



Premi “Catalunya Europa Segle XXI” -  
Desembre 2013

***EUROPE AND THE PETERSBERG TASKS***

-

***NATION-STATE BEHAVIOR THROUGH THE  
PRISM OF STRATEGIC CULTURE***

By Florian Lang

*Amb la col·laboració de*

Fundació  
**BancSabadell**



#### RESUM/RESUMEN/ABSTRACT:

The Petersberg Tasks is the most ambitious set of operational tasks the EU has set itself in the development of the CSDP. For the practical utility of this set of tasks, it can be expected that the strategic cultures of the member states have to be compatible to a large extent in order to create a European strategic culture with a clear conception. This study compares the strategic cultures of Germany, the United Kingdom and France in respect of their compatibility by testing a comprehensive paradigm of strategic culture in two recent cases, offering the circumstances of conducting the Petersberg Tasks.

#### RESUM EN CATALÀ:

Les missions Petersberg són l'operatiu militar més ambiciós organitzat per la Unió Europea en el desenvolupament de la CSDP, Política Europea de Seguretat i Defensa. Amb l'objectiu d'aconseguir una organització efectiva y funcional d'aquestes missions, és desitjable que les cultures estratègiques dels diferents Estats membres siguin, en gran mesura, compatibles en benefici d'una cultura estratègica europea amb directrius clares. Aquest estudi compara les cultures estratègiques d'Alemanya, el Regne Unit i França en referència al seu nivell de compatibilitat contrastant-les amb dos casos recents, exemples paradigmàtics de cultures estratègiques integrals. D'aquesta manera, pretenem descriure les circumstàncies en què es desenvolupen les missions Petersberg.

**KEYWORDS:** Strategic Culture; European Security; International Crisis Management

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The international crisis management of the European Union, embedded in the Treaty of European Union as the Petersberg Tasks, is a highly ambitious effort to live up to Europe's responsibility in the world. A very reasonable perspective of investigation is to study the multilateral composition and organization of CSDP in order to make statements about the functioning of institutional framework of the EU. This study however, switches the perspective on a member state level, as it assumes the cultural compatibility of the most decisive actors to be the basic requirement of coherent, effective crisis management.

In this comparative analysis of Germany, France and Great Britain, nation-specific strategic cultures are defined and tested in two case-studies to measure the cultural influence on strategic behavior in practice. Strategic culture is hereby a unique mix of cultural beliefs and historic tenets regarding the use of military force, established in society through an educational progress of social construction. To investigate this strategic culture and remain a standard of testability, a four dimensional framework is used to translate secondary literature into a ranked set of expected strategic preferences, measuring the proclivity to the use of force in each of the dimensions. The framework resembles those aspects of the strategic culture most decisive to international crisis management. The dimensions in question are the circumstances under which the use of military forces is an accepted option, the proportionality of its military strategy, the multilateral cooperativeness and the quality of international and domestic authorization requirements. The proclivity to the use of force of the nations and the inferred strategic preferences are then tested in two case studies at the moment when a military intervention became a debated option. The symbol analysis of the decision-making and decision-justification process in the Libyan crisis 2011 and the Malian crisis in 2012 is supposed to reveal the magnitude and quality of impact of a persistent national strategic culture on strategic behavior in actual crises. For this purpose, the attitude, rhetoric and action of the nation's political elite is traced in official statements, public appearances and actual political results. A consistent strategic behavior in line with the expected strategic culture as a result would mean that strategic culture can have a significant impact on strategic behavior which allowed making comments about the compatibility of the nations as security actors.

The results show that strategic culture exists as an influential aspect when studying the strategic behavior of nation state but is not as decisive as to allow precise predictions of behavior in specific scenarios. Therefore, the study of strategic culture enables plausible interpretation but defies determinism. In the case of France and of the UK, although the strategic cultures slightly differ in their proclivity to the use of force and international aspirations, a potential compatibility was identified, making more cooperation and integration possible. Germany's strategic culture however is fundamentally different and can therefore be classified as highly incompatible. While in the UK and France, humanitarian interventions are considered to be a legitimate tool in foreign policy, the German culture of restraint eliminates offensive military operations. The consequence is that military integration within a European Framework has reached a persistent limit which indicates that the European Union requires alternative approaches when confronted with humanitarian crises that obligate to take action, like the cooperation of the most willing and capable member states under European patronage.

## ÍNDICE

1. Introduction . . . . .	6
2. Research Framework	
2.1 The Notion of Strategic Culture in Security Studies . . . . .	10
2.2 Framework for Strategic Culture . . . . .	15
3. The Strategic Culture of Germany, the United Kingdom and France	
3.1 The Strategic Culture of Germany	
3.1.1 Essential Elements of the Strategic Culture of Germany . . . . .	19
3.1.2 Strategic Preferences for Germany . . . . .	22
3.2 The Strategic Culture of the United Kingdom	
3.2.1 Essential Elements of the Strategic Culture of the UK . . . . .	23
3.2.2 Strategic Preferences for the UK . . . . .	26
3.3 The Strategic Culture of France	
3.3.1 Essential elements of the Strategic Culture of France . . . . .	27
3.3.2 Strategic Preferences for France . . . . .	30
3.4 Graphical summary of the Nations' Strategic Preferences . . . . .	31
4. Strategic Culture in Practice	
4.1 Case Study Libya	
4.1.1 Germany's Strategic Behavior in Libya . . . . .	32
4.1.2 The UK's Strategic Behavior in Libya . . . . .	36
4.1.3 France's Strategic Behavior in Libya . . . . .	40

4.2 Case Study Mali		
4.2.1 Germany's Strategic Behavior in Mali	. . .	43
4.2.2 The UK's Strategic Behavior in Mali	. . .	46
4.2.3 France's Strategic Behavior in Mali	. . .	49
4.3 Summary of the Findings	. . . . .	51
5. Conclusion		
5.1 On Strategic Culture as analytical tool in Security Studies	. . .	53
5.2 On the Compatibility of the three Strategic Cultures	. . .	54
5.3 On the Consequences for CSDP	. . . . .	57
6. Bibliography	. . . . .	60

## ABBREVEATIONS

BRIC	-	Brazil-Russia-India-China
CFSP	-	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CSDP	-	Common Security and Defense Policy
ECOWAS	-	Economic Community Of West African States
EU	-	European Union
EUTM	-	European Union Training Mission
NATO	-	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NLC	-	National Libyan Council
OP	-	Operative Part
UN	-	United Nations
UNSC	-	United Nations Security Council
UNSCR	-	United Nations Security Council Resolution
WEU	-	West European Union
WWII	-	World War II

## TABLES

Table 1: "Paradigm of ranked Strategic Preferences regarding the use of force"	17
Table 2: "Nation's Paradigm of ranked Strategic Preferences"	31

## 1. Introduction

In the absence of the existential threats the cold war posed towards Europe, the transatlantic security community embraced ó politically and in parts practically - its responsibility for conflict prevention and solution or peace-keeping and peace-making in a global context. In a United Nations context, with its legal base in the United Nations Charter (Chapter VII), these sorts of tasks are known as the initiative õResponsibility to Protectö. In Europe, the Petersberg Tasks form the catalogue for operational tasks in this global security context.

The Petersberg Tasks, elaborated in 1992 by the West European Union (WEU) in Bonn, Germany, and extended in the following Treaties of the European Union, include in Article 28B of the Treaty of Lisbon: õ...joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilization. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their territories."

The European perspective on international security and crisis management, which should be shaped by those tasks, can be observed on distinct but often interdependent policy making levels. A very obvious starting point is a multilateral perspective to analyze the functioning of the institutional framework of the European Union as an actor in this foreign policy realm. Interestingly enough, after this framework had been reformed with the Treaty of Lisbon, CFSP and CSDP have been object to numerous studies examining democratic legitimation, organizational effectiveness and real impact of EU Foreign Policy. For further reading of studies from EU perspective, a number of scholars can be recommend, for example Helene Sjørnsen<sup>1</sup>, dealing with the democratization of CFSP, as well as Nicole Koenig<sup>2</sup> and Daniel C. Thomas<sup>3</sup> work about the EU's quest for a coherent foreign policy. Highly recommendable are also the

---

<sup>1</sup> see: Sjørnsen, H. (2011) 'The EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy: the quest for democracy' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18 (8), pp. 1069-1077.

<sup>2</sup> see: Koenig, N. (2011) 'The EU and the Libyan Crisis--In Quest of Coherence?' *The international spectator*, 46 (4), pp. 11-30.

<sup>3</sup> see: Thomas, D. C. (2012) 'Still Punching below Its Weight? Coherence and Effectiveness in European Union Foreign Policy\*' *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50 (3), pp. 457-474.

thoughts of Anand Menon<sup>4</sup> and Sten Rynning<sup>5</sup> evaluating research approaches for the study of CFSP/CSDP.

This study however chooses a point of view that has not received the deserved attention despite being at the very fundament of a functioning *common* security policy of an emerging multilateral strategic actor as the EU. It seeks to identify and comparatively analyze nation-specific strategy styles with the objective of making evaluating statements about the cultural compatibility as it is translated into strategic behavior. Because, although other explanatory factors like institutional and capability limitations play a greater or lesser role, ignoring the nation-specific strategic culture means risking blackboxing governments and opening up for all the intellectual dangers of misperception.<sup>6</sup>

Embracing this perspective, it can be presumed that combining the security policy standpoints of 28 Member States is an objective of utter ambitiousness. They can be expected to have a very different idea of threat evaluation, the conditions for the use of force and global aspirations. For such a set of operational tasks as the Petersberg Tasks, which in theory includes the necessity to respond fast and fierce to grave violations of human rights or terrorists threatening the orderliness of sovereign states, the countries of the European Union should ó if not share a common strategic culture ó at least be compatible to a degree that allows quick decision finding and action. Thus, comparing the strategic cultures of the EU member states seems to be a logical, consecutive first step when examining the EU's ability to conduct the full range of the Petersberg tasks on a CSDP level.

Truly significant and therefore object of interest for this study are the big three of the EU, Germany, the United Kingdom and France. Although the dynamics between the 28 single states of the European Union and the dynamics between certain groups with common security interests are decisive factors for the EU's ability to respond to international crises, the functioning of the CSDP crises management and the role of

---

<sup>4</sup> see: Menon, A. (2011) 'Power, institutions and the CSDP: the promise of institutionalist theory' *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49 (1), pp. 83-100.

<sup>5</sup> see: Rynning, S. (2011) 'Realism and the common security and defence policy' *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49 (1), pp. 23-42.

<sup>6</sup> Booth, K. (2005) 'Strategic Culture: Validity and Validation' *Oxford Journal on Good Governance*, 2 (1), p.27



Europe and the EU as a global security actor depend heavily on the strategic behavior and cooperation between the United Kingdom, France and Germany.

The study aims to identify strategic cultures in Europe and to test the inferred national strategic behavior in two recent international crises that offered quite precisely the conditions for the implementation of the Petersberg Tasks: the crises in Libya 2011 and Mali 2012/2013. In both cases, highly violent civil war crises were causing civilian casualties and threatening the wider region of becoming infected by the violence. Furthermore, in both cases, humanitarian intervention formed part of the juridical legitimization according to international law with the UN as the world's governing institution. The choice for these two case studies is also guided by the proximity in time that doesn't leave much room for interpretations based on a slow evolution that strategic culture could entail. The cases differ in key aspects as well, leaving space for statements about those elements. Other than the geopolitical relevance and political reality of the two African countries, a remarkable aspect is the commitment or non-commitment of the US and the NATO, a crucial factor for Europe's Security and Defense. By revealing the connection between strategic culture and strategic behavior in these scenarios, statements about the compatibility for the context of international crisis management can be made.

The referent group in the case studies is the individually defined elite of the 'political-military decision-making sphere' which has more detailed insights in security issues, reflect societal moods and are by profession shaping the agenda and national discourse.<sup>7</sup> Narrowing the referent group to the mentioned elite gives us the opportunity to entail information from a rich scope of elements without drifting into irrelevance. A limited referent group very suitable for the outreach and scope of this study are directly involved political-military decision takers. Thus, the study limits the referent group to the Head of State, the Foreign Minister, the Defense Minister and the official representatives of those positions.

The object of analysis will be limited to a representative sample of content of official and public statements regarding opinion-making, decision-making and decision-justification of the political-military sphere in the key moments of the chosen crises.

---

<sup>7</sup> Longhurst, K. (2004) *Germany and the use of force: The Evolution of German Security Policy 1989-2003*, Manchester: Manchester University Press., p.22

Given the interdependence between public discourse and decision-making sphere, it can be assumed, that if a strategic culture matters it has to materialize in the decision-communication towards the public and the representatives in the parliament.

For the purpose of tracing strategic behavior deriving from strategic culture in the objects of analysis, a symbol analysis is most suitable for the abovementioned objects. If strategic culture indeed has significant effects on strategic behavior, it can be assumed that the behavioral pattern experienced a social translation into a specific rhetoric and language that are constant across the decision-making sphere (even if opinions differ) and strategic contexts and can be logically related to a set of preferences.

If the strategic behavior proves to be congruent across the cases it can be argued that a strategic culture matters and is transferred to a certain degree into strategic behavior that is predictable. This degree will be defined by to what extent the dominant cultural aspects have influenced the strategic behavior when argued against the influence of ahistorical or non-cultural, hence materialistic-structural factors.

The first section is dedicated to the research framework, providing a brief history of the notion of strategic culture in security studies and a comprehensive analytical framework for strategic culture. Next, the second section will translate central historical and cultural tenets into this ranked framework for each of the three countries. In the third section this framework is tested in the selected case studies. In conclusion, the results regarding the strategic behavior in the case studies will allow making statements, addressing the driving question behind this study: Does a nationally individual strategic culture translate into strategic behavior, and if so, are the strategic cultures of Germany, the United Kingdom and France compatible to a degree that enables the construction of an effective CSDP crisis management?

## 2. Research Framework

### 2.1 The Notion of Strategic Culture in Security Studies

This section elaborates the development of the notion of strategic culture as an instrument to analyze nation-state behavior in security and defense related decision taking, with an implicit focus on the use of military force. The concept of strategic culture is hereby an interdisciplinary, constructivist theory that aims to make statements and predictions about nation-state behavior that cannot be sufficiently explained by strictly realist approaches. According to Ken Booth, one of the most renowned researches in the field of strategic culture, several of its attributes make it an essential complementary theory in the science of international relations.<sup>8</sup> First, it contributes to the understanding of the behavior of a strategic actor on its own term, for example taking history into account. Also, it tears down the boundary between the domestic environment in which decisions are produced and the external security environment by reminding that decision-making as well as military structures and processes operate in specific political cultures. Finally, it helps to explain irrationalities in the behavior of a culture other than the observer's and therefore improve communication and general understanding. After that, this section wants to explain how the concept of strategic culture contributes to the understanding of nation-state's military behavior and gives insights about the dynamics of security policy in a multilateral framework.

