



# A NEW AMBITION FOR EUROPE

November 20, 2014 | Brussels

## **MODERATOR:**

**Judy Dempsey**, nonresident senior associate at Carnegie Europe and editor in chief of the *Strategic Europe* blog

## **SPEAKERS:**

**Marta Dassù**, editor in chief of *Aspenia* and senior director of European affairs at the Aspen Institute

**Jessica Tuchman Mathews**, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

**Robin Niblett**, director of Chatham House

**Jan Techau**, director of Carnegie Europe

**Justin Vaïsse**, director of policy planning staff at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

**JESSICA MATHEWS:** I'm Jessica Mathews, President of the Carnegie Endowment. It's a great pleasure to welcome all of you here today, and this very distinguished panel. Carnegie, as most of you know, maybe some don't, is an international network of research centres that are located in Moscow, Beijing, Beirut, Brussels and Washington, and next year in New Delhi. They are each of them locally staffed and locally led, and they work on issues that are both unique to that country or region, and together on issues that are of global significance and relevance, whether it's environment, trade, security, geopolitics, the whole gamut.

Today's subject is one that fits both the local and regional criterion of importance and one that is, I think, of global importance, because its subject, A New Ambition For Europe, a memo to new EU Foreign Policy Chief and really, Foreign Policy Team, is one that is of huge importance to Europe, therefore of great importance to the United States, and of global significance as well.

It is written, the report that you have received, and of which this is the formal launch of, by a group of Carnegie scholars, Jan Techau, who is the Director of Carnegie Europe, Stefan Lehne, we expect both of them are here today, and Dan Keohane from FRIDE, who is also here today.

The publication is intentionally short, which means that the process of arriving at it was very long. It came out of a series of six expert seminars and many long writing sessions over the course of this past year, to try to arrive at a consensus on the key issues and then boil them down to their essence. The result is, it's a demanding document to read, because there is an idea virtually every sentence. It is, I think, coming out at an enormously timely moment. The new team of course is still looking for desks and telephones and business cards, but the effect of this document which has been circulated some, is already very evident.

Its message, the vision that the authors were attempting to achieve and to convey, is that a new EU leadership team needs [tape cuts] and the impact of this around Europe in the member states. The memo makes the case, the core of the argument, that the EU needs to become far more secure in its foreign policy purpose and ambitions, and that doing so is a matter of existentialism importance, to the union and to the region.

It's a matter of securing Europe's welfare and prosperity in response to the challenges that now surround it, inside, but more importantly, outside the union.

The EU we know, is in its deepest essence, a rules based system designed to resolve conflict and enable the nations of Europe to live together in peace and prosperity. For a long time, the European Project has been focused on this ambitious and important original ambition. But we dare not live mentally in a time that no longer exists. Today, peace in Europe does not only depend on the EU's inner workings. It will depend on equal, or, I would guess, greater measure, on Europe's ability to bring about peace and stability outside its borders.

Foreign policy, in other words, can no longer be a side show in EU affairs. It must be at its very heart and centre. This is the core of the belief that the authors shared from the outset, and attempted to turn into policy recommendations that they have laid before you today.

This has been the focus of Carnegie Europe's work for about four years, Europe's role as a strategic actor, and it will not be the end of that process, but rather the beginning of a broader one, we hope. We see this document, today's discussion, as beginning a conversation around what it laid out here. We hope that conversation will deepen and broaden and improve the thoughts that the authors have

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

laid out, and that perhaps a new version, a new and improved version, based on conversations all around Europe, will come out of that process.

Today's world order is, I think we all would agree, brittle and shaky, and the European pillar of it needs to be much stronger than it has been to date. We have a superb panel, cast of panelists here to discuss the memo, to take it apart, to add to it, and we are very grateful to each of them for joining us today. I think it would be hard to gather a more qualified group of panelists who have both the knowledge of how governments work from inside, and the distance and instinctive scholarship and freedom of thought that comes from working outside.

That's the balance that we look for, and have, I think, found today. So we are in the hands of Judy Dempsey as our moderator, who edits Carnegie's Strategic Europe blog, and has been writing steadily on this subject for years and years. I think all of you know her and know her writing. We also have Marta Dassù, who is the Senior Director of European Affairs at Aspen Italy in Rome, and who previously served as Italy's Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs. Justin Vaïsse, next to Jan Techau here, is the Director of Policy Planning Staff at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Robin Niblett is the Director of Chatham House, next to Marta, and at my left here, Jan Techau, one of the authors of the Programme, and the director of Carnegie Europe.

