

The Future of Europe's Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) and the Limits of Intergovernmentalism

Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law
and International Law (MPI)

19-20 September 2003, Heidelberg

Thesis 1

The current **U.S. foreign policy is unsustainable**. Domestic and international requirements will lead to a U.S.-European rapprochement. However, the age of cozy transatlantic relations is over. Both sides need to **work hard to re-invent traditional bonds**.

- U.S. and Europe must rebalance their hard and soft power capabilities
- U.S. must underline that it cares for allies and long-term strategic partnership and remains committed to multilateral cooperation ("locked in")
- Europe must complement its extensive soft power capabilities with hard power capabilities and increase coherence in using hard/soft power

Thesis 2

The draft **EU security strategy** is a welcome step into the right direction. It has many strengths, but it falls short on two important aspects: it does not address how the **EU's wide array of instruments** should be used and remains silent about the need for closer **inter-institutional cooperation**.

- Security strategy good at analyzing key strategic threats and identifying Europe's strategic objectives
- Use of available instruments must be clarified
 - What policy mix is best suited to address Europe's zones of interest?
 - When, where, and how is preemptive engagement necessary and reasonable?
- Inter-institutional cooperation must be geared up
 - EU, UN, OSCE must increase joint efforts for preventive diplomacy and post-conflict peace-building
 - EU and NATO must agree on joint areas of cooperation in and beyond Europe

Thesis 3

Role specialization and **pooling of resources** should be embraced across the whole spectrum of ESDP and CFSP tasks. Unleashing the potential of these approaches requires **more "jointness" at the European level** and thus more supranational integration, rather than intergovernmental cooperation.

- Potential benefits
 - Addressing capability shortfalls in a systematic way
 - Saving financial resources which are in short supply
 - Contributing to improved interoperability and doctrinal coherence
- Both approaches should be applied beyond military affairs (e.g., development policy, foreign policy, civil-emergency planning, intelligence cooperation, S&T)
- Challenges
 - Approaches encroach upon national sovereignty
 - More jointness: resources, planning, decision-making

Thesis 4

The defense industry plays a key role in implementing ESDP. European planning and programming will benefit from the launch of the European Armaments, Research and Military Capabilities Agency, but more must be done to **guarantee smooth cooperation with defense contractors.**

- Defense industry provides key capabilities
- Civil industry sets the pace for technology development
- "EU Defense Industrial Policy" needed
 - Harmonize national approaches to defense PPP
 - Joint identification of military services suited for outsourcing
 - Set up common regulations for industry integration into the frontline
 - Adopt common approaches to cover industry risks when sharing the frontline

Thesis 5

Key industries, such as biotechnology, genomics, life sciences, and nano-technology, need to be **better integrated** into the provision of security policy capabilities.

- Key S&T areas for C4, ISR, CBRN
- No direct link between the 6th EU Framework Program for Research and Technological Development (13 bn Euro) and the provision of adequate security policy capabilities
- Challenges
 - Increase coherence among EU strategies for defense-related industries and for life sciences and biotechnology
 - Promote military and security policy research under the EU umbrella
 - Provide for the mutual exchange of knowledge and lessons learned in these dual use S&T areas

Thesis 6

Implementing ESDP and CFSP in tandem will require a fundamental **shift in mind set** from security policy in stovepipes to an **integrated** understanding of **security policy**.

- Traditional dichotomy between military and civilian security is inadequate:
 - New security challenges blur the distinction between peace and war
 - Low intensity conflicts demand new type of operations
 - EU development requires more coherence among various instruments
- Core ideas of integrated security policy
 - Network centrality, i.e., smooth interplay between all security sector actors, all instruments and all levels of interaction
 - Joint capabilities for all security forces
 - Co-operability among security forces required to act as an "integrated actor" (intelligence sharing, common standards, joint training and exercises)

Thesis 7

ESDP increases the need to **harmonize national planning and decision-making processes**. Here the notion of "network centric warfare" as a major challenge for politico-military relations should receive utmost importance when redesigning national and international institutions and decision-making processes.

- Planning
 - Network centric challenges demand network centric policymaking, i.e., processes and structures that cut across existing organizations (overcome stovepipes)
- Budgeting
 - Increasing demand for "security budgets" covering the tasks of all security forces
 - Could encroach upon parliamentary competencies
- Decision-Making
 - Institutional (in)compatibilities and differing judicial requirements with regard to the use of force demand increased awareness
 - Beware of asymmetric politico-military decision-making processes