

Needs for an updated or revised EU global strategy (EUGS)

Essay

created for the CSDP Olympiad 2020
in Dubrovnik – Croatia

Author:

Cadet Luka Mesić

Student of the Croatian Defence Academy “Dr. Franjo Tuđman”
Croatia

Zagreb, December 2019.

Abstract and Keywords

EU global strategy (EUGS) is one of the most crucial documents regarding European Union's Foreign and security policy. Its importance is in determining common guidelines for joint activities on the field of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). Signing of this strategy is a big step towards integration of all the member states regarding CFSP. It is precisely because of the great importance of this strategy that we need to reassess and critically analyse it. Upon studying currently available sources it becomes clear that there is not a single study which does exactly that. That is why this paper will analyse the strategy in detail. It will break down the strategy into components and will explain its logical structure, after which a research of logical consistency will be conducted. At the very end of the paper the results of the overall analysis are presented, and the author discusses the conclusions reached.

Keywords: EUGS, security, strategy, CFSP, revision

1. Table of Contents

1.	Table of Contents	1
2.	Preface	2
3.	Introduction	3
4.	Current State of Research	4
5.	Research gap	6
6.	Research question	7
7.	Methodology	8
8.	Research and Results of Research	9
8.1.	Values, interests, principles and priorities	9
8.2.	Priority analysis	10
8.3.	Research results	12
8.3.1.	What is the Strategy's logical structure?.....	12
8.3.2.	Are there any shortcomings in the Strategy's logical structure?.....	12
8.3.3.	Does EUGS need to be updated or revised?.....	12
9.	Discussion of Results and personal Conclusions	13
10.	Annexes	15
10.1.	List of abbreviations.....	15
10.2.	List of literature	15
10.2.1.	Books	15
10.2.2.	Articles	15
11.	Affidavit	17

2. Preface

As a third year cadet on Croatian Defence Academy „Dr. Franjo Tuđman“ the author has attended a fair number of courses in field of political , geopolitical, security and management studies and as such understands the importance of strategic management today. So far, the author has studied the National Security Strategy of Republic of Croatia, written in 2017, as well as the process of its making. Aware of the potential weaknesses of security policy created by Republic of Croatia without the help and cooperation from its allied states, and the possibilities which the integration of the CFSP policies offers, the author took interest in EUGS. The need for a proper EU strategy is of utmost importance to the Union itself. It is thus necessary that such documents are constantly revised and updated. The ever-shifting world around us necessitates that we actively partake in upgrading our strategic management. Critical thinking and studies of existing strategy is our duty as European citizens if we are to secure a peaceful and prosperous lives for our children.

3. Introduction

Three years have passed since making EUGS. This document has made a great leap from the idealism of ESS, the strategic document which preceded EUGS. The new strategy is rooted in realpolitik, but „*Realpolitik in the original sense of the term. As John Bew usefully reminds us, Realpolitik as coined by the German liberal Ludwig von Rochau in 1853 meant a rejection of liberal utopianism, but not of liberal ideals themselves.*“¹ Such a strategy is necessary for European CFSP if desired results of those policies are to be seen. Regardless, despite the many advantages over the older versions such as ESS, it is worth looking into just how well EUGS is written and recognising certain aspects of it that can be improved. This intention is what this entire paper is based on. In order to effectively examine this idea, previous studies on this subject must be analysed. After this, certain topics that were not addressed in previous studies will be researched. In this paper, all the research shall be conducted exclusively on EUGS. It will be broken down into elements, which will then be systemised into a logical structure and presented. All of this will be done in order to define a clear purpose of each priority given in EUGS so that the inconsistencies in the strategy itself can be recognised.

Through this paper the concept of security will be used. Since this concept can be defined in many ways it is imperative that it is clarified. When security is mentioned here, it is referred to the book *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*.² In this book security is defined through five dimensions i.e. military, political, economic, social and environmental security. Population, state and international community are referent objects when talking about security. The Strategy itself states that it is oriented towards the security of the citizens and territory of the European union, while the international community is observed due to its role in providing said security because „*The external cannot be separated from the internal.*“³

¹ Biscop, S. (2016). *The EU Global Strategy: Realpolitik with European Characteristics*. Security Policy Brief No. 75. June 2016. P. 1.

