JAN TECHAU
editor

STRATEGIC EUROPE

CARNEGIE EUROPE
CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

STRATEGIC EUROPE

The obvious and often painful mismatch between aspiration and reality in European foreign policy has plagued discourse on European integration during the last decade. Today, the awkward truth is that the Lisbon institutions have brought more ambiguity than clarity about Europe's capacity and role in the world.

To surmount this impasse, Carnegie Europe is reinvigorating the debate with new perspectives, fresh impulses, and thought-provoking ideas on this key policy field.

By discussing long-term European foreign policy interests and objectives, asking how they should be prioritized, inquiring how they can be pursued, and seeking to identify which means and instruments will be needed to do so, *Strategic Europe* aspires to infuse the European foreign policy discussion with the sense of strategic purpose that is so often lacking in current discourse.

As a first step, in a special online series in the fall of 2011, a select group of policymakers, diplomats, academics, think tankers, and journalists contributed concise and timely interpretations of what a truly strategic Europe would look like.

Follow the *Strategic Europe* debate online for further commentary and analysis on the daunting international challenges shaping Europe's role in the world.

CARNEGIE EUROPE

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

WASHINGTON DC ▪ MOSCOW ▪ BEIJING ▪ BEIRUT ▪ BRUSSELS

CarnegieEurope.eu

The Carnegie Endowment does not take institutional positions on public policy issues; the views represented here are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Endowment, its staff, or its trustees.

For electronic copies of this report, visit:
CarnegieEurope.eu/publications

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
1779 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: +1 202 483 7600
Fax: +1 202 483 1840
CarnegieEndowment.org

Carnegie Europe
15 Rue du Congrès
1000 Brussels
Belgium
Phone: + 32 2 735 56 50
Fax: + 32 2 736 62 22
CarnegieEurope.eu

CONTENTS

A NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

JAN TECHAU

This volume was prepared to address the all too visible lack of true strategic thought in contemporary discourse on long-term European foreign policy interests and objectives. It brings together a series of commentaries from a select group of policymakers, diplomats, academics, think tankers, and journalists.

Having identified the multiple challenges Europe faces in developing a sense of "strategic-ness" in an increasingly globalized world in my opening article for the *Strategic Europe* series—"Time for Strategic Europe"—I invited the members of this group to share their personal interpretations of what *Strategic Europe* means.

Their articles were published on a daily basis over a six-week period in the fall of 2011 and appear here in chronological order with their original publication dates.

The series brought new thoughts and perspectives to many classic European foreign policy debates—hard power versus soft power, the importance of transatlantic relations, and the role of the European Union as an

actor in its neighborhood—but also highlighted the new challenges the old continent faces, whether it be tackling the economic crisis, establishing strategic relationships with emerging powers, or facing up to responsibilities in addressing nuclear dangers.

In my concluding article—"The Strategic Europe Yardstick"—I reflected on the wide variety of issues raised, aiming to distill the key points into an overarching framework for measuring the strategic value of European policy over the full range of foreign policy issues.

I would like to express my gratitude for the advice and support of those who assisted me in the conception and execution of this project. I drew extensively on the resources of Carnegie Europe, in particular Lizza Bomassi, Malachy Tuohy, Elizabeth Hartman, and Oliver Russell. Carnegie's communications team—including David Kampf, Jessica Katz, Tim Martin, Ilonka Oszvald, Jocelyn Soly, and Erin Taylor—provided crucial support and assistance in the conception, design, editing, and web publication of this series and its articles.

Of course, this series would not have been possible without the contributions of all of its authors, who gave their time, knowledge, and analytical skill generously and who did not shy away from my original entreaty for strong opinions, provocative ideas, and engaging formats.

Jan Techau
Director, Carnegie Europe

INTRODUCTION

SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

TIME FOR STRATEGIC EUROPE

JAN TECHAU

If strategy is the pursuit of political goals—chosen after careful definition of one's own interest, using appropriate means, and executed over the long term—Europe is in for some nasty surprises. As a geographic region, and, more narrowly, as an institution in the form of the European Union, Europe is in inevitable decline. Its substance in terms of social stability, economic strength, and the ability to innovate are undoubtedly still strong and its influence, especially in its immediate neighborhood, is still considerable. But compared to other regions, this Western annex of the Asian land mass is destined to slowly lose influence and standing. This loss of power will put at risk the freedom, peace, and prosperity that Europeans are so used to.

The unsettling thing in all this is that Europeans are at a cultural disadvantage for coping with their relative decline in a globalized world. They have never had to develop the proper mind-set for surviving the global competition they now face. Europeans have always been on top, either because of their own strength—until the 1940s—or as part of the West in alliance with—and by the grace of—the United States. This privileged

position has made them lazy in their strategic thinking about the world and themselves.

The new world Europeans find themselves in is a scary place where the internal rivalries that still feature so prominently on Europe's daily agenda count for very little. This new world will not only teach them a painful lesson about the necessity to cooperate if they want to retain the privileged lifestyles and the social cohesion they cherish, but also force them to learn how to be strategic players who use their limited means and limited influence in as smart and goal-oriented a way as possible.

The times when sheer wealth and cultural clout bought Europeans the possibility to improvise their external relations are over. So is the era when Americans would freely improvise it for them. In the long run, the only real hope for Europe's dwindling number of citizens is that decline will make them smart. If it doesn't, hard times are ahead.

Five elements need to be at the core of the future strategic European mind-set.

First, Europeans need the courage and openness to think about the world, themselves, and the future in more realistic terms. The current political debate in Brussels and other European capitals is still conducted as if nothing much will change, as if internal quarrels are really existential, and as if wealth and importance can be taken for granted. The financial and euro crises are just gentle harbingers of the upheaval that's ahead of us.

A new-found European realism will have to be about developing a healthy sense of Europe's own size and influence, its fateful reliance on globalization, and its geopolitical dependence on access to markets—for both imports and exports. It is also about an increasingly dangerous and disorderly world in dire need of stability provided by capable and responsible powers.

European realism needs to acknowledge that peace and freedom are hard-earned and that both rely on the willingness and ability to defend them militarily, if needed. These may sound like truisms, but Europe-

ans—pampered by seven comfortable postwar decades—often show a bothersome reluctance to accept even rather basic facts. And their political leaders show little appetite to speak full truth to the people.

Second, Europeans need stability and cohesion at home if they want to be strong abroad. This has two dimensions: social cohesion at the national level and political integration on the European level. The glue that holds both together is the legitimacy of the integration project. Far more integration will be needed to cope with global challenges. This deepening of the Union can't be based solely on output legitimacy—the ability to produce benefits for the people—as it was in the past. It will need a lot more input legitimacy—the possibility for the people to have a say.

If Europe continues to be an elite project, the people will revolt either openly or by silently withdrawing their loyalty and support from both the EU and their home nations. Populism, extremism, isolationism, and potentially even violence could be the result. The EU will need a participatory revolution to boost legitimacy for integration, not only because it needs to become strategic, but also for its very survival.

Third, Europeans need to stay rich if they want to matter in the world. The reason why Europe is still relevant today is its immense economic power. This is due to an unprecedented economic integration process that created a single market, turned the EU into a global trade powerhouse, and generated the wealth to pacify Europe's notoriously incohesive societies. It also made Europe attractive for immigration—the needed and the unneeded kind—and gave European nations the ability to heavily co-finance the institutions of global governance—the United Nations, International Monetary Fund, and World Bank. It also allowed Europeans to become the world's primary aid donors for international development.

All of this bought global influence. With budgets in tatters, many economies unreformed, and sub-standard growth rates considered normal, however, this influence is now dwindling. Europe needs to drastically revamp its economic model if it wants to count for something in the future.

Fourth, Europeans will have to accept that their own strategic posture will be untenable without a close partnership with the United States. Wash-

ington crucially underwrote the European integration process—a fact comfortably forgotten by many Europeans—by providing both the capital and security umbrella that made it possible. It still provides the defense guarantees that keep Europeans safe from political blackmail and allow them to dramatically underperform militarily. In other words, there would be no peace, no stability, and no wealth in Europe without America.

Even in times of austerity, Americans are unlikely to give up on Europe entirely, but they will need far greater contributions, more political creativity, and a stronger sense of responsibility from Europeans in order to justify the expense of propping up the old continent. This will be expensive, but still much cheaper than the alternative, because the uncomfortable truth is that while America is possible without Europe, Europe is impossible without America.

And finally, Europeans need to develop a limited but ambitious agenda for their external affairs. The key to this will be the ability to make tough policy choices. "Global Europe," a catch phrase from the more ambitious past, is over. This is the age of Strategic—read selective—Europe. The top issues on Europe's strategic agenda must include:

- Europe's neighborhood, including Turkey—Europe's coming great power;
- Europe's military capabilities;
- energy, including its related issues of climate, Russia, and the Arctic;
- EU-Asia relations;
- North Africa after the Arab Spring; and
- global trade and international finance.

As this list implies, European "strategic-ness" must by definition combine the internal and the external dimension of the integration process. The old dichotomy that played internal cohesion against external engagement is no longer useful. What's new in today's world is that Europeans don't

have a choice anymore. Integration without an active role in the world will fail. A role in the world without integration is impossible. It's time for Strategic Europe.

JAN TECHAU *is the director of Carnegie Europe, the European center of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.*

SEPTEMBER 14, 2011

THE IMPORTANCE OF HARD POWER

PETER SPIEGEL

It could well become one of the iconic images of the war: a Libyan man, grinning broadly, walking the streets of Benghazi holding a self-made sign that reads very simply, "Merci Sarkozy."

It is a sentiment that, given the continued unrest in post-Qaddafi Libya, the French president may one day come to regret. But it speaks to a broader truth in international relations: true influence in global affairs can only come if soft power is backed by its harder counterpart.

For all of Nicolas Sarkozy's attempts to exert European influence in North Africa—he expended huge amounts of political capital just three years ago to set up a now almost forgotten Union for the Mediterranean—it was not until he ordered Rafale fighters to bomb Tripoli that he changed the shape of the region's future, for good or for ill.

It is a reality that the European Union frequently seems to want to ignore. Indeed, the very idea of creating a high representative for foreign affairs was driven by the desire to bring together, in one coordinator, all of the EU's global soft power roles, particularly in trade and development.

But security policy, which technically is also part of the high representative's remit, has never seemed to be on the agenda. As one senior American official recently fretted to me, if the EU could not find a role in the Libya war—a relatively simple air campaign against a country with a third-world military—it will never be able to become a hard power player.

The importance of hard power is frequently denigrated in EU circles. As the world's largest economic bloc, the thinking goes, a more coordinated and focused use of trade policy and development aid—taken together with a new, sophisticated diplomatic corps—should move the EU to the top ranks of international actors.

But that logic belies almost all recent evidence to the contrary. Japan, the consummate financial giant and military dwarf, has played little to no role in influencing international affairs beyond its immediate waters despite spending much of the last twenty years as the world's second largest economy.

China, on the other hand, has grasped reality and now spends as much on defense as France and Britain combined. All one needs to do is spend a few minutes with leaders in capitals as disparate as Canberra, New Delhi, and Jakarta—not to mention Washington—to sense how the People's Liberation Army build-up is shifting strategic thinking throughout the world.

Even where aid policy has been coordinated and well directed, its influence has been limited. The billions of euros spent by the EU on development aid in the Palestinian territories over the last fifteen years has not increased its influence on the Arab-Israeli conflict, just as the billions of dollars spent by the United States on aid to Pakistan appears to have had almost no effect on American influence over Islamabad's strategic priorities.

And there is a moral question that attaches itself to such efforts: should aid and trade policy really be used for strategic purposes, when both—particularly development assistance—is intended to help feed and clothe the needy masses?

Rightly or wrongly, Europe's influence overseas remains strongly tied to the legacy of empire and the deployability of its militaries. Britain and France drove a global coalition into war in North Africa not on the strength of its strategic vision, or at least not entirely. It was because of its ability and willingness to use its air forces in anger.

Similarly, Britain still plays a top-tier role in South Asia and the Middle East—and France in the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa—because of the historical ties derived from their histories of colonization. It may be an uncomfortable reality, but it is reality nonetheless.

One of my most vivid memories from my postings in Baghdad are the meals I spent with a retired (and now deceased) Iraqi admiral who waxed poetic about his admiration for the British military, under whose guidance he had done much training, decades after all legal ties to Britain had gone. His grandfather had fought alongside the British-backed King Faisal during the Arab Revolt—and he had the photos to prove it.

It has become fashionable in Brussels to argue those ties are gone, never to be recaptured. But as the 2009 furor that erupted in India over David Miliband's ill-timed lecture on Kashmir and the more recent reliance on French forces to restore order in Côte d'Ivoire both illustrate, former colonial masters still play an outsized role in the worldview of their former colonies.

The lesson, then, is not to ignore Europe's strengths—its still formidable, though weakening, militaries; its historical ties to certain parts of the developing world—in order to form a new, soft, Brussels-based power. Instead, it should be refocusing on those very things that make it an influential global player. Countries should be reinvesting in their depleted militaries and ending the gradual—and in some cases, not so gradual—chipping away at their diplomatic corps.

Conveniently, Europe already has a common security forum where its military strengths are focused and where its global ties could be maximized. They don't call it a common security policy, however. They call it an alliance.

Even though it sits just minutes away, en route to Brussels's airport, the EU seems to regard the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as an afterthought. One NATO ambassador from a non-EU country once claimed to me he spent more time with his country's EU ambassador than most of his European counterparts. It may have been an exaggeration, but at times it doesn't appear like much of one.

To be sure, there is the awkward issue of Turkey and Cyprus. But if the EU truly wants to see its geopolitical role in the world match its economic standing, it will force Cyprus to allow Turkey into the EU's security dialogue so that the two Brussels-based organizations can work seamlessly together.

Robert Gates, the former U.S. defense secretary, once told me about a spat he had with then-French foreign minister Bernard Kushner in which he described NATO as the front military wheel of a geostrategic bicycle that should have the EU as the back political wheel. Kushner dismissed the idea, but it seems apt—only through the close collaboration between Europe's currently disparate military and political competencies can it truly achieve a top-tier role as a global actor.

Rather than creating new and sometimes redundant structures, to create a truly strategic Europe, leaders should strengthen the institutions the EU already has. It should build on its advantages—its military traditions, its legacy of empire, its diplomatic expertise—and push the EU ever closer to NATO, where its strategic vision can be given the hard power it needs.

PETER SPIEGEL *is the Brussels bureau chief of the* Financial Times *and a former national security correspondent for the* Los Angeles Times *and the* Wall Street Journal.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2011

A MORE REALISTIC EUROPE

ROLAND FREUDENSTEIN

Strategic Europe is, first of all, a European Union that develops a realistic view of its own potential and limitations. Second, it is an EU that gets its act together domestically. And it is, third, an EU that tackles its global goals in a close alliance with the United States.

All three of these definitions seem to fly in the face of what is considered "strategic" in Brussels today. The Brussels consensus has, for too many decades now, pretended that Europe resembles the proverbial man on a bike going uphill who needs to pedal forward if he doesn't want to fall. Upon which John Bruton once quipped: "That's nonsense. All one ever has to do is firmly put one's foot on the ground!" In that sense, in being realistic about what the Union can be and what it cannot be, in tackling its real instead of its imaginary challenges, and in returning to our real instead of our imaginary friends as well as foes, we can metaphorically put our foot on the ground and redefine strategic Europe.

A realistic view of its own potential implies the recognition that for a long time to come, there will not be anything resembling a United States

of Europe, but that whatever emerges from the current economic and financial calamity, improvement will be incremental and will contain strong elements of intergovernmental cooperation. Progress in European integration has always come in moments of drama and crisis, but if we want to keep the citizens on board, we need to make it clear that whatever competencies we exercise jointly in terms of financial and economic policies, there have to be palpable advantages.

To play any credible role on the world stage, the EU needs to get back to sustainable growth and dynamic competitiveness, instead of constantly debating the next institutional reshuffle or the next instrument of a Common Security and Defence Policy. Saving the euro is only one component of this domestic angle. Effective economic governance is a necessary but not sufficient element of this. The underlying values must be solidarity and subsidiarity: a solidarity that works both ways—partners are not only morally committed to helping each other, but the recipients of that help must make credible efforts to help themselves as well. Subsidiarity simply means that effective economic governance must not become an oppressive economic government that strangles Europe's strengths of diversity and economic dynamism.

Consequently, it must be accompanied by further liberalization of the single market. All our investment into "social Europe" and the next big industrial project and all improvements in research and development and in education and training will come to nothing if we don't tackle the elementary problem of making the EU economy more competitive. That will only happen by removing existing obstacles to growth and profit. The same is true for arguably the second biggest mega-challenge Europe's societies face now and in decades to come: the ostensible paradox that in order to address the problems of an aging population, we need immigrants, but at the same time, immigration without efficient integration seems to have reached the limits of societal acceptability. Here, too, no state-sponsored antidiscrimination program will develop the leverage that the prospect of success and a culture of achievement will have in attracting the immigrants we need and avoiding the parallel societies we don't want. Strategic Europe creates the framework for this.

In other words—and that brings us to the third element of strategic Europe—there are still a number of things Europeans can learn from Americans, and I am not talking about lessons on what not to do here. I am talking about the simple idea that the success or failure of an individual is, above all, dependent upon the individual. That may be self-evident to a lot of people. In the corridors of Brussels, it is not. Let's face it: the United States looks to many of us (and to some Americans themselves) like a staggering giant, an overstretched, unsustainable empire stuck in a glorious past. Funnily, many Americans think exactly that about Europe in its present state and shape.

Sure enough, the rampant success of Chinese state capitalism, the youthful punch of the Arab revolutions, the Iranian and the Turkish versions of Islamism, and to some even the cynicism of Russian or Central Asian autocracy, look so much fresher than Europe and North America, and their cumbersome democracy and dogged insistence on human rights. And precisely at this point in time, like in an unwitting alliance, the anti-Europeans in America (both on the left and the right of the spectrum) and the anti-Americans in Europe (both on the left and the right of the spectrum) blow the trumpet of a post-Atlantic world. But not only are there still numerous advantages to be gained from improved transatlantic economic and security cooperation, there is also no alternative of other strategic partners in the world that would share the same basic values that Europe and North America have in common.

There is nothing wrong with visions. But these must be visions our people can actually share. And that is simply not the case with the mantra of "more Europe is the solution." More Europe, in the sense of more power for a centralized bureaucracy, belongs to the twentieth century. More integration sounds more like the future, when it makes palpable sense to our citizens and where it is backed up by the self-evident interests of a maximum number of Europeans. And that includes leaving some important competences with the nations, the regions, and the municipalities of our multilayered Europe. In order to make Europe strategic, we have to stop piling treaty upon treaty and institution upon institution. The best role the EU can play now is to safeguard and improve the framework

for free citizens to reclaim the momentum we all have lost over the first decade of the twenty-first century.

ROLAND FREUDENSTEIN *is the deputy director and head of research of the Centre for European Studies, the political foundation affiliated with the European People's Party. The views expressed in this text are entirely his own.*

SEPTEMBER 16, 2011

SIX VIGNETTES ABOUT EUROPE

JOHN KORNBLUM

1. In 1945 Europe was a broken and isolated continent. Its grand traditions of openness and invention had seemingly been shattered forever. It was a civilization without a strategic purpose, other than to regain stability. For the past six decades Europe has defined its strategic choices from this starting point. Even two decades after the collapse of communism, Europe still seems burdened by a trauma from the past. Its primary political roadmap is a 20-page treaty which outlines its internal bureaucracy. Economically, Europe has risen far beyond even the most optimistic predictions of sixty years ago. But its political life seems to be frozen in time. In a world of radical change, the debilitating effect of this stasis on political leadership has been severe. European leaders find it hard to deal with new challenges because they have forgotten how to think strategically… Europe is, in a very real sense, a strategy-free zone.

2. In today's Europe, as Marshall McLuhan put it: "the medium is the message." Raised on Europe's mantra of peace and stability, many Europeans actually feel a sense of superiority from the success of

what they see as their innovative "peace policy." They believe that their multilateral institution-building has "erased the threat of war forever," and that this method can be applied across the globe. Even the euro was sold not as a tool for a dynamic financial future but as a guarantee that Europe would never fight another war.

3. John Kay noted recently in the *Financial Times*: "From its inception, the guiding philosophy of the EU was that if you took every opportunity to promote the mechanisms of integration, political and economic reality would eventually catch up. But such a policy was always risky, because if institutions did not match aspirations then the resulting strains would jeopardize not just future progress but the gains already made."

   Exactly this happened in two post–Cold War crises—the Balkan wars of the 1990s and the current financial instability. In each case, European leaders were unable to deal with situations created by outside players who wanted conflict rather than peace. Neither Slobodan Milosevic nor financial markets gave one hoot about the august ideals of the European Union.

4. One often meets Europeans these days who say their belief in Europe was nothing but an illusion. The EU is experiencing a serious crisis of confidence among its citizens. Equally worrisome is the growing loss of confidence by its essential protector, the United States. America is effectively also a European power whose interests are deeply integrated across the Atlantic. Even today, without the support and presence of the United States, the EU as we know it could not exist. But continuation of this active support is anything but certain. America no longer sees its own identity reflected in global structures of multilateral diplomacy. It judges partners by performance rather than historical ties. In this race, Europe is bound to lose.

5. During the Cold War, Europe enjoyed a strategic advantage of the first order—its territory constituted the front line of East-West military confrontation. Europe's most important strategic goal after 1990 should have been to offset the loss of geographic advantage by

defining a new post–Cold War global strategic relationship cementing America's presence in Europe through NATO. Instead, European NATO allies committed one of the most dramatic blunders of modern diplomatic history. Rather than expanding their horizons, they contracted them, attempting to outfit their new "European Union" with a separate military and security identity outside of NATO. Europe turned dramatically inward, with lasting consequences, not just in the field of security. The Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) as it is now called has done little to increase Europe's defense contribution but it has reduced European influence by progressively severing the strategic link to American global thinking.

As a result, Europe and the United States have reached a defense policy stand-off reflected dramatically in former U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates' recent valedictory speech. America is consumed by global crises and cares little for Europe's preoccupations. With publics schooled on the mantra of the EU, European leaders have been unable to communicate a credible strategic narrative to the United States. Talk with American military planners these days and you learn that Europe is no longer a part of their strategic calculations. America's next generation will care even less.

6. For nations dedicated to expanding their global economic and cultural influence, Europe's declining ability to protect its security interests is cause for major concern. If current trends continue, Europe's central geographic position, highly developed infrastructure, and commercial skills should lead to growing engagement across the globe. In order to protect these interests, Europe desperately needs an updated defense concept and a revitalized alliance with the United States. Luckily, Europe is not without options. Despite its current weakness, Europe still maintains an amazing advantage not available to anyone else—it is tied together with the greatest military power in the history of mankind in a formal military alliance. The United States is committed to defend, militarily if necessary, European security interests within the area defined by the treaty.