Strategic culture was first introduced into the field of security studies when Jack Snyder examined possible reactions to limited nuclear operations as a discussed alternative to previously prepared massive operations. In this study, Snyder defined strategic culture as 'the sum total of ideas, conditioned emotional responses, and patterns of habitual behavior that members of a national strategic community have acquired through instruction or imitation and share with each other with regard to nuclear strategy'<sup>9</sup> and concludes that unique historical experiences, distinctive political and institutional relationships and the preoccupation with a different set of strategic dilemmas had indeed

---

<sup>8</sup> Booth, K. (2005) 'Strategic Culture: Validity and Validation', p.26-27

<sup>9</sup> Snyder, J. L. (1977) 'The Soviet Strategic Culture: Implications for Limited Nuclear Operations: A Project Air Force Report Prepared for the United States Air Force' Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, p.8

produced a unique mix of strategic beliefs and a unique strategic behavior based on these beliefs<sup>10</sup>. This interpretation challenged the classical view of generic rational actor paradigms and game-theory models that saw the United States and the Soviet Union as two actors playing the same nuclear war game and suggested that they would therefore apply similar strategic decision making.<sup>11</sup> Snyder assumed a certain consistency in this strategic culture that would, if not unlink strategic behavior from the immediate conditions and changes in the strategic environment, then respond in a way mediated by preexisting cultural beliefs<sup>12</sup>

Besides Snyder there was a number of scholars in the late 70s and early 80s that came to the conclusion that contemporary security and defense studies did not recognize sufficiently that much of the strategic ideas and strategic behavior depend on the educational progress of social construction<sup>13</sup>. Because of the ongoing cold war and the United States as the birthplace of this first generation of scholars, it is not surprising that much of their work was intended to provide insights about the strategic behavioral patterns of the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the use of nuclear force. Colin S. Gray, one of the most renowned scholars of the first generation addressed in his early works the notion of national style comparing it to the rational style of the United States strategy and the dynamics between national style and nuclear strategy.<sup>14</sup> Other important contributors were Carnes Lord, which wrote implicitly about the American Strategic Culture<sup>15</sup> as well the Carl G. Jacobson, Ken Booth and David R. Jones when comparing the strategic power of the United States and the Soviet Union<sup>16</sup>. Their findings suggested that the Soviet Union had a preference for preemptive, offensive use of force that was deeply rooted in Russia's history of external

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p.38

<sup>11</sup> Longhurst, K. (2004) *Germany and the use of force*. Manchester University Press.,p.8

<sup>12</sup> Snyder, J. L. (1977) 'The Soviet Strategic Culture: Implications for Limited Nuclear Operations: A Project Air Force Report Prepared for the United States Air Force', p.8

<sup>13</sup> Gray, C. S. (1999) 'Strategic culture as context: the first generation of theory strikes back' *Review of international studies*, 25 (1), p.51

<sup>14</sup> See: Gray, C. S. (1981) 'National style in strategy: the American example' *International Security*, pp. 21-47.

<sup>15</sup> See: Lord, C. (1985) 'American strategic culture' *Comparative Strategy*, 5 (3), pp. 269-293.

<sup>16</sup> See: Jacobsen, C. G., Booth, K. and Jones, D. R. (1990) *Strategic power: USA, USSR*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

expansionism and internal autocracy. The United States, on the other hand, showed the tendency for a sporadic, messianic and crusading use of force that was deeply rooted in the moralism of the early republic and in a fundamental belief that warfare was an aberration in human relations.<sup>17</sup>

With the introduction of this interdisciplinary approach into the field of security studies, Snyder and the other agents of the 'first generation' engaged decent scholarly attention for the notion of strategic culture. This attention led to the continuous development of the concept in the following years that was marked by the spillover from nuclear strategy studies into all fields of security studies and severe methodical controversies. The common classification of strategic culture into three generations of scholars differently addressing those concerns was introduced by Alastair Ian Johnston in his works about strategic culture.<sup>18</sup> In Johnston's opinion, as part of the third generation, the separation of the generations is not only applied on the scopes of interest but puts emphasis on the severe logical consequences of the different methodical approaches and the interpretation of its results. Because of space constraints and the utter importance of exactly this controversy for the present study, the methodological debate between Alastair Ian Johnston as agent of the third generation and Colin S. Gray as agent of the first generation will be the methodological aspect in spotlight.

The first generation, as mentioned above, wanted to explain the fundamental and hegemonic differences between US and Soviet thoughts on nuclear strategy. Scholars from this generation innovatively added strategic culture to the realm of security studies but also demonstrated severe weaknesses in their studies. Those weaknesses described by Johnston are related to the vague and all-consuming definition, the mechanically deterministic conclusions and the unchangeable persistency.<sup>19</sup>

Third generation scholars in most parts thoroughly exclude strategic culture from strategic behavior but assume that the country-specific strategic culture does have an effect on a nation's strategic behavior.<sup>20</sup> The determinism of the first generation is

---

<sup>17</sup> Johnston, A. I. (1995) 'Thinking about strategic culture' *International security*, 19 (4), p. 36

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p.36

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p.41

neglected by excluding behavior from the independent variable and conceptualizing strategic culture in a way that allows it to vary, equally affected by recent experiences as by deeply historically rooted determinants.<sup>21</sup> Johnston concludes that the general strength of the third generation and its superiority rely on the research possibilities of the approach by turning strategic culture into the independent variable and strategic behavior into the depended variable, where organizational culture can be an intervening variable<sup>22</sup>.

The description of particular weaknesses of the different approaches helps to identify and address key concerns when creating a research framework dealing with strategic culture. In its essences however, Johnston thoughts are a heavy critique on the first generation`s failure to explain anything because they tried to explain everything<sup>23</sup>

In Gray`s opinion, scholars of the third generation in general, and Johnston as its most progressive agent, did not understand the nature and concept of strategic culture, when implying that strategic behavior can be observed distinctively from strategic culture in a cause/effect relation between the former on the latter. The methodological rigor that Johnston applies is admirable but it ought not to take precedence over an inconvenient reality<sup>24</sup>

In promoting the idea that makers of strategic decisions would be quasi non-cultural entities that are affected by historic as well as other explanatory factors (e.g. from a materialistic-structural perspective), they would illogically assume that a decision taking person could be left uncultured by his social background. Gray notes that -Strategic behavior can be eccentric from some viewpoints, incompetent, unsuccessful, even contrary to cultural norms, but it cannot be a-cultural, beyond culture. A de-cultured person, organization or security community would have to be deprogrammed even of the process of learning about, and from, his or its own past<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Legro, J. (1995) *Cooperation under fire*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.; cited in Johnston (1995): *Thinking about Strategic Culture*, p.41

<sup>22</sup> Johnston, A. I. (1995) 'Thinking about strategic culture', p. 42

<sup>23</sup> Gray, C. S. (1999) 'Strategic culture as context: the first generation of theory strikes back', p.54

<sup>24</sup> Gray, C. S. (2007) 'Out of the Wilderness: Primetime for Strategic Culture' *Comparative Strategy*, 6 (2), p.3

<sup>25</sup> Gray, C. S. (1999) 'Strategic culture as context: the first generation of theory strikes back', p. 62

It is hard to escape the logic of Gray's arguments, in finding that strategic behavior patterns are a part of a nation's strategic culture. Observing the realm of strategic ideas separately from the realm of strategic behavior in order to weigh the influence of strategic culture against other explanatory factors does indeed imply the existence of a realm not exhibited by 'encultured' human beings. Thus applying the notion of strategic culture means to embrace the idea of an all-encompassing context as there indeed cannot be strategic behavior beyond culture.

But if the concept of strategic culture 'defies falsification'<sup>26</sup>, trying to explain all that 'weaves together'<sup>27</sup>, how can a research framework be conducted in the way that it still provides information to interpret strategic behavioral patterns regarding the use of force, occurring in a security sub-context like crisis management, leading to plausible insights about the general compatibility of the countries?

---

<sup>26</sup> Longhurst, K. (2004) *Germany and the use of force*. Manchester University Press., p.19

<sup>27</sup> Gray, C. S. (1999) 'Strategic culture as context: the first generation of theory strikes back', p. 68

## 2.2 A Framework for Strategic Culture

This study follows a concluding recommendation of Colin S. Gray, not to pursue strictly one line of research (first vs. third generation) but to find new, practical ways to combine the two main approaches.

It makes the assumption that a contemporary country-specific strategic culture, which is dominated by persistent, normative elements based in historical experience and shaped by recent experiences, influences and shapes the nation-state behavior regarding the use of force.

But instead of testing this strategic culture merely against other explanatory factors when making statements about the persistency of strategic behavior over time, this study tries to observe the functioning of strategic culture in two different strategic contexts. It wants to identify if and how a contemporary strategic culture translates into strategic behavioral patterns when applied in specific strategic scenarios and if they show consistency across strategic contexts. If they prove to be consistent across strategic contexts, it would mean that the strategic cultures of the three countries indeed influence strategic behavior. This would then make it possible to predict further strategic behavior in other contexts and therefore to make statements about the compatibility of the strategic cultures. If they show great variance across the contexts, it would imply that strategic culture has a lesser influence than the strategic context which would lead to the result that the strategic behavior of the three countries is context-dependent and thus not sufficiently predictable by the ideational culture of the countries.

With this objective in mind, this section produces an analytical framework that leads us to a testable image of the contemporary country-specific strategic culture of the United Kingdom, France and Germany. Keeping in mind what Gray stated about the universality of culture, this image has to be to some degree descriptive and arbitrarily weighted from the researcher's perspective. Nevertheless, the close relation of the observed dimensions to the study interest should reduce the methodological flaw that inevitably occurs at some point of any strategic cultural study.



Kelly Loghurst describes three basic elements when defining the concept of Strategic Culture.<sup>28</sup>

Foundational elements of a strategic culture are those basic, deeply rooted values and qualities that have their origin in a primordial or formative phase of the country. Security policy standpoints lie between foundational elements and regulatory practices and can be best described as common contemporary interpretations of how core values are to be promoted through a framework of preferences of policy choices by political decision-takers. Regulatory practices form the observable manifestation of strategic culture. They are longstanding policies and practices that actively relate and apply the substance of the strategic culture's core to the external environment, essentially by providing channels of meaning and application<sup>29</sup>. The regulatory practices are dependent on the dynamic between foundational elements and security policy standpoints. Thus, regulatory practices are usually usually are a set of policy-options given to decision makers in a general regulatory context, restraint by foundational elements of the strategic culture.

To address the abovementioned flaw in favor of the testability, the study will translate secondary literature that has been produced about the three countries in question, and primary sources when necessary, into a model of ranked strategic preferences inspired by Johnston's central paradigm of strategic culture.<sup>30</sup> With a ranked set of preferences it will later be possible to make statements about the effect of strategic culture via the consistency of the ranking assumed across the varying strategic contexts. Also it is a way to reduce the estimated effect of cross-national overlapping ideational elements as ranking will lead to a further specification and individualization of the element as of the whole set.

In his studies, Johnston made assumptions about the role of war in human affairs (whether it is inevitable or an aberration), about the nature of the adversary and the threat it poses (zero-sum or variable sum), and about the efficacy of the use of force (the ability to control outcomes and to eliminate threats, and the conditions under which

---

<sup>28</sup> Loghurst, K. (2004) *Germany and the use of force*. Manchester University Press., p.17

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Johnston, A. I. (1995) 'Thinking about strategic culture', p. 46

applied force is useful).<sup>31</sup> With the disappearance of a third, possible nuclear war and the constant disappearance of clear antagonisms in global politics, the assumption that European countries would face in any way a zero-sum threat cannot be made. Still, the perception of the threat can translate into offensive, unilateral win-maximizing or compromised, multilateral win-distributing strategies. Thus, the study will translate it into a more contemporary set of preferences and objectives. For this purpose, a table inspired by Wilhelm Mirow is used.<sup>32</sup>

**Table 1: "Paradigm of ranked Strategic Preferences regarding the use of force"**

Proclivity to Use of Force	1	2	3	4
Conditions for the Use of Force	Territorial Defence, Reaction to immediate Threat	Plus: humanitarian Intervention, stopping grave Violation of Human Rights	Plus: self-serving Intervention for materialistic or ideological Interests	Plus: territorial & political Expansion and Conquest
Military Strategy	restraint, highly proportionate, very low risk tolerance	proportionate, low-moderate risk tolerance	disproportionate, moderate risk tolerance	highly disproportionate, high risk tolerance
Level of Cooperation	Neutrality (defensive)	Affiliation with Alliances / Organisations	Affiliation with particular States	Unilateralism (offensive)
International / domestic Authorization Requirements	high domestic / high international	high domestic / low international	low domestic / high international	low domestic / low international

Table 1 describes the four-dimensional framework used to measure the likeliness of a nation using military force in an international crisis situation. The dimensions cover decisive aspects regarding the use of force and are ranked; a higher score equals a stronger tendency to use armed forces. The *conditions for the use of force* are basic, politically agreed **purposes** of a nation's military, ranging from territorial defence to territorial expansion. The *Military Strategy* describes the way in which the armed forces

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Mirow, W. (2009) Strategic culture matters. Berlin: Lit Verlag., Table 1: Strategic norms concerning the legitimate ends and means of Defense Policy, p. 11

are used by measuring the **modality** of nation's military regarding proportionate action and risk tolerance. The *Level of Cooperation* indicates the degree of independence that a nation's military has of its allies when applying force by measuring its **cooperativeness**. *Domestic and International Authorization Requirements* define the quality of political and legal resistance against the use of military force from inside and outside, measuring the difficulty to reach acknowledged **legitimation** for an act of military force.

The ranking will occur through the translation of foundational elements, security policy standpoints - and to some extent the regulatory practice - into the strategic options and requirements defined in the framework (Table 1) above. At this point, the direct link between strategic culture and strategic behavior is created.

### 3. The Strategic Culture of Germany, the United Kingdom and France

#### 3.1 The Strategic Culture of Germany

##### 3.1.1 Essential Elements of the German Strategic Culture

Discovering a formative period in which foundational elements have their origin proves to be in the German case an endeavor not too difficult. After World War II, Germany's pre-war strategic culture that was shaped by its extraordinary militarism and the deep nationalistic sentiments due to its defeat in World War I, has turned into the exact opposite. Germany's strategic preferences are very much influenced by this formative period.