² Cf.: Buzan, B. & Wæve, O. & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*.

³ European Union Global Strategy (2016). P. 17.

4. Current State of Research

In this chapter previously conducted researches about EUGS will be discussed. The primary objective is to find research gaps which will allow the author to make his own contributions to the subject. Upon analysis of these studies, it becomes clear that they can be roughly categorised into three distinct categories. This rough estimate will allow easier understanding of the topic.

The first category is consisted of studies that aim to describe the process of how EUGS came to as well as its differences from ESS from 2003. Some of these studies are as follows:

In the book *Towards an EU global strategy – Consulting the experts*⁴ the early ideas of what EUGS should be like are given, however, since it came out before the release of EUGS it lacks a critical analysis of currently existing Strategy

Antonio Missiroli (2015.)⁵ describes the stages in the making of EUGS in his book.

In a study by Žutić and Čehulić Vukadinović (2017.)⁶ a comparison between EUGS and ESS is made, from which a conclusion that EUGS is a strategy that established the EU as an effective strategic actor arises. However, they too did not conduct research regarding needs for revisions.

In an article by Tocci (2016.)⁷ the genesis of EUGS is described in detail, but once again without a critical analysis.

The second category consists of studies made on a single aspect of the strategy, while omitting other parts of it. Some of these are as follows:

⁴Cf.: Missiroli, A. et al. (2016). *EU-ISS: Towards an EU global strategy – Consulting the experts*.

⁵ Cf.: Missiroli, A. (2015). *Towards an EU global strategy – Background, process, references*.

⁶ Cf.: Žutić, I. & Čehulić Vukadinović, L. (2017). *EU GLOBAL STRATEGY – AN UPGRADE OR NEW OS?*. *Europske studije*. 3 (5-6). 0-0.

⁷ Cf.: Tocci, N. (2016). *The making of the EU Global Strategy*. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 37(3), P. 461-472.

Sven Biscop's article (2016.)⁸ talks about the most realistic strategy yet. His research is not aimed at finding shortcomings of EUGS, but rather at explaining the core principles on which it was made.

Wolfgang Wosolsobe in his article⁹ talks about the Strategy by summarizing guidelines given for military engagement

In article Juncos, A. E. (2017)¹⁰ discusses a new all-around access of strengthening countries' resilience introduced by EUGS, but without critically analysing the entire Strategy.

The third group consists of researches that haven't significantly touched on the content of the Strategy, rather discussing its effects on other political domains. Some of the examples are:

Article made by Margriet Drent & Dick Zandee (2016.)¹¹ problematizes the process of carrying out policies of the EUGS.

In article Howorth, J. (2016.)¹² effectiveness of the EUGS is questioned on a political level without critically thinking about its content.

⁸ Cf.:Biscop, S. (2016). Op. cit.

⁹ Cf.:Wosolsobe, W. (2016). *After the EUGS: specifying the military tasks*, Alert – No. 35.

¹⁰ Cf.: Juncos, A. E. (2017). Resilience as the new EU foreign policy paradigm: a pragmatist turn?. *European security*, 26(1), P. 1-18.

¹¹ Cf.: Margriet Drent & Dick Zandee (2016). *After the EUGS: mainstreaming a new CSDP*, Alert – No. 34.

¹² Howorth, J. (2016). EU Global Strategy in a Changing World: Brussels' approach to the emerging powers. *Contemporary Security Policy*. 37(3). P. 389-401.

5. Research gap

As shown in the previous chapter, author didn't find a single relevant paper that would critically discuss EUGS in its entirety. It also appears as no one has even thought of questioning the logical structure of the Strategy. No researches were conducted about necessity of adding amendments or altering parts of the Strategy.

6. Research question

The main question of this essay is: does EUGS need to be updated or revised? To answer this question, we must first answer two sub-questions: What is the Strategy's logical structure, and are there any shortcomings in it?