So Judy, we're now in your hands, and in the audience's hands for a great discussion. Thank you so much and thank you for joining us.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Thank you very much Jessica, thank you very much for coming over, it means a lot to us, and thank you very much for your thoughtful, very trenchant and important comments on perhaps what Europe should be. But we won't dwell in the past on that. Of course, thank you very much for the audience, thank you for making the time, I mean, there's so much competition for all of you to attend, so many venues and meetings and other events in Brussels, thank you very much.

Now, this format is very straightforward. Our speakers are distinguished speakers, because they work very very hard, they don't have to give any opening statements or any speeches. The whole idea is that I shall ask each of them, and they can all interrupt of course, one question each, of course based on the report, and Jan will pick up any weaknesses or strengths of the report as well, and we will have a thorough discussion on this for at least 45 minutes or an hour on issues out of this report, which is mercifully short, but as Jessica said [unclear]. So I am going to kick off with a question for [tape cuts] the questions that I have. So, this is a very nasty trick. Anyway, so I think it's only fair that I start with Jan. He's nursed, shepherded this report through for many many many intense months, so he doesn't know what I'm going to ask him. So Jan, this is your chance.

When you actually look at this paper, do you really think that the institutions are up to, are prepared to take on board any of the recommendations and implement them? And by the way, the whole idea is to have a dialogue on this, and to have the questions relatively punchy, and answers short.

**JAN TECHAU:** I think, that is actually really a question I didn't expect, but it's an important, and perhaps even in the context of Brussels, a crucial question. I think the institutions are perfectly capable of doing this. The question is twofold, are they willing to do it, and will the member states let them do it? Because we should not forget, in all of our obsessions about institutions in this town, that the members states are running the show on foreign policy, and the institutions can shepherd, can inform, can guide, can suggest, but they cannot really run it. There are of course parts of foreign policy and trade, and perhaps in development here and there, where the institutions have a high degree or

## *Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

autonomy or even full autonomy, but in the classic field of foreign policy, that's not the case, that's where the member states are jealously guarding their prerogatives.

So the big question I guess is, you know, also that we try to tackle in the paper, is how can the institutions position themselves to not be sidelined by the member states too much, to be the real guardians of the European wide interest, and to make EU foreign policy more the sum of its member states parts.

This is why we put institutional as well as content suggestions in the paper. So my feeling is, the answer to your question depends, to a large degree on whether the institutions can suggest stuff to the member states that it becomes so compelling and so intelligent and so constructive for them, that's it's very hard for them to sideline it. And then it depends on the member states, you know, whether they are actually willing to pool it a bit more here in this town, and we've seen in recent months, you know, a tendency to not do that. So I'm optimistic in theory, but practice seems to indicate that it's going to be a very tough call.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** You see, in your paper, and I see Uli Speck is here, one of the authors, and Daniel and even Stefan, the whole team is actually here, which is great. The thing is, in your paper, you mention this idea of a national security councillor, or the head of a national security agency type. Marta, do you think this is a good idea?

**MARTA DASSÙ:** I'd say it's a good idea in the sense that it gives a title to a concept. If that means that for that Federica Mogherini, is not to consider herself as the number 99, 29, for a minister, this is okay, and yet in my view, there are many differences. So I don't think this analogy is the perfect one, letting aside the fact that national is bit strange, to be applied to the role of Federica.

Two points are important in my view, the first one is, how much foreign policy will be recognised as a real priority, this is linking to you Jan, and from this point of view, the paper is very important indeed, because you rightly say, this is existential. In my view, it is existential, not only because challenges are important, but also for political reasons.

Let me quote two points. The first one is that part of the Euro sceptic or anti European parties are purporting, for instance. The second point is the importance of migration, for instance, in a theme that is exploitive, again, by anti European forces. So my point is, either we are able to manage foreign policy in an effective way, or the European Union itself will be at risk.

So, starting from that, Federica's role would be very important, and we can discuss it later. My viewpoint is that she would be effective if she will be able to do much more than Kathy, I have to say, a coordination effort. She has to be able to give a foreign policy ambition to all these different strands of the external action.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Marta, it's really interesting that you bring up the immigration issue, because we have Robin here, who's based in London, as everybody knows, and the panelist of Great Britain still is David Cameron, and immigration is still very much, a very serious issue. What would Cameron think of this paper?

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** He would probably be glad that migration doesn't feature in it very much actually, but I would think at the moment he's trying to strike up some bilateral deals on that, and then he would rather people talked about it more broadly, at an EU level, I think once he's got his position sorted out with Germany.

