

**Karsten D. Voigt**  
**Coordinator for German-American Cooperation**  
**Federal Foreign Office**

**"The post-Convention Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU  
and the European Security and Defense Policy  
– Challenges for the Euroatlantic relationship"**

**Contribution to the University of Birmingham Workshop Panel  
"CFSP/ESDP – Singing from the same hymn sheet?"  
London, 22 October 2003**

We are witnessing new and more dangerous forms of international terrorism, and not just since September 11, 2001. Weapons of mass destruction in the hands of violent dictators pose a threat to international security. At the same time, the collapse of state structures, together with the emergence of new violent non-state players, are jeopardizing world peace. The disintegration of national structures has been increasingly observed since the 1990s, for example in Somalia, Bosnia and the Congo. The new threats to world peace, as well as the terrible reality of war crimes in national and international conflicts mean that we must reform our security strategies and instruments enabling us to tackle new problems and conflicts.

Our concept of security has changed: In an era of non-state actors and asymmetric threats, security for our peoples cannot be assured by military means alone. We need a comprehensive culture of prevention – one that addresses the roots of these new threats to our security. The European culture of prevention is emphasizing multilateralism and international law.

The current international system is dominated by a host of players, with the United States playing a predominant role. The United States will remain indispensable when it comes to tackling major challenges. The combination of its military, economic and cultural strength puts the US in a particularly strong position. I regard this as a positive factor. However, it should use its power constructively to help further develop international law. It would be regrettable if in certain situations

it were to define its unique role and power outside the norms and procedures of international law. Regardless of its strength, the United States cannot master major challenges on its own. The American political scientist and former leading official in the Pentagon, Joseph Nye, accurately describes this as "The Paradox of American Power", that is to say the combination of an exceptionally powerful position and the necessity to cooperate with others, primarily Europeans. Internationally, acceptance of America's predominant role can only be guaranteed on a long term basis if the US respects international law and institutions. The more the US is receptive to the arguments and influence of its transatlantic allies, the easier it will be for America's strategic partners in Europe to accept the predominant role of the US as a self-confident democracy.

Despite all the differences of opinion on individual issues, transatlantic relations will maintain their overriding importance. First of all, Europeans and Americans, granted from different positions, are dependent on one another. Secondly, we share the values of democratic and open societies based on the rule of law. And we do so in a much greater measure than is the case between other regions. This is still true even though we have made different decisions on some key issues: for example the International Criminal Court and Kyoto, to name just two.

The strategic dialogue at transatlantic level must reflect changes in the international situation following the collapse of the old bloc structure of the Cold War and September 11: Europe is no longer the scene of the greatest global conflict. It is less dependent on the US in resolving crises in its own region. And Europe could become more important in future as the natural ally of the US in resolving regional problems outside Europe or in tackling global problems. The most important lesson to be learned from the Iraqi crisis for us Europeans and for the transatlantic partnership is that we will only be internationally effective and more influential if we join forces. Our common task is to strike a balance between actual power and the ideals of international law. We Europeans have to press hard for a reform of the system of the United Nations and NATO, as well as a closer cooperation between NATO and the European Union, to help create greater stability and democracy throughout the world.

The attacks of September 11, synonym for the new challenges, highlighted the importance and necessity of deepening and enlarging the EU. With furthering

European integration, the EU will contribute to stability and security to the whole continent and hopefully worldwide. It is true, the military decisions in the matters following September 11 were taken in the European national capitals, but at the same time decisions taken by the European Council on combating terrorism gave strong impetus to the deepening of the EU, particularly in the so-called "third pillar", i.e. justice and home affairs, but especially with regard to the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). Europeans are well aware that this momentum for the reform process has to continue.

CFSP was created not even a decade ago to enhance Europe's capabilities as well as capacities for common action. CFSP is the necessary tool for Europe which is still an economic superpower lacking influence in security issues. CFSP will be necessary for the continuation of the European integration process. However, CFSP will remain a work in progress as long as member states are not willing to fully give up national sovereignty over international affairs. Take for example the fact that not the EU as such but two member states are permanent members of the UN Security Council.

Part of CSFP is the European Security and Defence Policy which has been created to improve its police and military capabilities. The question today remains how to organize better these instruments, how to make them more effective, how to give them even more teeth and bite and to assure its acceptance among the population. Europe cannot become a relevant partner for the solution of global challenges unless it succeeds in making decisive progress across the whole spectrum of European foreign and security policy. The irreconcilable opinions inside the EU during the Iraqi crisis have underscored a lot of the arguments by Euro-sceptics claiming that the EU will never be capable of evolving into a serious player in the international system. And there is no doubt, in the final analysis only political will can guarantee more effective policy-making and common external EU action. The Convention on the Future of Europe has put a lot of energy in the debate of not only internal institutional reforms of the EU, but also Europe's future role in the world.

