

Analysestandpunkt 11 (Oct. 2008) Analytical Standpoint, no. 11 (Oct 2008)

Herausgegeben von/edited by Alexander Siedschlag

ISSN 1819-7116

A Policy Primer on Security Research Contributions to EU Rapid Reaction

Alexander Siedschlag¹

“Scientific man vs. power politics”²

In December 2007, on the Lisbon Summit, EU heads of state and government mandated a review of the European Security Strategy (ESS),³ adopted on the Brussels Summit four years before, in December 2003. The review process will require Union bodies and member states to address a set of challenging questions, such as establishing a strategic hierarchy between the big five

-
- 1 Dr. habil. Alexander Siedschlag, former Full Professor of European Security Policy, is director of the WWEDU Center for European Security Studies in Wels/Austria (<http://www.european-security.info>). He has served as an evaluator in several Security Research calls of the European Union and is a member of the Working Group “Governance and Coordination” of the European Security Research and Innovation Forum – ESRIF (<http://www.esrif.eu>). The author would like to thank Mag. Andrea Jerković for reviewing the paper.
 - 2 Hans J. Morgenthau: *Scientific Man vs. Power Politics* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1946). Morgenthau argues that political issues must be understood through the reason of science, but the reason of science is *not* a model to solve them because “politics is an art and not a science”. Seen this way, security research shall not contribute to a simplification, but to the full appreciation of the complex variety of security challenges and different ways nations confront it by both political and rational (or science) means.
 - 3 *A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy*. Brussels, 12 December 2003, <http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf>.

threats identified in ESS and associated strategies to meet them on a national and a European level.⁴

At the same time, the European Security Research and Innovation Forum (ESRIF)⁵ is preparing a report on mid-term threats and challenges to EU and EU member states security, including a catalogue of themes for applied security research to meet these threats. It is a remarkable development to base the Union's and its member states security also on research findings, but at the same time, this poses a couple of challenges.

These challenges link up to issues in the ongoing ESS review, such as establishing a link between civil and defence security policy and security research, connecting the search for scientific foundations of meeting security challenges with the investigation of potentials and limits for the Europeanization of security research, along with the Europeanization of security itself. Notably, in addition to the well-established idea of the Union representing an area of freedom, security and justice, the EU treaty text of Lisbon speaks of the security of "the Union" as such in its own quality – and of the "Union's competence" in this respect –⁶ vis-à-vis the (national) security of its member states, which the Lisbon treaty explicitly leaves in their national domain.⁷

It is a challenge for security research as an only emerging field of studies to meet the need for providing linkages between these two, politically separated but logically linked areas of *Union* and *member state security*. This is even the more the case as common European security capabilities will for the time being consist in exactly what member states develop and make available for the Union as a whole.

A further challenge for security research is to connect defence-related with civilian research, feeding into capability-building for EU rapid response, which is a defining goal for both the civilian and the military aspects of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP),⁸ including the question of harmonization and avoidance of duplication.

4 On the ESS review process, see Thomas Bauer/Florian Baumann: "ESS 2.0 – Establishing strategic hierarchy in Europe", *C·A·Perspectives*, no. 1, September 2008, <http://www.cap-lmu.de/publikationen/2008/caperspectives-2008-01.php>.

5 <http://www.esrif.eu>.

6 *Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union*, art. 24 para. 1, <http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf>.

7 *Ibid.*, art. 4 para. 2.

8 See our Center's comprehensive documentation presentation: "The multidimensional development of ESDP as an instrument for comprehensive conflict management", Institute of European Studies of Macao, 2006, http://www.european-security.info/esdp_macao.pdf.

This need is pointed up by recent developments in the context of the European Defence Agency (EDA), which has compiled an initial ESDP Capability Development Plan (CDP) focusing on military capabilities. The EU member states participating in EDA have agreed on an initial tranche of selected actions in order to operationalize CDP findings.⁹

This policy primer takes the opportunity to place results from the Center's ongoing research, reported in the *Analytical Standpoint* no. 10 "European Countries National Security Research Policy Compared in the Light of FP 7"¹⁰ in the contexts of these challenges. It does so in the light of the question to what extent existing national security research programmes can make a contribution to support EU civil and military rapid reaction in crisis response.

National security research contributions to EU rapid response capabilities

Following the analysis reported in the *Analytical Standpoint* no. 10,¹¹ the following countries covered in the underlying case study have a focus on crisis management in their security research programmes, combined with an emphasis on reaction/response (as opposed to preparedness/prevention): France, Germany, Italy, Spain and Sweden. However, except Sweden, all these countries were found to follow a (national) coordination approach (as opposed to an international cooperation and standardization approach) in addressing transversal and comprehensive issues, such as meeting security threats by a combination of civil and military capabilities. This allows only a limited scope for a common European research agenda on comprehensive capabilities for EU rapid response.