## *Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

So what would he like and not like? The Brits are most worried about process, so they're most worried about sovereignty. I am generalising, okay, but certainly you said, let's take it as a David Cameron Conservative Party viewpoint, in particular. So anything about over ambition will worry the Brits, because they will have to react against it, because over ambition will sound like it needs a process to make it manageable.

So if the paper starts out saying the EU should become, and I write this down, 'a powerhouse of global order', well that will probably turn some of the Brits off, because they just can't see the EU as a powerhouse in global order. I think that kind of, the high ambition, and it's maybe British more generally, the hyperbole would get an antibody or two into the bloodstream. But I think the process actually, some of the lines may be a little worrying, I picked out a line, something about the high representative giving tasks to the foreign ministers.

I think the way that David Cameron would see it would be the opposite, yes, the tasks will be given by the foreign ministers to the high representatives. The idea that public communications will create influence, or give the EU the capacity to have influence, again, probably not a British viewpoint, where it would be more about results.

If there's results, then you have influence, and I think actually the results that Kathy Ashton was able to achieve towards the tail end of her time, she has changed some British views, probably as to where the EAS could be useful. I mean, it's interesting, on the National Security Council bit, I think I share maybe some of Marta's standpoint, the word national is a little strange, but it could be changed. But more importantly, the reason you have the words, National Security Council is they sit at the centre of power. They sit at the centre of power, yet as Jan said himself, the centre of power in foreign policy is the national capitals.

So you have a National Security Council in Brussels, in a way, it's a bit of a contradiction in terms. However, I think to be very fair to the paper, this is where the Brits are probably going to be soft on it, is that most of the recommendations on process are more about strategic analysis and co-ordination than about proactively.

Having said all these points, there's a lot to like, I think from a broadly British perspective. It's global in its ambition, it talks a lot about China, and about the neighbourhood. It talks about the importance of our defence, it's pretty tough on Russia, which would be a standpoint I think that would be shared in most circles, though not all, not all in Britain. There are debates in Britain as well as to how tough to be there as well.

There's focus on other partners, Brazil, Indonesia, South Africa, Japan, the government has been trying to do that, and how to build up relationships with China. So I think... and cyber security, huge issue for the UK government, where I think they appreciate, like energy security, they are going to have to team up with others.

So I think actually on the process, a few little nervous looks, but on the grand strategy, probably quite supportive.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** And that's really a plus aspect of the paper, that its breadth is very wide, it gets out of the European box. But you mentioned this process, and we discussed this briefly before we met, process is both, it's such an old term, it's nearly run its course perhaps, maybe for some of the institutions, maybe not for the Commission. But Justin, let me bring you in here, when we talk about

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

process and foreign policy, I mean, in the European context, when you listen to Robin and Marta and Jan, what does foreign policy mean?

**JUSTIN VAÏSSE:** You know, I guess in the small sense of the term or in the restricted sense of the term, it's about managing external relations, it's about the good ones, the positive ones, the good exchanges we have with the outside, the near abroad or the further abroad, and the more negative ones, that we want to guard against. But in the larger sense, it's about projecting oneself, it's about projecting one's preferences on one's environment, and so that means a lot of different things. In this sense, I do believe that the paper is sharp and offers many views.

I think it also lacks a few of the, both of the instruments to talk about how we affect our environment, and also another issue about the European narrative that I will go into, but let me first say a few words. I think there are many things, many good things, the National Security Advisor metaphor is good. I disagree with it, that it helps think things through.

I think the high representative plays on many different chess boards, even more than the National Security Advisor, who has to manage very raucous bureaucracies, and you know, public opinion in different countries, but for the high representatives, it's her own bureaucracy, it's the member states, it's a sort of relationship with the Commission, it's European public opinions, and of course it's the internal scene.

So it's even more complex than I think the National Security Advisor metaphor lets us think about. But leaving that aside, I think among the tools to affect the environment, and one great thing about the paper is that it's just five pages long, that it's been restricted, and thank God it's not 55 pages, because that would have been a temptation that would have led to a paper that a few people would have read. I would have read it, but I think a few other people would have read it. Here it's short, but you know, we could have talked about culture, and also about sanctions. I think sanctions is a tool of growing importance for Europe.

We've been using sanctions not just as a default tool, although sometimes that can seem the case, but also as a tool of choice in order to have leverage on other places. There are many different countries in the world which are under European sanctions, and I think these sanctions are actually effective, not as a crisis management tool, but precisely to create that [unclear] as we say in French.