For Germany's devastating defeat, a burning Europe and the feeling of guilt for the uniquely horrifying crimes committed by the Nazi Regime, the Germans blamed its ill culture of militarism and nationalism and were eager to erase it.<sup>33</sup> At the same time, the international community was determined to eliminate all militaristic capacities and tendencies in order to prevent Germany being a substantial global threat again.<sup>34</sup> The German society fully cooperated with the Allied occupants by bringing the old military and political elite to justice and distributing anti-military propaganda in different ways like, for example, through relentless text books for schools.<sup>35</sup> Being traumatized and ashamed of the crimes they had committed or were a conscious part of, the guilt that Germans felt, made them unable to feel pride towards their nation.<sup>36</sup> Germans suffered from an exhaustion of nationalism and statism, which means that the concept of the state as the organizing principle to which pledge allegiance was highly rejected within a mindset, in which the state is the problem and not the solution.<sup>37</sup> Alienated by the prospect of yet creating an own national identity, several tendencies in Germany after

---

<sup>33</sup> Conrad, B. and Stumm, M. (2004) 'German Strategic Culture and Institutional Choice: Transatlanticism and/or Europeanism?' Trier Working Papers on International Politics (TAZIP), (9), p. 16

<sup>34</sup> Longhurst, K. (2004) Germany and the use of force. Manchester University Press., p.27

<sup>35</sup> Skemperis, G. (2003) 'Strategic Culture in Post-War Europe' ELIAMEP Postgraduate Notes, 5 (1), p.15

<sup>36</sup> Duffield, J. S. (1998) World power forsaken. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press., as cited in Conrad, Björn; Stumm, Mario, German Strategic Culture and Institutional Choice: Transatlanticism and/or Europeanism?, p. 17

<sup>37</sup> Longhurst, K. (2004) Germany and the use of force. Manchester University Press , p.46

WWII summed up to form a preference for multilateralism and the integration into a broader international framework. Because Germany should never again be able to conduct unilateral power politics, there is a recommendation for the integration in international security commitments fixed in the German Basic Law, provided for an alternative foreign policy strategy.<sup>38</sup>

The military in Germany was not only perceived with a different notion, but rejected in its entirety after WWII. It was no longer seen as the embodiment of a national identity and self-consciousness. On the contrary, the image of the soldier was defamed by removing military culture entirely from state and society.<sup>39</sup> This relation towards the military and the use of force was also established in the German Basic Law, that forbids the preparation of a war of aggression and restraints the use of the German military to defense purposes in the own territory or the territory of allied countries.<sup>40</sup> The military was denied to be instrument of foreign policy and was embedded in the multilateral NATO-framework, with the *Bundeswehr* subordinated to NATO allied command.<sup>41</sup>

After the cold war, when international crisis management entered the main stage of international security policy, and, along with its non-military contribution in the Gulf War 1990/1991, Germany's foreign policy was criticized of being weak, pacifistic and neutral. It was accused of using cheap excuses for its restraint in leading the international community to demand the normalization of Germany's security policy.<sup>42</sup> Germany's decision makers were struggling between the inherent desire to be a reliable partner and the international pressure on the one hand, and the deeply rooted anti-militarism in its public discourse, on the other. Consequently, it was not until 1994 that Germany's constitutional court confirmed the basic compatibility of the German Basic

---

<sup>38</sup> Duffield, J. S. (1998) *World power forsaken*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press., as cited in Conrad, Björn; Stumm, Mario, *German Strategic Culture and Institutional Choice: Transatlanticism and/or Europeanism?*, p. 17

<sup>39</sup> Longhurst, K. (2004) *Germany and the use of force*. Manchester University Press., p.47

<sup>40</sup> Conrad, B. and Stumm, M. (2004) 'German Strategic Culture and Institutional Choice: Transatlanticism and/or Europeanism?', p. 17

<sup>41</sup> Hoffmann, A. and Longhurst, K. (1999) 'German strategic culture and the changing role of the Bundeswehr' *WeltTrends*, 22, p. 148

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 151

Law with the use of force in foreign territory, leaving the interpretation of a key security policy issue to the domestic legal framework.<sup>43</sup>

The high expectations that have been generated by that development have been disappointed since then. In the most recent Defense Security Guidelines, issued in 2011, the Department of Defense is clearly implying that Germany is prepared to use the complete spectrum of national policy instruments. This includes the employment of armed forces but highlights on the same pages the responsibility of the German parliament and the severe consequences of the use of force and promises detailed case-to-case evaluation of each case to the skeptic public.<sup>44</sup> The often criticized strategic deficit that Germany displays in international crisis situations is mainly due to the varying degree of public debates in specific situations. When the media coverage is strong and critical, German governments tend to follow more pacifistic point of views; in topics that don't receive full attention by media and public debate, deployment of military forces might just be an option. This discrepancy in the perceptions of Germany as a global security actor between Germany's political leaders and the German people forms today maybe the most defining element of the strategic culture of the country as a whole. As a precise example for this discrepancy serves the resignation of Germany's former *Bundespräsident* (president of the federation) Horst Köhler who tripped over the remark, that is absolutely justifiable to use German military capacities in order to secure Germany's vital economic interests. The outrage and critique in the German media and public debate were intense enough to frustrate the *Bundespräsident* who was overwhelmed by the public reaction and resigned in consequence.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Stöhr, F. (2012) 'Sicherheitspolitische Kultur in Deutschland - Politik und Gesellschaft im Widerstreit?' *Kieler Analysen zur Sicherheitspolitik*, (31), p. 3

<sup>44</sup> German Ministry of Defence (2011) 'Defence Policy Guidelines Safeguarding National Interests ó Assuming International Responsibility ó Shaping Security Together', p.4

<sup>45</sup> *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (2011) 'Horst Köhler über seine Rücktrittsgründe' [online], 09.06.2011

### 3.1.2 Strategic Preferences for Germany

#### Conditions for the use of force ó 2

The deployment of military forces óespecially the deployment of combat troops- in foreign territory has not stopped to be a topic of utmost delicacy in Germany. The juridical restraints and fierce public and parliamentarian debate that go along with every decision regarding the use of force, define war as the absolute aberration and the last of all means in human affairs. As a sub-assumption of a preferred strategic option, it can be inferred that *German policy-makers will only deploy military troops when substantially threatened or as a last resort in case that all other non-military strategies in an international crisis have failed and catastrophic consequences can be expected.*

#### Military Strategy ó 1

The deeply rooted anti-nationalism forbids Germany to pursue power or interest politics to a large scale. Offensive strategies are constraint to a very limited set of justifiable options, with extremely low risk tolerance. Thus, restraint strategies have the prospect of securing beneficial outcomes while leaving a significantly broader flexibility in political action. It can be inferred that *German policy-makers will choose non-confrontational strategies and highly restraint military operations.*

#### Level of cooperation - 2

Germany is embedded into a network of multilateral organizations and political frameworks. For a long time directly subordinated to the NATO-command, a driving force for the European Integration and the functioning of the United Nation, it can be inferred that *German decision makers will only apply military force in a broad framework of multilateral organizations and its allies.*

#### International/domestic authorization requirements - 1

Germany is heavily constraint by its Basic Law when the military is sought to be used as foreign policy instrument. Also a German use of force, without a UNSC mandate and European support seems unimaginable. Thus, it can be inferred that *Germany has high international and domestic authorization requirements.*

## 3.2 The Strategic Culture of the United Kingdom

### 3.2.1 Essential Elements of the UK's Strategic Culture

The participation in two world wars and the aftermath of those devastating wars have consequently left their mark on post-war Great Britain, shaping existent foundational elements and imposing new ones. Still, the implications naturally differ widely from those in Germany both from a social and a political perspective and specifically in their magnitude. Hence, the strategic culture of the United Kingdom was rather shaped than newly invented by WW II. The same does apply for the second formative period of Tony Blair as Prime Minister, from 1997 to 2007, which should prove to be a very influential anomaly indeed.

Starting as a major colonial and maritime power into the 19th century, the United Kingdom saw a severe decline in relative power over the course of two world wars and an exhaustingly threatening cold war.<sup>46</sup> By the end of WW II, the United Kingdom had to face the fact that it had been displaced as the leader or hegemon of the international community. Nevertheless, the notion of the empire and the desire to maintain the status quo remained vital in British strategic culture as a heritage of the country's glorious past.<sup>47</sup>

Guided by the multilateral structures that emerged after World War II (most notably the NATO) the United Kingdom's policy makers as well as the British people were reminded of the importance of the transatlantic link in security matters and the cultural ties between Great Britain and the United States. The reason for this was the common concern about the soviet menace and the possibility for the former hegemon to conduct a foreign policy that would be more influential than its relative power suggested.<sup>48</sup>

Similar to the German case, the notion of crisis management became central to British security policy after the common threat of a new world war was banned by the fall of

---

<sup>46</sup> Miskimmon, A. (2004) 'Continuity in the face of upheaval' British strategic culture and the impact of the Blair government' *European Security*, 13 (3), p.276

<sup>47</sup> Skemperis, G. (2003) 'Strategic Culture in Post-War Europe', p. 10

<sup>48</sup> Miskimmon, A. (2004) 'Continuity in the face of upheaval' British strategic culture and the impact of the Blair government', p.276



the Soviet Union. In line with the other NATO Members, the United Kingdom's security policy was in search for a new *raison d'être*.<sup>49</sup> Although the defense and deterrence strategy that the cold war era entailed was consequently abandoned, the Gulf War 1990/1991 displayed a high demand for "sanitized" military involvement in international crises and generated high expectations in the conventional use of force.<sup>50</sup>

When coming into office in 1997, Tony Blair was eager to redefine British foreign policy, paying special attention to the role of the armed forces and international crisis management. Blair pursued the strategy of attempting to create and mediate an all-encompassing western-led international security framework of EU, NATO and the UN Security Council - referred to as the "international community" - with an interventionist approach.<sup>51</sup> This military doctrine was very much taken from George W. Bush's military doctrine of pre-emptive strikes and disregards the sanctity of national sovereignty based on the Westphalian states system in cases where nation-states have systematically sought to abuse the rights of individuals or groups within their territory.<sup>52</sup> This was a fundamental shift in the conditions under which the UK would consider the use of force, in that values might have to be fought for with military force. As Clark states, Blair saw a world that had the willingness to embrace a liberal democratic capitalist world order on a global scale in which the use of military force for fighting is as much a policy instrument in the developing world as foreign aid.<sup>53</sup> Blair's interventionism that was not thoroughly supported by British people is an influential anomaly regarding Britain's conservative tradition. "The continuous effort of avoiding any shift in the international balance of power for over a century can explain why the British polity has been tormented with conservatism. British political leaders, electorate, even the academia were oriented against risky policies, avoiding initiating invasive

---

<sup>49</sup> Wallace, W. (1992) 'British foreign policy after the Cold War' *International Affairs*, 68 (3), p. 423

<sup>50</sup> Mäder, M. (2004) *In pursuit of conceptual excellence: The Evolution of British Military Doctrine in the post-cold war era 1989-2002*. Bern: Lang., p. 25

<sup>51</sup> Miskimmon, A. (2004) 'Continuity in the face of upheaval' *British strategic culture and the impact of the Blair government* , p.284

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> Clark, M. (2007) 'Foreign Policy' In: Seldon, A. (eds.) (2007) *Blair's Britain 1997-2007*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.599

ventures, and joining only after benefits had been secured.<sup>54</sup> Although it is to expect that Tory governments like the one of Prime Minister David Cameron are keen to preserve aspects of the conservative tradition, the impact of Blair's years in office on the strategic environment for his successors is tremendous. Due to its participation in the Iraq war 2003, the UK is facing security threats that are still ranking high on the national security agenda. Addressing these threats requires at least an alteration of the traditional conservatism.

The UK's colonial past, coupled with its institutional embedding in the international community, has created a sense of responsibility and global outlook in the mindset of the British public and political elites regarding the UK's international responsibilities for peacekeeping and crisis management. There are no obvious 'no go areas' for the UK armed forces in the way that the German armed forces are constrained.<sup>55</sup>

The most recent defense policy guidelines, outlined in the 2010 *Strategic Defence and Security Review* promote that the British military forces remain a vital instrument of British foreign policy but appear to be smoothed after the years of Tony Blair. The review states that the UK will remain 'ready to use armed force where necessary to protect our national interests' but at the same time focus on 'tackling risks before they escalate' and be far more 'selective in our use of the Armed Forces, deploying them [ ] only where key UK national interests are at stake; where we have a clear strategic aim; where the likely [ ] costs are in proportion to the likely benefits; where we have a viable exit strategy; and where justifiable under international law.'<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Skemperis, G. (2003) 'Strategic Culture in Post-War Europe', p. 10

<sup>55</sup> Miskimmon, A. (2004) 'Continuity in the face of upheaval: British strategic culture and the impact of the Blair government', p.281

<sup>56</sup> Cabinet Office (2010) 'The strategic defence and security review: securing Britain in an age of uncertainty' [online], p. 17

### 3.2.2 Strategic Preferences for the United Kingdom

#### Conditions for the use of force ó 3

Blair's interventionism and classical Tory conservatism differ essentially in the question of pre-emptive strikes and the justification for conducting combat forces. Cameron's conservatism is more likely to considerate all possible consequences and decide more pragmatically. It can be inferred that *British decision-makers will apply military force if it serves the British scope of interest and potential consequences are perceived as justified by potential outcomes.*

#### Military Strategy - 2

The element of conservatism, provided in the observed period, promotes strategic considerations with a low risk tolerance towards casualties and costs. Still, the United Kingdom is willing to raise the risk tolerance to small scale if British interest is at stake. It can be inferred that *British decision-takers will choose restraint military options to avoid casualties and costs.*

#### Level of cooperation ó 3

The United Kingdom has a differentiated approach on the European Integration and seems to cooperate only within a self-sustaining strategy. Of particular importance is the strong alliance with the USA. It can be inferred, that *British decision-makers work to together with particular states, most preferably via the transatlantic link.*

#### International/domestic authorization requirements ó 2

The notion of conservatism implies that the use of British force and military personnel has to be justified adequately in public discourse and to the parliament. Internationally, the United Kingdom, as a member of the Security Council, is mostly unrestrained, in particular cases US support is necessary. Thus, it can be inferred that *the United Kingdom has high domestic and low international authorization requirements.*

### 3.3 The Strategic Culture of France

#### 3.3.1 Essential Elements of France's Strategic Culture

The French strategic culture was fundamentally shaped in two periods after the Second World War. While the basic foundational elements were laid in France's so-called fourth republic right after WW II, the French strategic culture as a stable notion was implemented in France's fifth republic, when Charles de Gaulle, arguably the most influential Frenchman in France's post-war foreign policy, consolidated these elements into a national strategy.<sup>57</sup> Philip H. Gordon states that although the vision of Charles de Gaulle was the continuation of the fourth republic's vision of France's defence, the Gaullist years are still unique, long lasting, clearly definable and highly consequential.<sup>58</sup>

Grandeur is one of the terms that frequently appear when French foreign policy standpoints or, more negatively interpreted, French nationalism is described. In the opening lines of *Memoires de guerre*, Charles de Gaulle states that for him France is not really herself unless in the front rank; that only vast enterprises are capable of counterbalancing the ferments of dispersal which are inherent in her people; that our country as it is, surrounded by others, as they are, must aim high and hold itself straight, on pain of mortal danger. In short, to my mind, France cannot be France without greatness.<sup>59</sup>

Although introducing the notion of greatness into French strategic culture, Charles de Gaulle never defined how grandeur actually translates in behavior. This task was left to historians of his presidential heritage. Grandeur can be best summarized as the will to be an ambitious, universal and inventive player in global politics and defend the independence, the honor and the rank of the nation. Still, Grandeur should imply

---

<sup>57</sup> Skemperis, G. (2003) 'Strategic Culture in Post-War Europe', p. 19

<sup>58</sup> Gordon, P. H. (1993) *A certain idea of France: French Security Policy and Gaullist Legacy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press., p. 6

<sup>59</sup> Gaulle, C. D. (1954) *Memoires de guerre L'Appel : 1940-1942*. [Paris]: Plon.; cited in Mahoney, D. J. (2000) *De Gaulle*. New Brunswick (U.S.A.): Transaction Publishers., p.16

unlimited imperialistic ambitions as it did the notion of empire which roots back to the pre-war era and was excessively present in the fourth republic.<sup>60</sup>

In summary, the *grandeur* aspect of France's strategic culture entails in its quintessence the idea that France is a regionally and globally leading security actor that is independent from multilateral security frameworks in its capacity to provide for its own interest. France nuclear deterrence policy is one example for this independence, as well as national interest politics in its sphere of influence (e.g. ex-colonial Africa) that have been perceived as neo-colonialist policies.<sup>61</sup>

