentoring and advising. Moreover, unlike select other EU civilian missions operating today, EUPOL does not have executive power, and therefore it can only act in a coordinating and advisory role.¹⁰⁶

The EUPOL Afghanistan mission works alongside other allied efforts and individual EU member states. As mentioned previously, one of the most effective contributions the EU makes with its civilian efforts is how its efforts complement the overall allied efforts. In this case, EUPOL operates alongside the US-run CSTC-A. In contrast to the EU effort, CSTC-A focuses on training large numbers of local police. EUPOL also operates alongside a number of bilateral efforts run by European member states through their PRTs. These missions focus on the bottom levels of the Afghan police force, while EUPOL focuses on higher-level staff. Unlike the other missions, EUPOL also provides staff with specific expertise, such as in forensics and other high-skill areas.¹⁰⁷ In addition to the US, European bilateral and EU missions, NATO recently began its own police training mission, the NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan (NTM-A). This

¹⁰⁵ Chivvis, "EU Civilian Crisis Management," 20.

¹⁰⁶ Chivvis, "EU Civilian Crisis Management," 22.

¹⁰⁷ Gross, "Security Sector Reform," 26.

mission focuses on both police and military training and to provide greater coherence to the police efforts that are taking place outside of EUPOL on a bilateral basis and to help coordinate these efforts with EUPOL.¹⁰⁸ While one may argue that the NATO mission is in response to the failure of the EU mission, the police training mission in Afghanistan is massive and requires an immense amount of resources that no single allied force is prepared to provide. Therefore, the NATO mission allowed several allied forces to join the effort to address the demands. Ultimately, the NATO mission is meant to complement the EU efforts and coordinate the bilateral efforts that are going on outside of EUPOL, and then coordinate with EUPOL itself.

Despite the overall contribution EUPOL has made to the police reform mission, it would be inaccurate to describe the mission without addressing its limitations. The most significant limitations include staff shortages, alleged risk aversion, and the limited size of the mission. First, the mission is always short on staff. Not only is the US mission CTSC-A several times larger, but the EU has continually had trouble meeting its own staffing goals.¹⁰⁹ Unlike missions in the Balkans, the Afghanistan mission is considered much more dangerous and is in a less convenient location for Europeans. However, even if the staff are willing, because of the intergovernmental nature of the ESDP, it is still ultimately up to their country of origin to release them from national duty. Theoretically, the EU has large numbers of deployable professional police. However in practice, many member states are unwilling to release experts because they are already in low supply domestically.¹¹⁰ The second limitation is alleged risk aversion. In other words, since the majority of personnel deployed through EUPOL are stationed in Kabul and the rest in provinces that are relatively secure, the EU mission has been criticized for averting risk and leaving the more dangerous areas to other allied forces. The third limitation is the limited

¹⁰⁸ Chivvis, "EU Civilian Crisis Management," 22.

¹⁰⁹ Chivvis, "EU Civilian Crisis Management," 25.

¹¹⁰ Gross, "Security Sector Reform," 30.

size of the mission. The small overall size of the EU mission, combined with the fact the mission is limited to just advising and assisting, makes the success of the mission dependent on the will and receptiveness of the Afghan government. Without strong political and financial incentives, it can be very hard to see reforms implemented.

Despite the mission's limitations, EUPOL Afghanistan has managed to fulfill its mission to train higher-level, higher-qualified officers. Additionally, the EU has contributed successfully with its role of coordinating the international police reform effort. It should be noted that the EU has recognized its shortcomings in this area and has already made measures for improvements. In 2010, European External Affairs Commission Benita Ferrero-Waldner stated that the EU is committed long-term to rebuilding of Afghanistan: "Afghanistan's problems cannot be solved without stronger governance and respect for the rule of law. Promotion of the rule of law will remain one of our key priorities for the years to come."¹¹¹ At the end of the day, a fully functioning Afghan police force requires effective officers at all levels. Therefore, the EU's training of upper level officers is still a contribution, even if it is not as significant as the US would hope for given the EU's resources.