So that's just one small thing that I think would need to fit into the global view of what foreign policy is. Perhaps the last one, is about, I like the global ambition and the idea of just the first thing, expanding global order. I think we've enormously benefited from the norms and from the order that was created after World War II, largely thanks to the US, but also thanks to what EU founders have done. I think the EU has been a contributor to that world order and to that process and to these norms.

However, we should also be conscious of the fact that power relations are changing and the world is changing. Being lucky enough to travel quite a bit I would say that beyond Europe and beyond the US, in New Delhi, in Indonesia, in Russia obviously, in Brazil and elsewhere, our narrative, the European narrative is not winning. Not only because we've been weakened by the financial and economic crisis, but also because our narrative on the Ukrainian crisis, on the Middle East, is generally not dominant. Only a hundred countries have voted in favour of just reaffirming what was in the UN Charter at the UN General Assembly when it was about voting on Russia.

## *Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

So my point, and to put it in a nutshell, is that if foreign policy is about affecting one's environment, we should also think of this aspect of, does the world buy our narrative and the way we present things, so are we managing and transforming the world to our own image?

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** It's a very important point. Jan, why aren't we winning the narrative?

**JAN TECHAU:** It's an inconvenient narrative. It's a narrative that doesn't let you off the hook easily. It's very easy to say, why should we worry about Ukraine, why should we worry about these tedious questions of sovereignty, and if we follow through with the narrative, that means also that you need to back it up, which is enormously expensive, requires politician engagement at the highest level, and for a long, long time. Plus, the guarantee that comes with it that you will be in conflict with the Russians, by definition.

So it's a very very inconvenient narrative. It's much easier to kind of turn around and turn your back on it, and not start looking at those kind of ones, and only a few number of countries, if we are really honest with ourselves, are tangibly touched by it yet. The narrative about the European Security Order at risk, is not something that everybody feels. So it becomes a huge kind of mountain that you have to argue against when you want to make that case.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Robin, do you want to pick up on this? Our narrative has been challenged, the Russia crisis, China challenges in different ways, we have any kind of conditionality or conditions [unclear] investing in Africa, for instance, or Latin America?

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** That's why I think I'd have some sympathy about the critique, let's say, of the global powerhouse. The fact is, the EU right now is in a difficult period. The paper rightly says, foreign policy starts at home. But EU countries right now are demonstrating the fragility of democracy rather than the resilience of democracy.

If that is a starting point, as other countries look in, and are wondering, to what extent would we follow or be partners with European countries, you are saying, well you are struggling with growth, you are structurally challenged in terms of demography, and ultimately, your political systems, all of you, from UK to Nordics to Southern, this isn't some particular part of Europe, you are all at risk.

So how are you guys going to deliver growth, when you've over reached in the past, and I think we're all still paying a price in these not following us the in the UN votes on Russia and Ukraine. We are paying the price of the sense that, Western powers over reached in their foreign policy, when they should have been focused on their citizens, and we as the government, are focused on our citizens, and if you over reach on foreign policy, you can't deliver what you need in terms of growth.

So let's not follow yet again, Europe and America into protecting their notions of international order, which seem to be run rather selectively. So I think it's very hard to push the narrative at that time. I think if there was one line, maybe the line, actually I didn't like in the paper, just on this point, because I think it plays into this feeling, it's this line I think we talked about, you must prod China and Russia to become global stakeholders, responsible global stakeholders. To me, that's what they don't like. Whose stakeholder, whose rules, you guys don't always follow the rules, you know, and also you're lumping China and Russia together, and I think they are on very very different tracks.

**MARTA DASSÚ:** I tend to agree with this point, I mean the narrative implied that the European Union was a working organisation after all. So the impact of the financial crisis of the current stagnation on foreign policy is a huge one, precisely because we have this foreign policy of example,

## *Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

and from this point of view, the paper is very good, because it is an initiation to change this, and to be able to project foreign policy, which is not only based on the European model, because this is a non starter.

One point I would like to raise if I can, of the paper, there are many points I am in agreement with, for instance the need to become more realist, see Russia as it is, it is one of the sentences in the paper on which I agree. There are other points which are much more general. The one Robin just mentioned, but also for instance, this kind of idea that enlargement can go on, notwithstanding the fact, and this is a point you raised, beyond the line, that enlargement has not enough public support now.