A second aspect of the French strategic culture is France challenging American hegemony, an element also constituted in Gaullism. In an in-depth analysis of French anti-Americanism, Sophie Maunier identifies distinctive forms of French anti-Americanism.<sup>62</sup> Although a fundamental aspect of Gaullism, the French anti-American sentiments last already for centuries and are deeply rooted within political and cultural elite alike. The French political critiques about the power ambitions of the United States were related to the inherent hypocrisy regarding the liberal values and the disregard for territorial sovereignty of states.<sup>63</sup> Also, the cultural influence of the US on Europe is met with deep skepticism.<sup>64</sup> This cross-contextual anti-Americanism is manifested in French opposition along with critiques regarding the US foreign policy in numerous occasions throughout the post-war era. As it has opposed the war on Iraq, it is commonly seen as the model case for this anti-Americanism shown in political decisions. Although French anti-Americanism was used to legitimize the standpoint and was wholeheartedly embraced by the decision making sphere, common sense and the lack of direct national interest contributed significantly to the opposition. Another example of anti-Americanism was the tough critique on the intervention of the US in the Tsunami of 2004, which has been criticized for being focused on the US interests,

---

<sup>60</sup> Mahoney, D. J. (2000) *De Gaulle*. New Brunswick (U.S.A.): Transaction Publishers., p. 17

<sup>61</sup> Mesfin, B. (2008) 'Only a Folie de Grandeur? Understanding French policy in Africa' *African Security Studies*, 17 (1), p. 4

<sup>62</sup> Meunier, S. (2005) 'The Distinctiveness of French anti-Americanism' In: Katzenstein, P. J. and Keohane, R. O. (eds.) (2007) *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17

rather than a humanitarian motivation; another example would be the opposition against the Vietnam war: another would be the public debates.<sup>65</sup>

The third element, whose foundation lies within the 4th republic but was fully embraced by de Gaulle's fifth republic, was the reconciliation with Germany and the attempt to embed the neighbor into a French-led European framework. The idea behind the reconciliation on the French side - and in de Gaulle's mind in particular - was to bind the threat that Germany was still believed to constitute at that time within a multilateral framework and to benefit from Germany's vast economic potential in a French-led European economic and defense integration.<sup>66</sup>

In the French defense policy guidelines of 2008<sup>67</sup> for the investigated time relevant -, the values of grandeur are very much reflected. The French government identifies *the French white paper on defence and national security* interventions abroad as the key determinant for its armed forces structure. The complete range of operations - from small special operations to major operations up to 30,000 soldiers - covered by the defense policy guidelines emphasize the readiness to fiercely protect its national interest and security, the international security and France's role in the world.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., p.2

<sup>66</sup> Skemperis, G. (2003) 'Strategic Culture in Post-War Europe', p. 20

<sup>67</sup> Ministère de la Défense (2008) 'The French White Paper on defence and national security' [online], p.11

### 3.3.2 Strategic Preferences for France

#### Conditions for the use of force - 3

The notion of grandeur implies that the French armed forces have to be at any given moment capable of ensuring the security of the nation and preserving the French interest, independent from any given multilateral security framework. It can be inferred that *French decision makers will choose to deploy the military force when French vital interests or the security of its global standing are at stake.*

#### Military Strategy - 3

Furthermore, the notion of *grandeur* explains the behavior of this variable, according to which France is pledging for a leader status in the world. This standing is to preserve and defend even if costs are considerably high. It can be inferred that *French decision-makers will choose offensive strategies and embrace the risk as long as it defends France's standing in the world.*

#### Level of cooperation - 3

Despite being a driving force behind European integration, French cooperation is mainly guided by an avoidance of the US-led NATO framework due to the traditional anti-Americanism. It can be inferred that *cooperation happens context-dependent along French interest and is usually the cooperation with particular states, especially Germany.*

#### International/domestic authorization requirements - 4

The notion of Grandeur is to a large extent socially absorbed. French public discourse does therefore only marginally restrain the use of force. From the international perspective, France, as a permanent Member of the UNSC, is able to conduct military operations on its own behalf and would have to face rather mild diplomatic consequences if not acting in line with the whole UNSC. It can be inferred that *France's authorization requirements are low both from a domestic and international point of view.*

### 3.4 Graphical illustration of the Nationsøparadigm

Proclivity to Use of Force	1	2	3	4
Conditions for the Use of Force		Germany	United Kingdom / France	
Military Strategy	Germany	United Kingdom	France	
Level of Cooperation		Germany	United Kingdom / France	
International / domestic Authorization Requirements	Germany	United Kingdom		France

Table 2: "Nation's Paradigm of ranked Strategic Preferences"



## 4. Strategic Culture in Practice

### 4.1 Case Study Libya

#### 4.1.1 Germany's Strategic Behavior in Libya

Decisions on the use of military force are always extremely difficult to take. We have carefully considered the options of using military force, its implications as well as its limitations. We see great risks. The likelihood of large-scale loss of life should not be underestimated. If the steps proposed turn out to be ineffective, we see the danger of being drawn into a protracted military conflict that would affect the wider region. We should not enter a military confrontation on the optimistic assumption that quick results with few casualties will be achieved. Germany, therefore, has decided not to support a military option as foreseen particularly in OP 4 and OP 8 of the resolution. Furthermore, Germany will not contribute to such a military effort with its own forces.<sup>68</sup>

With this statement, the German ambassador to the United Nations, Peter Wittig, declared Germany's abstention from voting on UN Security Council Resolution 1973. Entailed in this statement is German foreign policy elite's assessment of the situation regarding a possible military strike. The statement is emphasizing especially Germany's very low risk tolerance, given that an intervention would still lie within the expected range of conditions which say that the use of force as a humanitarian intervention is a justifiable option.

For Germany's internal decision-making process leading to the abstention, Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle has been the acknowledged driving force.<sup>69</sup> The day after the passing of UNSC Resolution 1973, he further emphasized the awareness of dramatic risks as driving factor by stating that "we are still very skeptical about the option of a military intervention in Libya also included in the resolution. We see considerable

---

<sup>68</sup> Wittig, P. (2011) Explanation of Vote by Ambassador Wittig on the Security Council Resolution on Libya. [press release] 17.03.2011., cited in Miskimmon, A. (2012) 'German foreign policy and the Libya crisis' *German politics*, 21 (4), p. 392

<sup>69</sup> Hansel, M. and Oppermann, K. (2013) "Counterfactual Reasoning in Foreign Policy Analysis: The Cases of German Non-participation in the Iraq and Libya Interventions of 2003 and 2011", paper presented at 63rd PSA Annual International Conference, Cardiff, 25.3-27.3.2013 p. 22

dangers and risks in this. Therefore we cannot agree to this part of the resolution. German soldiers will not participate in a military operation in Libya.<sup>70</sup>

In a session of the German parliament, he showed himself in particular skeptical about the effectiveness of a no-fly zone in a country like Libya [...] which is approximately four times bigger than the Federal Republic of Germany. Westerwelle raised the possibility that the intervention may weaken rather than strengthen the democratic movements across North Africa<sup>71</sup> and answered to the question of a German journalist, if political pressure is of any matter to a crazy dictator: "The question is, if Germany fights a war in Libya, with international participation [ ] and I won't accept, that there is a war fought in Libya with German soldiers [ ] Because what if the no fly zone, that means airstrikes, proves to be unsuccessful, with ground forces further approaching? Are we going to go there then with our own ground forces like it happened in Iraq? I want to prevent Germany from such an asymmetrical situation."<sup>72</sup>

The impression of Germany pushing out of circle of the Western security framework - considering the rigor with which it justified its abstention - was even enforced when Defense Minister Thomas de Maiziere indirectly accused the British and French of a lack of planning, saying that: "I believe that each military operation must be analyzed to determine whether its goals can be achieved with appropriate means and within an appropriate time frame as well as how one gets out at the end. Every one."<sup>73</sup>

Over the course of the conflict however, Germany has not been sidelined constantly. Germany sought the cooperation with all possible allies and international organizations, promoting thoroughly their understanding of international law. Guido Westerwelle was keen to ensure that he welcomes UNSC Resolution 1970 as the "hoped-for clear

---

<sup>70</sup> Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Federal Foreign Minister Westerwelle on the Libya Resolution of the UN Security Council' [online]

<sup>71</sup> Westerwelle, G. (2011) 95. Sitzung des Bundestages. [Plenarprotokoll]. 17/95. , cited in Hansel, M. and Oppermann, K. (2013) "Counterfactual Reasoning in Foreign Policy Analysis: The Cases of German Non-participation in the Iraq and Libya Interventions of 2003 and 2011 p. 26

<sup>72</sup> Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Außenminister Westerwelle im Interview mit dem Deutschlandfunk zu Libyen' [online]

<sup>73</sup> Miskimmon, A. (2012) 'German foreign policy and the Libya crisis', p. 393

response from the international community to the brutality of the Libyan leadership<sup>74</sup> as well as EU Council Decision 2011/137/CFSP and added that those are both decisions that we worked actively to help bring about.<sup>75</sup> Only one week before the vote on UNSC Resolution 1973, Westerwelle announced that the international community must increase the pressure on the Libyan leadership. The UN Security Council has to take another look at the situation in Libya. Additional targeted sanctions and an end to all payments to the Qadhafi regime need to be urgent items on the EU and UN agendas. Every action beyond the scope of targeted sanctions must be authorized by the UN Security Council and can only proceed with the approval of partners in the region.<sup>76</sup> Demonstrating the strong cooperationist tradition of German Foreign Policy, Germany was pushing the topic forward in the international agenda, believing that a political solution was possible. When a military strike became probable, Germany backed out of the international community. This indicates that the extreme risk aversion of German decision-makers is the dominant factor, probably more dominant than other observed notions of strategic culture like seeking international cooperation and the basic willingness to apply in international crisis management.

Chancellor Angela Merkel had left the design of an adequate response for Libya to Guido Westerwelle and his Federal Foreign Office and made clear in an interview right after the abstention that her Foreign Minister had acted in line with her position on the matter. In an interview on March 17th, she said that the abstention does not signify not acting and defended the economic sanctions imposed. Regarding a military intervention she still offered a somewhat different perspective, saying that she is very skeptical about a military intervention and that I, as chancellor, cannot lead German forces into a mission with highly uncertain prospects<sup>77</sup> When asked at what point she would consider military action, she answered: "We defined that point very clearly in Afghanistan for example. The terrorism planned and armored there is a threat for Europe.

---

<sup>74</sup> Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Federal Minister Westerwelle welcomes UN sanctions against Libyan leadership' [online]

<sup>75</sup> Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Federal Minister Westerwelle welcomes naming of UN Special Envoy to Libya' [online]

<sup>76</sup> Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Foreign Minister Westerwelle welcomes EU sanctions against Libyan leadership' [online]

<sup>77</sup> German Federal Government (2011) 'Bundesregierung | Sicherheitssysteme werden umfassend überprüft' [online]

It can be said beyond any doubt that in Afghanistan our security is defended. That reasoning does not apply for Libya.<sup>78</sup> Next to the low risk tolerance, Chancellor Merkel directly refers to an aspect defined in the Germany's strategic preferences that has to be questioned at this point: Is a humanitarian intervention that aims to stop grave violations of human rights really a part of Germany's strategic culture? The Chancellor speaks in clear terms of the defense of the security at home and the Defense Minister states that 'the responsibility to protect a country's civilian population if its government violates human rights is firmly anchored in international law. But does that mean we are allowed to intervene? Or does that mean we're actually required to?'<sup>79</sup> It appears that in terms of the conditions for the use of force, condition 2 only applies when condition 1 is fulfilled coevally.

With Westerwelle pushing for more pressure on the Qadhafi Regime and keeping military options on the table if legitimized by the UN Security Council, Germany's final decision to even abstain from vote is a memorable one. Given the possibility that Germany could have symbolically participated with logistic or medical contributions, Germany's decision came as a surprise and imposed the German government to severe criticism from EU and NATO partners. Even in Germany, the abstention from vote along with China and Russia irritated and was called 'the biggest foreign policy debacle since the founding of the Federal Republic'<sup>80</sup>, by the former foreign minister Joschka Fischer. While the strict 'no' to the deployment of the military, especially to combat troops can very well be explained with Germany's very low risk tolerance, the abstention from vote do not. Alan Miskimmon argues that Berlin could have been too sure that the US would not participate either.<sup>81</sup> The abstention is also frequently put into the context of two important regional elections<sup>82</sup>. In the end, it is difficult to determine the exact incitement but permitted to state that the political move didn't have the desired effect.

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Miskimmon, A. (2012) 'German foreign policy and the Libya crisis', p. 393

<sup>80</sup> Der Spiegel (2011) 'Ein einziges Debakel', Spiegel-Gespräch mit Joschka Fischer' [online]

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., p. 395

<sup>82</sup> See: Hansel, Mischa; Oppermann Kai (2013): Counterfactual Reasoning in Foreign Policy Analysis: The Cases of German Non-participation in the Iraq and Libya Interventions of 2003 and 2011, Paper to be presented at the 63rd PSA Annual International Conference 'The Party's over?'

In sum, the strategic culture is profoundly constituted in the strategic behavior of Germany in the Libya crisis, confirming the low scoring and the assumptions made about behavior in its set of strategic preferences. The extremely low risk tolerance has shown to be the most dominant preference in this case. It has a measurable influence on the conditions under which the use of force is applied and the power to outplay Germany's emphasis on cooperating with international organizations and their allied states.