Events since 2001 have demonstrated that the United States is now willing to expand NATO's reach beyond the area originally covered. This is a bounty unprecedented in history. In a more rational world, Europeans would run, not walk to reconsecrate this bargain. Drastic increases in defense budgets are probably not necessary. More important would be an open dialogue which seeks new strategic unity. An initiative for a "crisis dialogue" with a broad agenda for a new "Atlanticism" would likely receive a positive response in Washington. What Americans want is a sense of strategic consensus and a willingness to take political risks in support of joint interests. Europeans are engaged in many parts of the world and could offer important insights. America's withdrawal from military conflicts and its need to cut its defense budget offer an excellent opportunity to define a new global Atlanticism.

JOHN KORNBLUM *is a former U.S. ambassador to Germany.*

SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

STRATEGIC EUROPE—SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

STEFANI WEISS

It has become fashionable to call almost all outlines, programs, or plans at whatever level and for whatever purpose a "strategy." But one should not be misled. We have not all turned into little "Clausewitzes." At least, it took us on a detour over the business world where classical military thinking outlived and inspired consultancies. The alleged rationality and efficiency with which private enterprises seek their advantage and exploit any weakness of their rivals seemed so compelling and their success so convincing that business strategies increasingly became the blueprint for politics. The high esteem of market logics peaked in the neoliberal reforms of the past twenty years and the call for liberalization and deregulation became the mantra of globalization. In the meantime, the state and civil society alike are permeated with market practices, principles, and values to a degree that the "social contract" on which every state is founded seems in danger of eroding.

With regard to the prevalence of the term "strategy," the European Union constitutes no exception. It commands a plethora of strategies spanning literally all walks of life and covering almost every region around the

globe. It has—to mention just a few—the EU2020 Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, a strategy for food security, one for e-learning and for competitive transportation (Transport2050), an energy strategy, the Baltic Sea Strategy, the Strategy for the Mediterranean, the Joint Africa Strategy, the Sustainable Development Strategy, the European Security Strategy accompanied by the Counter-Terrorism Strategy and the Strategy Against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Moreover, the EU has built strategic partnerships with all the other global players, whether they are old, new, or emerging.

Unfortunately, all these strategies could not prevent the EU from gliding into uncertain waters. The current crisis is so severe that Europe is even in danger of losing the very foreign and security policy accomplishment which truly could be named "strategic": the process of European integration itself.

It is therefore no surprise that the "strategic community" in Brussels and beyond is pressing ever more desperately for a "grand strategy" to stop Europe's decline. In a similar vein, there are calls for re-energizing the faltering EU around new "strategic" projects. Again others suggest the need to invent a novel European narrative that would be more inducing in our times to close ranks behind the integration process and thus strengthen Europe's role as a global actor. However, it remains unclear what the new story should be about. One problem is that there is simply no good enemy anymore. For Europe at least, Russia is too weak and China is too far away—and too interesting to do business with—to qualify for such a role.

What comes as a surprise is that many of those putting forward every reasonable argument for a grand strategy are still judging Europe's fate by classical notions of power politics and by categories of war and peace. Accordingly, they are overemphasizing what a foreign and security policy could achieve. However, no power projection or diplomatic skills could revamp the Greek economy or put us back on track for growth rates high enough to overcome the economic and social heterogeneity under which the EU suffers.

Today, the global financial market sets the pace, making governments look much like the sorcerer's apprentice. Neoliberal politics of the past have unleashed forces that national governments and even regional powers such as the EU are no longer able to contain. But if we need an enemy, private rating agencies would do. This is not to say that their ratings are wrong. Instead, they should remind us that in our history states were always more than mere marketplaces.

Ordinary citizens have seemed to sense for some time that events are driven less by our politicians at the helm and more so by the power of capital—or as we prefer to say, market forces. A great deal of citizens' disenchantment with politics is rooted in a loss of confidence in their governments' ability to cope with economic globalization. Instead, they witness unemployment on the rise and more and more public goods being privatized, thereby becoming less and less affordable. In addition, even among those member states with the best economic performance, wages have stagnated and the gap between rich and poor has widened. The growing legitimacy problem of the EU can in part be traced to the perception of its citizens that it is the EU that appears to be trading away precious achievements of the European social market model without gaining much in return.

We are now in an era in which all the former "national champions" and "European champions" have gone global, where new market opportunities have unfolded in emerging and low income countries, and where no amount of deregulation or liberalization within member states or the EU's single market could bring back the comparative advantages that business is seeking. On the contrary, we need to re-establish the primacy of politics over the economy and put an end to the situation in which we can be blackmailed by the corporate world. Deregulation at any cost has not proven to be the silver bullet, especially if it is destroying the tax base and stopping governments from producing public goods.

Security is an eminent public good. We cannot live without it. Yet, security will only be assured if the necessary money is available and not lost by tax loopholes and offshore tax havens. For the strategic community it is high time to deal with political economics. This field should no longer

be left to the mathematicians of collateral default swaps. The "collateral damage" is too high a price. It threatens social peace and undermines Europe's defense and security as well as its role in the world. If Europe wants to be a strategic actor, it needs first and foremost strategies that reshape the economy in a way that it serves its citizens.

STEFANI WEISS *is a program director at the Bertelsmann Stiftung in Brussels.*

SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

NEIGHBORHOOD-TO-THE-WORLD

RICHARD YOUNGS

One of the many dimensions of a "strategic Europe" relates to the European Union's geographical coverage. With the world order changing fast, the challenge for the EU is to strike an appropriate balance in the geographical distribution of its strategic efforts. A particular imperative is that the focus on rising powers must not neglect the EU's immediate neighborhood, where the Union can still have its strongest impact.

The EU spent the first decade of the twenty-first century worrying about its global presence and rising powers. This was necessary and overdue and much progress is still needed here. But the Union took its eye off the ball in its own immediate neighborhood. Most obviously, it chose not to heed the warnings of growing instability in Arab states, but it also failed to seize the extent of Ukraine's drift, of Turkey's self-confidence, and of recidivist powers in the Balkans returning.

The EU must build outward from a strong focus on its neighborhood and not deal with it reactively merely to douse intermittent crises or as an inconvenient distraction from the market opportunities of rising powers.

The sobering and unavoidable irony of a self-styled post-modern power is that its geostrategic footprint is ultimately shaped by geography. The EU needs the right balance between the near and the far, between influence in its neighborhood and global presence. This balance should be as such: in Asia, the EU should seek politically-backed economic power; in its neighborhood, economically-backed political power.

The Arab Spring undoubtedly corrected Europe's neglect of the Middle East and North Africa. Many aspects of the EU reaction to the Arab revolts show an apparently strong commitment to supporting modernizing change in the region. The EU has promised additional resources, more generous market access, better labor mobility, transition-related technical assistance, conditionality-based rewards for democratic reform, and broader based civic dialogues. Certainly, the surprise factor of the popular protests across the Middle East has sufficed to shake off the seduction of hyperrealism.

It remains to be seen how far these early signs of commitment are carried through to constitute a real geostrategic priority. So far, member states have not invested significant amounts of new money themselves to back the Arab Spring; trade access remains a promise rather than a reality; restrictions of migration registers a highly negative symbolic tone among Arab reformers; and in some Arab states a European preference for stability and managed reform clearly persists.

The military engagement in Libya demonstrated a real commitment to the neighborhood. Some member states have concluded that this is where the EU can count geostrategically, even if it means reducing commitments to Afghanistan and other more distant theatres. But the Libya conflict also exposed serious limitations to the breadth and depth of engagement. Although the Qaddafi regime has now been ousted, there were recurring mutterings from the beginning of the campaign over the limits to European military engagement. Governments flew far fewer sorties in Libya than in Kosovo over a decade ago and yet they complained of overstretch. Britain and France were forced to use planes slated for decommissioning. Member states could not even agree on a common EU mission to evacuate European citizens—resisting the idea of helping each

other. In some ways—especially Germany versus Anglo-French—the divisions over Libya were more serious than those over Iraq: the latter were about how to react to a peculiar moment of U.S. unilateralism, whereas splits over Libya revolved around the whole principle of active engagement in a very close, major crisis. Ironically, a northern country that opted out of EU defense, Denmark, flew the most sorties per pilot in Libya, killed Qaddafi's son, and even sought additional bombs to carry on its campaign, having used up its own stocks. Other states who talk endlessly about the need for EU cooperation did not do nearly as much.

The Balkans suffered even more conspicuous neglect during the last decade. As several states in the region approach the latter stages of their pre-accession preparations, it may be that the EU stands ready to complete its stabilization-cum-anchoring role. But the road has been unnecessarily long and rocky. Balkans experts charge the EU with offering membership a decade ago and then leaving the region on autopilot and assuming that the same model used for Eastern Europe would work the same magic in an area that was obviously subject to far more complex and violent dynamics. The EU has backed off from encouraging constitutional reform in Bosnia. The scale of its Common Security and Defence Policy (CDSP) missions in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Macedonia has been limited. The lack of a common EU position on Kosovo's independence reveals how some states have prioritized domestic sensitivities (with recognizing the territory) over the Balkans' strategic importance. Post-conflict institution-building aid across the region has gradually dwindled. Even at the very last hurdles, France has delayed Croatia's accession unnecessarily. It would be ironic if the Arab Spring further turned the EU's strategic efforts away from the Balkans, when the region continues to be such a necessary part of a secure neighborhood.

The danger of undue neglect is a more pressing danger now in the states to the EU's east. Thus is the case most dramatically with Ukraine. German officials now completely rule out any favorable consideration of Ukraine's accession. The focus on membership, they say, is diverting the EU from hard-headed pursuit of interests. The European Commission has just granted Ukraine an additional €17 million for civil society reform projects. But such initiatives do little to mask the feeling that the

EU has turned its back on the country. Even the supposedly pro-Russian Yanukovych government, in power since 2009, appears more interested in cooperating with the EU than the EU is in building a genuinely strategic partnership with Ukraine. The EU seems content to have Ukraine as a kind of neutral buffer between it and Russia, rather than a partner with whom the deepest degree of integration possible would be of geopolitical value. The EU's own reset with Russia seems to embody the more general EU swing away from "neighborhood power" toward "great power engagement."

Much analysis has focused on the flurry of recent EU activity in Asia: the free trade agreements either signed or being finalized; the five strategic partnerships offered in the region; and the courting of liquidity-rich governments whose help is needed to cover European deficits. The focus on Asia is extremely welcome and needs to be deepened further into a genuinely geo-strategic policy. But the EU must work to ensure the right balance between the opportunities offered by the rising powers and the need to invest resources and diplomatic priority into stabilizing its own neighborhood.

Crucially, a more "strategic Europe" would break free from a paternalistic attitude that focuses on sporadic crisis-management approach to states in the EU's neighborhood. Rather, it would map out a vision based on deepened partnerships across the neighborhood as instruments to help the EU build its global presence. The EU and the countries to its east and south will need to establish a common cause in confronting future challenges together. The near and far need not be mutually exclusive priorities for a strategic Europe; the challenge is to build from a strong neighborhood out toward the broader changes to global order.

RICHARD YOUNGS *is the director of FRIDE, Madrid, and associate professor at the University of Warwick.*

SEPTEMBER 21, 2011

WHAT THE WAR IN LIBYA TELLS EUROPE

STEVEN ERLANGER

The war in Libya may be one of those quietly telling moments in the history of more important nations. For the first time, the United States has taken a secondary role—"leading from behind," if "leading" is even the right word—in a war prosecuted by NATO and driven by Great Britain and France, the two strongest military powers in Europe.

But oh what a war! Seven budget-busting months against one of the weakest militaries in the world, with shortages of planes, weapons, and ammunition that were patched over by the pretense that NATO was acting simply to "protect civilians," when it was clear to everyone that the Alliance was intervening on one side of a civil war. All resemblances to the Kosovo war, of course, are a priori inadmissible. That was the war when NATO said: "Such a success, never again!"

Yet here we are—with the "responsibility to protect" the new mantra, replacing Kosovo's "humanitarian intervention." Both, of course, are highly debatable, to use delicate language, given the failure to intervene in Chechnya then and Syria, Bahrain, or Yemen now.

Libya was a war in which some of NATO's mightiest members did not participate—or did not participate with combat aircraft, like Spain and Turkey. It was a war where the Danes and Norwegians did an extraordinary amount of the combat sorties, given their size. Their planes and pilots became exhausted even as the French finally pulled back their sole nuclear-powered aircraft carrier for overdue repairs and Italy withdrew its aircraft carrier to save money.

Only eight of the 28 allies sent combat forces and most ran out of ammunition, having to buy, at cost, ammunition stockpiled by the United States. Germany refused to take part, even in setting up a no-fly zone.

And although Washington took a back seat in the war, which the Obama administration looked at skeptically from the start, the United States still ran the initial stages, in particular the destruction of Libya's air defenses, making it safe for its NATO colleagues to fly. The United States then provided intelligence, refueling, and more precision bombing than Paris or London want to acknowledge.

Inevitably, then, NATO airpower and technology, combined with British, French, and Qatari "trainers" working "secretly" with the rebels on the ground, have defeated the forces, many of them mercenary, of Colonel Muammar Qaddafi.

As of this writing, there are still important pockets of resistance, but the war has been won.

The question, however, is whether European members of NATO will ever decide to embark on such an adventure again.

The experience of Libya, it seems to me, will have one of two responses. Either Europeans will develop the security and defense identity they have advertised for so long, so Europe can have its own credible voice in a world not only run by soft power, or given the expense and difficulties of defeating even Libya, they will simply stop trying. The jury is out, but the verdict is important.

Some, like Tomas Valasek of the Centre for European Reform, suggest that Washington's diplomacy worked, in that during the Libyan conflict,

"the allies established a new division of labor for NATO operations on Europe's borders, which should be encouraged."

Possibly. And just possibly, given the cost and strain of the Libyan operation, combined with the vital necessity to cut budget deficits at home to save both the eurozone and themselves, even the eight European nations that fought will decide that a real European security and defense identity is too expensive, and their already shrinking defense budgets will continue to shrink past the point of utility—at least to Washington. After all, the European Union itself played no role at all in the war.

François Heisbourg, a French defense analyst with the Foundation for Strategic Research in Paris, said that the decisions made in Washington and Berlin will have "major strategic consequences for both NATO and the European Union."

The lack of a sustained American "shock and awe" campaign probably left more of Libya's infrastructure intact for the new government, he noted. But less happily, he said, "if 'leading from behind' becomes the rule rather than the exception," which he regards as likely given U.S. budget cuts, "then European force planners will have to invest" in air-defense suppression and more close-air support.

And how likely, after all, is that? And if France, Britain and others do invest more in these areas, they will have to cut in others, and will be less likely to engage in over-the-horizon expeditions like the war in Afghanistan.

So Libya may be a dark model for NATO's future: internal coalitions of the willing, hemmed in by conditions and national "caveats," running out of ammunition and targets, with inadequate means to stated political goals.

The economic crisis has only exacerbated Europe's unwillingness to live up to its grand ambitions to play a global role in foreign and defense matters. The biting complaints of former U.S. defense secretary Robert Gates about the fading of Europe and a "dim if not dismal future"' for an increasingly "irrelevant" Alliance were only an echo, if said more harshly, of similar speeches that many NATO secretary-generals have made before him.

In February, at the Munich Security Conference, NATO's current head, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, ominously noted that in the last two years alone, European defense spending had shrunk by $45 billion—the equivalent of Germany's entire military budget. Only France, Britain, and Greece (which can't afford it) are spending the agreed 2 percent of GDP on defense, and Britain is now cutting sharply. If these trends continue, Rasmussen said, "We risk a divided Europe" and "a Europe increasingly adrift from the United States." He noted the rise of China and the impatience of Washington: "If Europe becomes unable to make an appropriate contribution to global security, then the United States might look elsewhere for reliable defense partners."

There is also the moral question. In Libya, NATO allies ran roughshod over the UN Security Council resolution authorizing military means to protect civilians—not intervention on one side of a civil and tribal war. France and Britain dismiss that argument, saying that it is trumped by the defense of Benghazi and the need to remove Qaddafi from power, and that every Qaddafi supporter with a weapon was a threat to civilians, even if they themselves were civilians.

But there is no example of NATO intervening to protect civilian supporters of Qaddafi from the rebels. And a strong case can be made that the commitment to the "sideshow" of Libya has meant the impossibility of getting Russia and China to act even with economic sanctions on Syria, where the moral argument and the "responsibility to protect" civilians is even clearer.

NATO, too, is suffering from a predictable post-Soviet hangover, combined with the strains of rapid expansion to countries that have sharply divergent views about Moscow, Ukraine, Georgia, the Middle East, and the real threats to Europe. NATO leaders, in their latest strategic doctrine, tried to find credible threats to Europe from matters like piracy, when the real rationale for the organization vanished along with the Soviet tanks along the Elbe.

As for Afghanistan, the least said the better. NATO allies are having a long collective buyer's remorse over their post-9/11 declaration of an

Article 5 war against al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Britain and France, still losing troops there and spending more there a day than they did over Libya, can't wait to leave. And no one thinks anymore that the war can be "won" in any traditional sense, that there will be any glorious ending, or even that the impact of this latest Western involvement will be lasting.

STEVEN ERLANGER *is the Paris bureau chief for the* New York Times.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2011

MAY EUROPE 3.0 STEP FORWARD

DMITRI TRENIN

Big strategic decisions are usually made in times of crisis and pain. In that sense, Europe is moving toward decision time. The fate of the euro, the war in Libya and the developments in North Africa and the Middle East, the impasse in Turkey's EU accession talks, and the collapse of Europe's multiculturalism all prepare the ground for new thinking on the Old Continent. But thinking alone is not enough. Action is needed, and it is only possible if there is strong political will and inspirational leadership. At this point, both are in short supply.

In the wake of the Cold War's end, the talk was of the "Hour of Europe." Unification of the divided continent seemed to offer the prospect of Europe as a strategic whole. This promise was not entirely unfulfilled. The European Communities evolved into the European Union, with a common currency in most of its member states. Membership in the EU was extended to more countries than there were members when the Berlin Wall fell. The enlarged EU became a pole of attraction to its neighbors to the south and east. Yet the EU has so far turned out to be more of a space than an actor.

The introduction of the euro has not been accompanied by a fiscal union. The sovereign debt crisis has brought the message home: turn the eurozone into such a union, or see the eurozone collapse. Solidarity in bailing out heavily indebted countries requires cross-border accountability in government spending. Sovereignty has to be shared much more than is the case today. Financial government is a must if Europe simply wants to keep the euro and the benefits it brings. To go forward, it needs to advance on other fronts as well.

Financial government needs to be supported by more proactive political government. The Lisbon Treaty was a step in that direction, but even this modest step has not been fully utilized. The current presidency of the European Council looks more like chairmanship in a presidium of an assembly than the "Presidency of Europe" as it was originally billed. To put it differently, the current presidency facilitates the intricate proceedings among the many national leaders rather than uniting Europe and leading it forward.

The companion position of a "European foreign minister" has likewise been allowed to become, at best, an addition to the national foreign policy apparatuses rather than a symbol of European togetherness in a global world. If this situation is allowed to continue, Europe, in the international arena, will be less, not more, than the sum of its constituent parts. Europe's dismal diplomatic performance amid the developments in the Middle East and North African countries this year is a warning. If this is not heeded, the European External Action Service may be a largely wasted effort.

The NATO operation in Libya has added a new—military—dimension to the list of areas where Europe comes short. For decades, Europeans have relied on the United States not merely for security, but also for strategic leadership. This may have been both necessary and inevitable in the Cold War, but it is both anachronistic and less tolerable two decades after the Cold War's end. Americans will probably never fully lose interest in Europe, but they are losing respect for a continent unable to get its act together and back that act with unified force.

Unless the issues behind the symptoms described above are treated, Europe's condition will not stagnate, but deteriorate further. The fruits of the European project, which are many and precious, are in danger of being lost. Europe's unity is not a given; it has to be fought for. Beyond a certain point, Europe will no longer be a solution to problems elsewhere; it will itself become a problem. After which it will only be a matter of time before a new scramble for Europe begins.

So, what needs to be done? To achieve a unified financial and political government, a common foreign policy and an ability to protect its own security, and to project stability beyond its borders, Europe needs a new integrationist effort. After the Cold War–era common market and the post–Cold War union of nation states, Europe, if it still wants to go forward and not slip backward, must become a federal unit. This will be Europe 3.0.

This is not a new concept. In the past, Europeans had the luxury of looking at it and rejecting it in favor of their more familiar and cozier national ways. Today, this luxury is no longer affordable. To have widely diverging fiscal policies; a vast bureaucracy in Brussels divorced from ordinary voters in the nation states; two dozen militaries of varied quality supported by a plethora of national defense industrial capacities; many hundreds of diplomatic representations without a single voice in the global arena—all this is too much for Europe. It deserves better.

A new political process is in order. This cannot be powered by the EU's heavyweights, imposing their vision of federalism on all others. It can only start from below, through an EU-wide political process. Europe's politicians, who for decades have been followers rather than leaders—whether in relation to their domestic publics or in their relations with the United States—need to rediscover leadership if they are to retain Europe.

It is quite possible that the present crop of politicians is largely not up to the task. It is likely that new faces will need to be recruited. Thanks to the degree of integration unprecedented anywhere else in the world, there is a generation of Europeans who actually feel European—not German, French or Polish first. They all are fluent in English. There is a pool

of pro-European energy and élan in some of the new members of the EU. These young men and women are the political base for new Europeanism. Using direct elections to the European Parliament, they can start changing this institution, so that it can eventually live up to its name. Politicians can yet again become political leaders.

European business communities are among those who reap the most benefits from a more unified Europe. They need to give support to political leaders' efforts to achieve greater unity, which means more competitiveness, and, consequently, more and better-paying jobs. Where consolidation is long overdue, like in the defense sector, it needs to be pursued in conjunction with a European security strategy which seeks to turn NATO into a more equitable arrangement, in terms of material and intellectual contributions of the parties.

Consolidation will be helpful not only in the defense industry and in NATO. In the international arena, reducing European representations abroad is likely to result in much greater European presence. A merger of British and French UN Security Council seats would greatly enhance Europe's global role, and a merger of their strategic nuclear assets would stimulate Europe's defense integration.

In terms of the conventional debate in Europe, all this is either a dreamland completely out of reach or a nightmare to be avoided. One thing must be clear by now, however: Europe 2.0 as a bureaucracy-driven process in a continent of growing Euro-apathy has run its course. The bureaucratic process cannot win; apathy can. It is time for a new 3.0 effort. Of course, it is up to the Europeans themselves to remake or unmake their Union. The rest of the world is watching with interest—as allies, partners, or neighbors. They would all be better served by a more unified and capable Europe. They hope that Europe steps up, rather than down.