7. Methodology

Our research question is the following: does EUGS require any changes or amendments? The answer to question can be researched in two ways. One is through analysis of the Strategy's content and condition of EU's strategic environment, thus finding defects in the Strategy. Second way to answer this question is to disassemble the Strategy into its logical components and analyse the logical structure. Author decides for the second approach and asks two sub-questions:

- What is the Strategy's logical structure?
- Are there any shortcomings in the Strategy's logical structure?

To answer these questions, we will explain Strategy's logical structure in the first part of our research. In the second part, we will analyse in detail each priority, as well as their relationship with strategic interests and values. Doing this will expose certain logical errors and point out any needs for amending the Strategy.

Thus, type of research requires only the Strategy itself and researcher's analysis. Our methodical approach to this research will be scientific hermeneutics, i.e. author's interpretation of the Strategy.

8. Research and Results of Research

In this chapter, we will conduct the research to answer the research question. We will first explain the relation of values, strategic interests, principles and priorities given in the Strategy. In second part of our research, each priority will be individually critically processed, and then connected to the strategic interest it directly affects. That part has the goal of exploring the existence of logical connection between priorities and strategic interests, as well as logical connection of guidelines given in the priority itself, all to finally provide the answer to our research question.

8.1. Values, interests, principles and priorities

EUGS is a strategic level document whose aim is to provide general guidelines for strategic actions of the European Union. The Strategy has an extreme importance, for it provides a vision of a strong, united European Union, ready to bear its role in global politics. To make that vision come true, the Strategy codifies commonly shared values, principles and interests among all members of the European Union. These interests and principles then beget priorities and principles for Europe's actions and attitude in its CFSP. EUGS attempts to instil a unity among all members of the European Union in their response on important strategic questions concerning safety of all European Union's citizens and European Union's territory.

The Strategy presents the main values of European Union to be peace and security, prosperity, democracy, and a rules-based world. Strategic interests stem from aforementioned values. Promoting peace and guaranteeing European citizens' and territory safety are quoted as primary interest of European Union. Improving prosperity for EU's citizens is quoted as a second interest. With prosperity meaning: „*promoting growth, jobs, equality, and a safe and healthy environment*”¹³. Furthermore, as third interest, strengthening democracies' resilience is stated, resilience in this case being defined in this manner: „*States are resilient when societies feel they are becoming better off and have hope in the future*”¹⁴. The fourth interest in the strategy is promoting world order based on multilateralism and a rules-based world.

Before setting priorities of EU's course of action, it is necessary to set principles which will guide EU in creating and conducting its policies. One of the main principles, is the unity of EU and its interests with national interests of individual member states. Inclusion in relevant events around the world and being committed to solving problems at their core is another crucial principle because „*internal policies often deal only with the consequences of external dynamics*”¹⁵. Listed as another principle is existence of feeling responsibility for the consequences of its actions. The last, but not least, is the principle of cooperation with countries, as well as regional and international organizations

¹³ European Union Global Strategy (2016). Op. cit. P. 14.

¹⁴ Ibid. P. 26.

¹⁵ Ibid. P. 17.

while enforcing policies. At the very end of the Strategy, it is said that its enforcement requires EU to be credible, responsive and joined-up

Priorities on acting were set to make sure their enforcement would be guided by predefined principles and result in realization of EU's strategic interests. They are the best-defined guidelines for enforcing the Strategy, and therefore take up the largest part of EUGS. To find shortcomings in the Strategy, we will break down one priority at a time and connect them with the interest they directly influence. It's important to emphasize that each priority indirectly influences all the interests, but we'll stay oriented on a direct correlation between a priority and an interest to look for possible lacks in Strategy's orienteers on each individual interest. Special attention must be paid to the first priority, because that's where the author found the Strategy to be inconsistent