#### 4.1.2 The UK's Strategic Behavior in Libya

“Tonight British forces are in action over Libya. They are part of an international coalition that come together to enforce the will of the United Nations and protect the Libyan people. [í ] What we are doing is necessary, it is legal and it is right. It is necessary because together with other we should prevent him from using his military against his own people. It is legal, because we have the backing of the United Nations Security Council and also of the Arab League and many others. And it is also right, because I believe we should not stand aside when this dictator murders his own people [í ] I believe that we should all be confident that what we are doing is in a just cause and in our nation's interest”<sup>83</sup>

With this announcement from the 20<sup>th</sup> of March 2011, David Cameron declared that airstrikes of British forces were enforcing UN Security Council Resolution of 1973. Cameron makes yet a clear reference to the conditions for the use of force in this case by highlighting the moral as well as the national interest. While the moral interest is a universal one, Cameron's referral to the national interest indicates that military force is an adequate instrument of foreign policy that should be applied when Britain's national interest is at stake. This national interest was further explained when David Cameron was speaking in front of the House of Commons on March 18th, justifying Britain's profound support for UN Security Council Resolution 1973: “Let us be clear where our interests lie. In this country we know what Colonel Qadhafi is capable of. We should not forget his support for the biggest terrorist atrocity on British soil. We simply cannot have a situation where a failed pariah state festers on Europe's southern border. This

---

<sup>83</sup> The Telegraph (2011) 'David Cameron: 'Libya action is necessary, legal and right'' [online]

would potentially threaten our security, push people across the Mediterranean and create a more dangerous and uncertain world for Britain and for all our allies as well as for the people of Libya<sup>84</sup> Foreign Minister William Hague specified this opinion, when he showed himself concerned that "after these recent events with Qadhafi running amok exacting reprisals on his own people, estranged from the rest of the world, as a potential source for terrorism in the future, that would be a danger to the national interest of this country"<sup>85</sup>

The aspect of moral and national interest was embedded in a narrative of "three criteria which I set out consistently over the last three weeks"<sup>86</sup>, that have been loosely adopted by Cameron when he made the speech in front of 10 Downing Street on the 20th. According to William Hague, when commenting on the vote in favor for Resolution 1973, these include "a demonstrable need - and the actions and statements of the Qadhafi regime in recent days have provided that demonstrable need. Secondly a clear legal basis; this is the clear legal basis in the Resolution of the United Nations Security Council. And, third, broad support from within the region itself and that is evident in the statement of the Arab League and in the readiness to participate in a no fly zone, for instance, by members of the Arab League."<sup>87</sup> Next to the interest, the aspects of authorization and cooperation play a main role in the decision-justification of Britain's decision-making sphere. Given the fact that a unilateral military intervention might have only caused criticism from the countries that in general refused military action, the consequences for Britain within the international community would have been marginal if consequent action would not have raised applause within its allies. The repeated mentioning of the UN as "the world's governing body, the clearest possible resolution, the clearest possible legal basis of action" and the involvement of the Arab World, emphasizing that this is "the Arab world asking us to act with them"<sup>88</sup>, can much more

---

<sup>84</sup> BBC News (2011) 'In full: Cameron Libya statement' [online]

<sup>85</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) "'UK is at the forefront of the international effort to isolate Qadhafi regime'" [online]

<sup>86</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'UN intervention in Libya: Foreign Secretary on BBC Radio 5' [online]

<sup>87</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'Foreign Secretary comments on UN vote on Libya no fly zone' [online]

<sup>88</sup> BBC News (2011) 'In full: Cameron Libya statement' [online]

be related to the domestic requirements. The interventionist Blair years had caused frustrating results, the need for international legitimation and incorporation is therefore high. Hence decision-makers were especially eager to ensure that the Arab League unanimously appealed for a resolution and a no fly zone and the UNSC Resolution 1973 does not empower us to implement regime change it empowers us to protect and safeguard the civilian population so that they can, hopefully, in the future determine their own future<sup>89</sup>

Connected to the international legitimation, is the risk awareness that is shown by the decision-makers. Cameron answered in an interview that of course I had to think extremely carefully before taking these steps but that it does seem to me that it is right for Britain not to play some disproportioned part, not the grand stand, not something we're not, but play our part with our allies, the American, the French, the Arab countries<sup>90</sup>. As expected in Britain's set of strategic preferences, the decision-makers did not push forward an all in approach including ground forces in order to end the conflict as soon as somehow possible but kept closely to the objectives of the UNSC Resolution. As William Hague confirmed in an interview right after the actions had begun: Well here the UN resolution is also clear because it, while it does mandate [a no fly zone, enforcing cease fire], it's very clear that there must not be a foreign occupation force in any part of Libya. So it does not support the idea of a ground invasion of Libya, let's be clear about that. Instead, military was used in a cost -and casualty- effective way to ensure an outcome of the civil-war in favor of the rebels.<sup>91</sup>

In the end, the military contribution of Britain was composed of a formation of Typhoon fighters and one of Tornados G4 aircrafts, that were supported by several intelligence and tanker aircrafts with transport aircrafts to follow.<sup>92</sup>

The British Government was eager to demonstrate how little effort has achieved so much in terms of ending the violence and avoiding civilian casualties. Foreign Minister

---

<sup>89</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'UN intervention in Libya: Foreign Secretary on BBC Radio 5' [online]

<sup>90</sup> BBC News (2011) 'BBC Interview with David Cameron about Libya'. [video online]

<sup>91</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'UN intervention in Libya: Foreign Secretary on BBC Radio 5' [online]

<sup>92</sup> Ministry of Defence (2011) 'Operations in Libya having a very real effect' [online]

William Hague published a letter he had received from a member of the local council in Misurata, thanking Britain and the allies for their action[1 ] for coming to the aid of the Libyan people, as he puts it, in their most needy of hoursø Hague also particularly mentions that the local council could testify for the effectiveness and the accuracy of those strikes and confirm that there has been not a single case of civilian injury let alone death in and around Misurataø<sup>93</sup>

In sum, the strategic behavior was in line with the expected range of options, allowing relating the decision-making process to the British strategic culture. The government has justified thoroughly why in their eyes the use of force is appropriate, and frequently pointed out the national interest that the operation upholds and defends. The conservative Tory government shaped a military contribution containing a very low risk for British soldiers and a proportionate use of its vast military power to reach the objectives announced. Interestingly, British decision-making sphere put high emphasis on the legality of the mission and the embracing of the Arab world as partner and solicitant for the operation. As mentioned above, the United Kingdom was not necessarily required to have all possible legitimation, but demonstrated the legality as domestic authorization requirement. It is very likely that the interventionism of Tony Blair, especially regarding the Iraq war, has produced a recent change in British strategic culture towards more international cooperation. In the Libyan case however, more international outlook is difficult to imply, as the US were crucially involved conducting the first attacks under their command.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'Foreign Secretary statement following the London Conference on Libya' [online]

<sup>94</sup> Hallams, E. and Schreer, B. (2012) 'Towards a post-American alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya' *International affairs*, 88 (2), pp. 321-323



#### 4.1.3 France's Strategic Behavior in Libya

France solemnly calls on all members of the Security Council to support this initiative and to adopt the draft resolution. If it is adopted, we are prepared to act with Member States – in particular Arab States – that wish to do so. We do not have much time left. It is a matter of days, perhaps even hours. Every hour and day that goes by means a further clampdown and repression for the freedom-loving civilian population, in particular the people of Benghazi.<sup>95</sup>

Alain Juppé's urgent call for support from the UN Security Council on the resolution that France had drafted together with the UK and the US, is another sign of the role in front-row when the situation in Libya made a military intervention more and more likely. French president Sarkozy was the first western leader who discussed the possibility of launching military strikes against Qadhafi – to assume its role, its role before history in stopping his murderous madness.<sup>96</sup> Already at the end of February 2011, when the UK was still seeking more profound international support, not seeing the point for military action already come, Nicolas Sarkozy called for a no-fly zone to – prevent the use of that country's warplanes against its population.<sup>97</sup> As the situation worsened in the beginning of March 2011, President Sarkozy was also the first western leader to discuss a – strategic plan that includes striking an extremely limited number of points which are the source of the most deadly operations.<sup>98</sup> The reasoning of the French government solely concentrated on the humanitarian, moral aspect, highlighted by Foreign Minister Alain Juppé: “Colonel Qadhafi's troops pursue their violent conquest of liberated cities and territories. We must not give free rein to warmongers; we must not abandon civilian populations, the victims of brutal repression, to their fate; we must not allow the rule of law and international morality to be trampled underfoot.”<sup>99</sup> France had made very clear, very early, that the country saw the

---

<sup>95</sup> Juppé, A. (2011) '17 March 2011 - Security Council - Libya - Statement by Mr Alain Juppé, ministre d'Etat' France ONU. [online]

<sup>96</sup> NY Times (2011) 'Sarkozy Puts France at Vanguard of West's War Effort' [online]

<sup>97</sup> The Guardian (2011) 'Libya no-fly zone call by France fails to get David Cameron's backing' [online]

<sup>98</sup> The Telegraph (2011) 'Libya: Nicolas Sarkozy to urge 'targeted air strikes' [online]

<sup>99</sup> Juppé, A. (2011) '17 March 2011 - Security Council - Libya - Statement by Mr Alain Juppé, ministre d'Etat' France ONU. [online]

conditions for the use of force as fulfilled in the Libyan case and that France is ready to lead the international community in such an effort. The French exceptionalism constituted in the notion of Grandeur can be observed in this willingness to counter grave violations of human rights as a powerful protector of international law. The fact that the action entails the use of military force has hereby not been questioned at all, confirming that France is willing to take offensive measures when serving its interest, although the interest is in the rhetoric of a wholly humanitarian nature.

In this effort, France didn't take much regard of its partners. Although seeking the legitimization by international law and regional powers, France unilaterally pushed the agenda forward towards decisive actions against Qadhafi. The best example for this unilateral engagement was the recognition of the National Libyan Council (NLC). On March 10th, President Sarkozy welcomed representatives of the NLC and declared that he regards 'the NLC as Libya's legitimate representative'<sup>100</sup> This untuned push forward that was accompanied by criticism of its European partners, shows how eager France was to take lead in this crisis, even if it would mean alienating key allies and acting unilaterally. This confirms the strategic preference and goes even beyond, drifting towards non-cooperation. Another aspect regarding the way France cooperated with its allies was the deep skepticism towards a political NATO engagement. When David Cameron announced that operational command would soon shift to NATO, Nicolas Sarkozy reasoned that 'it would be playing into the hands of Colonel Qadhafi to say NATO is taking over' because 'NATO cannot swallow the United Arab Emirates and Qatar' therefore is 'the NATO issue a practical and not a political one. The political coordination is with the 11-member coalition'<sup>101</sup> By highlighting the NATO's difficult relation with the Arab World, this behavior shows the expected tendency away from the transatlantic security framework.

The promotion of France as the leading force of the international community against Qadhafi included the authorization of the UN Security Council and generally positive reactions to the plans on behalf of the Arab World. When speaking in front of the UN Security Council, Alain Juppe emphasized that 'the international community has reacted in near unanimity' and that 'regional organizations have [also] expressed themselves

---

<sup>100</sup> BBC News (2011) 'France recognizes Libyan rebels' [online]

<sup>101</sup> The Guardian (2011) 'Libya: Nicolas Sarkozy reignites row over Nato military role' [online]

forcefully. First and foremost, the League of Arab States called on the Security Council [1 ] to establish a no-fly zone<sup>102</sup>. Although authorization requirements for the use of force are both domestically and internationally low, France showed that the confirmation of the UN Security Council and the embracement of regional powers are key requirements for the use of force.

To sum up, one can observe that French strategic culture is constituted in its strategic behavior during crucial moments of the Libyan crisis. France saw very early the conditions for the use fulfilled and demonstrated great eagerness in leading the international community to fierce response to the crimes the Qadhafi regime was committing. France's behavior towards its key allies was marked by the search for international confirmation but also the unilateral pursue of its own interest with a political distance to the NATO. This is in line with the expectations, but goes beyond that, with a tendency towards unilateralism.

---

<sup>102</sup> Juppé, A. (2011) '17 March 2011 - Security Council - Libya - Statement by Mr Alain Juppé, ministre d'Etat' France ONU. [online]

## 4.2 Case Study Mali

### 4.2.1 Germany's Strategic Behavior in Mali

When it became clear that the Malian forces would not be able to withstand the fast approaching Islamist and Tuareg forces and France started its ad-hoc intervention, Germany's security policy decision-making sphere hurried to demonstrate full political support for France's decision to answer the call of the Malian government. In various statements, Merkel, Westerwelle and de Maiziere, justified this intervention in front of the international law, EU interests and the strategic rationale. Defense Minister de Maiziere said in an interview three days after the intervention: 'France's intervention with military forces is consequent and correct. The Malian army was not able to stop the terrorists approaching from the north. This is an essential necessity though and declared goal of France's intervention. France is acting according to the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council and the international law.'<sup>103</sup> In an official statement immediately issued after the official beginning of Operation Serval, on the 11th of January, Guido Westerwelle had already confirmed that Operation Serval is legitimized by international law and strategic necessity, adding in a foot note that the French government had previously informed Germany.<sup>104</sup> The reason for this was the statement of Guido Westerwelle earlier that day, when in an assessment of the situation in Mali, he had not lost a single word about a possible military intervention from Europe and displayed the position that Germany had had for most of the course of this conflict: 'I am very concerned about the further escalation of the situation in Mali. [í ]It is right, to push on the efforts to deploy the African intervention force with all given dispatch. [í ] Addressing the security situation, the EU has signaled the willingness to support the training of the Malian forces, if ó and only if óthe needed conditions are given.'<sup>105</sup> Following these policy standpoints, Germany has been acting with a cautious strategy regarding the prospect of a European (or German) military contribution but not in a countervailing fashion as it did in Libyan crises. Germany supported the drafts for the

---

<sup>103</sup> Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (2013) 'Thomas de Maizière im Interview: 'Den Einfluss des Westens nicht überschätzen'' [online]

<sup>104</sup> Federal Foreign Office (2013) 'Federal Foreign Minister Westerwelle on France's intervention in Mali' [online]

<sup>105</sup> Federal Foreign Office (2013) 'Federal Foreign Minister Westerwelle on the situation in Mali' [online]

UNSC Resolutions 2071 and 2085, giving a broad UN mandate to the African Union and ECOWAS deploying troops and was also engaged and committed to the creation of the CSDP Training Mission, which has been on the agenda since October 2012. On the necessity of action on the side of the international community, Angela Merkel noted that 'free democratic states cannot accept that the North (of Mali) turns into a safe haven for international terrorism. We know that Malian forces are too weak to act. They need assistance.'<sup>106</sup> Defense Minister de Maziere showed he was confident that Germany is ready to meet expectations and responsibilities in the international crisis management, including a possible German military contribution. Referring to Germany's position as one of the biggest economies in the world, he stated: 'If an engagement is the political will, necessity or decision, the *Bundeswehr* has to be capable of and ready for military operations, and it has to be ready fast and without long preparations.'<sup>107</sup> Still, the decision-making sphere made very clear that a participation of combat forces would by no means represent an option, in contrary to other military assets like training staff and logistic material.

After a phone conversation between Guido Westerwelle and French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius, the Federal Foreign Office issued a press release, saying: 'Foreign Minister Westerwelle conveyed the German Government's offer to examine together with the French Government how Germany, while not sending combat troops, can support the French mission in political, logistical, medical and humanitarian terms.'<sup>108</sup> Yet, in October, after UN Security Council Resolution 2071 had been passed, Westerwelle mentioned to the press that 'Germany is not going to deliver weapons to Mali. We also won't send combat troops. It is about training and instruction. It's about technical, financial and humanitarian support for an African Mission.'<sup>109</sup>

Again, the German reservations to make use of their own force have prevailed in the debate. Although not sidelined this time, it was obvious that the German idea of humanitarian intervention is mostly the idea of politically supporting other countries'

---

<sup>106</sup> Spiegel Online (2012) 'Kampf gegen Islamisten: Merkel gibt grünes Licht für Mali-Mission' [online]

<sup>107</sup> German Ministry of Defence (2013) 'Verteidigungs- und Außenminister äußern sich zu Mali' [online]

<sup>108</sup> Federal Foreign Office (2013) 'Mali: Foreign Minister Westerwelle has telephone conversation with Fabius' [online]

<sup>109</sup> Tagesschau (2012) 'Keine Kampftruppen aber Training für Mali' [online]

interventions. The risks of a possible asymmetric situation in West Africa with German combat troops involved have dominated the military discourse, with high ranking Bundeswehr officials concerned that the Bundeswehr is once again thoughtlessly and irresponsibly sent into a mission that is part of fragmentary political conception. The term training disguises what the Bundeswehr could face in Mali and that is a direct involvement into warlike fights. The soldiers rightfully ask themselves if they are again sent to the desert for alliance policies<sup>110</sup>. This mentioned alliance policy as an aspect of German Foreign Policy is maybe the most significant one when examining the German relation to the use of force. As Germany's strategic culture tends to embrace international organizations and the wide range of their allies, the decisions taken by those allies and organizations are supported and promoted until the very moment when decision-making turns into action. At this moment, Germany's actual conditions for the use of force (immediate threat, defense of national and ally territory) dominate the cooperation aspect. Although it did not reach the extent as it did in the Libya-crisis, this element has been consistent across the cases.