DMITRI TRENIN *is the director of the Carnegie Moscow Center and the author of* Post-Imperium: A Eurasian Story.

SEPTEMBER 23, 2011

MAINSTREAMING ASIA IN EU STRATEGIC THINKING

NORIO MARUYAMA

Policymakers need to be creative in the twenty-first century. New challenges like climate change, terrorism, and nuclear proliferation, to name but a few, transcend traditional borders. Technological developments and the democratization of communication are changing the concept of foreign and security policy. The traditional, separate nation-state is less significant than ever. The security of regions, even those that are geographically distant, is now interdependent.

Recent world events clearly show us how things that happen in one part of the planet can have an immediate impact on the other. For example, the "Arab Spring" occurred in the Mediterranean region but was immediately regarded in Asian countries as a great challenge. A nuclear accident that occurred in the eastern part of Asia shook national politics in Europe. And piracy off the eastern coast of Africa resulted in the participation of aircraft and naval vessels from Asia.

All those challenges are so huge, complex, and diverse in this new borderless world that one state can no longer afford to survive alone by its own traditional means and resources.

Policymakers also realize that in this century, sticking to traditional geographical demarcation has less meaning. What counts more is how to achieve tangible results. How to cooperate and share work with other relevant stakeholders should be the priority of any policymaker in the world.

My suggestion to my colleagues from the European Union is to move away from the traditional approach and try to think of an approach that nobody has ever seriously considered: mainstreaming Asia within the strategic thinking of the EU. Asia includes some of the most dynamic economies and emerging powers in the world. Thus Asia can be a pool of relevant and pragmatic solutions for Europe.

The priorities of EU diplomacy, such as its neighborhood policy, climate change, counterterrorism, the Middle East, development in Africa, anti-piracy, and so forth might be better achieved by involving Asian countries more. Asia and the EU have already cooperated in an ad-hoc way on anti-piracy missions off the coast of Somalia and on counterterrorism in Afghanistan. The question is how we can more steadily do this and how we can extend the area of cooperation.

I would like to give you some examples of the areas where the participation of Asia may be of benefit to the EU.

First, the "Arab Spring."

Asia may help the EU both politically and economically to find solutions to the challenges facing the Middle East and North Africa. Democratic Indonesia, with a majority Muslim population, may be able to share relevant knowledge from its experience of democratization. The economic recovery process can be done more efficiently by combining initiatives emanating from Asian countries. For instance, a country like Japan has its own initiatives to help the economic and social recovery of the MENA countries.

Second, particular attention should be drawn to the anti-piracy issue.

In the strengthening of maritime law-enforcement capabilities in the region surrounding Somalia, Asian countries could provide the useful expertise they gained from the establishment of the Regional Cooperation

Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia. In response to the increasing cases of piracy, especially in the Strait of Malacca, a legal framework was established to facilitate an exchange of information on piracy and to enhance the contracting parties' ability to respond to incidents of piracy. Since the agreement's entry into force in 2006, there has been a dramatic decrease in incidents of piracy; 242 incidents in 2000 fell to 45 incidents in 2009. A similar regional mechanism could be further developed in the region surrounding Somalia.

Another example is disaster management.

Asia is one of the regions in the world which is frequently affected by natural disasters like earthquakes, tsunamis, floods, typhoons, and so on. A natural disaster and its impact is one of the primary concerns of Asian countries. ASEAN countries are enhancing their coordination to respond rapidly to any disaster. Furthermore, Asian countries are willing to share their expertise and knowledge of natural disasters with the EU. This could add value to the EU's disaster prevention studies.

The experiences of Asia in the field may also contribute to the planning of future EU rescue operations and allow for the more efficient implementation of current disaster relief activities. Take for instance the use of the military for disaster relief. This is a difficult subject among EU member states. However, Asia's experiences prove that the use of the military in this context can be efficient. A country like Japan, which has a unique Self Defense Force, can demonstrate how the use of military logistics for disaster relief is appreciated by its public.

To continue the list of potential areas of cooperation with Asia, we simply need to have a look at the agenda from the Asian side. At the July East Asia Summit's Foreign Ministers Meeting in Indonesia, the ministers pointed out issues which might affect the stability and security of the Asian region, including:

- the possibility of a new global financial crisis;
- denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula;
- maritime issues, including maritime security and safety, freedom

of navigation, and the peaceful settlement of disputes in a transparent manner and in accordance with international law;

- nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament;
- trafficking of persons;
- sharing of democratic values;
- climate change; and
- the environment.

If one examines these issues, it is clear that both the EU and Asia prioritize the same things.

Japan and the EU have started a scoping exercise to expand their cooperative relations in parallel with an economic partnership agreement. It may encompass all aspects of political cooperation between Japan and EU. In other words, this is an ambitious attempt by Japan to mainstream the EU in its foreign policy.

This agreement will surely be an opportunity for European policymakers to move away from *le sentier battu* regarding Japan. Our relations were too much inclined to the economic and purely centered on trade. The negative experience during this difficult period of trade friction still haunts our relations. We need to reevaluate our relations to fulfill the requirements of the twenty-first century.

My dear European friends, Asia may provide a new kind of thinking to realize solutions to the borderless challenges of this century. How about mainstreaming Asia in your strategic thinking?

NORIO MARUYAMA *is the ambassador for political affairs at the Mission of Japan to the European Union. This article is the personal opinion of the author and does not reflect the official view of the Government of Japan.*

SEPTEMBER 26, 2011

A 2025 LETTER TO EUROPE'S HIGH REPRESENTATIVE

ALEXANDER GRAF LAMBSDORFF

May 9, 2025

Honorable High Representative,

Exactly seventy-five years ago today, Robert Schumann declared his vision of a supranational Europe. In light of this momentous anniversary, pending your address before the plenary in the European Parliament, and given the current tumultuous events in the Nagorno-Karabakh region along our southeastern-most border, it may be time to ask ourselves some vital questions with respect to our current and future policies.

How well do we project our values and power elsewhere in the world where we have key strategic interests? What are the levels of our strategic depth since the ratification of the Treaty of Zagreb and the subsequent introduction of the European Foreign and Security Policy (EFSP) eight years ago? How capable are we at handling conflicts and exerting influence in our neighborhood after the completion of the enlargement process? Have the strategies we employed in regards to global threats like climate change, energy security, and cyberterrorism been successful in your view?

The thought of a truly strategic Europe seemed almost unfathomable even fifteen years ago, but we Europeans seem to have the relentless capacity to reinvent ourselves, just as we did when we rose, almost Phoenix-like, from the rubble of the Second World War. Few dared to predict the progress we have made since, when as a result of economic woes and a feeling of estrangement in a globalized world, the specters of re-nationalization of European politics and of rising nationalism were looming large at the beginning of the last decade.

Progress, it seems, was once again born of necessity. The events following the Arab Spring of 2011 made clear that we had to act united—and we eventually rose to the occasion. What clearly helped us was a gradual shift in thinking that took place in our societies over the last decades. European citizens have largely come to terms with the changed realities of our time and today they generally view global interdependence as an opportunity rather than a threat.

Subsequent to the Iranian test of a nuclear warhead in 2015, there was also a growing realization among the decisionmakers in the European Union member states that we needed to transcend outmoded concepts and come up with a viable supranational mechanism that would allow us to cope with vital security challenges. This holds especially true in light of the transnational nature of many of today's threats and the increasing meaninglessness of national borders when it comes to the issues of our time. Ultimately this was how we made headway with respect to the last domains of national prerogatives—foreign and defense policy, once considered sacred cows of national sovereignty.

We have managed a transition from an almost exclusively civilian power to a player that has the necessary teeth to back the actions sometimes required when its values and interests are at stake. Introducing the fully-fledged, joint EFSP in 2017 was a quantum leap for the EU. We have regular reporting by and tough hearings for ambassadors and high-level diplomats in the European Parliament where the most lively foreign policy debates now take place. We have a working qualified majority voting system within the Council that has put the EU on the playing field in international diplomacy. We have never betrayed the principle that we

resort to the use of force only when the situation clearly requires it. But when these situations arise, we can tackle them more efficiently, with a slimmer, streamlined European army whose deployment has to obtain the approval of the Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA), composed of members of both national parliaments and the European Parliament.

I am glad that the EU Defense Minister was finally able to announce last week that two more member states will join the European Defence Forces (EDF) by the end of the year. Our Europe of defense has grown steadily from the permanent structured cooperation of the original eight states to a permanent force to be reckoned with, now comprising men and women from the 29 member states that make up the fabric of the EDF, thereby bestowing even greater legitimacy on Council and JPA decisions regarding deployment.

In the international arena, notions of cooperation have equally changed since the doctrine of absolute territorial sovereignty was successfully qualified by principles like humanitarian intervention and the responsibility to protect. States and the growing number of supranational bodies modeled after the EU are now increasingly reminded not just of their rights but of their responsibilities vis-à-vis their citizens. This is a result also of the determination and perseverance that has characterized our democracy support policies over the last decades.

Securing one of the exclusive permanent seats in the enlarged Security Council at the United Nations was by no means an easy feat, but it can be rightly described as one of the EU's biggest diplomatic victories and in line with our overall weight. An EU seat has also forced us to align policies when taking decisions on the most important matters of our time.

We need to acknowledge these achievements more forcefully when confronted with undue criticism—and to the naysayers who now again warn of a divided Europe I would point to how far we have progressed. Having said all this, it is true that not all is perfect.

Foreign policy and defense issues require the backing of our European society—they touch on the very basic emotions and moral fiber of our people. We need to foster an even deeper identification with our com-

mon history, identity, and destiny. That holds especially true of the Balkan countries where unresolved issues still simmer. We can also witness a degree of dissonance with respect to the aforementioned conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh and a possible EU intervention there. But the putative east/west divide that is often cited as an example of division among Europeans is a temporary phenomenon at best. It is certainly true that there are regional differences both in terms of perceptions of where our diplomatic and security focal points should lie. We must do a better job at explaining our decisions—and we must do so in a more transparent manner. But vital discussions are part and parcel of a healthy democracy.

Despite the inherent, systemic problems that our bulky and sometimes still cumbersome system entails, we can be proud of what we have achieved. Jean Monnet used to say that Europe would be the sum of its crises and that it would grow through each one. In the past seventy-five years, then, we have grown both in quantity and quality, and the notion that we share a common history and a common purpose is still very much alive.

I look forward to your speech before Parliament and to continuing our fruitful collaboration.

Sincerely,

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff
Member of the European Parliament
Rue Wiertz 60, 1047 Brussels
The single seat of the European Parliament

ALEXANDER GRAF LAMBSDORFF *is a German politician and Member of the European Parliament with the Free Democratic Party of Germany.*

SEPTEMBER 27, 2011

CAN LISBON'S POTENTIAL BE REALIZED?

STEFAN LEHNE

Imagine for a moment that Washington decides its Afghanistan policy by consensus of the 50 states and following consultations with the Asia experts of Nebraska, Florida, and their 48 colleagues from the other states. Imagine further, that in addition to U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton flying to Kabul to explain this policy, the foreign ministers of California, Texas, and others also arrive there to convey their own messages and priorities to the Afghan authorities. Imagine finally that the implementation of this policy is similarly decentralized, leaving it up to the governors and the legislators of the individual states to decide to what extent they wish to underpin the U.S. Afghanistan strategy with civilian and military resources.

This is how the European Union conducts its foreign policy today. Even though the EU appoints ambassadors, engages in summitry, decides on sanctions, and sometimes even sends troops abroad, it most definitely cannot be compared to a state. Moreover, European foreign policy cannot even be compared to other projects of European integration such as trade or monetary policy. In these areas competencies are transferred

to Brussels or Frankfurt and common European institutions exercise functions that once belonged to member states. In foreign and security policy, common action at the EU level coexists with 27 national foreign policies, perceived by some member states to be indispensible elements of national sovereignty and identity.

In spite of these structural constraints, EU foreign policymaking has gone through important developments since its inception in the 1970s. The level of activity has increased greatly. The scope has been extended to security and defense, which used to be taboo subjects, and public support for establishing the EU as a real international actor has grown significantly.

Three factors determine the further development of the EU's foreign policy:

1. Incremental reforms through treaty change. Jean Monnet's old dictum that integration requires institutions and timelines still holds true.

2. The internal dynamism of European integration that also drives its external policies.

3. The external challenges the EU faces, which require and stimulate an appropriate response.

The Lisbon Treaty foreign policy provisions represent the most ambitious effort at institutional reform in this area so far. The treaty is hardly revolutionary in character. The duality between EU foreign policy and that of members remains. Nor did Lisbon change the intergovernmental character of EU foreign policy or the consensus principle. But by strengthening the position of the High Representative, who replaces the rotating presidency and also assumes the functions of the External Affairs Commissioner, and through the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS), Lisbon provides a new institutional framework that offers the potential of a more coherent and effective policy. Whether this potential is actually utilized, however, will depend on the way the new provisions are implemented. Lisbon could signify a more effective EU foreign policy, but it can also mean stagnation or even decline.

The overall dynamic of European integration is obviously a key factor in this regard. If you have a common market with binding standards for 500 million people, a common currency, and an area without internal border controls (Schengen), you will inevitably have to manage the external implications of all this "commonness." You will need effective mechanisms to defend the common interests in these areas at the international level and your neighbors and partners in other regions for their part will seek to engage you on these issues bilaterally and multilaterally. And this "spillover" of the internal progress in European integration into external relations almost inevitably also becomes interconnected with the more traditional aspects of foreign and security policy.

While the Lisbon foreign policy reforms were thus meant to respond to the deepening of European integration achieved over the past decade, their implementation is overshadowed by the deep and persistent current crisis of the EU. The financial, economic, and national debt crises of the last three years and the ongoing struggle to save the common currency constitute the worst possible context for a new departure in foreign policy. Permanent economic crisis management leaves little room for foreign policy on the agenda of policymakers. The pervasive sense of crisis saps the confidence needed for new ventures and the massive budgetary constraints faced by member states and the EU starve the new Lisbon structures of resources. Foreign policy costs money. Very little money means very little foreign policy.

External challenges are the third factor determining the development of European foreign policy.

The postmodern harmony and stability that reign over major parts of the European continent—in and of itself the greatest achievement of European integration—contrast with highly unstable and volatile situations in many other parts of the world. And as a result of globalization, the impact of developments in these regions on the security of EU member states is greater than ever before. Uprisings in Northern Africa can produce migration flows, which as a result of the Schengen Agreement, impact on all EU member states. Religious strife in South Asia can produce terrorist threats in Scandinavia. Piracy around the Horn of Africa

can have important economic repercussions everywhere in the EU. Individually, member states can do relatively little about these developments. Only collective action on a regional and sometimes on a global level can have a significant impact.

In terms of its size, wealth, and overall resources, the EU as a whole certainly has the potential to have a significant influence on developments across the globe. At present however, due to the structural underdevelopment of EU foreign policy, the EU hardly ever succeeds in bringing its collective strength to bear and contributing to outcomes that correspond to European interests and values.

As regrettable as this deficit is today, it is bound to worsen in the future. The countries in the EU today collectively represented 15 percent of the world population in 1950, 7 percent today, and will represent 5 percent in 2050. In terms of their share of world GDP they had 28 percent in 1950, 21 percent today, and will have around 18 percent in 2050. Similar trends can be identified in many areas ranging from technological innovation to military power. They amount to a fundamental rebalancing of the international system as other continents catch up with Europe's previously privileged position. While Europe's overall situation remains enviable by most standards, its weight on the global scales is clearly diminishing. And what is true for the EU as a whole applies in even greater measure to the individual member states. Even traditional great powers such as Great Britain, France, and Germany will experience an accelerating decline in influence over the coming decades. If Europe wishes to play an important role in shaping the global decisions of the future, it will have to get better organized and act more coherently and effectively.

A more effective European foreign policy is no longer a dream of European enthusiasts but a necessary response to concrete changes in the international system. The Lisbon Treaty provides not a perfect but a serviceable blueprint for such a better foreign policy. But only a Union that deals successfully with the current crisis will have the confidence and strength to implement it in a credible fashion and allow the EU to finally get its international act together.

STEFAN LEHNE *is a visiting scholar at Carnegie Europe in Brussels. He was formerly the political director of the Austrian Ministry for European and International Affairs and also served as a director in the Council of the European Union's Directorate General for External and Politico-Military Affairs.*

SEPTEMBER 28, 2011

THE FAILURE OF SOFT POWER

JUDY DEMPSEY

Europeans have long believed soft power to be the best instrument to promote their values and their security.

They have a strong sense of moral superiority about it, particularly when looking at hard, or military, power.

Military action is something that the Europeans leave to the United States, Britain, and France. Even if it wanted to, the European Union cannot do it. It lacks the basic capabilities, such as heavy airlift and logistics. It lacks an integrated defense policy for armament procurement. It also lacks a security strategy that includes the use of hard power as an option.

The soft power instruments that Europeans have used over the years consist of development aid and civilian assistance, such as training the police and judiciary in some countries. The Europeans also sometimes couple soft power with trade incentives or with sanctions. Above all, they pride themselves on basing their actions on the defense of human rights, which are, at least officially, at the core of Europe's value system.

But Europe's record in making soft power the cornerstone of its security strategy has been patchy. It has been worked incredibly well in Eastern Europe. Enlargement with its plethora of promises and incentives is soft power at its most powerful. But Europe cannot enlarge to the rest of the world.

That is where Europe's soft power policies have had so little, if any, success.

Take Iran.

Years of negotiations with Iran to get it to abandon its nuclear ambitions have gotten the Europeans nowhere. Promises of technical assistance and closer economic cooperation have had no impact on the regime in Tehran, even though some of the sanctions are biting.

The reason why the Europeans have failed is because Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is just too stubborn. He seems determined to develop a nuclear military capability for Iran's own geostrategic interests no matter what the cost to his people. Soft power can find no grip there.

Bosnia-Herzegovina is another case where the instrument has failed. Fifteen years after the Dayton accords that ended the civil war in the former Yugoslavia, Bosnia is mired in corruption and misrule. This is despite the presence of a large EU police force, not to mention the billions of euros the European taxpayer has poured into this tiny country. The state that the EU is trying to build has never really been accepted by the ethnic communities living there. And the EU is not prepared to stop the bullying and separatist tactics of the Bosnian Serbs in particular.

Afghanistan is another stain on the EU's soft power record. There, the Europeans have done too little and too late, wasting the initial good will of the Afghan people after the Taliban regime was overthrown in 2001. While the United States and its coalition forces were distracted by the war in Iraq, the Europeans did little to fill the gap left in Afghanistan. Europe's most abject failure is its police-training mission there. It is still underfinanced and understaffed. What a shame for what should have been a stellar example of the EU's use of soft power.

And there is North Africa and the Middle East. Europe's record in colluding with dictators in the region before the Arab Spring is well known. Now would be the chance to repair its credibility by putting its soft power to work.

It would not require much.

First of all, Europe would have to become much more outspoken and committed in its defense of human rights. How? It would need to do more to support the opposition to dictatorial regimes. For instance, it could support political prisoners in Iran by discreetly providing aid or and even legal assistance to their families. Europe should also open its doors to asylum seekers from these countries. That's not idealism. This is about Europe defending its human rights values.

Then there is trade. The EU must open up to trade from North Africa and the Middle East. This is crucial for economic reform, prosperity, and the development of a vibrant middle class that would strengthen stability and security across the Mediterranean.

Borders, too, should gradually be opened despite the growing anti-immigration movements across Europe. Young people from North Africa and the Middle East must be allowed to travel to Europe and they must have access to education there. Indeed, the Arab Spring presents an ideal opportunity for the EU's Erasmus higher education programs to take the initiative. Trade and education in the Middle East are very much in Europe's long-term strategic interests.

Development aid should no longer be channeled to such a large extent to state-controlled organizations. Of course, it is naïve to think that aid targeted for civil society movements would be free from corruption or misuse. It would need rigorous monitoring, too. Once the EU's external services finds its feet, there is no reason why there could not be a specialized civil society department, with well-trained staff, set up in the new embassies.

Also, Europe could do much more to get police and judicial missions off the ground quickly. This certainly requires more money but, even more

importantly, a core group of experts in every country ready to pack their bags at short notice.

But above all, soft power requires sustained attention. Europe's political leaders need to do something that is very difficult when so many issues compete for their time: They need to keep their eye on the burgeoning civil societies in their greater neighborhood, as they did on Eastern Europe when those countries were getting ready to join the EU.

None of this will be easy, but the EU needs to do it if it is serious about making soft power work to defend human rights. Of course, neither soft power nor, indeed, hard power is a panacea. But the Arab Spring could be Europe's chance to restore its credibility. Failure to do so would mean the long-term erosion of Europe's values and its own security.

JUDY DEMPSEY *is senior correspondent, Europe, for the* International Herald Tribune.

SEPTEMBER 29, 2011

A NEW EQUATION FOR THE TRANSATLANTIC ALLIANCE

JACKSON JANES

Europe has always been more than the sum of its parts. For more than a thousand years, it has been an evolving idea. Today the European idea is closer to what has been envisioned along the way than at any time in history. Within the wink of an historical eye—a half century—Europe has emerged as one of the greatest experiments in international affairs. A group of 27 states has created structures and policies which form a unique blend of markets, a common currency, and the capabilities to pool national sovereignty for the good of the union of the half billion people they represent. Its success can be measured by the desire of many more states waiting and wishing to join this club, for which they must work hard to qualify.

Amid all these accomplishments, Europe is still evolving with accompanying debates and constant discussions about its next steps. As the debate over the Lisbon Treaty made clear, the European Union is still made up of member states developing forms of shared sovereignty while wanting to maintain some balance of authority among themselves and the governance of the EU. European integration continues to increase its

reach and impact on the domestic structures of the member states. This has not been without resistance. If it is going to be capable of generating legitimacy and therefore the ability to govern at the European level, there is a need to find new equations of representative and participatory democracy within the framework of the EU.

As a historical comparison, the experience of the United States in the nineteenth century might be helpful. Before the Civil War, the United States was referred to in the plural, as in "The United States are…." After the Civil War assured the preservation of the country, the verb turned to "is," underlining the concept of the United States as one country. Europe may not be able to aspire to becoming a United States of Europe for now, but the aspiration of achieving a sense of unified purpose behind the idea of Europe has long been at the foundation of the European movement.

An important dimension in the European evolution includes the need to examine the role of the EU on the global stage. The evolution of the last fifty years has seen the mission of European integration move through a period following World War II in which the priority moved from establishing a framework of peace and order on a continent which had known centuries of war, to the need for the EU to see itself as part of a transforming global order, one in which it can and must play an important role as a strategic Europe.