So this is an important point, in my view. How much can we go on promising things that do not happen, we pay a cost for that, for instance, we are losing Turkey also for that. So my point of view, from a methodological point of view, the idea to go on promising formulas that are not going in the end to become true, to be implemented is a very serious mistake.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** The Turkey example is very important, because it's not just Turkey's problem and Turkey's fault, I mean, the EU, the Commission made any number of mistakes in dealing with Turkey, and allowing Cyprus to actually block some of the chapters. I will call a spade a spade on this, and this has actually alienated Turkey, and done very little for the kind of democracy and the civil society in Turkey. This is a huge mistake that Brussels will sooner, rather than later, regret.

But I want to bring up this enlargement issue, because we can't escape from it, we have the issue with Ukraine, we haven't put enlargement on the table, we have the Western Balkans, we had the aspirations of... I mean, Turkey is still not monolithic, thankfully. I mean Biela Rasbe [?] have so much unfinished business in our own neighbourhood, before we even talk about Latin America and China. Jan, is the European experiment, is post war Europe contingent on enlargement?

**JAN TECHAU:** No, I don't think so, enlargement is a very key building block after the end of the Cold War obviously, but it is not the essence alone of what makes the EU. I would say no to that. That doesn't mean I easily dismiss it. I think it has proven to be the most geostrategically effective in the European toolbox over the last twenty five years or so, and that's also the reason why the Europeans find it so difficult to abandon it, it has worked really miracles for them. I mean, look at the record on the Eastern flank of the EU, what it has done there, and so it's very difficult to say no to the tool that has worked so well for you.

But we also, we are now at the point where we face this dilemma where enlargement of course becomes both, more difficult to absorb but at home, but we also find less and less candidates who are actually intrinsically motivated themselves to go to great lengths to actually join, to do the painful reforms. Part of the dilemma was the neighbourhood policy was of course, to implement parts of that enlargement process, use the same tools, and transform these places, and we've see that has not been very effective. Even the accession candidates are not splendid on their record. So finding candidates that are willing intrinsically, and motivated and willing to do the reforms becomes more difficult.

Having said all this, I would say we should be cautious, not over promise, but we should also not say this is over forever, because there might come a moment, you know, at some point down the road, where we will have to reactivate that tool, and then we will be very happy that we still have people who remember how to do it.

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

**JUSTIN VAÏSSE:** This just invoked something about Russia, because we have tended to consider that precisely, you know, bathed in this narrative that we were a force for good, that there was a form of soft imperialism etc, that enlargement was an unmitigated good, that everyone was supposed to see us as such. Well, Vladimir Putin for one, I think started considering it with benign neglect, if not outright contempt, to be honest.

I think he didn't have much regard, and doesn't have much regard for Brussels, for the Eurocrats who gave marriage to everyone and who are decadent in their mores and manners. But I think something happened last year which precisely sort of demonstrated that enlargement is not just a technical issue, and it's not just about these countries, it's also a project of deep political significance. We have to consider it as such, and the first idea of the Eastern partnership was out, it was, what do we do with these countries that are not supposed to have accession, at least not for a very very long time, and how do we deal with them. It more or less became an antechamber for accession. I think it's not good, it's not good for these countries, it's not good for relations with Russia.

Russia sees EU accession as a threat, for some of the countries that surround it. We should not give it a veto, but on the other hand, if it's not our aim to have them joined in the short or medium term, why make it an issue, plus Russia of course sees that as not only as an antechamber for EU accession, but also as an antechamber for NATO accession.

After having seen in the 1990s and 2000s, that all countries that were joining the EU were joining NATO, so here I think there's a fundamental point in the overall relation with Russia issue where we have to find the right balance between on the one hand, not giving a veto to Russia on our policies, but on the other hand, realising that what we do abroad are deeply political.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** This goes to the heart of the paper as well, this is how Russia sees us, how we see Russia. To me one of the most important lines in the paper is the one about, giving priorities to strengthening national and institutional governance. We have to start with that at home, I know it's applied through the paper, actually not just in Europe, and it's applied to Middle East, it's applied globally, and I subscribe to it globally, but the place we absolutely have to start is at home. Personally my view is, I'm not as worried about how Russia sees us, I don't think we should indulge in President Putin's world views, which ultimately, if you see where they are rooted and where they came from, we probably contributed to it and fed the narrative here and there with some bad mistakes, but ultimately I think it was inevitable.