8.2. Priority analysis

The first priority is security of the EU. The Strategy here lists threats to its citizens and territory to define sub-priorities required to fulfil the first major priority. These threats are „*terrorism, hybrid threats, climate change, economic volatility and energy insecurity*”¹⁶. Defining the threats gives us a better outlook of EU's security, however, things begin to change when the Strategy lists five sub-priorities, which are: security and defence, counterterrorism, cyber security, energy security and strategic communications. The sub-priorities clearly show a more narrow understanding of the term „security“, i.e. without considering economy and ecology, as the Strategy completely lacks guidelines on how to respond to climate changes or economic volatility. All of the sub-priorities are directed at strategic resources required to defend against an outside hybrid threat. Although the first sub-priority mentions the word safety, it is understood in a narrower context, without considering economic and ecological dimensions of safety. Although visible from the whole chapter, it is best shown in the following excerpt: “*addressing challenges with both an internal and external dimension, such as terrorism, hybrid threats, cyber and energy security, organised crime and external border management.*”¹⁷ Furthermore, sub-priority „energy security“ does not provide an answer to the threat of climate changes, because is focused solely on energy management aimed at strategic energy supply autonomy, without even addressing the issue of climate changes. Therefore, the Strategy talks about safety of its citizens and territory, yet completely ignores economic and ecological dimension of security. How illogical and inconsistent the Strategy is, is best recognised in the fact that its first priority recognises the problem of economic volatility and climate changes, yet still forgets to provide guidelines on how to address these threats. All in all, we can say that the first enforcement priority has a direct influence on realization of the first interest – promoting peace and guaranteeing security of EU's citizens and territory – should we consider security as a term that doesn't include ecological and economic dimension.

Second priority is investing in resilience of countries to the east of Europe all the way to central Asia, and to middle Africa to the south. The Strategy divides that priority into activities towards countries with ambitions to join EU, activities towards those that wish to reinforce their cooperation with the EU, and activities towards unstable countries in

¹⁶ Ibid. P. 18-19.

¹⁷ Ibid. P. 20.

these regions. As another important part of this priority, the Strategy lists the need for a better migrations policy towards countries in transition. This shows that all determinants important for realization of this priority have been considered, which directly affects the realization of the third interest – strengthening democracies' resilience.

The third priority is an integrated approach to conflicts and crises. Integrated approach means „*use of all available policies and instruments aimed at conflict prevention, management and resolution*”¹⁸. This priority is in fact an amendment of the previous one. When enforcing the second priority fails, and a crisis arises in a specific country, different sort of activities are required. Activities in third priority consist of pre-emptive activities, activities responding to crisis and activities towards rebuilding state and society after the crisis is over. Strategy puts special emphasis on importance of establishing a legitimate economy in crisis-struck countries. We can say that the third priority has considered all the most important items for its realization, hence directly enabling the third interest – strengthening democracies' resilience.

Fourth priority are cooperative regional orders. It has been stated that „*Voluntary forms of regional governance offer states and peoples the opportunity to better manage security concerns, reap the economic gains of globalisation, express more fully cultures and identities, and project influence in world affairs.*”¹⁹ This is one of many reasons why this strategy decides to settle on a multilateral approach to world order. This priority consists of activities towards building European security, emphasizing the threat coming from Russia, activities towards Mediterranean, Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa, activities towards countries across the Atlantic, activities towards dominant countries in Asian regions and activities towards Arctic. It's easily noticeable that this priority has given attention to all the important regional systems, which directly enables the realization of fourth strategic interest – strengthening multilateral world order.

Fifth priority is global leadership for the 21st century. The Strategy envisions UN as „*bedrock of the multilateral rules-based order, and develop globally coordinated responses with international and regional organisations, states and non-state actors.*”²⁰ Put simply, the priority is creating a powerful UN, which would be accomplished by reforming it, investing in it, and especially its missions, enforcing its decisions regarding sustainable growth, climate change, encouraging free trade, enforcing disarmament treaty, and defining rules in all areas of activity shared with other international actors. From this stem a conclusion that the fifth priority provides all the guideline necessary for its execution. Fifth priority has a direct influence on realization of the fourth interest – creating a rules-based global order based on multilateralism.

¹⁸ Ibid. P. 28.

¹⁹ Ibid. P. 32.

²⁰ Ibid. P. 39.