Also, the domestic authorization requirements prevented one again a more relevant contribution. The sending of two Transall transport aircrafts to transport ECOWAS-troops to Mali was not necessarily designed to play a part in the intervention, but due to the fact that this is a measure below the barrier of a measure that requires a mandate of the German Bundestag.<sup>111</sup>

For Germany's participation in the CSDP Mission EUTM Mali, the EU could agree on, on the 17th of January, and the sending of a special tanker aircraft following a French request, such a mandate became necessary and approved on the 28th of February in the German parliament. In total, Germany's military was able to deploy Transall aircrafts, four A310 tankers and contingent of military personnel of 330 consisting of 180 soldiers for the training mission and 150 as logistical transport assistance.<sup>112</sup>

In sum, Germany's strategic culture of extreme constraint regarding the use of military force and the extreme low-risk tolerance has been consistent across the cases, reassuring the low score. Also, the decision-makers struggle to meet on the one side the

---

<sup>110</sup> Zeit Online (2012) 'Nordafrika: Militäreinsatz in Mali beunruhigt Bundeswehr' [online]

<sup>111</sup> German Ministry of Defence (2013) 'Verteidigungs- und Außenminister äußern sich zu Mali' [online]

<sup>112</sup> N-tv (2013) 'Deutsche Soldaten nach Mali: Kabinett plant mit 330 Mann' [online]

expectations of the international community and the domestic expectations to refuse using military force as foreign policy element. This contradiction has led to a remarkable critique of humanitarian organizations in Germany. They accuse Foreign Minister Westerwelle of mixing humanitarian assistance with military contribution in order to sell Germany's logistical, financial and medical support as meeting Germany's responsibilities to militarily act in a humanitarian crisis.<sup>113</sup>

#### 4.2.2 The UK's Strategic Behavior in Mali

“The situation in Mali is a serious concern for the UK. It would not be in our interests to allow a terrorist haven to develop in Northern Mali. As a responsible member of the Security Council, we must support the region in limiting the danger of instability in that part of Africa, threatening UK interests. [í ] I would like to reassure the House that British forces will not undertake a combat role in Mali. The Prime Minister has authorized a limited logistical deployment following a direct request from one of our closest allies.[í ] We must not allow northern Mali to become a springboard for extremism, and create instability in the wider West African region. The ferocity and fanaticism of the extremists in northern Mali must not be allowed to sweep unchecked into the country's capital. France, which has an historic relationship with Mali, is quite rightly in the lead.”<sup>114</sup>

Summarizing the UK government's standpoint on the French intervention in Mali, Foreign Undersecretary Mark Simmonds underlined the differences in the opinion of the decision-making sphere across the two cases. While in Libya the UK saw itself required to participate and take a leading role in action, the responsibility for a military intervention in Mali was delegated to France, emphasizing its colonial past in West Africa. In explaining its political support and military contribution in form of logistical support and intelligence exchange, the British decision-justification reminded of the German response.

---

<sup>113</sup> Médecins Sans Frontières (2013) 'Mali: Medizinische Hilfsorganisationen werfen Außenminister Westerwelle Missbrauch humanitärer Hilfe vor' [online]

<sup>114</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2013) 'Foreign Office Minister statement on Mali' [online]

In a first reaction David Cameron praised the French intervention, highlighting that 'there is a very dangerous Islamist regime allied to al-Qaeda in control of the north of that country' and because this threat was now pushing forward to the south 'we should support the action the French have taken'<sup>115</sup>. For this reason, 'we were first out of the blocks, as it were to say to the French, we'll help you, we'll work with you and we'll share what intelligence we have with you and try to help you with what you are doing'<sup>116</sup>. Still, as in the German case, a role of British forces in the combats was consequently denied from the beginning of the intervention, with David Cameron and William Hague jointly confirming that 'no British forces will be involved in a combat role at all.'<sup>117</sup> This should be mainly due to the action that France had already taken and was inevitably forced to continue whether additional combat forces of the international community would accompany them or not. After the UN Security Council Resolution 2085 had passed, David Cameron's special representative to the Sahel, including Mali, showed himself concerned that 'if we don't act, we send a message to all secessionist groups that the international community turns a blind eye to states within states [and] there is very real threat of further attacks in Africa and, eventually, Europe, the Middle East and beyond' and added that 'I'm not going in with a closed mind to rule anything out. We will do our best to play our part. I haven't ruled anything out.'<sup>118</sup> It can be argued that if the request to the French government on behalf of the Malian Government would not have occurred that for British decision-makers a military intervention would have lied within a broader scope of options, dependent on the development of the situation. As this outcome was avoided, the low risk tolerance ruled out an engagement in combat, because the British national interest was already served by the French intervention and it was supported in very cost-effective way without harming British military personnel.

The British support for the EUTM Mali was also comparable to the German response. Foreign Office Minister David Lidington welcomed the creation of a CSDP mission because 'the EU has an important role to play as part of the international response to the

---

<sup>115</sup> BBC News (2013) 'No UK army boots in Mali, says PM' [online]

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

<sup>117</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2013) 'UK to provide logistical military assistance to Mali' [online]

<sup>118</sup> The Telegraph (2012) 'Britain to support African force in bid to recapture northern Mali' [online]



crisis in Mali<sup>119</sup> but also emphasized that "the training mission will be time-limited with a clear mandate to advise and train Malian armed forces: it will not be engaged in combat<sup>119</sup> Defense Secretary Philip Hammond outlined after the agreement, which additional military assets are planned in for the CSDP Mission. He stated that apart from financial assistance for the African-led intervention force and the logistical assistance already provided to the French consisting of two transport planes and a surveillance aircraft, the UK will contribute "up to 40 British personnel either in a headquarters or training team role<sup>120</sup> but not provide troops in a combat role or force protection for the mission<sup>120</sup> as "that role is being carried out by French and Czech personnel.<sup>120</sup> So although contributing to all initiatives taken during the course of the crises, the UN Security Council Resolutions 2071 and 2085, the EUTM Mali and the French unilateral intervention, the United Kingdom avoided the use of their own force.<sup>120</sup>

In this case, the low-risk tolerance and the high domestic authorization requirements were the constituted, dominant factors of Britain's Strategic culture. In the view of British decision-makers the interests and the influence that the United Kingdom has in francophone West-Africa did not make up for a more risky response in form of a combat participation. The non-commitment of the NATO and the US has very likely played its part in those considerations and enforced the cautiousness of British decision-makers. Persistent over the two cases, was the high domestic authorization requirements and the embracing of all included international organizations. A plausible explanation for this is impact of the Blair legacy on a now more cautious and risk-aware British public discourse in terms of military interventions and Britain's heavy reliance on the transatlantic link. The cooperation level that was estimated is therefore only partially appropriate as both cases illustrate a clear shift towards more international cooperation.

---

<sup>119</sup> Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2013) 'UK welcomes establishment of EU Training Mission to Mali' [online]

<sup>120</sup> Ibid.

#### 4.2.3 France's Strategic Behavior in Mali

"French forces brought their support this afternoon to Malian army units to fight against terrorist elements. This operation will last as long as is necessary. The terrorists have recently regrouped on the line that artificially separates North and South Mali, they have even advanced and seek to strike a fatal blow to the very existence of Mali. France, like its African partners and the international community cannot accept this. We are facing an aggression, so I decided that France is ready to respond on the side of our African partners, on request of Malian authorities. France will do this within the framework of the Resolutions of the United Nations Security Council. We will be ready to stop the terrorist offensive, because this is the requirement of solidarity and responsibility."<sup>121</sup>

At the time of this statement given by French President Francois Hollande, informing the public about the French military intervention in Mali, the first air strikes had already been conducted. The French reaction in form of a unilateral intervention, naturally the key aspect of the Mali conflict, can even more than the Libyan case be seen as a profound constitution of the notion of Grandeur and the strategic options it implies. Again, a French President took the lead when international political pressure turned into action. The special relation with Mali as an ex-colony serves in this regard as an amplifier, which can be noted in the dominating rhetoric of post-colonial responsibility and friendship. This was especially emphasized, as France's national interest of securing industrial engagement in West Africa seemed to apparent to international observers which compelled Francois Hollande to remind that "France is not pursuing any particular interests other than the safety of a country that is a friend and no other purpose than the fight against terrorism. That's why our action is approved by the international community and welcomed across the African States"<sup>122</sup> In order to avoid any confusion about the objectives of the operation, Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius defined the three key objectives of the military operation: "The first is to stop the southward offensive by the armed terrorist groups who were threatening the whole of Mali and particularly the capital, Bamako. This operation is under way and is going satisfactorily. The second objective is to prevent the collapse of Mali. This is the

---

<sup>121</sup> Aljazeera (2013) 'France launches Mali military intervention' [online]

<sup>122</sup> Présidence de la République (2013) 'Déclaration du Président de la République à l'issue du Conseil restreint de défense' [online]

essential precondition for restoring Mali's territorial integrity. The third objective is to allow the implementation of the international resolutions, whether those of the United Nations, the African Union, ECOWAS or the EU. This is of course our main objective<sup>123</sup>. Whether or not materialistic interest formed the cornerstone of strategic thinking in Paris or the violent situation and the defense of the population, France proved again the assumption regarding the conditions for the use of force and showed also, considerably more than in the Libyan case, that it is prepared to take high risks in order to confirm its self-perceived high standing in the world.

Still, this standing in the world proved to be very closely related to the legality in front of international law. The reference to the Malian request, the UN Security Council resolution and the Charter of the United Nations highlights the contemporary desire in all western countries to demonstrate international consensus and regional ownership. Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius declared regarding the legitimacy of the French intervention: "I want to stress that this intervention falls strictly within international law. It responds to a formal request by the Malian President and is being conducted in accordance with the UN Charter, in compliance with UNSCRs 2056, 2071 and 2085. The framework is therefore the UN, Mali is making the request, and our partners are the Africans and the international community. Obviously, we don't intend to act alone. We have and I would like to highlight this almost unanimous international political support. We've acted in a fully transparent manner; we've informed all our partners."<sup>124</sup> For France in this case, this consideration was very meaningful as France had been frequently accused of using its post-colonial influence to pursue economic interest politics with 37 major military operations from 1960 to 2006.<sup>125</sup>

As it was the case in Libya, France did not seek the assistance or commitment of the NATO in this conflict, which was confirmed by NATO General Secretary Anders Fogh Rasmussen who said, that no request for assistance was transmitted by the French nor did the NATO discuss this case because the UN Security Council foresees an African-

---

<sup>123</sup> Fabius, L. (2013) 'Mali: Statement by Laurent Fabius (January 23)' [Consulfrance-nouvelleorleans.org](http://Consulfrance-nouvelleorleans.org). [online]

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> Griffin, C. (2007) "French Military Interventions in Africa: French Grand Strategy and Defense Policy since Decolonization", paper presented at International Studies Association 2007 Annual Convention, Chicago, 28.2-3.3. Los Angeles: University of Southern California., p. 7

led stabilization force.<sup>126</sup> Instead, France accepted the help of particular key allies although this help has jointly been a merely symbolic, logistical assistance.

In sum, it could be observed that in the Malian case the assumed strategic behavior has prevailed. The fight against terrorism, the stability of industrial assets in the region and solidarity for the former colony were vital interests at stake, which fully justified a military operation, assuming a considerable risk, conducted practically unilaterally. For this operation France sought the legal confirmation and political support of its key allies and welcomed assistance and could rely on very low internal authorization requirements. The focus of cooperation was clearly directed towards Europe although US surveillance and intelligence was accepted. The NATO - just like in the Libyan case - was avoided to the most possible extent.

#### 4.3 Summary of the Findings

In the case of Germany, the identified set of preferences translated profoundly into strategic behavior in both cases. Interestingly, the German rhetoric and political self-perception as an international security actor indicated a strategic culture, which includes countervailing grave violations of human rights with military force when necessary. The participation in the wars in Kosovo and Afghanistan with combat troops (although restraint in the mandate), had suggested that such a normalization process indeed had taken place. Germany's strategic behavior however clearly showed that the conditions for the use of force are practically limited to the defense of the own (or ally) territory and immediate threats to national security. Germany's extremely low-risk tolerance marked the core of German rhetoric regarding an operational military strategy and served as explanation and tranquilization of the war-weary German population. This rhetoric founds its peak in the abstention from vote in the Libyan case and the justification of that decision. Germany's strategic culture can explain the mere symbolic contribution in the Malian case and could have explained a symbolic contribution in the Libyan case, but it is not able to provide a plausible explanation for the abstention from vote. The cooperation and the international authorization of the use of force were in both cases sought in the most multilateral setting possible, confirming what has been

---

<sup>126</sup> Hürriyet Daily News (2013) 'NATO backs France in Mali, but says no aid request' [online]

expected. Germany's domestic authorization requirements proved to be extremely high. The domestic legal framework strictly limits the strategic options Germany possess due to the definition of the *Bundeswehr* in Germany's Basic Law while the historic anti-nationalism and anti-militarism dominates the public debate.

The United Kingdom perceived the potential risk and cost of a military intervention in Libya as justified regarding the strong international commitment, especially of the US. As expected, the defense of the national interest is just as an important part regarding the decision-making process as it is the humanitarian necessity. In the Malian case, this commitment was missing which led to a contribution on a very low-risk level with out-of-combat troops. Also part of the decision in Mali was the fact that France did not leave very much to do apart from logistical assistance. A more offensive strategy would have therefore been illogical. Without the intervention from France, the United Kingdom would probably have applied the same requirements in Mali as it did in Libya and participated in an international effort. The United Kingdom cooperated with international organizations and allies in order to lower the risk of the operation. The comparison of the Libyan and the Malian case reveals the expected strong relation to the US and the NATO when it comes to own military actions.

In the case of France, the strategic behavior exceeded the assumptions derived from the identified strategic culture as compared to the German case. In both cases, the French decision-makers' rhetoric was very much implying the notion of Grandeur and the independent, leading role France wants to play in international politics. In the Libyan case this resulted in the demanding promotion of military strikes and the implementation of the no-fly zone, which contained unilateral elements not in line with European and transatlantic partners. In the Malian case, France even decided to intervene by itself, with military forces, and /assume unilaterally the risks and possible consequences of such an operation. As expected, this behavior is showing the national interest as a justification, with the national interest being a proof of its self-perception as well as materialistic interests. Also in both cases it is shown that cooperation ought to go along French interest and is therefore happening as long as France's agenda is the leading element. Still, France is seeking a solid legal legitimization for its actions as it is sensitive for the impact of other regional powers and the political support of its allies, although it was expected to act not only under low domestic but also on low international authorization requirements.

## 5. Conclusions

### 5.1 On Strategic Culture as analytical tool in Security Studies

The ongoing analytical and methodological debate around the notion of strategic culture has indicated that it is an instrument which should be applied with the utmost caution and this warning has proved to be justified. It was certainly demonstrated that an image of a contemporary strategic culture is in most cases not able to produce solid predictions about the strategic behavior in very specific strategic contexts. It would be necessary to identify an extensive set of sub-assumptions for a broad selection of different strategic contexts that would have to entail a huge variety of variables to determine. It can be stated at this point, that the notion of strategic culture does maybe not defy falsifiability but it most certainly defies determinism. As Ken Booth put it, the study of strategic culture is a demanding intellectual challenge that will always rather be art than science, as most important dimensions of international politics.<sup>127</sup> In the case of Britain, it could be demonstrated very well how ambitiously changing Foreign Policy had modified the strategic behavior almost completely to the contrary of what could have been expected before Tony Blair came to office. This indicates that there is a variety of aspects with different magnitudes able to change solid historic tradition.