Like it or not, the EU has a role to play. Our own European interests demand that we play a global role – for some countries this is more the case than for others. Even Germany with its long tradition of not being engaged outside its own borders

has shown in recent years that it is capable and willing of a more robust engagement.

However, increasing Europe's scope for action is not intended to build up Europe as a counterweight to the US, but rather to make this Europe a more effective partner for the US. Strong transatlantic relations and U.S. engagement in the "Old World" as a European power, provide the backbone of stability which allows the project of European integration to proceed. European integration, on the other hand, - that is widening and deepening the zone of democratic, prosperous European states - provides America with a economic, political, and, increasingly, military partner.

Time and again the ESDP project acts as an irritant in transatlantic affairs. The development of crisis management capabilities or the idea of "European headquarters" coordinating "the capacity of autonomous action" provokes a gut reaction especially on the other side of the Atlantic that is sometimes difficult to explain. In Washington there are some who would prefer a maximum degree of burden sharing with a minimum degree of influence sharing, whereas on the European side there are various opinions as to the desirable degree of autonomy. It is only in this specific context that I can understand the logic of the US position which on the one hand is emphasizing its capability and willingness to – de facto - reserve the US's own right to autonomous military action while, on the other hand, the US adamantly criticize the development of even very limited capabilities for autonomous actions by the EU.

Without ESDP, however, the potential for friction would presumably be greater still, since now, as the Cold War is over, the United States expect the Europeans to shoulder a greater share of our common responsibility for security.

Moreover, North America and Europe continue to be each other's principal partners on the international political scene, and a stronger Europe is thus just as much in their common interest as is a strong America. European integration and strong transatlantic relations are not contradictory – they are mutually reinforcing. With additional capabilities, Europe would not only become more reliable and useful but also more relevant in the eyes of Washington – that serves both parties.

The alternative is falling back on a system of coalitions of the willing with compliant partners to resolve future conflicts. This alternative holds risks. Firstly, in contrast to strategic partnerships, coalitions of the willing do not allow states to plan and pursue a long term preventive policy. Rather, they merely allow them to react to problems once partners have been found. Although coalitions of the willing are not in direct contravention of the NATO Treaty when they do not concern Article V obligations, they do not conform to the strategic partnership between NATO partners. If NATO is only used as a "toolbox" for coalitions of the willing, this would inevitably lead to the erosion of its very substance.

Furthermore, we must ensure that the "coalitions of the willing" principle does not also take root outside the transatlantic context. Just imagine – and I say this quite unpolemically – what would happen if this principle were to become widely accepted: how would we react if India were to decide one day to take action against Pakistan in a coalition with, for example, Afghanistan, as well as other states? We should also remember that a coalition of the willing very often provokes a counter-reaction from the "unwilling". But those who criticize this "ganging up against a country" should, at the same time, take a self-critical look at what they may have contributed to such a situation.

It is our role to explain to our transatlantic partners that ESDP is an integral part of a strong and cohesive Europe which participates in shaping globalization in line with the values and interests of the EU member states.

ESDP does not aim to create a substitute for NATO. A Europe with an effective security policy strengthens NATO by improving transatlantic interoperability and developing a European pillar within the alliance.

ESDP is part of the project of political integration, which includes the perspective of a common defence policy which could consequently lead to a common defence. It serves increased integration within the scope of the EU and will ideally not lead to a "Union within the Union". The objective is to improve European operabilities, even if not all EU member states participate initially. – Frankly, by the sheer size and economic power, no one expects all European countries to participate from the beginning. ESDP is intended to develop more options for integration for all EU members without the initial participation of all. This is especially the case with regard to the forthcoming enlargement by ten states. An important instrument to this end is the introduction of enhanced cooperation in the EDSP field.

ESDP should, through increased cooperation and integration, foster the willingness of EU member states to develop greater military capabilities from their limited defence budgets through pooling of resources, division of labour, a European armaments agency. This, as well is not done overnight: key projects like the "European headquarters" have to take shape step by step and will find consensus in the end.

Despite the current disagreements, all of us - Europeans and Americans alike - have to keep the big picture in mind. North America and Europe are linked by shared values, interests and ultimately visions of the world we want to see in this 21<sup>st</sup> century: a world founded on freedom, human rights and the rule of law. Not a single problem in the world can be solved if Europe and the United States are at odds. The transatlantic partnership is a key factor for stability and security throughout the world. Nonetheless, this process will not advance of its own accord; the two sides must rather cooperate to give it form.