8.3. Research results

8.3.1. What is the Strategy's logical structure?

The Strategy is assembled by defining EU's core values, from which strategic interests are derived. Certain priorities are defined to assure interests' realization. From these priorities, sub-priorities have been derived, whose enforcement is directly correlated to the realization of priorities. To assure policies directed via priorities and sub-priorities positively affect the realization of strategic interests, adherence to certain principles is required. Simultaneously, successfully implementing the strategy requires EU to be credible, responsive and joined-up.

8.3.2. Are there any shortcomings in the Strategy's logical structure?

Research results have shown that the Strategy's logical structure itself is flawed, making two major logic flaws, as the strategy lists four major interests, along with five priorities which are supposed to assure interests' realization. This would not be as odd, had the second interest not been directly unsupported through any of the priorities. Not a single priority addresses the interest of „*growth, jobs, equality, and a safe and healthy environment*”²¹. Second major logic flaw is the fact that while the Strategy acknowledges the threat of economic volatility and climate change, it doesn't provide even a single guideline in dealing with these threats to provide EU's citizens with economic and ecological security.

8.3.3. Does EUGS need to be updated or revised?

A rather obvious conclusion is that a consistent strategy would require addressing economic volatility and climate change through either an additional priority, or through a first priority's sub-priorities, providing clear guidelines for tackling these issues. The nature of these guidelines is a topic for another research, but these measures should be aiming for prevention, response to, and recovery from eventual financial and ecological crises. To answer our research question, revision of the Strategy is most certainly necessary due to its logical fallacies.

²¹ Ibid. P. 14.

9. Discussion of Results and personal Conclusions

One of the most important prerequisites for making a good strategy is its logical structure. It is essential to clearly define values, interests, priorities and sub-priorities and put in a clear hierarchy. Each sub-priority must directly influence the execution of priorities, which in turn must be determined in a way that allows for a direct influence on completion of interests. Those interest must originate from established, written values. When making a strategy, we must first observe the core values, then interests, which finally lead to priorities and sub-priorities. Before determining the priorities and sub-priorities, a strategic analysis must be conducted. This can be achieved through SWOT analysis or any other technique which will help us to determine best priorities for achieving our interests. After this whole process is done, it is necessary to regulate principles which will guide the policies' application based on that strategy. In order for strategy to keep its logical consistency it's important that for each interest there exist at least one subordinated priority with its sub-priorities. In addition, each written value must be articulated as interest.

In the EUGS it really is the case that for each value there is an assigned interest, however it becomes clear that there is a big flaw in connectivity between interests and priorities. The strategy did not determine a priority which would directly influence on achieving the second interest so a mistake in a logical structure of strategy itself has been made. It has also been noted that during the strategic analysis for determining first priority's sub-priorities the danger of economic volatility and climate changes has been observed. Despite this, these threats have not been addressed at all when determining sub-priorities. In this way the Strategy has shown its inconsistency once more. A question arises; how can such obvious mistakes be made in such an important document? Possible answers to this question shall be presented in the next paragraph of this chapter, however it will not offer a definitive or conclusive solution to this problem which will leave room for further research into this topic.

At first glance there appear to be two possible explanations. First is that these errors are accidental, with second being that they were made on purpose. With the assumption that these mistakes were accidents, the solution is pretty simple. The authors of EUGS didn't think the logical structure through, and simply forgot to give guidelines for dealing with defined threats after finishing the strategic analysis. Given that the great number of experts on the subject have contributed to EUGS, as seen in an article by Tocci N. (2016.)²², this idea must simply be rejected. Thus, it can be concluded that this error was purposeful. Such an interpretation presents many new questions, of which two stick out the most. These are as follows: why such mistakes have been made, and in whose interest? This paper will not even attempt to offer any answers to these questions since it would derail the paper from its main topic.

Regardless, one might be tempted to argue that ecological changes have been addressed. Indeed, in the fifth priority there is a sub-priority that defines EU's willingness to abide by UN's decisions on sustainable development and climate change. Therefore, it can be argued that this sub-priority is connected to enhancement of the prosperity of EU citizens.