However, our case study findings provide foundations for expecting the following national contributions to a European research agenda for rapid response in crisis management:

- *France* could contribute to developing cross-cutting capabilities needed in no matter of what specific type of crisis is at stake.
- *Germany's* contribution could focus on protection and rescue of people, and it should be born in mind that its security research programme is strictly focused on civil protection.

9 See: European Defence Agency: "Background Note: Capability Development Plan", 8 July 2008, <http://www.eda.europa.eu/genericitem.aspx?id=386>.

10 Alexander Siedschlag: "European Countries National Security Research Policy Compared in the Light of FP 7", WWEDU Center for European Security Studies, *Analytical Standpoint* no. 10 (July 2008), <http://www.european-security.info/asp10.pdf>.

11 Ibid.

- *Italy* could concentrate on comprehensive risk assessment and rapid-response civil protection.
- Our findings do not suggest a relevant issue area for *Spain*, and crisis management does not figure as a topic or strategic activity in security research.
- *Sweden* could focus on mobile and integrated communication and information systems, including detection and sensors.

In sum, national findings suggest that crisis management as a security research activity is typically associated with a national/coordination method of governance, keeping technology and innovation at home. Equally, technology-centered approaches to solutions for security problems are, in sum of all countries analyzed, more strongly associated with prevention than with response/reaction. Moreover, countries focusing on international standardization as method of governance for security research tend to also have a focus on prevention/preparedness rather than response, thus not very much qualifying for topics related to EU rapid response.

This means there are clear structural/political limits to national security research contributions to EU rapid response. A feasible area however appears to be mission support by intelligent surveillance, which is in the centre of member states' contributions to European security research institutions.¹²

Towards comprehensive instruments? – Security capabilities vs. defence capabilities

The political objective of comprehensiveness in EU crisis management is not yet mirrored in the thematic thrust of member states' security research programmes. The most of the analyzed countries define their security research programme as a programme for civil security research to a maximum of policing research. This is reflected in the finding that the majority of national security research programmes have a focus on prevention (rather than reaction), accordingly focusing on preventive (civilian) capabilities.

In Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway¹³, Sweden and the UK, relevant programme development/review committees and/or responsible agencies were been found not to explicitly include the defence sector. Only in Austria, France and Spain, Ministry of Defence expertise was found to be included on the level of security research programme development or programme review.

¹² See *ibid.*, p. 13.

¹³ Norway was included in the underlying country case study framework as a relevant non-member state participating in Security Research in the EU 7th Framework Programme.

Generally, technology-centered approaches to solutions for security problems as they could support EU Rapid Reaction Forces are, in sum of all countries analyzed, more strongly associated with prevention than with response/reaction. In addition, EU member states focusing on international standardization in security research have a focus on preparedness/prevention rather than reaction/response. Therefore, there are distinct structural/political limits to national security research contributions to EU Rapid Reaction capabilities.

Policy recommendation

In the light of our findings, EU action to enhance, support and coordinate security (research) policy of member states should take into account that the often advocated development of a common “security culture” as for example advocated in the European Security Strategy (ESS)¹⁴ will not necessarily lead to enhanced harmonization and coordination of national security (research) policies.

Rather, ongoing research on national security (research) cultures has shown that the establishment of common symbols and values representing security on a European level may lead to divergent national responses and needs to be anteceded by a process of convergence of national practices and instruments for security (research) governance.¹⁵ In the majority of the countries considered in our case studies, security continues to be regarded as national cultural value. Enhancement of nationally driven initiatives for standardization and certification, including support for according multilateral repertoires of action, may therefore be a more effective choice for EU action.

In the light of these findings, coordination between member states as well as between member states and the EU in the process of European capability development for rapid reaction in the framework of the initial ESDP Capability Development Plan (CDP) should be pursued by methods like the following:

- Building on convergence of national practices and instruments for security (research) governance
- Enhancing nationally driven initiatives for standardization and certification (as opposed to harmonization).

14 *A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy*, p. 11.

15 This refers to findings from research conducted by the WWEDU Center for European Security Studies within ESRI (<http://www.esrif.eu>) Working Group 10 and in the course to the project CPSI – Changing Perceptions of Security and Interventions (http://www.european-security.info/cpsi_info.pdf), funded by the European Commission under the first Security Research call in the 7th Framework Programme (Call Identifier FP7-SEC-2007-1, Project/Grant Agreement No. 217881).

- Supporting cross-national compatibility of security capabilities as well as aggregation and integration of national/proprietary standardization and certification procedures
- Supporting expansion of scope of member states security research programmes so to include organizational studies about adaptive and co-ordinated inter-agency structures in order to support a comprehensive approach to EU crisis management operation
- Supporting additional research about common/compatible practices of cooperation and Europeanization of member states security research policies

Summary of changes

Ver 1.0, 31 Oct 2008 – Initial release

Ver 1.1, 25 Nov 2008 – Debugging of formal issues

<http://analysestandpunkt.european-security.info>