

## FOLLOW UP REPORT

### « European defense in all its states »

July 3, 2007 (17:00 – 20:00)

Palais d'Egmont, Brussels

On July 3, at Palais d'Egmont in Brussels, some 50 experts and representatives from institutions and industry discussed European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) and its implications.

Key participants included: **Gabriele Altana** (IT/COPS); **Orlando Arango** (EIB); **Guillaume de La Brosse** (F/COPS); **Stavros Kyrimis** (EDA); **Antonio Missiroli** (EPC); **Alessandro Pansa** (Finmeccanica); **Gerrard Quille** (EU Parliament); **Paolo Venturoni** (Finmeccanica); **Dirk Wouters** (BE/COPS). The debate was moderated by **Paolo Raffone** (CIPI).

Central in the discussions were the issues of coordination among the different actors in the ESDP and of the funding for defence and security. Ambassador **Dirk Wouters** opened the debate by formulating some proposals for ESDP future development.

- ⊛ He advocated the expansion of the core activities of ESDP in the most professional way, given the growing importance of the missions entrusted to the European military arm. “*A peace-keeping action by the European Union is becoming increasingly popular*” both inside and outside Europe, he said. It was therefore important to continue improving civil and military structures, making them more effective and independent outside and more streamlined inside and to overcome the present budget constraints. More money therefore was required and more resources to achieve an appropriate European coordination. But the budget was limited while the demands were increasing, including those of internal security. Defence therefore needed to be seen as having a particular specificity, i.e., more credibility.
- ⊛ He suggested using more extensively the existing and often under-used instruments. Would it not be a pity, he said, to realize in a couple of years that the European Union had never deployed a single Battle group and that member states never referred to an operational centre, thus missing a good opportunity to test a real joint operational experience between European military and civilian personnel? Would it not be a great pity that Defence Ministers continued to make national decisions in the field of procurement and investment without taking into consideration the advice of the European Defence Agency? Would it not be a great pity not to involve the European police or Eurocorps in EU missions which often require their kinds of skill? The same could be said for military training and the use of existing institutions such as the European College of Security and Defence.

It was, therefore, important to emphasize the importance of available instruments by using them more frequently.

- ✪ ESPD should be used as a support for European Foreign Policy and be integrated with development policy, trade policy etc. But this support does not mean that ESDP contributes exclusively to the external stability of the Union. It has also to contribute to its internal security, as European public opinion increasingly demands to be protected against new and diverse kinds of risks for which the existing national instruments are no longer sufficient.
- ✪ Ambassador Wouters wanted the specificity of Defence to be recognized and the retention of the diversity of the member states, their military capabilities, their different level of development of defense industries, their deployment capacity, their nuclear capacity etc., without trying to reduce or eliminate such differences. In fact some differences may even help since defense policy strikes a very sensitive chord of national sovereignty and military leaders want to be associated at all levels of decision making. Developing military capacities and making them more interoperable whilst respecting such differences will make the entire ESDP more credible.
- ✪ Finally, he suggested that it would be advisable to increase the political and parliamentary control on the defense and security related activities, a point that was subsequently made also by Antonio Missiroli when he mentioned the case of Turkey.

**Alessandro Pansa**, co-author, with Antonio Missiroli of the book “*European defence*” presented during the round table, underlined the role of the defense industry which he reckons is one of the few sectors that make public funds profitable. How does demand increase? In which directions does the industry go? At the top there are some EU countries, then Turkey, then a group of countries able to invest a great deal (e.g. the Gulf States, Malaysia). Then there is another group of countries, such as India, China and Russia, which are increasingly interested in high technology armaments. But in spite of technological developments in this sector, particularly in military communications, there is a lack of cooperation in Europe. He advocated increased cooperation at the EU level but so far only two European technological standards have become widespread in the field of communications: GSM and UMTS. Only with more cooperation between EU governments and within the EDA can the European Union have a more relevant role comparable to the DARPA in the United States. It is EDA who should insure a coherent approach in coordinating the defense market.

On the role of EDA **Stavros Kyrimis** underlined the scarcity of funding for this European agency at a time when security risks are increasing in the world. A shift in emphasis is needed from defense to security and infrastructure protection against terrorist threats. But the defense industries risk missing the train given insufficient expenditure! The positive aspect he said is that Solana is both the head of EDA and the person responsible for CFSP. Another advantage is that the Commissioner responsible for industrial development Günter Verheugen is at present sitting around a table with the military and defense people.

For **Guillaume de la Brosse** insufficient financing of EDA is not only a technical problem but a political one since not all countries want to spend to improve their technologies. It is important, he said, to avoid duplications with NATO but it is up to

the EU to decide which course to follow. The French approach to the EU policies in the defence and security fields would not necessarily change following the recent election of the new President of the Republic, he said. In fact, he added, the large consensus of French political forces on these matters should allow for a continuing stability of the process. On the other hands, it would be possible to see a “*rapprochement*” between France and the US. However, he concluded, this would not be incompatible with the deepening of the ESDP process.