The defining cornerstones of the European movement have included the commitment to the rule of law, conflict resolution, the priority of human rights, and the commitment to shared sovereignty and multi-level governance to deal with shared challenges and opportunities. While that has defined Europe in its efforts to date, today and tomorrow will require that Europe not only live up to its own standards but that it also meet its responsibilities on the global stage.

While those goals are enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty and institutionalized in the creation of a High Representative for Foreign Policy and the European External Action Service, full implementation will be slow to take effect. The track record of European integration is one of process leading to consensus which leads to policy. Because it involves multiple

decisionmaking centers, it can be a frustrating experience for those watching from the outside. Yet the weight and influence of the EU generates significant capacities of value not only to the EU members but to the multiple partners it interacts with around the globe.

Seen from an American perspective, Europe is a unique, important, and also difficult partner across a range of shared challenges and opportunities. There is an enormous set of interests which bind the United States and Europe together, while others underscore differences. Just as the vast network of transatlantic economic ties dwarf all others, they also generate frictions in their interdependence and asymmetries. There are shared sets of values and goals in a world shaped by both threats and needs that impact the entire globe, even though there are divergent approaches to pursuing them: energy supplies, nuclear proliferation, an endangered climate, the pathology of terrorism, and the increasing demands of billions of people who want an equitable share of the world's resources and opportunities—all these represent the twenty-first century agenda for Europe and the United States.

In all of these issues, the United States and the EU are challenged to think and act as global players. Just as globalization is changing the nature and implementation of national power and influence, the United States and Europe can bring unique combinations of resources to deal with the need for a security framework in which both sides have a stake and shared capabilities. For more than sixty years, that point has been defined by NATO. But as the EU has been working to enhance its ability to make viable decisions ranging from the economic to the political and military, the challenges of meshing the two institutions remain significant. They have been aggravated by the economic recessions and the domestic arguments on both sides of the Atlantic over priorities at home and abroad.

This comes at a time when there is a problem in generating a defining mission for mobilizing the power and resources of the transatlantic community. During the Cold War, that mission was defined as the defense of freedom through common security. During the past two decades, with a transformed global landscape, that mission has become a more compli-

cated process in the face of a diffusion of threats, challenges, and power itself. Europe became more immersed in its own process of deepening and expansion while the United States, particularly after the September 11 attacks, became more immersed in its own struggles to develop a new understanding of both vulnerability and global capacities to respond to a changing equation of American power, purpose, and influence.

The centrifugal forces emerging from these trends have pushed and pulled on transatlantic relations, making consensus building on both sides of the Atlantic as difficult as across the ocean. This has made finding a shared strategic direction difficult. Yet we are challenged to build an equitable equation between burden-sharing, decisionmaking, and power-sharing in the changing framework of a world in which boundaries of many kinds erode in the face of an increasingly complex web of interdependence. Such an equation was formed after World War II and created the foundations on which today's EU and the transatlantic alliance were to be built. As a result, some of those former boundaries have become bridges, such as in Europe, where Cold War divisions were replaced by decisions to build a larger, more inclusive community of nations.

Today there is a need for a new equation and it can now be built with a new basis of partnership, one in which the European side can and must be capable of defining and implementing a strategic role for itself, confident of its capabilities and values, aware of its interests, and able to define its parameters. There are multiple platforms on which to exercise this capacity, well beyond Europe, be it in the Middle East, Africa, in relations with Russia, or within the web of international organizations in which the EU and its individual members play a critically important role. And there is a degree of urgency in many cases, which can often outpace the process of European decisionmaking.

Within the EU, it will be a complex debate for some time to come as to how that strategic role will be realized. And that debate cannot be contained within the closed quarters of political elites but must be carried out in the public squares and fora at multiple levels if the results are to both be understood and supported by the European community at large.

The United States must also pay close attention. But Europe should be taken for what it says it wishes to be and held up to its own standards. A strategic Europe will have the capability to think beyond the focus on itself and to lift its gaze, capacities, and engagements beyond its borders and boundaries of today to a global arena tomorrow. In doing so, the European idea will continue to evolve and will also continue to be more than the sum of its parts.

JACKSON JANES *is the executive director of the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies at the Johns Hopkins University.*

SEPTEMBER 30, 2011

EUROPE'S MULTIPOLAR NEIGHBORHOOD

MARK LEONARD

Much of the rhetoric following the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt implied that a "Berlin Wall" had collapsed in the Mediterranean and that the European Union should fall back on its tried and tested model of transition to help its southern neighbors become democratic—in the same way that it reached out to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe after the Cold War. But rather than copying the legacy of 1989—and offering an anemic and underfunded copy of the enlargement process minus the benefit of membership—it is time for the EU to develop a more political and differentiated approach to its southern neighborhood. This week, the European Commission announced another €350 million package to support the Arab Spring. Like the earlier two strategies, it shows how Baroness Ashton has skillfully tried to push the envelope of what cash-strapped and introverted EU governments are willing to do. However, it may now be time to revisit rather than re-enforce the core principles of the European Neighbourhood Policy.

A NEW NEIGHBORHOOD

The big story of 1989 was about a "return to Europe" for countries that did not just want to deepen their links with the EU; they wanted to transform themselves to become the EU. The Arab world—on the other hand—is being reshaped by the intersection of three big trends—the global political awakening, the shift of power from East to West, and the long tail of the Great Recession—which are combining to change the political and economic landscape in ways that are challenging to the EU and its policy framework for building "deep democracy" and economic development.

After 1989, democratization and Westernization went hand in hand. When the countries of Eastern Europe threw off autocratic rule, they wanted to join the West. But now that Arab countries are democratizing, they are not turning toward the West. In many ways they are going through a "second decolonization," emancipating themselves from Western client states in the same way that earlier generations freed themselves from Western rule. Although the revolutionaries themselves may have been using Facebook and working for Google, the politics they have unleashed will be challenging for the West. I do not think we will necessarily see fundamentalist Islamists coming to power across the region—but in Egypt we can already see some of the challenges in the result of the referendum and some of the early moves on foreign policy. It stands to reason that the "dignity revolutions" will not just be about emancipation from dictatorship, but also from Western rules and practices.

The economic picture is also challenging for the EU—showing the combined impacts of the Great Recession and the power shift. It is clear that the optimism of the revolutions is already leading to an economic slump because of a collapse in tourist revenues, capital flight, and rising inflation. Experts predict that gross domestic product (GDP) growth in non-oil countries will go from 4.5 percent in 2010 to a 0.5 percent decline in 2011. These economic problems—coupled with the underlying forces of demography, rising inequality, unemployment, and corruption—could lead to a crisis of expectations that overwhelms the Arab Spring.

But a cash-strapped EU has had an underwhelming response to the crisis, promising just €5.8 billion—approximately $8 billion—when Egypt alone has a debt of over $80 billion. When the G8 met in May, Western powers promised a mere $10 billion, while urging Gulf oil states to give $10 billion and the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to provide another $20 billion of loans. There is a lot that the West, and particularly the EU, can do—from opening its markets to agricultural products, to helping with investment vehicles for small- and medium-sized enterprises, and eventually moving toward a customs union—but the timid response so far will mean that other powers such as the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) and China will probably play an ever more important role as an economic forces in the region.

However, it is not just the threat of member states adopting a miserly approach to the promises they have made on money, markets, and mobility that could make the EU underperform. There is also a threat that it will not take advantage of the Arab revolts to rethink its approach to the neighborhood. The problem with the EU's approach is that it is modeled on the approach to Eastern Europe where we were the main economic and political power; where countries were desperate to adopt our values; and where the end-goal of membership made it worthwhile to go through the painful process of transition.

A NEW NEIGHBORHOOD POLICY

None of these conditions applies in the southern neighborhood. The European Commission's strategies are based on the model of enlargement-lite—where the EU signs action plans for reform with the countries on its periphery, monitors their performance, and rewards their success with extra money, markets, or mobility—"more for more." The trouble with this approach is that it is difficult to deliver and driven more by the needs of the European suppliers—the European Commission bureaucrats who oversaw the enlargement process—than local demand. The EU has a chance to review its approach to the neighborhood across four different dimensions:

- **Real differentiation**: There should be a few common elements in the approach to all of our neighbors: upgraded political dialogue; support for free and fair elections (with all the tools that EU has developed); and support for civil society. Beyond that we should look at countries on an individual basis and develop bilateral relations with them based on a short list of pressing needs.

- **Scrap the lengthy action plans**: Given that none of the EU's southern neighbors will join the Union, it would make sense for the EU to abandon its current approach, which is based on lengthy action plans modeled on the membership process. In their place, the EU could sign a series of sectorial development strategies. For one or two countries—maybe Moldova in the eastern neighborhood or Tunisia in the southern neighborhood—it may make sense to develop a model of enlargement-lite. In order to deliver this, the EU should radically change the make-up of its personnel in the region and its spending priorities.

- **Involve member states**: To move from a bureaucratic to a political approach, the high representative for foreign affairs and security policy will need to find creative ways of linking the EU's policies and approaches to those of the member states. This is politically sensitive as it is easy to alienate excluded member states and there are strong reasons not to want to allow the eastern or southern neighborhoods to become the *chasse gardée* of their closest neighbors. One idea would be for Baroness Ashton to look to the model the G8 set up for Afghanistan, asking each foreign minister to lead on a substantive area—rule of law, media reform, policing, and election support—in some of the key countries. It is also important to embrace some political symbolism.

- **Reach out beyond a "European" Neighbourhood Policy**: The area surrounding the EU is moving from being a "European neighbourhood" to a more multipolar one, where different political and economic models vie for attention. In this more competitive environment, the EU still has much to offer but is likely to maximize its influence by reaching out to other players such as Turkey, the United

States, and the GCC and finding institutionalized ways of working together.

The destabilization of Europe's periphery puts the EU in a dramatically different position to the status it enjoyed at the end of the last century. The EU is still the most significant source of trade and investment for all its neighbors to the south and east, but this is now a competitive rather than a "European neighbourhood." The EU therefore needs to develop a real foreign policy—using national and collective sticks and carrots to support political transition and advance European interests. Let us hope that they put the current approach behind them and opt for a more radical rethink of our approach to the region.

MARK LEONARD *is the co-founder and director of the European Council on Foreign Relations.*

OCTOBER 3, 2011

ENDS, MEANS, AND MEANING

SVEN BISCOP

A European External Action Service that is a foreign, development, and defense ministry all in one. A much stronger position for the High Representative, foreign minister in all but name, chairing the Foreign Affairs Council. Permanent Structured Cooperation to accelerate military capability development. These are just some of the instruments introduced by the Lisbon Treaty which hold great promise for a dynamic European Union foreign policy.

But they are just that: instruments, tools, means. Means only acquire *meaning* if they serve an end. That, unfortunately, is less clear. An External Action Service—to achieve what exactly? If asked what EU foreign policy is about these days, no answer readily comes to mind. The EU lacks clear foreign policy priorities.

That doesn't mean that the EU is not active. Quite the contrary. Europe invests a huge diplomatic, economic, military, and civilian effort in many important issues. But in spite of that, few see the EU as the game-changer on the key issues of the day. Its efforts are not focused enough and it lacks a clear strategic narrative.

The EU does have a strategic concept, a foreign policy *idea*. The European Security Strategy starts from the philosophy that durable stability can only be guaranteed where security, prosperity, democracy, and equality are guaranteed to all citizens. Promoting those four core values in the rest of the world, therefore, is the best way to safeguard them for ourselves. To that end, the Union pursues a holistic, preventive, and multilateral foreign policy: putting to use in an integrated way the full range of instruments of external action, to address the root causes of instability and conflict, in partnership with others.

This tells us *how* to do things—but Europe is much less clear on what to do. The method appears sound, but the EU needs to identify the key foreign policy issues on which to apply it as a matter of priority.

The starting point of any such reflection is the Union's vital interests:

- Defense against any military threat to our territory.
- Open lines of communication and trade (in physical as well as in cyberspace).
- A secure supply of energy and other vital natural resources.
- A sustainable environment.
- Manageable migration flows.
- The maintenance of international law and of universally agreed rights.
- Preserving the autonomy of our decisionmaking.

Three issues stand out as being both the most strategic in regards to our vital interests and the most in need of deepening our strategic thinking.

First, the ***European Neighbourhood Policy***. Long before the Arab Spring it was clear that the EU was pursuing a false stability in its southern neighborhood, negating its own strategic concept. Rather than promoting core values, Europe worked with any regime, regardless of its human rights record, as long as there was cooperation on terrorism, migration,

and energy. In reality, our authoritarian neighbors are inherently unstable because of the huge internal gap between the haves and the have-nots. That would in any case have led to an eruption at some point. Now revolution is upon us, in spite of, rather than thanks to, our policies. The good thing is this proves that the core values we should have promoted are indeed universal: where they are not respected, revolt will ensue.

Those southern neighbors that already were or that now emerge as democracies deserve our real support, notably in terms of investment. Large-scale public infrastructure works can generate durable economic development, are guaranteed to benefit the local population, and are in the interest of Europe. The United Nations, the international financial institutions, and the Arab League must be our partners in this. For those countries that remain autocratic, conditionality must be effectively applied. Elections that earned the Belarusan regime sanctions previously earned the Tunisian regime congratulations—that must change.

Second, ***relations with the other big powers***. The EU has ten so-called strategic partnerships with other global players. But without a strategy, those do not make much sense. Only when the Union knows which strategic objectives it aims to pursue can it identify which issues are vital to take up with which other power. If the EU has grand ambitions in managing climate change, for example, then China is a vital player; but if Europe were to abandon that ambition, then we don't need a dialogue with China. In other words, the strategic partnerships should not be used exclusively as instruments of bilateral relations. Their real added value lies in their usefulness to promote our overall vital interests.

Finally, ***global crisis management***. Europeans like to think of themselves as security providers, but the Libyan crisis demonstrated that actually we lack any collective idea of what our ambition as a security actor is. Why does Europe undertake the military and civilian operations that it does? And why in other cases does it refrain from action? The answers to these questions would amount to a civilian-military strategy for the Common Security and Defence Policy. Without strategy, we can never be sure that the operations we do take are indeed the most relevant and important. And we cannot direct the operations we do undertake to achieve the

desired strategic effect. We should make clear the priority regions and issues for which we must plan and prepare. To stay in tune with today's higher level of crisis management activity, the existing military Headline Goal has to be interpreted broadly. The aim to deploy a corps (of 50,000 to 60,000 troops) should be understood as a deployment that EU member states must be able to undertake at any one time *over and above ongoing operations*. Then the EU would be able to deal with every eventuality.

The EU needs to decide for itself where it wants to make its mark. Only then can it generate the necessary drive and sense of purpose that will give meaning to the External Action Service.

SVEN BISCOP *is the director of the Europe in the World Program at Egmont-Royal Institute for International Relations in Brussels and a visiting professor at Ghent University and at the College of Europe in Bruges.*

OCTOBER 4, 2011

STRATEGIC EUROPE REVISITED: A TRANSATLANTIC VIEW

IAN LESSER

Europe is the original strategic actor—and that may be part of the problem. If we define "strategic" as a concern for vital interests and objectives, broadly defined, Europe has been in the strategy business for a very long time. From Mediterranean empires, to the rise of modern nation states, to the industrial revolution and the globalization of European competition, Europe has led the intellectual debate about geopolitics and strategy. It has also experienced the dramatic costs of strategic ambition as well as the failure to think strategically. I hope my former RAND colleagues will forgive me if I say that, even during the Cold War, much of the best strategic thinking was to be found in Europe. Europe has a long history of thinking and acting strategically. But this history, especially when it comes to questions of national power, is also highly fraught.

For the American foreign policy establishment, the desirability of a strategic Europe is no longer a topic for debate. Twenty years ago, there were still doubters fearful of the implications of a more cohesive Europe for U.S. interests, and not least, the role of NATO. Today, a stronger European partner is widely seen as serving core American interests and a

stronger European Union defense capability is more likely to save NATO than drive it out of business.

Assuming that Europe (including key EU institutions) is able to commit the political, human, and financial resources to build a serious capacity for strategic action—still an open question under prevailing economic conditions—what would this imply? What are the priorities? From a transatlantic perch, several elements stand out.

First, environment shaping will matter as much or more than crisis management. There has been a natural tendency to measure Europe's strategic capacity in terms of crisis response. This is understandable given the recent experience in the Balkans, North Africa, and elsewhere on the European periphery. Iraq and Afghanistan have also been part of the equation. But this is only part of the picture, and perhaps not the most important part. Beyond crisis management, a strategic Europe needs to be concerned with shaping the strategic environment in ways that serve European security interests over time. There may be some truth to the observation that Europe qua Europe has only had one real foreign policy instrument—enlargement. But this is actually saying a great deal, given the transforming effect of both EU and NATO enlargement on the geopolitics of Central and Eastern Europe.

There is still unfinished business on the enlargement front in the Balkans. But the key challenge in this arena will be Turkey. Turkey can be a key partner for Europe in shaping the environment to Europe's south and east, especially in light of the ongoing revolutions in the Middle East and North Africa. And the prospect of eventual Turkish membership in the EU retains considerable power to shape Turkish society, notwithstanding the very troubled state of Turkey-EU relations. The truth is, Turkey's candidacy was always a long-term, open-ended project. Membership may be the ultimate goal, but the core strategic interest when seen from Brussels, Ankara, or Washington, is to ensure the continued convergence of Turkey and the "West," sector-by-sector, policy-by-policy. This process of convergence is centuries old. It is likely to continue regardless of the pace of Turkish accession or affinity with the Muslim world. In the meantime, Europe needs to find a way of including Ankara as a foreign and security

policy partner, decoupled if need be, from the membership process. An unpalatable concept for some, but it will be essential to address challenges in Syria, Iran, and elsewhere.

Second, a strategic Europe will need to look beyond the neighborhood to develop a shared understanding of and approach to global shifts. What will the rise of China, India, and Brazil mean for European interests? The attention of the American "strategic class"—many of whom matured in a European security context—has shifted substantially to Asia. The political and commercial forces driving this diversification of American strategic attention are at play in Europe, too. Even in an Atlantic context, Europe will need to think more imaginatively about transatlantic relations, including a more comprehensive approach in which Brazil, South Africa, and even Morocco can be accommodated. This should be just as much of a priority for Washington.

Third, modern strategy needs to be sustainable. This was possible in the context of EU and NATO enlargement, both of which derived great impetus from the desire to seal the end of the Cold War in geopolitical and normative terms. It also helped that the decade of enlargement coincided with a period of strong growth, economic optimism, and relatively weak nationalism. Today, big environment shaping projects on Europe's periphery will be more difficult to sustain. Intervention in Libya is the focus of public debate, rather than the more important and expensive project of reinventing Europe's Mediterranean strategy as a whole. Yet, the postrevolutionary environment across the Mediterranean will be a leading influence on Europe's future. The United States has consistently failed to develop a strategic approach to Mexico. Perhaps Europe can do better in its near abroad?

Finally, American complaints about Europe's defense spending and indecisiveness may be beside the point. European societies simply will not spend a great deal more on defense under current conditions, and Europe's institutional arrangements for foreign policy decisionmaking may never mirror those of the United States (where we have some problems of our own). Europe's ability to manage the financial crises in southern Europe, and to limit the consequences for global financial stability, may

ultimately be more important to American strategic interests than the level of European contributions in Afghanistan or the tempo of European air operations in Libya. In this sphere, at least, Europe is already a leading strategic actor.

IAN LESSER *is the executive director of the German Marshall Fund's Transatlantic Center in Brussels. The views expressed here are the author's own and not those of GMF.*

16

OCTOBER 5, 2011

STRATEGIC EUROPE: STILL A CIVILIAN POWER

ROBIN NIBLETT

To be strategic, a state needs to be able to define its long-term interests and then apply the means at its disposal to achieve the ends that further those interests. Is the term "strategic Europe" then a contradiction in terms? In creating the European Union—its institutions, the single market, euro currency, and *acquis* of shared laws, regulations, and decisionmaking processes—a majority of European states have indeed acted strategically over the past fifty years. They have overcome the regional political imbalances that led to two world wars and are attempting to confront together the ever-changing external risks to their domestic security and prosperity, whether from the rise of new economic powers, financial instability, terrorism, or illegal migration. By diluting aspects of their domestic sovereignty, EU member states have been able to strengthen their economies and protect their societies in ways that would never have been possible if they had acted alone.

Where the EU and its member states have rarely acted strategically is in applying all of the means at their disposal to try to shape the world beyond the EU's borders. The two important exceptions to this have

been the EU's enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe and EU trade policy. The former transformed the geopolitical map of Europe. The latter, although contradictory and focused on the short term at times, has contributed to market opening and wealth creation across the world.

European foreign and security policymaking, however, remains a sovereign and inter-governmental exercise. The political and democratic reasons for this arrangement are self-evident. But the result is that the EU struggles to act or to be perceived as a strategic actor on the world stage. Instead, the EU remains principally a "civilian power"—using the leverage of access to or exclusion from its large domestic market, alongside a dominant position in economic standards-setting and regulatory design, to achieve economic advantage or to try to modify the behavior of other governments.

RESPONDING TO DOMESTIC VULNERABILITIES

Fifty years after the Treaty of Rome established the European Economic Community, EU member states still have the greatest potential to act strategically when they look inward toward their shared domestic vulnerabilities. These vulnerabilities tend to take three forms. The first is economic and is a result of the steady fall in the relative competitiveness of many parts of Europe when compared to rising economic powers across Asia and, increasingly, Latin America. Stung into action by the fallout from the global financial crisis, which exposed the extent of this loss of competitiveness for a large proportion of the EU, European governments and EU institutions are working around the clock to prevent the collapse of the eurozone and a fall into long-term economic stagnation. There is a growing risk that the speed with which governments and societies must react and the depth of reform necessary to address these challenges are driving EU member states apart rather than together. On the other hand, the recent negotiation of new processes for fiscal and macroeconomic coordination among EU members points to a continuing sense of common strategic purpose.

The second shared vulnerability emanates from the EU's "neighborhood," including Eastern Europe, Russia, the Caucasus, the Middle East,

and North Africa. This neighborhood can act as a conduit for a range of domestic risks to EU member governments and societies, such as illegal immigration, organized crime, terrorist attacks, and energy insecurity. EU member states have responded to these common domestic vulnerabilities, improving levels of cooperation on internal security, policing, and justice over the past ten years, as well as the current effort to build a more interconnected and resilient European energy infrastructure.