We need to think about how we see Russia, and in particular, how we see Russia in the context of the importance of institutional governance and strong states, within Europe, and importantly for the EU, within our neighbours. If our neighbours are brought into a sphere, not of influence, but also of economic opaque corrupt activity, and that corruption, we are so arrogant as to think, will not penetrate into London, Berlin, Paris, Rome etc, then I think we're into a dangerous future, never mind being a global powerhouse, we won't be a European powerhouse.

I think we really, we need to be very firm in my opinion on this view of where we draw the line in the place that is most unique to Europe, which is the rule of law and transparency, at least we aspire to that. Therefore, the bit that frustrates me about the paper of not seeing in there, is Ukraine. Ukraine comes up very little in the paper as Ukraine, maybe once, twice.

This is the battleground, now whether you give an enlargement perspective, long term or not, personally I just don't think that for Western Europe and Central Europe and the EU's future one can sort of be halfway about Ukraine, I think you've got to commit.

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Can I just ask Jan about this, you are actually hitting on values really, the whole issue of values, and in fact double standards, where we have some of our own member states...

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** But values is a part of security, values is a part of, not just because they're nice.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** But we can't talk about Russia without talking about Ukraine, and we can't talk about Ukraine without talking about Russia, but we shouldn't see Ukraine through the prism of Russia, which we have seen how we have viewed Eastern Europe for such a long time. Jan, why isn't Ukraine part of a bigger discussion of the paper?

**JAN TECHAU:** Before I answer that, let me just ask Robin real quick, because you said we can't be halfway about Ukraine, and you apply this to enlargement as well?

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** I think the perspective as you said in the paper, treating European neighbours different, neighbours of Europe, applies to Ukraine. So the Association Agreement strikes me as a good point, in the long long term, to use your phraseology back to yourself, I think the idea of not taking away a perspective, that later on you might need, certainly applies to Ukraine. So I think my personal view, it's a long, long, long way away, but I wouldn't take away an ultimate enlargement perspective to Ukraine.

**JAN TECHAU:** On your question Judy, we had long debates about whether we should make this, you know, a central point of it, because we all, in our group of four, we understand and we agreed that this was the big litmus test for EU foreign policy. If this doesn't work, I mean, it's the first time that we are out there without the assistance of the big boys over the Atlantic, that we have the tools for it, and that our own security is kind of immediately affected, and we have to get it done, and if this doesn't work then what will.

But at the same time we decided not to make it a Ukraine paper because you can easily start to obsess about a single case and then it ages very quickly, and also we wanted to kind of distil a few more fundamental rules out of this, and Ukraine is just one case in the neighbourhood. It is perhaps the biggest, and the Crown Jewel, if you will, in the neighbourhood conundrum, but had we focussed on this too much, I think it would have been too much in the new cycle...

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** Paragraph on Eastern Europe and Russia, one mention of it would be....

**JAN TECHAU:** Robin, you said that it was great that it was just five pages.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** No, no I didn't, he did, I went on to page 12, 13, and I liked the fact that it was 12, 13.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** I have a point, everybody says it's five pages, I counted thirteen this morning. You see Jan, I mean, you have written this, this is something so new for Europe, but so fundamental, for the Ukraine crisis, it shows that this is about a competition, it's a serious competition which we cannot afford to lose. How Japan will see us, how China will see us over Ukraine, how Latin America, I mean we saw what was happening in Brisbane, apart from Chancellor Merkel's talk with Putin, but there was Putin, he had no friends except the Brits so far. They're still friends with him, but this is a serious competition that is just not about Ukraine or Russia, it's about our integrity of having a serious foreign policy that is based on values and competition. I don't know if the institutions and the member states are aware of this.

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

**MARTA DASSÙ:** One word on that, it could have been interesting in my view, Jan, to try to understand in the paper why we made some mistakes, let's put it this way, in Ukraine, because clearly we mismanaged that, and the lessons learnt are important, so this is the missing link in my view.

One word I would like to add on that is apparently, as far as I know, the first Foreign Affairs Council ran by Federica Mogherini precisely was on Ukraine, and she introduced a new methodology which could be a very good innovation in a sense. She produced an initial paper on Ukraine, with many different options discussed in the direction of the National Security Advisor if you wish. That was part of the discussion on Ukraine, leaving aside Russia for a moment, for the next council, that apparently went on very very well.

So judging from this first Council, the idea, some of the ideas you are raising the paper are already at work.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** I want to pick up on both of you on this. Actually, I don't agree with you Marta, I think it would have been a mistake because it would have been unending to write about the lessons learnt. I think it would have been a mistake to say, what lessons have we learnt, because there are so many topics we could have brought up, apart from Libya of course, and Ukraine. I think they were right to focus on the future, this is very important.