According to **Gabriele Altana** (COPS) EDA was created with a limited scope rather like a small DARPA. Since the EU’s defense budget is very limited a stronger cooperation with the industrial sector is necessary moving from a strict military approach to a more open industrial one. Cooperation among states in this sector has proved very difficult to achieve, with even the prohibition for example on the use of equipment of another nation. Defence is devolving power to others.

For **Orlando Arango** effective defence systems need to address technology, logistics and the public opinion. Improvements in European defence may be achieved through better research, development and innovation. Efforts along this path generate as well significant benefits for civil applications that lead to increased competitiveness, social and economic gains. Constrained public budgets call for public private partnerships in this sector.

**Gerrard Quille** observed that ESDP (as well as the EDA) has now a real opportunity to come out from the legal shadow in which it had been confined so far. A more open debate, also within national parliaments, on defence issues is therefore more than welcome in order to further a positive and coherent defence and security policy.

**Antonio Missiroli** spoke on the subject of coherence when he suggested that the challenge in the field of military technology is to find the right mix in different situations relating to defence. France and United Kingdom have made it impossible to achieve the objectives of ESDP and are still difficult to manage. But the interesting problem for EU defence is the way in which the management of foreign policy has completely changed. He cited as an example the successful ESDP initiative last year in Congo which was a military success but a political failure because when EU forces left the political situation deteriorated. The new member states have been traditionally pro US but after the Iraq war the situation has changed also in these countries which are becoming, even in Poland, more pro-European compared to when they entered the EU. In answering a question about the “*Easternization*” of ESDP he suggested that Eastern countries do not have too much to offer to the EU but they can certainly help shape the future security scenario with Turkey in an important role.

**Paolo Venturoni** also spoke of the position of Turkey, a member of Nato but outside of the EU. Why, he asked, this separation of European identity? Would it not be better to develop a European identity more coordinated and amalgamated which includes Turkey?

**Alessandro Pansa** defined Turkey as the “headache” of Europe. Is Turkey important for the EU security? He asked. Probably yes. Will it continue to play a role inside or outside the EU? It remains to be seen. In any case, Pansa concluded, Turkey is one of the important elements in the European defence picture and it will be with us for a long time.

It was up to **Missiroli** to conclude by asking what are the drivers to create a political will in defence policy. Do we need a shock for this, he asked? And he concluded that the issue of Turkey, a very contentious one, would not go away. He suggested,

therefore, that it would be better to make it more European also in the field of defence by stressing the importance of civilian control over the military.

**List of key speakers :**

Ambassadeur Claude Misson, Directeur Général, EGMONT  
Paolo Raffone, Secrétaire Général, Fondation CIPI  
Orlando Arango, Porte Parole à Bruxelles, BEI  
Guillaume de La Brosse, Conseiller, Représentation de la France au COPS  
Stravos Kyrimis, Directeur Adjoint, EDA  
Antonio Missiroli, Directeur de la Recherche, EPC  
Alessandro Pansa, Codirecteur Général, Finmeccanica  
Gerrard Quille, Département thématique, Relations extérieures, PE  
Amb. Dirk Wouters, Représentant Permanent de la Belgique auprès du COPS

**ABSTRACT of the book:**

“La difesa europea”, Antonio Missiroli / Alessandro Pansa

Outside of the relevant specialist milieus, very little indeed is known about the actual and possible role of the European Union in security and defence policy as well as the management of international crises. The international media tend to speak of “Europe” in a generic way, normally as the combination of the different positions of a few major countries, only to discover it on the occasion of the negotiations over Iran’s nuclear programme, the peace-keeping mission in South Lebanon, or the tortuous developments concerning EADS and Galileo. For their part, academics and experts tend to either overestimate or underrate that role - thus confirming the traded vision of an expectations-capabilities gap affecting European “foreign policy” at large.

The book by Missiroli and Pansa aims first and foremost at filling the vacuum, in terms of information, that exists especially in the Italian debate. It goes through the main stages in the development of the European security and defence policy (ESDP) launched in the wake of the Kosovo war and, in parallel, also through the complex configuration of defence industry across Europe and the rest of the world. Furthermore, the book tries to highlight both limits and contradictions of the current state of affairs, and its significant record and still unexplored potential - which make it (as most opinion polls clearly show) arguably the most popular and dynamic common policy in today’s EU.

**For further information please contact:**

Press: [marialaurafranciosi@compuserve.com](mailto:marialaurafranciosi@compuserve.com)

CIPI Foundation: [info@cipi-network.org](mailto:info@cipi-network.org)

Egmont: [t.stevens@egmontinstitute.be](mailto:t.stevens@egmontinstitute.be)