This does not mean however, that the notion of strategic culture is not useful in the study of nation state behavior regarding the use of force. Although sometimes key aspects of behavior changed across the contexts, it was within a range that was not contradicting the overall impression of the strategic culture of the countries. It was certainly shown that an image of a contemporary strategic culture is able to give a plausible framework of limited options and assumed reactions. Most plausible, in fact close to determinism, has been proved the German strategic culture that was so crucially influenced by the horrific Nazi-Regime and the consequences of its behavior. Germany has produced a line of security policy standpoints and regulatory practices that cannot be explained by any structural-materialistic theory but only with a concept of cultural and historic dimensions.

---

<sup>127</sup> Booth, K. (2005) 'Strategic Culture: Validity and Validation', p. 26

Therefore, the study of strategic culture can be highly recommended to be further utilized in finding explanations for strategic behavior of global security actors. This does especially apply on cases like the European Union with its complex dynamic between multilateral institutions on the one side and Member States with different cultural identities on the other. It adds to the lack of political and the institutional weakness the dimension of cultural compatibility. The framework used in the study is a first try to involve nation-specific strategic cultures and their consequences for strategic behavior in the debate about the role of Europe and the EU as a security actor as it produces insights on both. It is far from being perfect, leaving space for alternating interpretation and does not meet the requirements for total falsifiability. Therefore, future researchers in the field of strategic culture are encouraged to continue to find new research methods and refine existing ones.

## 5.2 On the compatibility of the three Strategic Cultures

As the strategic cultures have been constituted to a sufficient extent in the strategic behavior across two cases of similar military tasks and different strategic context, it is now possible to make statements about the observed compatibility regarding the use of force in humanitarian crises that are covered by the Petersberg Tasks.

Although scoring differently in the framework, the strategic culture of France and the United Kingdom are to a very large extent similar regarding the role that the military and the use of force play as foreign policy instrument. Both countries share a long tradition of military interventions and have a clear conception regarding the conditions for the use of force. British and French decision-makers have shown in both cases that they embrace the 'responsibility to protect' that was unanimously adopted on the 2005 UN summit<sup>128</sup>, as part of their responsibilities as permanent members of the UN Security Council. It is in both countries widely accepted and demanded to clearly define and communicate why a humanitarian intervention is not only morally justified but also in the nation's very interest.

---

<sup>128</sup> Bellamy, A. J. (2010) 'The responsibility to protect - five years on' *Ethics & International Affairs*, 24 (2), p. 143

These similarities have translated into the strategic behavior as well in the decision-justifications of the decision making sphere and resulted into a demonstrated strong partnership in the Libyan case. The partnership in Mali has to be interpreted with more caution however. Although Britain's military did only provide a rather symbolic contribution to the French intervention, it can be argued that this was a reciprocal interest for both countries. While France was eager to demonstrate its unilateral responsibility and readiness to act in francophone West-Africa, the United Kingdom was able to pursue a proportionate and conservative approach, doing justice to the relatively high domestic authorization requirements and the non-commitment of the NATO. Because the United Kingdom had absolutely no need to take risks after France's unilateral action, it can be argued that these very specific political aspects have prevented a broader British commitment rather than a strategic culture of restraint.

It was also possible to trace and confirm differences between the two countries. While the United Kingdom has a very strong link to the transatlantic framework and sees introducing the US into the operational framework as a way to significantly reduce risks, in France, the notion of grandeur implies the independency from bi- or multilateral alliances. This especially counts for the NATO and the US. In Libya, France tried to avoid the transatlantic link and promoted the Franco-British relation while in Mali, France acted unilaterally, ignoring the non-commitment of the NATO and the US.

Completely different is the case of Germany. It became clearer in those recent crises that the German strategic culture is highly incompatible to France and Great Britain. Although the rhetoric of the decision-makers follows that of the British and French in condemning grave violations of human rights, highlighting the responsibility of the international community to act and promoting hard decisions on a broad multilateral basis, Germany rules out his own engagement either right from the start or in the most critical moments. Germany's behavior in the Libya crisis is of course related to the anti-nationalistic, anti-militaristic and anti-interventionist culture but still inexplicable. The abstention from vote along with the BRIC countries has produced severe criticism and damaged Germany's political ambition to become a normalized security actor demonstrating its vast economic potential. Germany has also in the Malian case demonstrated the huge gap between political self-aspirations and the reality of their domestic legal and social restrictions. The German legal process is not at all suitable for



a quick, consequent response to a humanitarian crisis in the shape of an intervention, as the use of the *Bundeswehr* is thoroughly bound to the defense of an immediate threat and only allows the military action under strict restrictions and with full parliamentary participation and control. Additionally, the fierce reluctance against the use of the military at all as foreign policy instrument, that has been fully persistent across time and contexts, continuously slows and restraints decision-making processes and is either used as inner political calculation or it is manifested as solid credo within the decision-making sphere.

Adding Germany to the comparison reveals the big gap and high incompatibility between Germany on the one side and France and the United Kingdom on the other. France and the United Kingdom share key aspects in their strategic cultures that overlap to a degree, which would allow further integration in defense policy. Additionally - France and the United Kingdom taken together - they embrace a broad spectrum of interests and responsibilities in most regions of the world. While often reciprocal, the differences between the specific interests don't defy a strong cooperation but just might define which of the countries turns out to be the leading force in an initiative. Germany, in this regard, could be classified as the sick man within Europe's big three. Its strategic culture of extreme constraint clashes with the external demand and political desire for more international responsibility, leaving no significant assistance in international crises except rhetorical and diplomatic support.

That impression is very much reflected and confirmed by the Franco-British defense cooperation, announced in November 2010, entailing the strengthening of operational linkages between the French and UK Armed Forces, sharing and pooling of materials and equipment, building of joint facilities, mutual access to defense markets, and increased industrial and technological co-operation<sup>129</sup>. Enforcing the bilateral ties on security and defense issues to this extent while sidelining in Germany the crucial factor for a further European Integration in this regard can therefore be expected to have severe consequences for European crisis management, meaning crisis management at an EU-level.

---

<sup>129</sup> Ministry of Defence (2010) 'UK-France Defence Co-operation Treaty announced' [online]

### 5.3 On the Consequences for CSDP

“The European Union, for its part, has failed miserably. Institutional Europe has not faced up to the challenge. In the North African saga it does not exist. It is incapable of agreeing on how to act, on whether to recognize the Libyan opposition and most, of all, on the legitimacy of the use of force. The disunity is total and particularly striking when it is a question of deciding on war – that is to say when history becomes tragedy and it is necessary to move from frothy rhetoric about the rights of man.”<sup>130</sup>

This devastating conclusion of the renowned French newspaper *Le monde* is an example of how the EU’s role in the Libya conflict was perceived, highlighting the disunity between the countries in a situation where no time was to be left. Others described it as ‘Europe’s ‘perfect storm’, revealing all of the EU’s inherent weaknesses while simultaneously offering an opportunity to put into use its full spectrum of instruments.<sup>131</sup> This study hasn’t revealed much to counter this perception but illustrated that persistent, individual strategic cultures give a plausible further explanation for this disunity. Much more important, by putting the focus on the most crucial moments (the final decision about a humanitarian intervention) of the two conflicts, it has been shown that the EU did not play a role at all when the use of force became necessary. The same counts for the conflict in Mali, where the French intervention and broad military effort did disguise that if had the jihadist militias been allowed to march on Bamako the whole idea of a Training Mission and further EU support would have become meaningless.<sup>132</sup>

But besides the fact that ‘today the EU institutions are simply not equipped to launch a rapid response operation of this type’<sup>133</sup>, the high discrepancy between the German strategic culture on the one side and the French and British one on the other, make it highly implausible that a ‘European Strategic Culture’ as outlined in European Security Strategy could ever be developed. It is not imaginable that there will ever be German

---

<sup>130</sup> Le Monde (2011); cited in Miskimmon, A. (2012) ‘German foreign policy and the Libya crisis’, p. 392

<sup>131</sup> Brattberg, E. (2011) ‘Opportunities lost, opportunities seized: the Libya crisis as Europe’s perfect storm’ Policy Brief, June, p. 1

<sup>132</sup> Coolsaet, R., Biscop, S. and Coelmont, J. (2013) ‘Mali: Another European Intervention without the EU?’ Security Policy Brief, 42, January 2013, p. 3

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., p. 4

combat troops involved in a humanitarian intervention under EU initiative and command, without a profound and case-specific evaluation by the German parliament. Furthermore, the German Basic Law would have to be thoroughly revised in order to broaden the operational spectrum according to what is needed for a rapid response in such situations. The consequence of this is that although both cases (especially Mali) entailed exactly the description of a humanitarian crisis for which the EU Battle Group Concept was once implemented, an actual use of this military instrument of the EU was neither in Libya nor in Mali anyway near of serious consideration. Still, it would be not justified to just blame the German strategic behavior for this consistent failure of the CSDP crisis management. Great Britain and especially France, where the notion of empire and grandeur respectively are still very influential, do not show a high interest in a European consensus but reserve their right to act unilaterally or bilaterally according to their own national interest and international law. And while France is continuously pushing for a French-led European security framework independent from the NATO, the United Kingdom keeps close ties to the United States and the transatlantic security framework.

Because of this incompatibility between the European security actors, that is also constituted in a cultural incompatibility, the German *Süddeutsche Zeitung* already predicts the upcoming end for the CSDP. The renowned newspaper argues that because of the disunity between its actors and its insufficient military capabilities, the Common Security and Defense Policy is heading for its collapse<sup>134</sup>. As mentioned before, the study of strategic culture should not entail such determinism. But with the three strategic cultures not being compatible, a functioning, effective CSDP crisis management is most certainly not plausible.

But what is the future of Europe as a security actor, if the findings of this study suggest that cultural incompatibility is one more severe obstacle? Other than the lack of political will in the member states and the institutional weakness that the EU foreign policy has. As these seem to be long-term obstacles that are not solvable via EU summits but only by social and political absorption, the speed of European integration in defense and security policy has to be reconsidered. If the European Union's contracts entail such severe measures as the Petersberg Tasks, then it must be a fast, reliable partner for the

---

<sup>134</sup> *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (2013) 'Warum die EU-Verteidigungspolitik vor dem Scheitern steht' [online]

people in countries where grave violations of human rights occur. In the field of international security, symbolic integration through institutionalization is clearly not reliable in the EU as a partner but has the contrary, severely negative effect of disappointing raised hopes over and over again. Instead of pushing forward a most improbable real integration in its security and defence policy, the EU should maybe rather focus on its diplomatic and economic weight as a non-military role model. There is no reason why in the case of urgent humanitarian crises, uni- or bilateral responses of the most capable and willing in Europe work against the idea of European integration in foreign policy. Apart from the question regarding whether European countries should at all intervene in international crises, a real European responsibility, resulting from the EU commitments, requires quick and proportionate responses, supported on an internationally legal basis with political EU-support.

## 6. Bibliography

- Aljazeera (2013) 'France launches Mali military intervention' [online] Available at:  
<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/africa/2013/01/2013111135659836345.html>  
[Accessed: 13.06.2013].
- BBC News (2011) 'In full: Cameron Libya statement' [online] Available at:  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12786225> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].
- BBC News (2013) 'No UK army boots in Mali, says PM' [online] Available at:  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-21009663> [Accessed: 11.06.2013].
- BBC News (2011) 'France recognises Libyan rebels' [online] Available at:  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-12699183> [Accessed: 10.06.2013].
- BBC News (2011) 'BBC Interview with David Cameron about Libya' [video online]  
Available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sO12n0ktuB8> [Accessed:  
08.06.2013].
- Bellamy, A. J. (2010) 'The responsibility to protectô five years on' *Ethics & International Affairs*, 24 (2), pp. 143-169.
- Booth, K. (2005) 'Strategic Culture: Validity and Validation' *Oxford Journal on Good Governance*, 2 (1), pp. 25-28.
- Brattberg, E. (2011) 'Opportunities lost, opportunities seized: the Libya crisis as Europe's perfect storm' *Policy Brief, June*.
- Cabinet Office (2010) 'The strategic defence and security review: securing Britain in an age of uncertainty' [online] Available at:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-strategic-defence-and-security-review-securing-britain-in-an-age-of-uncertainty> [Accessed: 03.10.2013].
- Clark, M. (2007) 'Foreign Policy' In: Seldon, A. (eds.) (2007) *Blair's Britain 1997-2007*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 593-615.

- Conrad, B. and Stumm, M. (2004) 'German Strategic Culture and Institutional Choice: Transatlanticism and/or Europeanism?' *Trier Working Papers on International Politics (TAZIP)*, (9), Available at: <http://www.deutsche-aussenpolitik.de/resources/tazip/tazip9.pdf> [Accessed: 14.08.2013].
- Coolsaet, R., Biscop, S. and Coelmont, J. (2013) 'Mali: Another European Intervention without the EU?' *Security Policy Brief*, 42, January 2013.
- De Gaulle, C. (1954) *Memoires de guerreó L'Appel : 1940-1942*. [Paris]: Plon.
- Der Spiegel (2011) 'Ein einziges Debakel', Spiegel-Gespräch mit Joschka Fischer' [online] Available at: <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-80165548.html> [Accessed: 13.10.2013].
- Duffield, J. S. (1998) *World power forsaken: Political Culture, International Institutions, and German Security Policy After Unification*, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Fabius, L. (2013) 'Mali: Statement by Laurent Fabius (January 23)' *Consulfrance-nouvelleorleans.org*. [online] Available at: <http://www.consulfrance-nouvelleorleans.org/Mali-Statement-by-Laurent-Fabius.html> [Accessed: 17.06.2013].
- Federal Foreign Office (2013) 'Mali: Foreign Minister Westerwelle has telephone conversation with Fabius' [online] Available at: [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2013/130114-BM\\_Fabius.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2013/130114-BM_Fabius.html) [Accessed: 10.06.2013].
- Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Federal Foreign Minister Westerwelle on the Libya Resolution of the UN Security Council' [online] Available at: <http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2011/110317-VN%20Resolution%20Libyen.html> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].
- Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Außenminister Westerwelle im Interview mit dem Deutschlandfunk zu Libyen' [online] Available at: [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Infoservice/Presse/Interviews/2011/110317\\_BM\\_DLF.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Infoservice/Presse/Interviews/2011/110317_BM_DLF.html) [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Federal Minister Westerwelle welcomes UN sanctions against Libyan leadership' [online] Available at: [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2011/110227\\_BM\\_VN-Sanktionen\\_Libyen.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2011/110227_BM_VN-Sanktionen_Libyen.html) [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Federal Minister Westerwelle welcomes naming of UN Special Envoy to Libya' [online] Available at: [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2011/110307\\_VN\\_Libyen.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2011/110307_VN_Libyen.html) [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

Federal Foreign Office (2011) 'Foreign Minister Westerwelle welcomes EU sanctions against Libyan leadership' [online] Available at: [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2011/110228-EU-Sanktionen\\_Libyen.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2011/110228-EU-Sanktionen_Libyen.html) [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

Federal Foreign Office (2013) 'Federal Foreign Minister Westerwelle on France's intervention in Mali' [online] Available at: <http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2013/130111-Mali.html> [Accessed: 08.06.2013].