What I find interesting about an aspect of the paper which in fact gives too great a role to the foreign ministries and maybe Mogherini's role may be easier, because foreign policy now is really in the hands of chancelleries, in the Prime Minister's office, really. So we see the foreign policy shift on the national level, that's become very much in the chancellery, I would be interested in what you say...

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** I'm not talking about this at all. He's joined the wrong part of the government.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Well of course, I'd forgotten, yes, the Foreign Ministry, yes. But I mean, it is interesting that we have seen this evolve over the past couple of years. Jan, do you have any thoughts on this, will it make our job, will it make the institutions more brittle or actually, this is not a bad thing, that the leaders made the foreign policy?

**JAN TECHAU:** This is really stuff on Stefan Lehne's topic, who is asking in a forthcoming Carnegie paper, whether prime ministers can actually do foreign policy, and wait for a brilliant piece of reading and it's going to be out soon. It is, on the one hand, it is a sign that at the EU level, member states realise how important this is, and indeed this can't be a side show any longer. That's the good side of it.

On the other hand is, when you go the top level for foreign policy, right away, kind of keep the foreign ministers out of the equation, you lose escalation depth, you go to the big boys right away and then once something ends there it ends there. You don't have the preparatory phases that you need, where you need to straighten things out and have reflection time built into it.

Then plus the other thing is, is that of course there is a fantastic tendency is all member states I think, of chancelleries and president's offices and prime minister's offices to sideline the foreign ministries, have it all done by their small group of advisors, thereby losing out on perspective and on depth and on knowledge. That tendency of course is worrisome, and I think perhaps, in an ideal little world, Miss Mogherini in her new job, can perhaps work a little bit as an antidote to this by activating the foreign ministers more, if that's in her capacity, she needs a lot of skill for that though.

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

**JUSTIN VAÏSSE:** Where you stand depends on where you sit, right, we all know that's true, so foreign ministries, at least in France, are still very important, they decide on foreign policy and they rely on their policy planning staff a lot. But joke aside, I would venture that, a couple of things. There is a diplomatic, so that's to go in the sense of what Jan was saying, there is a diplomatic knowledge or know how or sensitivity which is necessary and which should not be skipped for the escalation reason you gave, but also for the expertise itself.

To take a slightly different angle, this is also a question that will be put to Mogherini as she takes on her job, which is what her relations will be with the Commission. We're not going to do lessons learned, but I do think that we have run the risk or we have seen the effects of what I would call under politicisation of some issues. I will give just two brief examples.

The first one is Ukraine, the DCFTA Association agreement. I think the EAS was not sufficiently involved in managing the diplomatic aspects of that. But the second one perhaps, Marta, would be how the Environment Commissioner dealt with the issue of the Emission Trading System for the International Aviation Organisation. I think she was right, and I think the EU was right, in trying to get the aviation emissions, which are completely outside the international framework of reducing emissions, they are outside of CWIRTO [?] etc, into the main fold. But the way it was done, I would argue, we've been waiting for the countries to act multilaterally and they've not, so we've acted basically unilaterally.

I think a dose of diplomatic expertise and input into this would have yielded better results. So based on these two examples, I do think that among the different balances that Mogherini must get right, there's also this thing, we don't want to give all the tools of EU Foreign Policy, because I think we would run the risk of over politicisation, that is to say if countries intrude upon trade, foreign aid, etc, too much. But of course she should have a say in things that are about external relations like trade, foreign aid or these energy and climate issues, a bit more than has been the case. So this is also to speak in favour of foreign ministries.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** By the way, the other side of the room, we had a distinguished Foreign Minister here, Sikorski, so it just shows how important foreign ministers are, for Carnegie. So these are all very important issues but I want to go back to one of the issues that really struck me, the military, the very small section on military. There's no mention of hard power in this paper and I would like to ask, whoever wants to take up this question on the panel, I mean, what is foreign policy without hard power?

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** I am critical of the paper here and there, but there was some quite good stuff I thought on hard power issue.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** No, I have it here.

**JAN TECHAU:** There is an entire annex on security.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** I haven't got the annex.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** You've got up to page eleven, so in that case you do.

**JAN TECHAU:** This is shocking Judy.

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Page nine, do not shy away from political confrontation. The EU has no interest in accommodating a neo Imperialist power in its Eastern neighbourhood that is keen on expanding control over other issues using coercive means including military force. But actually, what we are now facing, what foreign policy is, what foreign policy has to be underpinned, is the instruments of soft power, but we have to decide what kind of hard power instruments we are going to use as well. Do we have these?