The third shared domestic vulnerability is to major global trends, such as international financial instability or the effects of climate change. EU members have jointly negotiated common EU policies on financial and climate-related risks. New EU authorities to oversee European banks, securities, insurance, and pensions, along with the European Systemic Risk Board, are designed to reduce the EU financial system's vulnerabilities to external shocks. And in the area of climate change, the EU is moving forward with ambitious plans to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by 20 percent, increase the renewable proportion of the energy mix by 20 percent, and cut energy consumption by 20 percent, all by 2020. Although these goals were adopted in part to set an international example, they are also designed to lessen the EU's exposure to rising fossil fuel costs and enable European companies to be at the cutting edge of renewable energy technologies and industries.

THE EU'S BROADER STRATEGIC AMBITIONS

To be considered a strategic actor, however, the EU cannot simply react internally to the problems beyond its borders. It should also use the means at its disposal to try to shape its external environment. Here the EU's record is far more mixed. The fact is that different EU member states have different geographic priorities when it comes to their foreign policy—Central European states are more focused on Eastern Europe and Russia; Spain, France, and Italy more on North Africa and the Middle East; Greece on the Balkans and Turkey; the UK on Afghanistan and Pakistan, and so on. EU member states also encompass different histories and cultures when it comes to undertaking military action abroad and in the types of defense expenditures that their societies will support. EU

member states tend, therefore, to prioritize different external risks and opportunities and, as a result, choose to retain an intergovernmental and sovereign approach to their foreign and security policies. And proposals for military specialization among EU member states or for the purchase of common weapon systems, which would maximize the impact of the EU's significant collective military force, have made little headway.

Consequently, the EU's external achievements have tended to be tactical rather than strategic. The EU has dispatched small civilian crisis management operations to Chad, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kosovo, and Aceh among other countries and regions in recent years to deal with a range of crises. The EU is also involved alongside NATO and others in tackling piracy off the coast of Somalia.

But the EU has not been the coherent and decisive actor one might have hoped for in the face of the major strategic challenges of the past ten to twenty years. It has taken a back-seat on the Arab-Israeli conflict; it was unable to craft policies to help North African states take a gradual rather than revolutionary path to reform; it remains divided in its policy towards Russia; it has failed so far to lead the emergence of an international agenda on climate change; and its much vaunted "strategic partnerships" with China and other emerging powers have tended to operate more as talking shops than instigators of change, either in the bilateral relationships or in the countries concerned.

The new procedures for foreign policy coordination contained in the Lisbon Treaty may make the EU's tactical presence more effective, not least through the creation of more integrated EU embassies around the world combining the EU's economic clout and some of its members' national diplomatic skills and leverage. But the treaty is still not designed to enable strategic action unless all member states sign up unequivocally for a common objective.

REMAINING A CIVILIAN POWER

So what path might the EU take towards being a more strategic actor? For the immediate future, the number one priority of the EU and its

member states must be to extricate themselves from their current state of economic crisis. It is futile to conjure the image of a "strategic Europe" until Europe regains a level of collective economic stability and dynamism relative to its main peers on the world stage.

While this may appear to be a tall order, the fact is that the EU's economic destiny still lies in its own hands. Despite facing structural problems including aging societies, shrinking workforces, the inability to integrate effectively the immigrants that it will require over the coming years, and entrenched but increasingly burdensome social welfare systems, the EU also has attributes that could cement its position alongside the United States, China, and possibly India as one of the poles of the global economy during this century. Even today, according to the World Economic Forum, five of the top ten of the world's most competitive economies are EU member states (Sweden, Germany, Finland, the Netherlands, and Denmark). These rankings reflect the EU's general—if not universal—strengths: European technology, design, brands, and business management; relative resource sufficiency when compared to the world's other existing or rising powers, especially for food and water; and resilient and open political systems with strong institutional balances in the judiciary, media, and civil society.

If EU member states can stabilize their economies and achieve a period of sustained growth, they will be in a position to use the magnetic force of the EU's enormous domestic market—500 million of the world's wealthiest savers and consumers—to try to engineer change in the world beyond Europe's borders. The EU and EU member states retain pivotal positions and experienced diplomats in all of the world's most important international economic and political institutions. They have the opportunity, therefore, to leverage their market power to help write the rules of global governance in an increasingly interdependent world, and draft new laws and standards for the transnational challenges, such as climate change, energy security, and financial regulation, that pose so many risks to the EU internally. EU members will still remain quick to use sanctions as a key tool of their external policy, even if the likely effects of such measures are uncertain at best—Syria being the latest example. But a more intelligent and strategic use of *access* to the single market might

also enable the EU to project growth and stability into its neighborhood, especially North Africa and the Middle East, and even beyond into some of the world's most fragile countries and regions that could be the sources of threats to European security in the future.

As far as one can see, therefore, a strategic Europe still needs to hone its skills at being a civilian power first and foremost. But in an interdependent world where economic clout will likely offer important forms of external influence, the EU retains the potential to be one of the decisive powers on the world stage in the twenty-first century.

ROBIN NIBLETT *is the director of Chatham House.*

OCTOBER 6, 2011

REAFFIRMING THE EUROPEAN MODEL

GEORGE PERKOVICH

I am not sure what "strategic Europe" means, but I think it has something to do with the projection of power. The question then becomes what sort of power can and should Europe project, and for what objectives?

Power is the capacity to achieve your preferences and not to have other people's preferences dictated on you. More ambitiously, power is the capacity to induce or coerce others to do what you want, or at least to feel they must compromise to accommodate your preferences.

Military power enables you to destroy people and things if they are threatening you or, potentially, if they don't do what you want. But the norms, laws, and interests of twenty-first-century Europe limit the utility of military power. Moreover, the major challenges on Europe's borders and beyond are challenges of "construction," not destruction. To facilitate political reform in the Arab world and greater employment opportunities for Arab youth. To stabilize and pacify Israel's relations with Palestine and other neighboring states. To motivate Iran's decision-makers to provide objective guarantees that their nuclear program is

peaceful and that Iran will be a constructive neighbor. To encourage Turkey to deploy its growing influence in ways that harmonize with Europe and do not conflict with it. To pull current and future Russian leaders toward Western values of the rule of law.

These and other challenges cannot be met at the point of a gun. Europe can influence their outcomes by the force of the example it sets and the economic investment and opportunities it provides. To do this, Europe needs first to reverse the course of recent events that cast doubt on its effectiveness as a union.

The greatest contribution Europe can make to strategic affairs would be to reaffirm its singular model of peaceful political, economic, and cultural integration. This model has come under stress thanks to the sovereign debt crisis, the disjunction between monetary union and political disunion, tensions over immigration and the assimilation of minorities, and divisions over NATO's missions and funding. If European states can reinvigorate their collective life, they will trigger the magnetic pull of envy and desire that makes others want to emulate Europe's civilizing features. They will also produce sufficient wealth to underwrite military capabilities and projection.

Think for a minute what makes people regard China as the next great global power. It is not the Chinese Air Force or the Chinese nuclear arsenal. It's the economy. Everything follows from that. What made the United States the most powerful state in the post–World War II period was economic primacy. Wealth and technological prowess then provided the wherewithal for a massive and incomparable military. This military superiority was made possible by unrivalled research and development institutions, which themselves often benefited from liberal immigration policies and a society that provides more opportunities for upward mobility than any other. Similarly, Europe's greatest "strategic" achievement in the past thirty years has been the mostly peaceful liberation and integration of its eastern half. Bombs were dropped in Bosnia and Serbia, but the real power was force of example and pull of wealth.

If putting Europe's internal house in better order is a mission too "soft" and does not satisfy the desire for harder stuff, let me suggest a simple "hard" security agenda: The twenty-two NATO states (out of twenty-eight total) that do not dedicate at least 2 percent of their GDP to defense should change this. More importantly, European states could actually address the reality that they must rationally and purposefully specialize the functions and capabilities their militaries can provide for the common defense. Current redundancies are self-defeating. Such reforms are what heroic CEOs do when they take over a new business, even if they are not the dreams of political or strategic heroes. Yet, which domain is more important today?

GEORGE PERKOVICH *is vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.*

18

OCTOBER 7, 2011

FOREIGN POLICY IN THE AGE OF AUSTERITY: RESTORING EUROPE'S ECONOMIC STRENGTH

MARTA DASSÙ

There can be no effective foreign policy or external projection for Europe unless the core economic strength and vitality of the continent are restored. We all live in an era of austerity, but Europe inhabits a world where its influence will steeply decline if current trends continue.

One of the unintended consequences of the fiscal crisis now under way—on both sides of the Atlantic—is the acceleration of a pre-existing trend: the end of American tutelage over Europe's security. If there was any lingering doubt more than two decades after the end of the Cold War, the Libyan crisis—in which long-term tendencies and contingent factors intersected to leave the Europeans without clear U.S. "leadership"—is the final turning point.

How to deal with Libya—whatever happens to Qaddafi—is in fact a European responsibility. This is because history has started moving again in North Africa, despite the resilience of conservative forces across the region. Libya is a key test case precisely because the Europeans will have to live with the outcome of the war and its regional ramifications, regardless of

the economic and political constraints that make them reluctant to take on new international responsibilities. In other words, while Washington has the option to pass the buck to its old allies, Europe lacks such a luxury.

Due to energy interests, migration concerns, and sheer geographic proximity, North Africa has become essential to Europe's security. The Libya conflict, whatever the motivations for our policy choices, stands to confirm this assessment. The management of this particular crisis also raises three crucial issues for the future of European security: first, assuming the primary responsibilities that we have inherited from the United States will be problematic, in light of the capability gaps and shortfalls that have been in full display. Second, the United Kingdom and France will strive to firmly establish their joint leadership, but it remains to be seen whether the rest of the European Union—starting with Germany, Italy, Poland—will accept this arrangement. And third, there is an overall question about the sustainability—and thus the feasibility—of complex security and stabilization interventions considering the major resource constraints and a lack of domestic consensus.

In this context of financial stringency, the case for a regional and rather selective—as opposed to global and open-ended—security role for Europe becomes stronger than ever. Only by concentrating its energies and specializing in some areas can aggregate Europe—whatever the format—hope to exert significant influence over events along its troublesome Eastern and Southeastern periphery.

This would also entail a pragmatic division of labor among EU members on the basis of their geographical and historical sensitivities, whereby there will be lead countries and core groups depending on the crisis or issue at hand. The precedents abound, from the Balkans to Lebanon to Libya, and even the institutional setup of the Lisbon Treaty allows for such a solution.

Yet for Europe to be effective externally, one obvious precondition must be met: the EU must survive its key economic challenges.

When an economic crisis in a country like Greece can lead the euro to the edge of the abyss, it is obvious that the European construction is not working properly.

Let us be honest. Resolving the Greek crisis should have been fairly simple. After all, we are talking about 3 percent of the eurozone's overall gross domestic product. The reasons for its becoming a mammoth task—and extending its contagion to larger economies—are political rather than economic.

As the critics warned at the outset, a monetary union devoid of fiscal coordination or a common budget policy cannot work. Or rather, it can work until it is tested. When it was put to the test—as it has been over the past two years—we discovered that there was insufficient political solidarity (both at the periphery of the euro and in its German heartland).

Indeed, the common feature that links the euro crisis and the recurrent flaws of the EU's international action is precisely the lack of sufficient political solidarity. This very weakness was also on full display during the most acute phase—to date—of the immigration crisis when, spurred by the North African revolts and Libyan crisis, the Schengen Agreement was suspended.

What is true of the euro as a safeguard system for its members—and the tangible core of Europe's economic strength in the world—is true of foreign and security policies: the EU must at least provide a real line of defense and threat prevention against international risks. Otherwise, there simply is no substance to the "common" dimension of our external projection.

It is a fact that Europe—and the entire Western world—is confronted with an unstable multipolar setting and diminishing resources to tackle it. Austerity is not only perceived, it actively constrains choices—and will do so for a number of years.

Therefore, even assuming that an arrangement will emerge to restore confidence in the euro and improve the overall prospects of the EU as an economic area, European external projection will have to focus in any case on few and well identified priorities, especially on widely understood security matters.

The immediate neighborhood is the key to the future of Europe, even if we entertain global ambitions. This means, first, that North Africa is a priority that will not go away: all means of influence thus need to be activated for the long haul.

Second, Turkey is a pivotal partner with growing regional ambitions. It is truly too big to be left hanging with no clear relationship with the EU. This is part of a more general problem: the rise of middle powers with regional reach—as a consequence of a partial U.S. retrenchment—forces Europe to elaborate a more coherent strategy vis-à-vis countries such as Iran, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Egypt itself. Relations with Turkey and Israel, in particular, risk dividing Europe—all the more so when the bilateral link between Ankara and Jerusalem is being eroded.

Third, Russia is an indispensable counterpart, which should not become a sort of reserved domain for a few capitals. Balancing the eastern and southern dimensions of Europe's security is key to a continental strategy.

It is a daunting agenda. Getting serious about the neighborhood is no longer a choice, but a strategic necessity.

MARTA DASSÙ *is the director of the Aspen Institute Italia.*

OCTOBER 10, 2011

STRATEGIC EUROPE: THINKING GLOBAL

SALLY KHALIFA ISAAC

Indubitably the talk about Europe exceeds the traditional notion of a strategic actor, a notion that is generally limited to the mere consideration of geographic importance and scope and intensity of economic or political influence. The talk about "Strategic Europe," however, necessarily entails a talk about "Global Europe," a rising pole that possesses the assets to transform the power structure of the international system as a whole. According to this broader perspective, a long-term thinking of Europe's interests and objectives is inseparable from considering that rising pole's global strategic vision and policy.

Signs of Europe's significant rise in the still budding post–Cold War global power structure have not been confined to economic advancement. Rather, it went beyond consolidating itself as a global economic power to affirming its status as an un-ignorable global political vigor, mainly deriving its allure from the multilateralism it epitomizes and the normative strength it convincingly presents. These unique characteristics are increasingly fitting in current and future tackling of new forms of soft security threats. These include the collective handling of ecological

problems, securing energy sources, combating terrorism, limiting illegal migration, and containing the assertive and sizable culturally diverse communities on the aging continent. Europe's untraditional power sources therefore are apt in a globalized era where the art of managing diversity through operating non-military means climbed to unexpected importance in the changing global milieu. Perhaps because of this logic, Europe is still globally strategic, despite the fact that its economic and political rise has not been matched by an equivalent military ascent.

By the same token, classical issue areas of current exalted concern—specifically, terrorism, illegal migration, energy security, and political, economic, and demographic stability in the near south and east abroad—are expected to constitute the prime sources of Europe's headache in the long term. Future concentration on these classical spheres of action does not impede, however, a European reconsideration of a comprehensive strategic vision and policy for more remote areas, particularly Asia and Latin America, where Europe's role has been generally limited and primarily reactive to developments there. Indeed, the time has come for Europe to consider the challenge of capitalizing on its current strong economic ties with single Asian and Latin American poles and groupings and promote them to wider political clout and influence.

Certainly, the optimism that the preceding lines unfold about the scope and intensity of Europe's ability to act and how realistic ambitions could be on its future foreign conduct is dependent on that rising pole's serious reconsideration of its global commitments, costs, and responsibilities of the empire it can be. The actual experience demonstrates that Europe has been reluctant to act beyond its classical near abroad, which is supposedly described as its vital sphere of influence and where Europe has been particularly eager to create a ring of friends. Perhaps looking into the example of Europe's Mediterranean partnership demonstrates how Europe has been especially blinkered in restricting its attention to the southern Arab Mediterranean countries, from which transnational security threats emanate and encroach on Europe's security, without appropriately raising its sight to the other eastern Arab flank in the Levant and the Gulf.

Conceivably, the most influential means for Europe to pursue its goals and objectives in the future would be governed by two main facts that seem to dominate current and future international politics: the first is the supremacy of economics in an increasingly globalized world, where the flow of money, business, and technology matters the most; and second is the upsurge of identity and cultural dimensions, which provide ever more plausible explanations for conflictive or cooperative relations as well as for distinguishing friends from foes. Therefore, a combination of Europe's soft power instruments—basically the moral leadership it represents and the cultural and civilizational approach it embraces—and the sticks and carrots of its economic power would be essential in the near future. Elaborating on what it can do, forging or strengthening alliances and partnerships, treating partners as partners, and intensifying constructive dialogue are thus thought to be the routes for future strategic Europe.

SALLY KHALIFA ISAAC *is an assistant professor of political science at Cairo University.*

OCTOBER 11, 2011

FROM VALUES TO INTERESTS, STILL A LONG WAY TO GO

OLIVIER JEHIN

If there is one area in which Europeans excel, it is in endless discussions. With the most striking example being Belgium: we are unbeatable when it comes to division and compromise based on the lowest common denominator. Wrangling prevents strategy.

Let's take a look at the recent past and some examples of division. In Copenhagen in December 2009, disharmony within the European Union's climate leadership resulted in a failed conference and delivered a blow to the fight against global warming.

In the related field of energy, instead of establishing a common policy and internal market based on efficient supply and production management, member states fostered the game of producer states, developing competing relationships and focusing on competing supply routes. But things did not stop there: after witnessing the Fukushima disaster, some chose to abandon nuclear energy without consultation, while others chose to continue its development or to engage in shale gas exploitation. Any national energy choice automatically has an economic and environmental impact on other members of the European family.

In the case of the sovereign debt crisis, endless procrastination over the aid mechanism, the amount of aid, conditions, and the contribution of banks has only exacerbated the crisis by strengthening speculation and increasing cost. Finally, on Libya, division in the EU resulted in NATO being entrusted with a military operation outside its traditional geographic sphere and not even indirectly linked to its core mission, even though Libya is in our immediate vicinity.

Examples such as these show that Europe still has a long way to go before it can assume a strategic role in the new twenty-first century world organized around a few regional powers and state-continents. Strategy development must meet three preconditions: first, awareness of oneself, second, politicians with leadership qualities, and third, identification of one's interests. However, the permanent Congress of Vienna that dominates political life in the EU, as well as bilateral relations between member states and the rest of the world, maintains the illusion of national sovereignty—albeit increasingly insignificant under the impact of globalization and the competition of emerging powers.

Ministerial reports of national interests haggled out in Brussels bolster the growing Euroskepticism of its citizens, and Europe's absence on all major issues deprives them of any sense of pride. But pride is the only foundation on which a strategy can thrive. National politicians have no incentive to develop a European vision of the future. And the method for selecting those who run the European institutions puts people of little charisma at the helm, able only to navigate between different national interests. European interests, too often presented as incompatible with national interests that actually differ little from each other, generally remain undefined.

Solving this challenge with three unknowns will be neither quick nor easy. It means fulfilling the dream, long cherished but never realized, of political union. To reconnect citizens with Europe, it is urgent to demonstrate EU effectiveness, both internally and internationally.

This requires immediate redefinition of the EU budget, which is barely 1 percent of the EU's collective gross domestic product (GDP), against

30 percent of GDP for the federal budget of the United States. The EU budget should be increased to provide leverage allowing for greater efficiency and visibility. It must also be reformed to break away from geographical redistribution and fund key strategic objectives: research and development; innovation and industrial policy (including the protection of strategic industries); infrastructure (including in space) and trans-European networks; energy diversification and efficiency; external relations, defense and security; and food and health. The introduction of new local resources would ensure this qualitative leap and is the only way to lighten the burden on indebted countries. By giving up certain powers, member states could save money and focus on education and primary health care, police missions, justice, territorial defense, environment, and so on.

Whatever the pace, this trend is inevitable unless we wish to give up European construction and accept permanent marginalization on the world stage. In external relations, member states must stop seeing the European External Action Service as a rival or auxiliary and instead reap the benefits that allow them to trim down their own diplomatic services. The same goes for defense—unnecessary duplication is rife but member states struggle to fund equipment and operations.

The second unknown is the lack of political leadership. Modest institutional reform is inevitably needed to enhance the political readability of how the institutions work and allow key officials to gain legitimacy and autonomy. During European elections, it might be useful to promote discussions on major European issues rather than national concerns by establishing transnational lists, as the European Parliament is currently considering. Appointment of the president of the European Commission based on these election results and the constitution of the Commission away from national bartering should allow this institution to once more become a driving force for European policy and produce a strategic vision. Lastly, the European Council should be reformed to be composed of European Affairs Ministers, who will not see all sector decisions in terms of national "victories" or "diktats" from Brussels.

Finally, we must define Europe's higher interests, which generally differ from national interests only in the short or very short term. The identi-

fication of European interests, however, has so far been carefully avoided in documents which, except for the 2003 security strategy, were drowned in beautiful values and great principles. Why not entrust a group of experts with drafting a white paper on European interests, based on consultations with European institutions and the authorities and civil society of each member state? This document could review all strategic issues, identify common interests, and provide tools for promoting and defending them. It could then serve as a basis for the adoption of strategic guidelines by the European Council.

Until these three challenges are solved, there will be no strategic Europe. Time is running out and, as Charles-Joseph de Ligne wrote, "In war, politics and love, seize the moment for it may not come again!"

OLIVIER JEHIN *is the former head of the Institut Français des Relations Internationales (Ifri) in Brussels, a freelance journalist, and editor of* Europe Diplomacy & Defence.

OCTOBER 12, 2011

EUROPEAN CONSENSUS ON STRATEGIC AIMS?

BEATRICE HEUSER

One of the most fundamental learning processes for a human infant is learning to check its purely selfish urges and to make allowances for the needs of others. It is counterintuitive at first to see this also as fundamental to conflict resolution, but recognizing the need for self-imposed restraints even in the case of war has long been understood by European civilizations. Referred to as the concept of a just war, its origins are in Roman times. Two fundamental assumptions can be found: first, that there are higher values (particularly the value of justice) than the simple pursuit of self-interest, and, second, in order to satisfy the requirements of these values, combatants have to fulfill certain criteria, both when resorting to the use of violent force and in the conduct of war.

With an admixture of Christianity, the criteria for a just war today are accepted by some thinkers and statesmen of different creeds as an essential underpinning of our international order. The United Nations Charter deems a war to be legitimate only if it is waged in self-defense or if it is authorized by the UN Security Council for the protection of a more general peace. Five basic criteria must be met, according to the A More

Secure World report, drawn up by sages from all corners of the world by the UN's secretary-general in 2004:

(a) Seriousness of threat.

(b) Proper purpose.

(c) Last resort.

(d) Proportional means.

(e) Balance of consequences.

Each one of these can be traced back to antiquity and has echoes through European history. They have been summarized time and again in permutations of the Aristotelian paradox that "We . . . make war that we may live in peace." The creation of a lasting peace must be the strategic aim of any war and many European writers have commented on the implications of this both for the conduct of war and for any post-hostilities regime. This includes satisfying the basic human needs of the defeated adversary's population, their protection against transgressions of all sorts, such as the infliction of bodily harm, or the denial of any other security or basic resources like food and shelter.