All in all, the EU has demonstrated in Afghanistan that it is committed to contributing to the international efforts before, during and after a crisis. Before the war in Afghanistan even began, the EU was already hard at work in its humanitarian mission to improve the lives of the Afghan people. This humanitarian mission did not end once the war began, but in fact it became stronger and much larger presence amongst the allied efforts. During the war, the EU took the lead on utilizing diplomacy to its fullest with many bilateral summits and the Bonn Conference. And finally, during the post-conflict reconstruction phase the EU used one of its newest

¹¹¹ "EU-Afghanistan Troika: EU Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner confirms long-term commitment to Afghanistan," European Union at the United Nations, accessed March 10, 2011, http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_7723_en.htm.

competences, civilian missions, to demonstrate its commitment to its role as an effective international actor in Afghanistan.

Conclusion

While critics may charge that the EU has not played a significant role in the Afghanistan war, there is strong evidence to suggest the contrary. Indeed, EU involvement in the Afghanistan war has proven to be a success, especially when recognizing the EU's lessons learned from the Kosovo war. As noted above there are many criticisms about the effectiveness of the EU contributions in Afghanistan, and to go further some even argue that the Kosovo and Afghanistan wars cannot be compared so closely. These critics note that the scale and location of the missions are completely different (Afghanistan is far away and very large, whereas Kosovo was closer and smaller) and the fact is that NATO enacted the Chapter 5 measure on collective security for Afghanistan and not Kosovo. But what is missing from this criticism is the value in the fact that the EU was able to contribute effectively to such a large mission that is not within Europe's territory. Unlike in Kosovo, the EU in Afghanistan was able to speak with one voice with High Representative Solana at the head and Europe's Big Three were able to forget their own national ambitions and instead worked toward a common EU goal. Instead, what is more significant here is the improvement and development that the EU showed in its ability to respond to crises. The EU showed great improvement right from the start by showing the international community that it could overcome its structural limitations and act quickly as a unit. Through its inherent strengths, the EU led the way in the multilateral efforts and the humanitarian mission. The EU also demonstrated through its military contributions that it understood its limitations, but

still contributed to the best of its ability. And finally, the EU was also able to utilize one of its newest competences, police missions, to contribute to the allied efforts.

The EU has made great strides towards improving the viability of CFSP in the Afghanistan war, but it is not a secret that the EU mission has produced imperfect results. As previously mentioned, there are still many limitations regarding the success of its civilian missions and the EU's military capabilities. In January 2011, Afghan Parliamentarian Golalei Nur accused the EU of not properly managing its aid to the country. More specifically, she said there is a "serious" lack of transparency in the way that aid is spent in the country.¹¹² Moreover, member states in the last couple years have pushed to emphasize national involvement, instead of global EU efforts, and appear to be giving priority to their own national profile in Afghanistan, rather than underscoring collective EU efforts.¹¹³ There is an increasing struggle to coordinate between the European Commission delegation in Kabul, EUPOL Afghanistan, Special Envoy Ettore Sequi's office and the new national "AfPak" envoys.¹¹⁴ Some have recommended the establishment of an EU contact group on Afghanistan in order to help with the coordination of all the EU efforts.

While the EU involvement in Afghanistan has its limitations, the EU's efforts need to be seen in the larger context of the overall international efforts. EU contributions are surrounded by fragmented international efforts and a lack of leadership or political direction from the overarching coordination bodies and lead institutions.¹¹⁵ This fragmented international environment comes from the fact that the international community decided to take a "light

¹¹² Martin Banks, "EU accused of 'failing' to properly manage aid in Afghanistan," *The Parliament.com*, January 31, 2011, accessed April 5, 2011, <http://www.theparliament.com/latest-news/article/newsarticle/eu-accused-of-failing-to-properly-manage-aid-in-afghanistan/>.