Federal Foreign Office (2013) 'Federal Foreign Minister Westerwelle on the situation in Mali' [online] Available at: [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2013/130111-BM\\_Mali.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/Infoservice/Presse/Meldungen/2013/130111-BM_Mali.html) [Accessed: 08.06.2013].

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'UN intervention in Libya: Foreign Secretary on BBC Radio 5' [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/un-intervention-in-libya-foreign-secretary-on-bbc-radio-5> [Accessed: 10.06.2013].

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2013) 'UK to provide logistical military assistance to Mali' [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-to-provide-logistical-military-assistance-to-mali> [Accessed: 11.06.2013].

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'Foreign Secretary comments on UN vote on Libya no fly zone' [online] Available at:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/foreign-secretary-comments-on-un-vote-on-libya-no-fly-zone> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) "'UK is at the forefront of the international effort to isolate Qadhafi regime'" [online] Available at:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-is-at-the-forefront-of-the-international-effort-to-isolate-qadhafi-regime> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'Foreign Secretary statement following the London Conference on Libya' [online] Available at:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/foreign-secretary-statement-following-the-london-conference-on-libya> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2011) 'UN intervention in Libya: Foreign Secretary on BBC Radio 5' [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/un-intervention-in-libya-foreign-secretary-on-bbc-radio-5> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2013) 'UK welcomes establishment of EU Training Mission to Mali' [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-welcomes-establishment-of-eu-training-mission-to-mali> [Accessed: 11.06.2013].

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (2013) 'Foreign Office Minister statement on Mali' [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/foreign-office-minister-statement-on-mali> [Accessed: 12.06.2013].

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (2013) 'Thomas de Maizière im Interview: šDen Einfluss des Westens nicht überschätzenö' [online] Available at:  
<http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/ausland/thomas-de-maiziere-im-interview-den-einfluss-des-westens-nicht-ueberschaetzen-12023721.html> [Accessed: 10.08.2013].

German Federal Government (2011) 'Bundesregierung | Sicherheitssysteme werden umfassend überprüft' [online] Available at:  
<http://www.bundesregierung.de/ContentArchiv/DE/Archiv17/Interview/2011/03/2011-03-17-merkel-saarbruecker-zeitung.html> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].



German Ministry of Defence (2011) 'Defence Policy Guidelines Safeguarding National Interests ó Assuming International Responsibility ó Shaping Security Together' [online] Available at:

[http://www.bmvg.de/portal/a/bmvg/!ut/p/c4/LYsxEoAgDATf4gdIb-cv1MYBzcQbMDgQ8ftSONtssUsrddQ3iDdk9YlmWnaM4XXhauIq9pPLYbB65wRDdF6FQzZ2R47PxdqtcTHGAXIU\\_q72byv9tgQFK91xGj6tRgx1/](http://www.bmvg.de/portal/a/bmvg/!ut/p/c4/LYsxEoAgDATf4gdIb-cv1MYBzcQbMDgQ8ftSONtssUsrddQ3iDdk9YlmWnaM4XXhauIq9pPLYbB65wRDdF6FQzZ2R47PxdqtcTHGAXIU_q72byv9tgQFK91xGj6tRgx1/) [Accessed: 14.10.2013].

German Ministry of Defence (2013) 'Verteidigungs- und Außenminister äußern sich zu Mali' [online] Available at:

[http://www.bmvg.de/portal/a/bmvg/!ut/p/c4/NYs9D8IwDET\\_kZ2IIj42qjKwskC7pW0UGTVOZZyy8ONJBU6kN9zT4YCI7DYKTimxW\\_CJ\\_UTn8QNj3AK8UpayQiSmt3qhHPFRP7OHKbHXSvWsVBJeARJYk-hSTRYpBmjG3tiuNdb8Y7-n3XA9NPvm2N3aO64xXn5A2QIZ/](http://www.bmvg.de/portal/a/bmvg/!ut/p/c4/NYs9D8IwDET_kZ2IIj42qjKwskC7pW0UGTVOZZyy8ONJBU6kN9zT4YCI7DYKTimxW_CJ_UTn8QNj3AK8UpayQiSmt3qhHPFRP7OHKbHXSvWsVBJeARJYk-hSTRYpBmjG3tiuNdb8Y7-n3XA9NPvm2N3aO64xXn5A2QIZ/) [Accessed: 14.08.2013].

Gordon, P. H. (1993) *A certain idea of France: French Security Policy and Gaullist Legacy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Gray, C. S. (1981) 'National style in strategy: the American example' *International Security*, pp. 21-47.

Gray, C. S. (1999) 'Strategic culture as context: the first generation of theory strikes back' *Review of international studies*, 25 (1), pp. 49-69.

Gray, C. S. (2007) 'Out of the Wilderness: Primetime for Strategic Culture' *Comparative Strategy*, 6 (2), pp. 1-20.

Griffin, C. (2007) "French Military Interventions in Africa: French Grand Strategy and Defense Policy since Decolonization", paper presented at *International Studies Association 2007 Annual Convention*, Chicago, 28.2-3.3. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, pp. 1-44.

Hallams, E. and Schreer, B. (2012) 'Towards a post-American alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya' *International affairs*, 88 (2), pp. 313-327.

- Hansel, M. and Oppermann, K. (2013) "Counterfactual Reasoning in Foreign Policy Analysis: The Cases of German Non-participation in the Iraq and Libya Interventions of 2003 and 2011", paper presented at 63rd PSA Annual International Conference, Cardiff, 25.3-27.3.2013
- Hoffmann, A. and Longhurst, K. (1999) 'German strategic culture and the changing role of the Bundeswehr' *WeltTrends*, 22, pp. 145-162.
- Hürriyet Daily News (2013) 'NATO backs France in Mali, but says no aid request' [online] Available at: <http://www.hurriyetaidailynews.com/french-widen-bombing-campaign-hit-central-mali.aspx?pageID=238&nid=39017> [Accessed: 12.06.2013].
- Jacobsen, C. G., Booth, K. and Jones, D. R. (1990) *Strategic power: USA, USSR*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnston, A. I. (1995) 'Thinking about strategic culture' *International security*, 19 (4), pp. 32-64.
- Juppé, A. (2011) '17 March 2011 - Security Council - Libya - Statement by Mr Alain Juppé, ministre d'Etat' *France ONU*. [online] Available at: <http://www.franceonu.org/france-at-the-united-nations/press-room/statements-at-open-meetings/security-council/article/17-march-2011-security-council> [Accessed: 13.06.2013].
- Klein, B. S. (1988) 'Hegemony and strategic culture: American power projection and alliance defence politics' *Review of International Studies*, 14 (2), pp. 133-148.
- Koenig, N. (2011) 'The EU and the Libyan Crisis--In Quest of Coherence?' *The international spectator*, 46 (4), pp. 11-30.
- Legro, J. (1995) *Cooperation under fire: Anglo-German Restraint during World War II* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Longhurst, K. (2004) *Germany and the use of force: The Evolution of German Security Policy 1989-2003*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Lord, C. (1985) 'American strategic culture' *Comparative Strategy*, 5 (3), pp. 269-293.
- Mäder, M. (2004) *In pursuit of conceptual excellence: The Evolution of British Military Doctrine in the post-cold war era 1989-2002*. Bern: Lang.

- Mahoney, D. J. (2000) *De Gaulle: Statesmanship, Grandeur, and Modern Democracy*. New Brunswick (U.S.A.): Transaction Publishers.
- Médecins Sans Frontières (2013) 'Mali: Medizinische Hilfsorganisationen werfen Außenminister Westerwelle Missbrauch humanitärer Hilfe vor' [online] Available at: <http://www.aerzte-ohne-grenzen.de/presse/pressemitteilungen/2013/pm-2013-01-30/index.html> [Accessed: 09.06.2013].
- Menon, A. (2011) 'Power, institutions and the CSDP: the promise of institutionalist theory' *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49 (1), pp. 83-100.
- Menon, A. (2011) 'Power, institutions and the CSDP: the promise of institutionalist theory' *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49 (1), pp. 83-100.
- Mesfin, B. (2008) 'Only a Folie de Grandeur? Understanding French policy in Africa' *African Security Studies*, 17 (1), pp. 114-118.
- Meunier, S. (2005) 'The Distinctiveness of French anti-Americanism' In: Katzenstein, P. J. and Keohane, R. O. (eds.) (2007) *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 129-157.
- Ministère de la Défense (2008) 'The French White Paper on defence and national security' [online] Available at: [http://www.ambafrance-ca.org/IMG/pdf/Livre\\_blanc\\_Press\\_kit\\_english\\_version.pdf](http://www.ambafrance-ca.org/IMG/pdf/Livre_blanc_Press_kit_english_version.pdf) [Accessed: 03.10.2013].
- Ministry of Defence (2010) 'UK-France Defence Co-operation Treaty announced' [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-france-defence-co-operation-treaty-announced--2> [Accessed: 28.05.2013].
- Ministry of Defence (2011) 'Operations in Libya having a very real effect' [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/operations-in-libya-having-a-very-real-effect> [Accessed: 11.06.2013].
- Mirow, W. (2009) *Strategic culture matters - A Comparison of German and British Military Interventions Since 1990*. Berlin: Lit Verlag.
- Miskimmon, A. (2004) 'Continuity in the face of upheaval: British strategic culture and the impact of the Blair government' *European Security*, 13 (3), pp. 273-299.

- Miskimmon, A. (2012) 'German foreign policy and the Libya crisis' *German politics*, 21 (4), pp. 392-410.
- Naumann, K. (2008) *Einsatz ohne Ziel?*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.
- N-tv (2013) 'Deutsche Soldaten nach Mali: Kabinett plant mit 330 Mann' [online] Available at: <http://www.n-tv.de/politik/Kabinett-plant-mit-330-Mann-article10148786.html> [Accessed: 09.06.2013].
- NY Times (2011) 'Sarkozy Puts France at Vanguard of West's War Effort' [online] Available at: [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/21/world/europe/21france.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/21/world/europe/21france.html?_r=0) [Accessed: 10.06.2013].
- Présidence de la République (2013) 'Déclaration du Président de la République à l'issue du Conseil restreint de défense' [online] Available at: <http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/declaration-du-president-de-la-republique-a-l-issue-du-conseil-restreint-de-defense/> [Accessed: 13.06.2013].
- Rynning, S. (2011) 'Realism and the common security and defence policy' *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49 (1), pp. 23-42.
- Sjursen, H. (2011) 'The EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy: the quest for democracy' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18 (8), pp. 1069-1077.
- Skemperis, G. (2003) 'Strategic Culture in Post-War Europe' *ELIAMEP Postgraduate Notes*, 5 (1), Available at: <http://www.eliamep.gr/old/eliamep/files/05.01.pdf> [Accessed: 23.05.2013].
- Snyder, J. L. (1977) 'The Soviet Strategic Culture: Implications for Limited Nuclear Operations: A Project Air Force Report Prepared for the United States Air Force' Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation
- Spiegel Online (2012) 'Kampf gegen Islamisten: Merkel gibt grünes Licht für Mali-Mission' [online] Available at: <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/merkel-gibt-gruenes-licht-fuer-mali-mission-der-bundeswehr-a-862736.html> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].

- Stöhr, F. (2012) 'Sicherheitspolitische Kultur in Deutschland - Politik und Gesellschaft im Widerstreit?' *Kieler Analysen zur Sicherheitspolitik*, (31), Available at: [http://www.ispk.uni-kiel.de/fileadmin/user\\_upload/thumbpublikationen/analysenzursp/KAzS31\\_sipol\\_Kultur.pdf](http://www.ispk.uni-kiel.de/fileadmin/user_upload/thumbpublikationen/analysenzursp/KAzS31_sipol_Kultur.pdf) [Accessed: 14.08.2013].
- Süddeutsche Zeitung (2011) 'Horst Köhler über seine Rücktrittsgründe' [online] Available at: <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/horst-koehler-ueber-seine-ruecktrittsgruende-die-angriffe-auf-mich-waren-ungeheuerlich-1.1106466> [Accessed: 28.05.2013].
- Süddeutsche Zeitung (2013) 'Warum die EU-Verteidigungspolitik vor dem Scheitern steht' [online] Available at: <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/europaeische-einigung-eu-verteidigungspolitik-wird-zum-gescheiterten-projekt-1.1666950> [Accessed: 08.06.2013].
- Tagesschau (2012) 'Keine Kampftruppen aber Training für Mali' [online] Available at: <http://www.tagesschau.de/inland/mali222.html> [Accessed: 08.06.2013].
- The Guardian (2011) 'Libya no-fly zone call by France fails to get David Cameron's backing' [online] Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/feb/23/libya-nofly-zone-david-meron> [Accessed: 10.06.2013].
- The Guardian (2011) 'Libya: Nicolas Sarkozy reignites row over Nato military role' [online] Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/mar/25/nicolas-sarkozy-nato-libya-row> [Accessed: 20.06.2013].
- The Huffington Post UK (2013) 'David Cameron Makes Surprise Visit To Libya, Pledges Security Help' [online] Available at: <http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2013/01/31/david-meron->
- The Telegraph (2011) 'David Cameron: 'Libya action is necessary, legal and right'' [online] Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/libya/8393478/David-Cameron-Libya-action-is-necessary-legal-and-right.html> [Accessed: 04.06.2013].libya\_n\_2588988.html [Accessed: 11.06.2013].

- The Telegraph (2012) 'Britain to support African force in bid to recapture northern Mali'  
[online] Available at:  
[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/mali/9628364/  
Britain-to-support-African-force-in-bid-to-recapture-northern-Mali.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/mali/9628364/Britain-to-support-African-force-in-bid-to-recapture-northern-Mali.html)  
[Accessed: 11.06.2013].
- The Telegraph (2011) 'Libya: Nicolas Sarkozy to urge 'targeted air strikes' [online]  
Available at:  
[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/libya/8374495/  
Libya-Nicolas-Sarkozy-to-urge-targeted-air-strikes.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/libya/8374495/Libya-Nicolas-Sarkozy-to-urge-targeted-air-strikes.html) [Accessed: 10.06.2013].
- Thomas, D. C. (2012) 'Still Punching below Its Weight? Coherence and Effectiveness in European Union Foreign Policy\*' *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50 (3), pp. 457-474.
- Wallace, W. (1992) 'British foreign policy after the Cold War' *International Affairs*, 68 (3), pp. 423--442.
- Westerwelle, G. (2011) 95. *Sitzung des Bundestages*. [Plenarprotokoll]. 17/95.  
<http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btp/17/17095.pdf>.
- Wittig, P. (2011) Explanation of Vote by Ambassador Wittig on the Security Council Resolution on Libya. [press release] 17.03.2011.
- Zeit Online (2012) 'Nordafrika: Militäreinsatz in Mali beunruhigt Bundeswehr' [online]  
Available at: [http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2012-10/bundeswehr-mali-  
einsatz-kritik](http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2012-10/bundeswehr-mali-einsatz-kritik) [Accessed: 08.06.2013].