The recognition that all humans have equal basic needs for survival and security is another European discovery, as seen in the declaration of human rights of 1789. Just war theory does not clash with this assumption. It denies no human being's rights, but exhorts us to weigh the consequences—or apply the criterion of the lesser evil—to judge whether it can be justifiable to sacrifice some for the benefit of many others during war. The just war theory does not deny that inflicting death and destruction upon non-combatants should be avoided, including on the adversary's side. Indeed, it holds that the death of soldiers on all sides is not the supreme aim of the war. The theory concedes that such action might be necessary in order to counter a greater evil.

With few exceptions (usually concerning the treatment of religious dissidents seen as dangerous heretics or concerning rebels against what was defensively seen as legitimate authority) writers on warfare prior to the

Napoleonic Wars took it for granted that war was waged for the purpose of establishing a better peace. Matthew Sutcliffe, chaplain to Queen Elizabeth I and King James I of England, said that unnecessary violence and cruelty should be shunned. A primitive hatred of the enemy was not a just motivation for war. The enemy was no longer to be fought, tortured, or otherwise harmed once he had declared himself defeated, that is, once the higher purpose of the war had been served.

Reality was often different, however. The motivations of princes in pursuing war often clashed with the requirements that needed to be fulfilled to make a war just. Writers on war, such as the Duke of Sully, adviser to King Henry IV of France, criticized this fact, and with it the princes who fought for base motives like "jealousy, avarice, ambition and vanity," and legal pretexts were found for the pursuit of selfish aims.

There was, of course, another important strand of thinking in Europe as well as the just war theory: the admiration of warriors and the glorification of war. The Roman nexus between consulship and generalship and between military victory abroad and political triumph at home, created the mold in which leaders liked to cast themselves until the twentieth century. In this tradition, the triumphant victor was often revered by contemporaries and posterity for his very success and the immoral yet successful pursuit of selfish interests without any regard to the rights of others was registered with grudging respect if not outright admiration.

It was only after experiencing the conquests of Napoleon that writers on warfare were so blinded by his success they lost sight of the only just strategic aim of any war, namely, a just peace. The pursuit of victory for its own sake now became the overriding preoccupation of strategic theorists. It went together with the rise of nationalism and racism, with the militarization of society in many continental European countries, a tidal flow that resulted in the torrent of the theory of total war—total in terms of one's own mobilization and, on the German side, the targeting of entire enemy nations.

It took two world wars and the contemplation of the devastating effects of nuclear weapons to lead Europeans to the rediscovery that military

victory cannot in itself be the proper grand strategic aim of war in and of itself. Instead, this has to be a durable, just peace. The realization that the mindless pursuit of military victory, rather than post-bellum peace, had led humankind into a terrible abyss dawned on some thinkers in the victor states of the First World War. Some individuals had seen this all along, working to create restraints on war and working toward what would become the League of Nations. It took the realization of the First World War's futility as demonstrated in the Second World War to bring the lesson home to many more.

Pitched against an enemy with total war aims—the elimination and enslavement of entire populations—Churchill's verdict of the Second World War is well taken: Britain had to fight for "Victory at all costs … for without victory, there is no survival." Churchill here recognized, however, that survival, not victory, was the ultimate aim in war against Hitler's Germany. A crushing military victory over an enemy might thus well be the main way to reach a durable peace. But only the American Marshall Plan to Europe and its similar aid efforts to Japan fully turned Germany and Japan into peaceful members of an international order.

In short, victory must be the means to peace and cannot be the end in itself. This is the widespread lesson many Europeans drew from events of the first half of the twentieth century, an interpretation of history on which European integration has been built. It is shared at least by parts of the societies of other countries that have participated in the two world wars—Japan, Australia, Canada—and is the prevailing opinion even in the United States, to name but a few.

Like the just war strand of the European tradition on warfare, however, this European lesson drawn from the catastrophes of the twentieth century is not the only view around. The pursuit of "national interest," without any concern for the interest of others, is still the leitmotif of the predominant "Realist" reading of international relations, and few undergraduates on either side of the Atlantic come away from this reading with moral outrage about governments acting in this manner. The curious relationship between the United States and its own creature, the UN, is a reflection of the persistent uncritical belief that U.S. governments

must, above all, pursue U.S. interests, unrestrained by the wider needs of humankind. "Realists" unrealistically think that only weaker powers—which by now include all the Europeans—need to hide their own interests behind international law and more general human interests; the world's remaining superpower, argues much of the American right of the political spectrum, does not need to do so.

Elsewhere, too, there are those who do not share this particular European experience and interpretation of the world wars or indeed European views of human rights. The national arrogance found in Europe pre-1945 has since found its equivalent in the post-decolonization nationalism and Islamism of other parts of the world. Nationalist selfishness is a disease that is currently kept in check within the European Union; beyond its limits it is still rampant. Nor is there a guarantee that, as the memories of the catastrophic world wars recede, new generations of Europeans with their multiple cultural roots are vaccinated forever against re-infection. The absence of rampant, selfish nationalism, however, is the essential prerequisite to any common European identification and pursuit of common strategic aims. As is the realization, not to be taken for granted again, that the only just strategic aim of the use of force is the creation of a more just and enduring peace. Not victory for its own sake.

BEATRICE HEUSER, *professor for International Relations at the University of Reading, is currently a visiting professor at the University of Paris 8 (St Denis). She is the author of* The Evolution of Strategy *and* The Strategy Makers.

OCTOBER 13, 2011

EUROPE AND THE ARAB SPRING: CRISIS AND OPPORTUNITY

PAUL SALEM

Europe's southern neighborhood has entered a new era. The uprisings that began in Tunisia in December 2010 have unleashed a set of dynamics that have changed the region. Europe has long-standing political, security, and economic interests in its relations with the Arab world. The new and fast-evolving conditions present a complex set of opportunities and risks. Europe needs to develop its southern neighborhood policy to reflect the momentousness of recent developments and to build on opportunities where they emerge and to manage risks where they menace.

Importantly, the prodemocracy values of the recent Arab uprisings have increased the space of common political values between Europe and its southern neighbors. In previous decades the Arab world had gone through ideological waves of anticolonialism, Arab nationalism, socialism, and political Islam, all of which posited a strong conflictual relationship with Europe and the West. The prodemocracy demonstrations of the Arab Spring have emphasized a universality of values that embraces both East and West. It is this commonality of values that underpinned the growth of the European Union in Western Europe, and then allowed

its expansion into Central and Eastern Europe. This commonality of values should also enable a fresh approach toward European-Arab relations that is built on deeper trust and cooperation.

Most importantly, it is critical that Europe help Arab countries that have overthrown their rulers to consolidate their transitions. Many revolutions that start with liberal agendas regress into authoritarianism as they face daunting political, security, or economic challenges. Europe has deep experience in political transitions—whether from fascism to democratic republics or from absolute to constitutional monarchies. Europe should share this experience with its southern neighbors and offer meaningful assistance in helping design and manage the constitutional, legal, and institutional aspects of political transition.

At the security level, revolutions are moments of national vulnerability, and Europe should be well aware that this period might be one in which security assistance—and occasionally intervention—is a necessary ingredient. In countries in transition, like Egypt and Tunisia, Europe needs to work with the governments and the security forces to ensure that armed groups do not succeed in hijacking or ruining the transition. Europe should also draw on its historical experience to provide guidance and assistance in terms of how armed forces can play a stabilizing role while ceding increasing power to elected civilian authorities. This area of civil-military relations and security sector reform is going to be an issue of key importance in the years ahead.

In countries in crisis, like Libya, Syria, and Yemen, Europe has to assess its responses on a case by case basis, weighing the costs of intervention against the consequences of inaction. In Libya, the NATO no-fly zone was a necessity to prevent a humanitarian disaster, and has helped unseat one of the most corrupt and dysfunctional regimes in recent history. Looking ahead, Europe needs to be standing by to provide rapid state-building assistance to post-Qaddafi Libya. Toward Syria, Europe was correct in imposing sanctions against the increasingly brutal regime of Bashar al-Assad, and should work with Turkey and other friends in the region to stand by the protestors and push the regime to accept real and immediate political reform. In Yemen, the risk of state failure is

immense, and Europe should continue to back the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) initiative to find a soft landing to the deep crisis there.

Much of the Arab unrest was linked to desperate socioeconomic conditions. These conditions also fuel the south-north migration, which is a main cause of concern for Europe. Postwar Europe had the Marshall plan, and post-Soviet Central and Eastern Europe had EU assistance and membership to transform their economies. The Arab countries that have thrown off dictatorship need their own Marshall plan. Europe and the United States have promised $20 billion in aid within the context of the G8, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development plans to begin investing up to $3.5 billion a year in the region. This is significant—particularly in light of the deep economic crisis in Europe—but a larger and more strategic economic partnership needs to be developed, necessarily with the participation of the oil-rich Gulf states, to ensure that the large non-oil countries of Europe's southern neighborhood can achieve high levels of growth and job creation. This will help secure the transitions, protect against regression into new forms of authoritarianism, reduce migration to Europe, and strengthen south-north interests and relations.

The GCC is a great source of capital. It has responded to the Arab Spring by providing some assistance to countries in need. Politically, however, it has been alarmed by the pro-democracy wave and has offered GCC membership to Morocco and Jordan, hoping to create a club of monarchies that would resist this wave. Europe needs to work with Saudi Arabia and the GCC to help make the case that monarchy and responsive government are not mutually exclusive, and to press the GCC to use more of its oil wealth to spur growth in the large non-oil countries of the region. The experience of several European states in building constitutional monarchies would be instructive.

Finally, political stability and economic growth will not be achieved in a region in crisis; and there are two crises that will destabilize the region in the years ahead: the Arab-Israeli conflict and the tensions between Iran and its neighbors. The two conflicts need high level attention and are not disconnected. Left unresolved, the Arab-Israeli issue will come back to

poison political transitions and might facilitate the rise of radical groups that speak to popular outrage regarding Jerusalem and the Palestinian issue. This could have the biggest impact in Egypt, whose political fate will play a determining role in defining the pattern of politics of most Arab republics.

With regard to Iran, tensions unleashed by the U.S. occupation of Iraq and the evolution of Iran's nuclear program have created a pattern of increasing conflict not only between Iran and much of the Arab world, but also between Iran, Israel, and the West. Left unresolved, this confrontation with Iran could unravel the precarious situation in Iraq, undermine Gulf security, and unleash sectarian tensions in Bahrain, eastern Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Lebanon; it could also lead to military confrontation between Israel and Iran, or even between Iran and the West.

Neither of these crises is easy to resolve, but Europe cannot afford to ignore them as it deals with the consequences of the Arab Spring.

The first decade of the twenty-first century started off ominously with Islamic terrorist attacks in the United States and Europe and Western invasions of two Muslim countries; this second decade has started positively with prodemocracy uprisings in several Arab countries calling for human rights and accountable governments. Europe has key political, security, and economic roles to play in helping to consolidate the positive aspirations of its southern neighbors. People on both sides of the Mediterranean have a deep interest in the success of this consolidation.

PAUL SALEM *is the director of the Carnegie Middle East Center in Beirut, Lebanon.*

OCTOBER 14, 2011

EUROPE NEEDS A TRULY GLOBAL ACTION PLAN FOR 2020

PARAG KHANNA

Europe has been a systemic anchor of world order since ancient times. It has shaped every major era of history including the Middle Ages, the modern inter-state system, colonization, and the Cold War. To retain its worldwide significance in the coming decades, Europe will need to ensure that its external strategy is a global one.

The U.S. National Intelligence Council has already conceded Europe's success. Its *Global Trends 2020* report states that "Europe's strength could be in providing a model of global and regional governance to the rising powers…. The EU, rather than NATO, will increasingly become the primary institution for Europe, and the role which Europeans shape for themselves on the world stage is most likely to be projected through it."

If stability and prosperity go hand in hand, then Europe must not lose sight of the long-term drivers of both: widening and deepening. A consistent and collective commitment to both has been and continues to be essential for Europe's long-term success. There are numerous internal scenarios that portray a European stability and prosperity threatened

by uneven fiscal fundamentals between the core and periphery, varying abilities to integrate immigrants and manage social unrest, and coping with the challenge of aging populations. But European leaders cannot let internal economic obstacles overwhelm the imperative of building a long-term basis for growth and influence on the world stage.

Even in a period of slow economic growth and delayed structural reforms, externally oriented policies are key to maintaining momentum for the European Union as a whole. For example, European industrial firms are currently successfully signing large long-term engineering and infrastructure contracts in the fast-growing economies of the Persian Gulf region and Asia. This generates high-skilled jobs on the continent as well as sizeable profits. Aggressive commercial expansion is therefore fundamental to a strong Europe.

Related to this, European governments could also consider policy interventions to shore up European economic productivity. Given Europe's vital role as a capital exporter, creating incentives for European multinationals to "buy European" might provide an important spark for job creation—while reminding America and China how important Europe is for their own economic trajectories. Both approaches are vital to enhancing Europe's global competitiveness.

Europe's investments close to home have been crucial to Europe's successful expansion politically and economically and must continue even as the common European house grows. As new European members secured market access, participation in the Schengen zone, official cohesion funds and subsidies, and improved credibility among creditors and investors, they quickly became the fastest growing nations in Europe until the onset of the financial crisis began in 2008. But the lessons from the recent crisis are that EU member states—new and old—have become interdependent and must support each other for collective gain.

It may seem ironic to advocate taking on ever more burdens through continued expansion of the EU, but bear in mind that calculations of global power frequently hinge on demographic size and economic

growth—hence some such lists tend to leave off Europe entirely while focusing on China and India. This is their mistake—and Europe's for not acting as one and investing in future growth. An EU that deepens ties with and eventually comes to include Ukraine and Turkey will add close to 150 million largely young, educated, and industrious citizens to its labor force, while simultaneously deepening its access to the markets and resources of the Near East and Russia. Deeper economic engagement with North Africa will also bring a Mediterranean Union to fruition faster than political overtures, while also expanding the European sphere of influence. The dictum that must always lead European thinking is that "There is no Europe, only Europeanization."

To act as one Europe will mean consolidating legacy European seats in major international organizations such as the United Nations Security Council and International Monetary Fund. This recommendation, which has been widely uttered in recent years, has been met with resistance in the name of maintaining influence in such organizations. But this counter-argument is deeply flawed. First, the lack of reform renders such bodies illegitimate, meaning Western powers may eventually stand alone in them, ultimately influencing no one. Second, precisely because the EU lacks the combined strategic capabilities of coercion outside of its immediate theater, it very much relies on diplomatic maneuvering in representative multilateral organizations. Creating space in such bodies for new members thereby also creates more—not fewer—opportunities for Europe to influence their behavior.

Despite the setbacks the eurozone faces with the crises in Greece and Ireland, the "European Model" is still a global standard bearer on many levels. Europe continues to represent both the aspiration and reality of nearly universal healthcare provision, low income inequality, social democratic governance, and ecological sustainability. At the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting in 2010, both European and Chinese ministers conceded that their models must be oriented towards such goals in order to provide for their anxious populations.

In short, Europe has done quite a lot right ever since the formation and evolution of the EU. And it has done so not by calling itself a "soft

power" or "civilian power," but by matching means to ends shrewdly and skillfully. This is the true test of strategy.

PARAG KHANNA *is a senior research fellow at the New America Foundation and author of* The Second World: Empires and Influence in the New Global Order *(2008) and* How to Run the World: Charting a Course to the Next Renaissance *(2011).*

OCTOBER 17, 2011

EUROPE'S SINATRA DOCTRINE

PAWEŁ ŚWIEBODA

Speaking on ABC's *Good Morning America* twenty-two years ago, Gennadi Gerasimov, the spokesman of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, coined the term "the Frank Sinatra doctrine" to denote the green light that Moscow was giving to its former satellites to choose their future geopolitical orientation. Gerasimov referred to Sinatra's song "I Did It My Way," reading more into the song's title than its lyrics, which are about having no regrets about one's choices and living "a life that is full."

Europe has always wanted to do things its way. In the last few decades, it had one dominant idea about how to organize the world and this was to make it resemble Europe. The experiment of sovereignty-sharing that Europe embarked on after the Second World War was seen as a blueprint for how to organize the international community. The more norms, the better. The concept became known as effective multilateralism and functioned as the moral and political spine of the European Union's first Security Strategy in 2003. It soon became clear, however, that it was based on an overoptimistic reading of the international dynamic. In the meantime, Europe's own power as

an example suffered as a result, initially, of the constitutional and subsequently the financial and sovereign debt crises.

As this was happening, the world rapidly entered a period of recalibration, with the rise of China, India, and Brazil but also with an intermediate category of mid-sized powers such as Turkey or Indonesia, making the international scene more crowded. Shocking as the pace of developments may seem, it is still curious why it took so long for some of the new actors to emerge. What we know very little about is how this emancipated world will behave. It may well be that the battle of international egos is just beginning. The new powers will want to increase their room for maneuver. Old powers will cling to the vestiges of their power. More checks and balances will be necessary. The level playing field will have to be hard fought.

In economic terms, the global emancipation process is gathering speed. The division of labor in which high value-added goods and services were to be delivered by the advanced economies and low value-added goods by the emerging ones no longer holds. Competitiveness will in the future depend on a broad range of factors, including transparency, education, and infrastructure. More factors than just sustainability will be important for the world economy. Not simply defending the status quo but also anticipating the way the economic model will change will be crucial.

In spite of its gloom and doom, Europe remains well positioned to swim upstream in this emerging world order. Its immediate task is to look after itself—perhaps most importantly—when it comes to the quality of its democracy. It may well be that in the world of tomorrow rating agencies will ask organizations like Freedom House to contribute vital data when making their assessments of economies' durability and vitality. The challenge for Europe is that it has taken for granted the way its democracy has functioned, only occasionally drawing attention to the more obvious cases of individual leaders challenging the accepted norm. The future of democracy will be at least partly decided by the sense of inclusion that our citizens feel and the way we go about handling marginalized minorities. It is only on the basis of a rejuvenated democratic ferment that we can hope to take on the autocracies of the world.

Issue number two will be the economic vitality of Europe, understood more broadly than simply through the prism of gross national product levels. One of the areas to focus on is cross-generational cohesion. If Europe is torn apart, it may be more likely to happen between generations rather than nations. Both ends of the age pyramid will be squeezed. The younger generation already cries for better prospects. The older generation will face falling pension levels. And yet the European way of life reserved for the middle-aged is not an appealing proposition.

Outside of its borders, the EU will need to do much more organic work, befriending new actors and socializing them back in the old corridors of international power, which in real life will mean power-sharing. Last year's flagship EU concept of strategic partnerships is intellectually the right way to go. In practical terms, the mountains have brought forth a mouse. The EU would need to undertake a massive reallocation of resources, including from the national diplomatic services and embassies, for this concept to fly. Each strategic partner should have a high-profile coordinator at the EU level, selected from among the former heads of state or government, recycling wisdom and experience back into the system. There should be top-notch staff at the European External Action Service and out in the field, together with several echelons of dialogue.

Whatever progress can be achieved with the strategic partners, the EU's immediate challenge lies in its neighborhood. Events in North Africa can be as formative for the EU's foreign policy as the Balkan wars in the 1990s, which compelled the EU to launch its Common Foreign and Security Policy. They are an open invitation for Europe to return to what it has always done best: the transformative agenda. A Strategic Europe will be one that can successfully zoom in to the neighborhood and zoom out to the strategic partners. Doing it its own way.

PAWEŁ ŚWIEBODA *is the president of demosEUROPA—Centre for European Strategy in Warsaw.*

OCTOBER 18, 2011

THE EU AND THE WORLD: SHRINK OR SWIM?

SAMI ANDOURA AND ELVIRE FABRY

Twenty years after the Treaty of Maastricht created the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), do Europeans really understand the danger of marginalization they face on the international stage today? The euphoric period following the fall of the Soviet Union, when it seemed obvious that the world would Westernize and politics would become more democratic and economies more liberal, is behind us, despite the Arab Spring. In that era the European Union's enlargement strategy, which reached its pinnacle with the addition of ten new member states in 2004, was a formidable instrument of foreign policy in the EU's near neighborhood.

Today the CFSP looks toothless when faced with the difficulties of new rounds of enlargement and delays in developing alternative and complementary policies. We are constantly reminded of how out of touch Maastricht's initial aims were with the means the treaty deployed. Jacques Delors's warning in 1992—"let's not talk of a single foreign policy—the objective is out of reach—but rather of the possibility of joint actions in foreign policy"—has become more relevant than ever.

In late 2011 the verdict looks all the more harsh given that the emerging trends of the first decade of the twenty-first century—the rise of new powers and the simultaneous decline of American capacity and influence under the strain of interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan—have been transformed by the financial crisis and Western public debt concerns into a full-scale upheaval of the relationship between emerging countries and the West. It is already clear that this economic crisis will last longer for Westerners, even if it is not yet clear how much it will reduce Europe's international capacities and influence.

To limit this loss of influence the EU needs to be more effective, concentrating on a small number of priorities and making better use of the main instruments at its disposal. The innovations of the Lisbon Treaty—in particular the European External Action Service—are useful additional tools that will take time to bear fruit. However, they must not lead the Union to lapse again into an obsession over an elusive CFSP. The EU would do better to concentrate on external interventions related to targeted priorities, supported by a sufficient number of member states and proportionate with available means.

The EU is above all a unique model of regional integration, with an integrated trade policy and an unparalleled internal market. It therefore has a major advantage in international trade negotiations, which should particularly allow it to introduce more conditionality in its bilateral relations.

Using its internal market and its competition policy, the EU must maintain its world-class capacity to produce the standards and principles needed in the domain of international trade and competition. If used well, the Union's capacity as a standard-setter can make it a leading actor in the creation of the new regulations which globalization makes necessary, an area where emerging economies remain hesitant and divided.

In addition, Europe's policies and institutions are still a model of sovereignty-sharing and economic solidarity between rich and poor—one which could prove useful inspiration for the new modes of international and regional governance made necessary by the political, economic, en-

vironmental, and other challenges and crises of the twenty-first century global order.

EU enlargement, which helps give concrete form to the elusive CFSP, can still be beneficial and therefore should be pursued, particularly in the Balkans. The Arab Spring provides an historic opportunity to strengthen another "pillar" of EU external action—the "neighbourhood policy."

Here it would be absurd to return to the sterile debate over competition between south and east: the EU and its member states must show moral support and material aid to build prosperity and the rule of law throughout the entirety of their neighborhood. It is in the EU's vital interest to base its relations with all neighbors on interdependence and shared values, and as such to build a veritable pole of influence at the global level.

This entails developing better relations with Turkey—independently from accession negotiations—by closely associating the country with the neighborhood policy and by developing joint policies on a broad range of issues. It also means making progress towards a stable and constructive partnership with Russia, the great neighbor that cannot be ignored.