¹¹³ Islam and Gross, "Europe's Credibility Test."

¹¹⁴ Islam and Gross, "Europe's Credibility Test."

¹¹⁵ Gross and Juncos, *EU Conflict Prevention*, 120.

footprint” approach towards Afghanistan’s post-conflict reconstruction. This decision has come to haunt much of the international community in light of the resurgent violence.¹¹⁶

The EU has recognized its limitations and has already made the effort to implement significant structural changes. The Lisbon Treaty, which entered into force in December 2009, has attempted to solve many of these problems. First and foremost, the Lisbon Treaty dissolved the pillar system and the ESDP was renamed and is now called the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). Additionally, the treaty created a High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, merging the post of High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the European Commission for External Relations and European Neighborhood Policy. These efforts have been made with the goal to improve the legitimacy of the EU’s role in Afghanistan.

The persistent limitations the EU faces in its foreign and security policy do not discount the progress. The important lesson learned from EU involvement thus far in Afghanistan is that the EU is one step closer to a stronger CFSP and that its role as a legitimate civilian power on the international stage has been strengthened. While there are still many improvements that need to be made to CFSP, the EU has moved forward in its involvement in Afghanistan, instead of backward, toward becoming a viable actor in international crises.

¹¹⁶ Gross, “Security Sector Reform,” 13.

Bibliography

- Anderlini, Sanam and Judy El-Bushra. "Post-Conflict Reconstruction." *Inclusive Security, Sustainable Peace: A Toolkit for Advocacy and Action* (2004).
- Archer, Cliver. *The European Union*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Banks, Martin. "EU accused of 'failing' to properly manage aid in Afghanistan." *The Parliament.com*. January 31, 2011. Accessed April 5, 2011.
<http://www.theparliament.com/latest-news/article/newsarticle/eu-accused-of-failing-to-properly-manage-aid-in-afghanistan/>.
- BBC News. "Blair's Statement in Full." September 11, 2001. Accessed February 16, 2011.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/1538551.stm.
- Buckley, Joanna. "Can the EU be more effective in Afghanistan?" *Centre for European Reform* (April 2010).
- Chivvis, Christopher. "EU Civilian Crisis Management: The Record So Far." *RAND Corporation* (2010).
- Cooper, Robert. *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the 21st Century*. London: Atlantic Books, 2003.
- De Ruyt, Jean and Joanne Myers. "The European Response to Terrorism." *Carnegie Council*, September 26, 2001. Accessed February 25, 2011.
<http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/transcripts/705.html>.
- Dempsey, Judy. "EU Chooses special envoy for Afghanistan German Diplomat." *Financial Times*, December 11, 2001.
- DePorte, A.W. *Europe Between the Superpowers: The Enduring Balance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Duchêne, François. "The European Community and the Uncertainties of Interdependence." In *A Nation Writ Large? Foreign-Policy Problems before the European Community*, edited by M. Kohnstamm and W. Hager, 19-20. London: Macmillan, 1973.
- Duke, Simon, "From Amsterdam to Kosovo: Lessons for the future of CFSP." *EIPASCOPE 2* (1999): 1-14.
- Elgström, Ole and Michael Smith, eds. *The European Union's Roles in International Politics: Concepts and Analysis*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Erlanger, Steven. "A day of terror: the world's reaction." *New York Times*. September 12, 2001.

Accessed March 5, 2011. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C07EFDC1238F931A2575AC0A9679C8B63>.

EUROPA Press Releases. "Romano Prodi – 2000-2005: Shaping the New Europe." Accessed March 28, 2011, <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/00/41&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>.

European Navigator. "Franco-British St. Malo Declaration." Accessed March 14, 2011. <http://www.ena.lu/>.

European Navigator. "Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the WEU." Accessed March 5, 2011. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/6_1_3_en.htm.