²² Cf.: Tocci, N. (2016). Op. cit. P. 461-472.

This argument loses its validity when one takes into account the following context: *“It will increase climate financing, drive climate mainstreaming in multilateral fora, raise the ambition for review foreseen in the Paris agreement, and work for clean energy cost reductions.”*²³ Just before this sentence it's written: *“The EU will lead by example by implementing its commitments on sustainable development and climate change”*²⁴ Taking into consideration that this is a sub-priority of the fifth priority it becomes clear that the main purpose of this policy is to strengthen the UN's position as a global leader. That is why the author believes that the security threat which the European citizens face has been ignored. This necessitates broader and clearer guidelines which will directly impact the second interest. It is important to note here that a well written strategy defines priorities in a way that they not only directly influences one interest, but indirectly affects others as well. Author is therefore inclined to believe that the Strategy is well written in these aspects.

This research has shown some glaring inconsistencies in EUGS. With all the due respect to the threat climate change poses, the author thinks that a far more pressing concern is the economic dimension of security. The logic behind this reasoning is that the lack of proper strategy on the matters of economics will affect the citizens sooner than ecological threats, which leaves more time for dealing with ecological challenges. It is author's firm belief that clear strategic guidelines for prevention of economic crisis, dealing with such crisis and for economic revitalization must be defined. If we truly want economic stability and security for our citizens it is important to implement these guidelines which will directly influence second interest, while at the same time indirectly affecting other interests and principles. The author encourages experts to conduct further studies which will show which guidelines, priorities and sub-priorities must be implemented into the Strategy to truly offer economic stability and prosperity for European citizens.

²³ European Union Global Strategy (2016). Op. cit. P. 40.

²⁴ Ibid. P. 40.

10. Annexes

10.1. List of abbreviations

EUGS	European Global Strategy
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
ESS	European Security Strategy
EU	European Union
UN	United Nations

10.2. List of literature

10.2.1. Books

01. Buzan, B. & Wæve, O. & de Wilde, J. (1998). Security: A New Framework for Analysis
02. Missiroli, A. (2015). Towards an EU global strategy – Background, process, references.
03. Missiroli, A. et al. (2016). EU–ISS: Towards an EU global strategy – Consulting the experts

10.2.2. Articles

01. Biscop, S. (2016). The EU Global Strategy: Realpolitik with European Characteristics. Security Policy Brief No. 75. June 2016.
02. European Union Global Strategy (2016.)
03. Howorth, J. (2016). EU Global Strategy in a Changing World: Brussels' approach to the emerging powers. Contemporary Security Policy. 37(3). P. 389-401
04. Juncos, A. E. (2017). Resilience as the new EU foreign policy paradigm: a pragmatist turn? European security. 26(1), P. 1-18
05. Margriet Drent & Dick Zandee (2016). After the EUGS: mainstreaming a new *CSDP*, Alert – No. 34

06. Tocci, N. (2016). The making of the EU Global Strategy. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 37(3), P. 461-472
07. Wosolsobe, W. (2016). After the EUGS: specifying the military tasks, *Alert* – No. 35
08. Žutić, I. & Čehulić Vukadinović, L. (2017). EU GLOBAL STRATEGY – AN UPGRADE OR NEW OS?. *Europske studije*. 3 (5-6). 0-0

11. Affidavit

I declare that I have written present essay independently and on my own. I have clearly marked any language or ideas borrowed from other sources as not my own and documented their sources. The essay does not contain any work that I have handed in or have graded as a previous scientific paper earlier on.

I am aware that any failure to do so constitutes plagiarism. Plagiarism is the presentation of another person's thoughts or words as if they were my own – even if I summarize, paraphrase, condense, cut, rearrange, or otherwise alter them.

I am aware of the consequences and sanctions plagiarism entails. Among others, consequences may include nullification of the essay, exclusion from participation in the CSDP Olympiad. These consequences also apply retrospectively, i.e. if plagiarism is discovered after the essay has been accepted and graded. I am fully aware of the scope of these consequences.



(cadet Luka Mesić)

Zagreb, Croatia in December 2019