To meet the challenge of increasing dependence on foreign energy supplies, the EU must put solidarity at the heart of a new common energy policy. That means that the Union and its member states must speak and act in unison, both with a view to extending the energy market beyond Europe's borders and during discussions with foreign suppliers.

It is also important to calmly discuss the issue of migration between European nations with aging populations and much younger foreign countries, whether they are neighbors or not. In the former, foreign labor is more of a solution than a problem. In the latter, while the majority of the population will find work at home, some people still wish to come to the EU. Upcoming discussions on harmonizing national asylum policies will be a first test in this area.

The conflict in Libya offers many lessons—it was a reminder of the need for more active engagement from all European countries, in particular Germany; it showed once again the importance of transatlantic coop-

eration, despite the stepped-back approach of the United States; and it confirmed the need for coherent and coordinated European military spending, particularly in the context of constrained public expenses.

If the EU is to consolidate the handful of policies mentioned above, it needs more than ever to be able to count on convergence between the positions of its member states. In areas where differentiated progress is possible—in particular in military matters—it is probably best either to pursue ad-hoc cooperation or to use the tools of enhanced cooperation and "Permanent Structured Cooperation" provided by the Lisbon Treaty. The fact that some ambitious member states take the lead in certain areas does not mean that these actions are not developed for the benefit of all the EU. Above all, in an inexorably shrinking Europe it is essential to ask whether it is time to accept a fundamental truth: that international strength comes only through union, and that we need to think global and act European. The alternative is to try to swim alone, in seas which have become too vast and turbulent for our individual states.

SAMI ANDOURA *and* **ELVIRE FABRY** *are senior research fellows at Notre Europe, the Paris-based European think tank created by Jacques Delors.*

OCTOBER 19, 2011

CHURCHILL'S EUROPEAN AMBITION

GIANNI RIOTTA

Winston Churchill astonished a war-weary European continent on September 19, 1946, by publicly advocating a United States of Europe and the immediate creation of a Council of Europe. This momentous event occurred during a period in European history that has been labeled by British historian Geoffrey Barraclough as the "European Civil War of 1914–1989." Barraclough's theory identifies seven decades during which European nations opposed each other in ideological conflict, beginning with the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand I in Sarajevo and continuing through to the fall of the Berlin Wall. Churchill's ambition in 1946 was to end the conflict in Europe permanently.

In contemporary Europe we have almost completely forgotten the fact that the European project boasts a British forefather; schoolchildren are taught mostly about Adenauer, a German, Monnet, a Frenchman, and De Gasperi, an Italian. However, it was actually Churchill, at the time the most prominent leader this side of the Atlantic, who originally initiated the idea.

The Italian daily newspaper *Corriere della Sera* enlisted the services of a quiet, middle-aged reporter named Eugenio Montale, renowned in literary circles for his obscure poems, to cover the proceedings of the newly born Council of Europe. When the Council convened for the first time, a unique connection was established between orator and reporter, with Montale, recipient of the 1975 Nobel Prize in Literature "for his distinctive poetry which, with great artistic sensitivity, has interpreted human values under the sign of an outlook on life with no illusions"[1] writing about the speeches of Winston Churchill, who was the 1953 recipient of the Nobel Prize in Literature "for his mastery of historical and biographical description as well as for brilliant oratory in defending exalted human values."[2]

Montale's articles are collected in the anthology, *Il Secondo Mestiere*, or "The Second Profession," and are worth reading in the current context of European discontent, characterized by debt crisis, Greek tragedy, a Mediterranean region in disarray, a despondent Germany, and a Great Britain dominated by the hack-gate scandal.

Montale writes that at the Council's initial proceedings Churchill was unwavering in his insistence upon one vital issue: the creation of a single European army with the responsibility of protecting the continent and providing European diplomacy with some muscle. Nobody listened.

The generation born while the two Nobel laureates navigated the same halls is close to retirement now and in some insouciant countries such as Greece, Portugal, and Italy, many of them are already enjoying their retirement. Yet the formidable European army is nowhere to be seen; rather, we can observe a European operation akin to the popular U.S. television show *M*A*S*H*, where it is almost impossible to refuel tanks or trucks from a universal EU petrol pump, and EU field radios do not even share the same wavelengths. Additionally, deep cuts in military spending contribute to the further erosion of Churchill's dream.

While the euro's ocean of red ink drowns European and world public opinion, the real euro-tragedy is unfolding discreetly. The European baby

[1] http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1975/

[2] http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1953/

boomers, born between 1946 and 1964, grew up with the promise of a continent that would become only more affluent, more powerful, and more integrated with the passing of time.

When I was an adolescent, to travel by train from my hometown in Sicily to London for mandatory English lessons and buy myself sandwiches and cokes for the 48-hour journey, I needed four different currencies: Italian liras, French and Swiss francs, and British pounds. Today the euro is respected even by Russian gangsters and Beijing central bankers.

However, the status quo has changed and not for the better. Europeans no longer think that in the next decade their continent will be more affluent, more powerful, and more integrated. The dream is over, and we Europeans have woken up to a post-boom generation characterized by euro-anemia, populist fever, and the voiceless unemployed.

European foreign policy will continue plodding benignly along, preaching to the Israelis and Palestinians to cease hostilities, while handing down recommendations with one hand and dispensing bribes with the other. The blue flag with its golden stars will soldier on with distinction in Afghanistan, ready to be unfurled as soon as the next political campaign requires. We will wage war in Libya against Gaddafi, but as separate nations, as France, the United Kingdom, and Italy, not under a common flag, with a common army, or adopting a common strategy.

The real hidden truth is that Europe failed when the Constitution was rejected by rabid public opinion, fed up with a document written by stale politicians, elaborated by worn-out thinkers, and read by no one. French and Dutch voters are blamed for their "NO" in national referenda, but their fellow Europeans were no less disenchanted.[3]

Our forefathers knew both what they desired: peace, prosperity, and the provisions of a welfare state, and what they rejected: war, Soviet brutality, neofascism, and American-style capitalism. When Churchill, the last lion, proposed a mighty European army, nobody listened. "Army? What army?" they responded. Club Med and ski resorts please, not another war.

[3] You can try to read the failed Constitution at your own risk: http://www.proyectos.cchs.csic.es/euroconstitution/Treaties/Treaty_Const.htm

Many fostered the delusion that Europe could be the "nice guy" of our troubled planet, proffering her generosity in the form of poorly conceived development plans. When the going gets tough we launch another investigation or fact-finding mission. America's ill-fated wars in Iraq and Afghanistan spread the following mantra in Brussels: "We do not need a common defense or a common foreign strategy."

It is frequent for European leaders to boast, "We are the true exporters of democracy, not the Americans, you need only look as far as Poland, Hungary, and the Baltic states…." While this may be true, the Cold War, however, was not won by establishing the euro, rather the euro was established after the end of the Cold War.

When I open my old grammar school textbooks at my mother's house, the old promises still enchant me: Euratom, the European Nuclear Agency, CECA, the European Coal and Steel Community; an attractive logo for each issue or problematic. We Europeans desperately wanted to be the world's nice guys after so many years of being the bullies, and now, middle-aged, we find that we have lived beyond our means, that our children won't be spending their summers at Club Med, and that we haven't eradicated the planet of dictators and despots.

Until Europe takes a stand, fighting the populist demons increasingly present on our domestic talk shows and websites, until we have decided what we really deem worth living and fighting for, and until we have found a modern-day Churchill to replace the toothless Van Rompuy and Lady Ashton, we cannot expect to see a twenty-first-century European foreign policy of intelligent diplomacy, supported by brave troops. Instead, we can expect documents, plenty of them, none Nobel Prize material; do not try to read them at home.

GIANNI RIOTTA *is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. His new book,* How Do We Get Ideas?*, was published in October.*

OCTOBER 20, 2011

ASSUMING A GLOBAL LEADERSHIP ROLE

FENG ZHONGPING

Europe had a golden opportunity for strategic development following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. At the time, European leaders understood this well and that is why the Maastricht Treaty was signed, which deepened the European integration process by launching a common currency and creating a political union. Without the end of the Cold War, there would have been no such space for Europe to shape the region as well as the world.

The subsequent eastward enlargement that brought in ten new member states—primarily former Soviet countries—is a choice most Europeans supported. While enlargement undoubtedly stabilized Central and Eastern Europe, bringing more members in, however, has made political integration more difficult. The Lisbon Treaty, designed to help the European Union speak with one voice in the world, is an important step in the right direction. However, with Europe badly hit by the global financial crisis, it came at an unfortunate time. With the EU and its member states struggling to address their economic and social woes, the push for further cooperation in the realm of foreign policy has become less of a priority for European leaders.

This situation, however, will not last for long. First, it has become increasingly difficult to separate a domestic issue from a foreign policy issue, since all issues are now highly connected as the result of economic globalization. Second, and probably more importantly, at a time when the United States has become less capable of taking the global leadership role, there is a sense of urgency for EU member states to work ever more closely in providing global public goods.

In this changing global context, Europeans can still derive international influence through their main achievements to date—the single market and the common currency. However, the Union should also reevaluate its policies towards its neighborhood, and strike a better balance in its relations with traditional allies and emerging powers.

The EU should work hard to maintain its integration achievement. The world regards Europe as a global player mainly because of its unity and its collective power in the world economy and trade system. When China applied for membership in the World Trade Organization in the 1990s, there was no need for China to talk to each European country. All negotiations were conducted between the Chinese government and the European Commission. The euro, although facing great difficulties right now, is Europe's symbol of global power and influence. European leaders are absolutely right to do everything possible to save the common currency.

The single market is as important as the euro. China considers the EU as a strategic partner first and foremost because its 27 members, as a whole, have been China's number one trading partner for many years. The EU recently completed a free trade agreement with South Korea. The impact of this will be one that an individual European country could hardly imagine.

The EU should also play the leading role in its neighborhood, including both Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean basin. The Arab Spring will likely become the greatest foreign policy challenge for Europe in the future, leaving the EU and its member states no choice but to play a leading role in the region. The new situation in North Africa and the Middle East requires a new neighborhood policy.

Emerging powers like China and India are equally important for Europe and deserve greater attention. European countries should consider rising powers as their third foreign policy pillar.

Most EU member states have so far had two foreign policy pillars—the transatlantic relationship, through NATO, and European integration, through the EU. During the Cold War, it was NATO and indeed the United States that provided security for Europe. After the end of the Cold War, many Europeans no longer considered Russian—or any other foreign invasion—as the real security threat. NATO, however, didn't die as some had predicted. The alliance today continues to play an insurance role for Europe. It has also been the most important mechanism for Europeans to exchange views with and even to influence the Americans.

However, the continued existence of NATO should not be an excuse for Europeans not to build up their own defense and security capabilities. The EU needs to avoid depending too much on the United States. Furthermore, although transatlantic relations are still very important for many European countries, one could wonder whether, in a rapidly changing world, the United States should continue to be the most important partner for Europe.

There are many reasons for Europeans to believe that Russia and the emerging powers should occupy as important a place as the United States does in the EU's foreign policy. Germany has shown some willingness to understand the Russians, but this has not been the case for many other European countries. NATO has already complicated European and American relationships with Russia. Hence for both long-term security and energy reasons, the EU must take Russia much more seriously than it has been doing so far.

Future global governance will be a "co-governance" between the traditional powers and new powers. The EU's interest lies in a closer cooperation with both its traditional allies and the fast developing powers.

FENG ZHONGPING *is the director for European Studies at the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations in Beijing.*

OCTOBER 21, 2011

EUROPE'S ENERGY

GÜNTHER OETTINGER

Without energy security, there is no security in Europe. Behind today's economic headlines an important energy debate is going on. All tasks have one goal: to make Europe more secure, sustainable, and competitive in energy.

Secure energy has enabled Europe to develop in peace and stability. Energy crises have an untold impact on societies, economies, and governments—as the oil embargo of 1973 and events at the Fukushima nuclear reactor in March 2011 demonstrate. A strong European energy policy is the only way to reduce risks to energy security and make Europe more resilient to potential fallout from global events.

European Commission President José Manuel Barroso has called energy policy "the next great European integration project." The European Council echoed this view at the Energy Summit of February 2011.

The European Union can develop a common European energy policy for a more secure future.

For two generations, Europe has resisted the force which brought it together in the first place: a common energy policy. But global, geo-political, and population changes are forcing countries to rethink their approach to energy.

The EU has identified the tools it needs to assert and defend its energy interests:

- A resilient, secure, and politically assertive European energy market;
- A diverse and sustainable supply base promoting low-carbon technologies and energy efficiency;
- Emergency response mechanisms and solidarity; and
- A common external policy.

We now have to develop and implement them fully.

The EU's Europe 2020 and the Energy 2020 Strategies adopted in 2010 are a good start. They commit Europe to building a more secure, sustainable, and competitive energy system based on freely flowing energy across Europe, with more low-emission, locally produced, renewable, and efficient energy. The 20-20-20[1] energy and climate agenda gives clear direction for 2020. Beyond this point, the Commission's 2050 Roadmap sets out the need to further intensify these efforts. Together, within a global effort that includes other developed countries, the EU can reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80 percent, compared to 1990, while improving our energy security.

The key to our future security is investment. We need a doubling of investments in renewable energy, almost a tripling for energy research, and some €1 trillion in infrastructure. This will help lift Europe's economy and bring much needed jobs, skills, and business opportunities. Lower energy demand will keep down energy bills for ordinary people.

[1] A 20 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions compared to 1990, a 20 percent share for renewable energy in the energy mix, and a 20 percent improvement in energy consumption/efficiency.

Secure energy must also be safe. The EU has some of the highest levels of energy safety in the world, both for nuclear energy and offshore oil and gas extraction, and we must keep it that way. We must also work to improve standards across the world, particularly as demand rises for nuclear energy in the developing world and more oil and gas is extracted in extreme conditions or from unconventional sites.

A secure Europe is a united Europe. On energy, the EU has been slow to develop a common message and voice. Yet we have an internal energy market which is dependent on imports for more than half of its fuel. Our energy market will only be truly secure when our external energy policy catches up with our internal policies.

Internal and external energy policies are two sides of the same coin. Europe's energy policies are not only bringing benefits to the EU. The Energy Community—which now includes Ukraine and could in the future include Belarus—demonstrates how EU energy policy has promoted stability and security in its neighborhood. EU energy partnerships, joint projects, and dialogues are helping to boost security more widely in the Mediterranean, the Middle East, and Russia.

Further afield, the challenges grow. Yet the solution—energy integration—remains the same. In the example of the Southern Corridor, which will bring energy resources from the Caspian to the EU, it is clear that partners such as Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan welcome a common European voice. It is time to make this the norm.

By "Europeanizing" our internal energy affairs, we will be stronger in our negotiations with external producers or suppliers. Whether we are negotiating as the EU or an individual member state, solidarity is crucial. When the EU can defend a single, consistent, and convincing position, our relations with our partners are richer. As well as a "soft" non–legally binding approach to third countries, we need a "harder" legally binding approach. The Commission has made specific proposals to achieve this.

The stakes are high. For fifty years, energy security has been a key input to economic growth and prosperity. This is the way to continue. But the world is changing and we need to adapt. The EU needs more than

ever to stick together, recognize common interests, and act on them, in solidarity. At a time of economic crisis, the pressure to neglect energy security is great. But if we do so, we may be paying the price for many years after today's crisis has entered the history books.

GÜNTHER OETTINGER *is Commissioner for Energy at the European Commission.*

OCTOBER 24, 2011

EXPANDING THE EU'S OSTPOLITIK

THOMAS DE WAAL

For a variety of reasons, the European Union's efforts to promote closer integration with the six Eastern European countries outside Russia—Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine in the east, and Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia in the southeast—are failing. The Eastern Partnership (EaP) is a worthy project and a great improvement on its predecessors, but September's summit in Warsaw showed how hard meaningful engagement with the eastern neighborhood is.

Russia of course poses challenges, but twenty years after they achieved independence from the Soviet Union it would be a convenient distraction to blame the problems of these countries on Russia. At the age of 20, these states have achieved adulthood and should take responsibility for their own actions. Besides, as Dmitri Trenin observes, Russia is in its own transition to becoming a "post-imperial" power. Aside from a few critical spots such as Abkhazia and the Crimea, Russia no longer feels the need to project hard power in its neighborhood. NATO expansion into Georgia and Ukraine was a red-line issue for Moscow, but the EU

by contrast is simply a fact of life to the West, just as China is in Central Asia and Turkey is in the South Caucasus.

The main problem Russia poses is an economic one. It is all too easy for these countries to fall back on a default model where business is controlled by cliques that are part of or close to the political elite, rules are bent, and profits are siphoned off. Even in Georgia, which has made some impressive economic reforms, there are still hidden monopolies that are not open to public scrutiny. Here Russia offers a much easier model, its businessmen offer lots of easy capital, and, in the case of Belarus and Ukraine, Vladimir Putin is offering a customs union that would mean soft integration with much of the Russian economy.

To these oligarchic elites, the EU's toughly regulated economy model is, as one Brussels official put it to me, a "Trojan horse," which could undermine everything they currently possess. This is why with three of the six countries—Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Belarus—there is currently no prospect of any free trade agreement and in the other three—Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine—there is resistance to the proposed Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) with the EU. Viktor Yanukovych's Ukraine is the starkest example of this duality. The Ukrainian leadership knows that the EU offers its best development model and route out of poverty, but the short-term political agenda—put crudely, the preservation of power and wealth—trumps a longer-term vision. The jailing of former prime minister Yulia Tymoshenko on October 11 was a slap in the face to concerted efforts by the EU to encourage Ukraine to look west.

Why is Brussels failing? Of course it currently has little time and few resources for its eastern neighborhood. It is facing an unprecedented crisis as it tries to save the euro, while the "Arab Spring" has sucked up any spare capacity of its top foreign policy officials. In Warsaw, the slow-burning crisis in Belarus captured most of the agenda. And yes, the External Action Service is still new and finding its feet.

But there is reason to believe that even if the view down the Rue de la Loi was completely serene, things would not be much different.

The problem is that the EU is simply not intellectually ready to embrace the concept of a wider union of perhaps three dozen countries. And therefore as a whole—some central European countries and the UK being the exception—it does not talk about a membership perspective for the eastern six.

Without the big carrot of membership, the incentives simply will not be there among the eastern six to make fundamental changes. Yet the fact that these countries are so far from EU standards—two decades away at least if they were to begin now—of course makes it easier for Brussels to make that offer. Think of Turkey in the 1960s, the road it has travelled and the fact that it is not even there yet—or has perhaps passed the EU by. The promise of eventual membership if standards are met would be a real stimulus for these European countries and separate the doers from the talkers. Naturally the EU they would aspire to join in 2030 would be so large it would be a different EU—but that in turn would stimulate a healthy debate about what kind of union could cover the whole of Europe.

The EaP has been innovative in two positive ways. The DCFTA project, by promising privileged entry into the EU single market, offers something very tangible to these elites. That may be enough for Moldova or for Georgia, if it ends its unrealistic flirtation with the idea of becoming a deregulated "Caucasian Singapore" or Dubai. The project's civil society dimension is also a recognition of an important reality—that ordinary citizens are often more pro-European than their rulers. If that insight is followed up in real initiatives, such as effective visa liberalization for professionals or increased opportunities for students to study in EU countries, that would be a very good start.

If a new Ostpolitik is to have a really transformative effect in these post-Soviet countries, then its central component should be an eventual membership perspective. Those who balk at this prospect should not just consider the positive outcomes it could bring but also the negatives of a continuing status quo. In the eastern regions of Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine, that would mean they remain a continuing source of criminality, poverty, and perhaps political repression, while

in the South Caucasus, that means they will continue to be sources of potential conflict and disaster—while in both cases the big western neighbor of these regions, the EU, will inevitably end up fighting the fires and footing the bills.

THOMAS DE WAAL *is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, D.C. He is the author, most recently, of* Georgia's Choices *(2011) and* The Caucasus: An Introduction *(2010).*

OCTOBER 25, 2011

EUROPE NEEDS TO SHOULDER MORE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADDRESSING NUCLEAR DANGERS

DES BROWNE AND IAN KEARNS

In the midst of a financial crisis of existential proportions for the euro, nuclear issues have been pushed to the margins of the European political debate. This is understandable, but it cannot be allowed to continue. The world faces potential new nuclear arms races and Europe systematically underestimates both the scale of the problem and the scale of its ability and responsibility to act.

To the extent that European policymakers have been paying attention to this agenda at all in recent years, they have been justifiably preoccupied with Iran. A nuclear Iran would cause enormous instability in the Middle East and could lead to a wider regional proliferation cascade. Even more terrifying, a nuclear stand-off between Iran and Israel would be one between states that have no hotline for crisis communication—and in fact have no direct communication with each other at all. Terrorist organizations, supported but not wholly controlled by Iran, could also play a critical role in turning a future crisis situation into a catastrophe.

Iran, however, is only one small part of the problem. Despite the fact that the global stockpile of nuclear weapons has declined from around 70,000 in the mid-1980s to around 23,000 today, and despite the welcome signing of New START between the United States and Russia, nuclear modernization or force build-up programs are underway in all of the currently nuclear armed states. Almost all have recently produced, or are planning, new or modernized nuclear warheads and better and more dangerous delivery systems. This applies to the United States and Russia, to China, India, Pakistan, France, the United Kingdom, and, reportedly, Israel. Recently, North Korea has been discovered to have uranium enrichment facilities of a far greater scale and sophistication than anything previously imagined by the international community.

While the total number of nuclear weapons in the world has gone down, the number of nuclear weapon states has gone up and—crucially—nuclear armed states now exist in some of the most unstable and conflict-prone regions in the world. The situation surrounding the North Korean program and its potential implications for stability across wider Northeast Asia remains serious. In South Asia, India and Pakistan, two countries that have fought three wars with each other and at least one other major skirmish in recent decades, are not only locked in an adversarial relationship but are reportedly developing smaller warheads for "tactical" use in war-fighting scenarios.

While attention has been focused on the newer challenges of globalization, the rationale for these nuclear force programs indicates the persistence of deterrence as a key concept shaping the defense policies of the major powers. The Russian program is said to be a response to concerns over U.S. ballistic missile defense, advanced conventional capabilities like Conventional Prompt Global Strike, and improved U.S. intelligence and surveillance hardware. The Chinese program is justified by reference to U.S. and Indian forces, and India's program is driven by fear over both Pakistan and China. French nuclear weapons modernization has been justified by President Nicolas Sarkozy explicitly as a response to stockpiles elsewhere that "keep on growing," while in the United Kingdom the weapons are seen as an insurance policy against the possible long-term re-emergence of a state-based nuclear threat to UK national security. While

policymakers might wish to delude themselves into thinking the nuclear problem ended with the Cold War, the truth is that the nuclear problem remains with us and has never gone away.