European Union at the United Nations. "Commissioner Patten's Speech on Iraq at the EP." Accessed March 5, 2011. http://www.europa-eu-un.net/articles/es/article_2110_es.htm.

Foster, Nigel. *Blackstone's EC Legislation 2004-2005*. Oxford: University Press, 2004.

European Union at the United Nations. "EU-Afghanistan Troika: EU Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner confirms long term commitment to Afghanistan." Accessed March 10, 2011. http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_7723_en.htm.

European Union External Action. "European Security Strategy." Accessed March 6, 2011. <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showpage.aspx?id=266&lang=EN>.

Gross, Eva. "The EU in Afghanistan: Growing Engagement in Turbulent Times" *Heinrich Boll Foundation* (August 2008).

Gross, Eva. "Security Sector Reform in Afghanistan: the EU's Contribution," *Occasional Paper* (April 2009).

Gross, Eva and Ana Juncos, eds. *EU Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management: Roles, Institutions and Policies*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Islam, Shada and Eva Gross. "Afghanistan: Europe's Credibility Test." *European Policy Centre* (March 2009).

Karns, Margaret. "Multilateralism Matters Even More." *SAIS Review* 28 (2008).

Korski, Daniel. "Afghanistan: Europe's forgotten war." *European Council on Foreign Relations*, January 21, 2008.

Korski, Daniel. "The EU is missing in action in Afghanistan" *Today's Zaman*, January 28, 2008. Accessed March 21, 2011. http://www.todayszaman.com/newsDetail_getNewsById.

action?load=detay&link=132932

Krohn, Fabian. "What kind of power? The EU as an International Actor." *Atlantic Community*.

Accessed on March 24, 2011. <http://www.atlantic-community.org/app/webroot/files/articlepdf/Fabian%20Krohn.pdf>.

Laqueur, Water. *Europe in Our Time*. New York: Viking, 1992.

Larsen, Henrik. "The EU: A Global Military Actor?" *Cooperation and Conflict* 37 (2002): 283-302.

Malici, Akan. *The Search for a Common Foreign and Security Policy: Leaders, Cognitions and Question of Institutional Viability*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Marsh, Steve and Hans Mackenstein. *The International Relations of the European Union*. Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2005.

Maull, Hanns W. "Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers." *Foreign Affairs* 69 (1990): 92-93.

Menon, Anand and Ulrich Sedelmeier. "Instruments and Intentionality: Civilian Crisis Management and Enlargement Conditionality in EU Security Policy." *West European Politics* 33 (January 2010): 75-92.

Nye, Joseph. "Why military power is no longer enough." *The Guardian*, March 31, 2002.

PBS, "International Leaders React to Attacks." October 7, 2001. Accessed February 25, 2011, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/updates/october01/international_10-7.html.

Richardson, Jeremy. *European Union: Power and Policy-Making*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Shepherd, Alistair. "The European Union's Security and Defense Policy: A Policy without Substance?" *European Security* 12 (March 2003): 39-65.

Smith, Karen E. "Still 'civilian power EU'?" Paper presented at the CIDEL Workshop, Oslo, Norway, 2004.

Solana, Javier. "10 years of European Security and Defense Policy." *Project Syndicate*, October 7, 2009. accessed March 15, 2011, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/solana3/English>.

Stavridis, Stelios. "Why the 'Militarising' of the European Union is Strengthening the Concept of

'Civilian power Europe.'" *Robert Schuman Centre Working Paper*, 2001 Accessed March 26, 2011, http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/WP-Texts/01_17.pdf.

Telò, Mario. *Europe: a Civilian Power?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Wagner, Wolfgang. "The democratic control of military power Europe." *European Public Policy* 13 (2006): 200-216.

Walker, Martin. "What is the EU doing for Afghanistan?" *Europe* 413 (Feb 2002): 33.

Wessel, Ramses A. *The European Union's Foreign and Security Policy: A Legal Institutional Perspective*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1999.