What, if anything, can Europe and European leaders do about this?

First, Europe has to acknowledge that it has a significant responsibility to act. Too many on the continent behave as though this is an issue for the United States and Russia alone. This is far from the truth. The United States and Russia possess over 95 percent of the world's nuclear weapons but European countries themselves occupy an enormously influential position in the U.S.-Russia relationship. What the European member states of NATO say and do in relation to Russia, for example, can either empower the United States to be bold in building cooperation with Moscow or be a major constraint on the progress that can be achieved. Europeans should seek to exert their influence to speed up, not slow down, cooperation.

They can do this through the European Union, where the Europeans have an opportunity to build a genuinely cooperative and influential relationship with Russia in their own right across the fields of trade, energy, and environmental cooperation. But they can also do this through influencing the ongoing NATO Deterrence and Defence Posture Review. This review may lay the foundation for the transatlantic and European security architecture for many years to come. There is a strong case in this context for European states acknowledging that NATO's non-strategic nuclear weapons in Europe have lost their original role of deterring massive Soviet conventional superiority. The European members of NATO should be willing in the circumstances to support—if not a full withdrawal—then a further reduction and consolidation of these weapons into fewer bases in Europe while also encouraging the broadest possible security dialogue with Russia across ballistic missile defense cooperation, the conventional force imbalance in Europe, and the issue of the frozen conflicts in the Russian near abroad.

Second, while the United States and Russia turn inward for presidential elections in 2012, France and the United Kingdom should seek to drive diplomatic energy into an initiative to map out how the nuclear disarma-

ment talks can be multi-lateralized. Working out how this could be done, the issues that would need to be addressed, and the obstacles that would need to be overcome in some detail would be a worthwhile British and French contribution in 2012.

Third, Europe needs systematically to identify, assess, and improve the disarmament and nonproliferation contribution of a wide range of European institutions from national governments, to EU institutions, and to the European nuclear industry. Some European institutions are well placed to promote disarmament; some are well placed to strengthen nonproliferation, and some to provide technical, human, and financial support to others in support of initiatives like United Nations Resolution 1540 which aims to address the threat of nuclear terrorism. Others still are in a position to shape, influence, or implement wider legal regimes that can make illicit trading in nuclear materials more difficult, and sanctions against nuclear regime violators more effective.

As Europeans we need to ask ourselves how effective are our contributions across this agenda today? Is enough being done? Are some countries and institutions showing more leadership than others? Is the EU playing a constructive role? Where is there a need and realistic opportunity for European institutions to do more?

Fourth, Europeans need to promote the idea of a Weapons of Mass Destruction–Free Zone in the Middle East. The 2010 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference clearly underlined its support for efforts to create such a zone. The agreement to hold a conference in 2012, attended by all Middle Eastern states and hosted, we now know, by Finland, provides a window of both responsibility and opportunity to make progress. The EU's External Action Service and European governments should therefore be exerting all the pressure they can behind the attempt to get a serious diplomatic process underway. There are plenty of people who like to say progress in this area is impossible, but those same people are largely bankrupt when it comes to offering other workable ideas on how to prevent nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.

Europe can and must play a central role in addressing the nuclear dangers we have described. It has the opportunity and responsibility to do

so but first it must acknowledge the scale of the problem being faced. European policy, in short, must include but go well beyond a concern with a nuclear Iran.

LORD (DES) BROWNE *of Ladyton is the former UK Secretary of State for Defence and* **IAN KEARNS** *is the chief executive of the European Leadership Network.*

NOVEMBER 28, 2011

STOP TALKING DECLINE. START TALKING SOLUTIONS.

RADOSŁAW SIKORSKI

Edward Gibbon, reflecting on the decline of the Roman Empire, noted that it "was the natural and inevitable effect of immoderate greatness." Rome's prosperity ripened the principle of decay. This reminds me of the ongoing discussion of Europe's decline. Have roughly six decades of peace and well-being made Europeans lazy, flabby, and, in effect, vulnerable? Are we unable to fight and face today's challenges?

Europe's decline is at the forefront of an entire policy debate in the European Union. But while Europe immerses itself in sterile disputes about its malaise, millions look to the EU with hope. Countries from the Balkans and Eastern Europe are still knocking on the Union's door. The inhabitants of Belarus and of the southern parts of the Mediterranean ask for our support in democracy building. For those on the outside, the European dream is a desirable reality. What will Europe's response be?

If the EU would only raise its eyes from its byzantine quarrels over institutional problems, it would see that a new world is being born—one that is more Europeanized, but less Eurocentric. Europeans are no longer

the only actors on the stage. Europe's mark can be found on a variety of international organizations, laws, and institutions but this does not translate directly into European influence on a post-Western world. An introspective and defensive Europe today means a marginalized and ultimately irrelevant Europe tomorrow. If the EU aspires to maintain its international status, it must follow the advice the wise Red Queen gave to Alice: "It takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place."

But what if the EU wants more? If the Union aspires to lead change and participate in the creation of a new international order, its actions can't be limited to effective crisis management or generous development aid. It is high time for the EU to become a strategic player—not just a payer.

Let's begin with Europe's neighborhood. Democratic movements have emerged there. The recent uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt have debunked many myths—among them the one of "authoritarian modernization." In fact, lack of freedom shackled development in these countries. As bizarre as it may seem to some, the prodemocracy elites in those countries are looking to the EU as a source of inspiration. Democracy is not the exclusive property of the West. Neither is prosperity. But the West's uniqueness lies in successfully bringing these two together. The EU should embrace its neighbors in an intimate and interdependent relationship—as a means of achieving shared prosperity. There are different forms of assistance, of which direct financial aid is only one—another is sharing expertise and education in ways that respect the autonomy and sovereignty of the country in question.

We should focus on opportunities rather than on threats. It is obvious that Europe will benefit from helping its neighbors. A real exchange of human capital in the entire region surrounding the EU could be a great source of renewed potential and political energy for the Union. To begin with, Europe must take some practical steps in favor of its neighbors, such as facilitating access to the single market—particularly for agricultural and fisheries products—or putting in practice mobility partnerships—facilitating travel to Europe, in particular for students, researchers, and businesspeople. If the expectations of citizens in Europe's neighborhood are not met, their lives may be poorer and shorter, but

Europeans will also lose out. Without meaningful social, political, and economic change in these countries, Europe will face a rise in sectarianism, radicalism, and instability in its neighborhood.

To help the EU's neighbors in Eastern Europe and North Africa, Poland has proposed a new European Endowment for Democracy (EED). The EED could address two objectives that existing EU instruments fail to meet. First, thanks to the EED, the Union could become a stakeholder in the long term. And second, it could offer tailor-made projects for all leading forces of change, including—aside from governments—civil society organizations and local communities.

One of the ways in which Europe could improve its policies toward the Southern Mediterranean and the Arab world in general is by working on joint projects with Turkey. Ankara is seen by many Arab countries as an attractive model. It could therefore play a crucial role in the peaceful democratic transformation of common neighbors, something that is in everyone's interests.

While focusing on the South, it is important not to forget about the East. The Arab revolutions are another reason we need to strengthen fragile Eastern European democracies. The most serious threat to democracy is the notion that it has already been achieved.

Part of the solution to the challenges facing Europe lies in maintaining a steadfast openness to new members. Why? Because the EU needs an injection of some fresh blood and dynamism. The opinion that the 2004 and 2007 enlargements have weakened the EU contradicts reality. Let's talk facts. Economically, the accession of 12 countries into the EU unleashed the growth potential and improved the resilience of the European economy by boosting its competitiveness. The direct beneficiaries are European entrepreneurs and consumers. In the old member states, export-oriented firms increased their potential and labor migration eased bottlenecks. New member states experienced rapid growth in productivity, falling unemployment, and income convergence. Thus the benefits have been mutual. The economic transformation of the new member states in the area of energy liberalization, direct tax competition, or labor

market reforms also put pressure on the EU-15 countries to reform. Today, when Europe is living through a time of numerous "fatigues," it needs more than ever the kind of modernization incentive that the Western Balkan states and Ukraine could give.

Openness must also shape Europe's policy toward the emerging powers that are fundamentally reshaping the world. But openness should be accompanied by reciprocity. The EU has opened more than 90 percent of its public tenders for non-EU countries while other economies have done the same by only 20 percent, or in some cases not at all. Reciprocity in EU relations with China, India, or Brazil means symmetry in access to public procurements, protection, and respect of intellectual property rights and state aid procedures.

But a *sine qua non* condition for any influence the EU may continue to exert on the world is that it talks with one voice. "Europe consists only of small countries—some of which know it and some of which don't yet know." These are the words of Paul Henri Spaak, one of the EU's founding fathers. So it's time to play collectively. The EU is still punching below its weight because of the irresistible temptation many member states have to act alone. Only by acting together can Europe become an actor—not solely an observer—in world affairs. That means a single EU voice at the United Nations and a single voice in multilateral fora like the G20. The EU must carry one message whenever possible.

The devil is in the details. In all the cases of European policy the question is not the dilemma between being in favor or against, but rather the awareness of how to tackle the issue. These topics need to be understood and managed together with the EU's political and economic goals, despite the current crisis—or perhaps because of it.

Gibbon attributed the causes of decay in Rome to its long peace and prosperity. Both "introduced a slow and secret poison into the vitals of the empire. The minds of men were gradually reduced to the same level, the fire of genius was extinguished, and even the military spirit evaporated." It may sound familiar these days but as a humble practitioner of diplomacy, I would suggest to focus on another cause for Europe's

decline. Europeans are failing because they have created institutions that have made leadership impossible. EU leaders are appointed, not elected. Let's create the possibility of leadership that is democratic and legitimate and elected in transparent procedures. The multiplication of chiefs of EU institutions does not enhance European influence but dilutes it. The EU should start by combining the functions of president of the European Council with that of president of the European Commission. Europe's power is in relative decline only. Lessons should be learned. The fate of contemporary Europe can be different from that of the Roman Empire.

RADOSŁAW SIKORSKI *is the minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Poland.*

JANUARY 9, 2012

THE STRATEGIC EUROPE YARDSTICK

JAN TECHAU

There can be no doubt that Europe aspires to be a powerful strategic player in the world—at least in theory. As a foreign policy entity, however, it is still very much a start-up enterprise.

Foreign policy did not appear on the official European Union agenda until 1993, when the Maastricht Treaty divided the Union into three political pillars, with "external affairs" as one pillar. Soon after that, Europe's failures in the Balkans in the 1990s clearly demonstrated the need for more cohesive external action, and as a consequence, the 1999 Treaty of Amsterdam created the position of High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. This new post, and a beefed-up bureaucratic apparatus to support it, gave the EU its first real foreign policy muscle that transcended the project management capabilities of the European Commission's External Relations Directorates General.

Under Javier Solana, the first to hold the position, this new tool had some real impact, especially in the postwar Balkans and by creating, in 2003, the EU's Security Strategy—which remains the only document

of its kind. However, the EU never managed to assume a truly strategic position on the world stage. The 2009 Treaty of Lisbon was supposed to change this by introducing new tools. But the integration method invented by Jean Monnet (the idea that treaties and bureaucratic institutions would develop enough momentum to force reluctant member states into a truly communal policy) failed in the field of foreign policy. The sovereignty bargains that make other parts of the integration process so successful are just not happening in external affairs and defense policy. Unity can only be achieved in either a symbolic, nonoperational way or on negligible side issues, but never in a way that has given the EU, as a unified group of 27, substantial clout on the world stage. To this day, EU foreign policy has failed to go beyond the project management approach that has been its hallmark for so long. In essence, it has never moved from being tactical to being strategic.

Today, almost any course of action based on a modicum of planning is called a strategy. This is reflected by the definition of strategy by the popular Wikipedia reference site as simply being "a plan of action designed to achieve a particular goal."[1] This, of course, is meaningless. Much more is required to turn a simple plan into a full-blown strategy. In the case of the EU's foreign policy, strategy is defined as being about "the long-term overall foreign policy objectives to be achieved, and the basic categories of instruments to be applied to that end."[2] This is getting much closer to what is needed conceptually. But with 27 sovereign member states forming a political entity *sui generis*, defining strategy is still more complicated.

This must not deter policymakers and analysts, however, from embarking on the necessary debates on either issue: first, what strategy is, and second, what a strategy for EU foreign policy might look like. So far, this debate is nowhere near profound enough, neither in Brussels nor in the member states' capitals. The results of that deficiency are visible everywhere. The EU is not considered a strategic player by any other

[1] Wikipedia, "Strategy," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Strategy.

[2] Sven Biscop, "Time for a European Grand Strategy," in Ideas on Europe Blog, August 18, 2009, http://europeangeostrategy.ideasoneurope.eu/2009/08/18/time-for-an-eu-grand-strategy.

world power. Nor are the documents it produces and that bear the name "strategy," real strategies. They are ersatz documents, reflecting the weakness of the discourse and the political institutions producing them.

What, then, would make EU foreign policy strategic? What are the quintessential ingredients Europe needs? What is the yardstick by which such policies ought to be measured?

There are ten characteristics that can make or break EU strategy:

1. **Ambitious:** Any policy must clearly reflect the ambition to craft a political outcome, be that change in a counterpart's behavior, a changed political environment, or a very concrete, measurable project outcome. This might sound banal, but too often EU papers are unclear or fuzzy about the willingness to influence others. Merely maintaining the status quo will not do for a strategic player. Without a credible show of political willpower no strategy will be taken seriously.

2. **Unified:** Actors in international affairs are usually unified actors, such as individual nation states or NGOs. The EU is clearly not a single unified body, but it aspires to act and be perceived as if it were one in foreign policy. Herein lies the crux of EU foreign policymaking. No European nation is powerful enough to make a difference in the world unilaterally. As a consequence, the refusal to cooperate will leave nations with a merely theoretical notion of sovereignty, as their ability to influence world affairs is undermined. Nations are obsessed about their national sovereignty, but the more they try to protect it, the more they risk losing it altogether. This paradox is hard to accept, especially when a nation's history is a proud one or when the human toll for winning national sovereignty was very high. So sovereignty transfers in the field of foreign policy are especially painful and will thus be postponed until the very last moment. The powerful embodiment of this attitude is the national veto power every EU member state holds in foreign policy. Being both disruptive and protective (unanimity is the most effective way to protect minorities), it symbol-

izes the member states' ambiguity about a more unified approach. In the end, however, the veto itself does not seem to be the decisive obstacle to a more unified EU foreign policy approach. Unity is easier to find when members share key interests—and are aware of them.

3. **Interest-based:** Interests are not to be confused with ambitions or goals. One can have interests without being particularly ambitious about them and without breaking them into more concrete goals. One can even have interests without knowing about them. This is why one of the key qualities of any European leader is the ability to make the shared interests of the EU visible. This is more important in foreign policy than in any other field of the European integration process, as foreign policy, unlike almost any other field, cannot be monetized—compromise can't be bought. The first big political transformation that EU leaders and institutions need to make is to identify and publicize shared interests among all countries. In reality, however, recent EU leaders have been very weak at creating such visibility—beyond general talk about all the good things that are generally desirable. The last great opportunity to do so—the war in Libya—was badly bungled. Unsurprisingly, NATO turned out to be the more effective military service provider. That it also proved more capable of managing political disunity amongst Europeans was a disaster for the EU. If this continues, no EU strategy will be possible.

4. **Goals-based:** As mentioned above, interests alone are not sufficient to make a policy strategic. A strategy provides the big picture, but it must also be workable and turned into operations. For that, interests need to be broken down into concrete policy goals. This is the second big political transformation EU strategists must accomplish. Goals are the tangible, countable, measurable outcomes that fill a strategy with life. They can be reached only by practical doing, for example as the result of a regulatory incentive, in the course of negotiations, or as an outcome of a civilian or military operation. A strategy will remain mere theory if it can't also define itself at this tactical level. In addition, as part of the policy plan-

ning process, carefully selecting concrete goals based on a defined strategy is a great reality check on the strategy itself. Grand strategists, absorbed by their macro level view of things, sometimes forget this.

5. **Prioritized:** One easy and much-practiced way of creating consensus among the 27 EU member states is to create endless wish-lists comprising every single interest and goal one might think of. Everyone can add their own personal pet-projects, and all projects appear equally important, so everybody can say yes to the plan. Such a list is, of course, worthless for the creation of a meaningful strategy. Strategy is essentially about choice. Means are limited, so ends need to be prioritized, not catalogued. Prioritizing interests and goals is one of the most difficult tasks in any decisionmaking environment. This is where the strategy-making process often fails, even if all other elements are in place. Planners often can't bring themselves to pick the ones that rank higher from that collection of worthy and desirable issues. Especially when necessity does not immediately dictate priorities, making these choices is very difficult. It becomes even more difficult when there are many equally pressing issues but not enough time or energy to tackle them all. A good planning process can help to weigh interests against each other. In the end, however, someone needs to make a decision. For prioritizing, again, leadership is key.

6. **Long-term:** Foreign affairs is the policy field least susceptible to long-term planning. Much of the work is crisis-management and coping with breaking news and unexpected developments. But contrary to common belief, this makes long-term planning even more important. Not because a plan can realistically predict the myriad of unforeseeables, but because its mere existence and the creation process give everyone involved a sense of purpose and position—and a reservoir of tools and instruments to draw from in an emergency. But long-term planning also delivers two other indispensible elements of strategy. First, it forces decisionmakers to address the long-term needs of the communities they serve, thereby countering the inherent tendency of politics to primarily

focus on instant gratification and quick returns. Second, it requires officials to think about the sustainability of their action. Can a chosen strategy be kept up long enough to deliver the desired results? What reactions will it provoke? What unintended side-effects could emerge? Are there enough resources to support it? Only these extrapolations will insert a sense of responsibility beyond the here and now. Which is exactly what strategy is all about.

7. **Realistic:** The question behind foreign policy realism is primarily one of having the correct self-assessment of one's own power. Do the resolve, skills, and resources match the defined interests and goals? Without such a sober analysis of the relationship between means and ends, a plan will never be strategic. Instead, it will end up being merely declaratory politics, devoid of any chance of realization, except by accident, and seriously undermining the credibility of its author. The EU has often been criticized for its grandiose foreign policy rhetoric, which it is regularly unable to match in action. For the most part, this criticism is legitimate. There is primarily one reason that the Union's credibility as a foreign policy player has not been completely destroyed: There is an enormous potential for real power and impact. The EU actually has a lot to offer. It just rarely chooses to bring its potential power to bear. For a start-up, that is acceptable for a short time. But it is not enough to become a mature strategic player.

8. **Holistic:** The EU's foreign affairs apparatus is about as incohesive as it can possibly get. The new instruments created by the Lisbon Treaty, most notably the European External Action Service (EEAS), have so far failed to create a streamlined, holistic approach to external relations. The European Commission still holds the development, trade, enlargement, and neighborhood policy portfolios, with little interest to share them with anyone, least of all the EEAS. The Council did not reduce its parallel structures for external relations after the EEAS was created. Several barely connected situation centers and crisis management cells exist. The division of labor and the reporting lines between all these entities are not always clear. The level of trust is low. And none of this

is unusual. Similar divisions, often with long traditions, exist in almost every member state. However, at the EU level, where it is already difficult enough to coordinate 27 member states, and where the resources of the institutions are so scarce to begin with, such internal strife and disorder is deadly. Strategy needs cohesion. A development policy is incomplete without being tightly fit into trade policies, environmental policy, and security considerations. A diplomatic initiative will remain toothless without the full weight of defense, trade, human rights, and perhaps investment policies behind it. Strategy can't force all players and all tools to act as one. But strategy must at least think about all these things in concert.

9. **Predictable:** Any foreign policy actor interested in peaceful relations with allies and partners must create a transparent strategy with predictable actions. Predictability is the secret currency of international diplomacy. If not well coordinated with friends and counterparts, strategies can infuse others with fear and create an aura of unreliability around any actor in the international arena. Admittedly, multi-player undertakings, such as strategymaking by 27 nations, will offer few elements of real surprise to outside observers. Neither can anything be held secret among member states for very long, nor will such a large number of players ever allow a revolution to happen in their foreign relations. Still, EU transparency should be the result of a deliberately transparent procedure, not just of mere happenstance. Far exceeding the positive symbol this would set, it would be a trust-building exercise par excellence. This aspect will become especially relevant with a view on that last indispensible element of EU strategy making.

10. **Values-based:** Theorizing between realists and idealists in foreign policy is as old as history itself. At least for open, democratic, liberal societies, this division is becoming increasingly meaningless. Security and survival are not to be achieved without interests-based use of power. Openness and democracy can't exist without strong adherence to fundamental values and principles. The latter is especially true for the EU. With 27 individual players around the table, all bringing with them different histories, geographies, traditions,

> mentalities, necessities, and worries, values become disproportionally important for the political entity's survival. Not only must the EU itself embody something fundamentally good and valuable for its citizens, it also must actively—but not naively—support such values abroad. An EU foreign policy strategy that is oblivious to such a fundamental insight will be sustainable neither internally nor externally. Democracies need poetry. It's the creed they want to live by. Europe, fragile as it has been throughout its history, needs it even more.

The ten elements listed above should serve as a yardstick in the debate about strategic foreign policy in Europe. They suggest a way to measure the "strategic-ness" of the EU's foreign policy thinking and doing. Taken together, the ten factors constitute a test against which future EU foreign policy documents, speeches, programs, and projects can be held. It is, admittedly, an ambitious test. But for Europe, with its vast possibilities, its pressing needs, its enormous potential power, and its huge regional and global responsibilities, the standard by which it measures itself must, by definition, be a high one.

CARNEGIE EUROPE

Founded in 2007, Carnegie Europe is the European center of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. From its newly expanded presence in Brussels, Carnegie Europe combines the work of its research platform with the fresh perspectives of Carnegie's centers in Washington, Moscow, Beijing, and Beirut, bringing a unique global vision to the European policy community. Through publications, articles, seminars, and private consultations, Carnegie Europe aims to foster new thinking on the daunting international challenges shaping Europe's role in the world.

Strategic Europe offers ideas and recommendations on how Europe can better position itself as a strategic player on the world stage. This volume looks to reinvigorate the debate over Europe's role in the world.

In the fall of 2011, Carnegie Europe asked a select group of policymakers, diplomats, academics, experts, and journalists to reflect on what a "strategic" Europe might mean by posing a set of fundamental questions.

What are Europe's long-term foreign policy interests and objectives? How can they be prioritized and pursued? What means and instruments are needed to do so?

STRATEGIC
EUROPE

CARNEGIE EUROPE
CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE
WASHINGTON DC ▪ MOSCOW ▪ BEIJING ▪ BEIRUT ▪ BRUSSELS