**MARTA DASSÙ:** The budget is made very clear in the paper to be harnessed. What I would say on that is in my view, economic policy in this moment, and foreign policy go in opposite direction, in the sense that the kind of fiscal stringency at the national level, prevents us to spend enough for defence and security policy. If we look to Italy for instance, we just decided to cut down again the defence budget, which is a shame, and it is clear that we need to do pooling and sharing etc etc but it will be very difficult to build up a real capability in military terms, cutting down national budgets.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** But Jan, you mentioned whoever in the office wrote this, the demilitarisation of Europe has to be stopped, how?

**JAN TECHAU:** That's very simple to answer, what I've done is another question, it's we have to spend the money that we have better and we will ultimately have to spend more, I think there's no way around it. Even when we do pooling and sharing at the maximum of what's possible, and the most positive scenario on pooling and sharing, that will not give us, you know, the return that we will need. But there is no wining with this one, even I think the Ukraine crisis has not really been a major wake up call. It has been in an individual state, but it has not been on an across the board kind of European movement in that direction. Quite to the contrary, there are allergic reactions to this, even when you incite them into the debate.

To get back to your original question, what is foreign policy without hard power. We were very cautious in our paper on hard security. We put an annex in, on security stuff in there, and even on the first page, there is a reference to it, that it needs to be stronger, but we know we have no illusions about the state of military affairs in Europe, and what's possible within the next two or three or four years. I think that's actually very limited, and therefore we think that actually even small progress is big progress in the EU, and we put in the annex, cyber security, where actually the network nature of the EU is almost like a kind of the ideal organisation to deal with that a bit more, but then again, cyber is a lot more about intelligence and that means that it's difficult.

In the end, I think you have to accept that foreign policy and diplomacy will be in a state of under development if it doesn't have a hard power component. Diplomacy lives off a hard security, hard power element to back it up. We are a huge player money wise in the Middle East, we are a zero player in the Middle East because we can't issue security guarantees. It's one currency of diplomacy. We were cautious, but if you are really honest to yourself, we would not be a diplomatic powerhouse ever, if there's not a considerable military backbone to underpin it, either in the member states, or in some very very distant future, and perhaps in a pooled and shared kind of way.

**JUSTIN VAÏSSE:** I just want to make a quote, I like this quote saying that every country as an army, its own, or that of another country, just think about it.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** I am thinking about that, and Sikorski actually said that he would be much happier without any foreign army in Poland, except he's happy to have NATO there. Robin, correct me if I'm wrong, but next year it will be the new British strategic defence review and we've seen practical decimation of Europe's, what used to be one of the world's great military powers, which

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

affects Europe. This demilitarisation, taking what Jan has said, how do you reverse this, €200 billion is not peanuts, this is what we spend every year.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** Look, it's very difficult to reverse and I think you're absolutely right to point out the UK, along with France, one of the two European members of the UN Security Council, proud of their military heritage and their ability to bring the military dimension to diplomacy and into international affairs, and despite that, it's one of the sectors that has taken very hard cuts. Although the government promised that if it rewon in the next election, that it would start increasing the spending again in the next parliament, the numbers that we've seen right now in this rather bizarre Shadow game in the UK, about the UK being an austerity country which is a little weird as we're still running 5%+ of the GDP as a deficit, never mind, but still, we're going to have that going for a quite a long time into the next parliament.

So actually that idea that we would be able to cut down and then build up again, although there is some modernisation taking place, we are being forced into some very difficult choices in the UK, in terms of the nuclear commitment, aircraft carriers, things that perhaps at one point, made sense in a larger global sense, for the ability to be able to pool with others and team with others, we don't have as much money to spend as we did.

What it means though is that so long as Europe is still in a period of economic recovery from this really devastating financial crisis which really masked the fact that all European countries the UK included, having to adjust from a welfare focused system of economic growth to one in which it is not competitive any more to sustain it. We are having to make such difficult political choices. The spending money on defence is really difficult when so much, as you said, of power is centralised in the chancellery of the Prime Minister's office, they can't answer it. So I think the UK will not descend below a certain level, but the idea that we're going to be able to step up again and perhaps lead, a sense of a bit of a renaissance, of European military capability is just not going to happen for the near term.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Which is really ironic, given that an economic crisis should spur pooling and sharing and more efficiency, but it isn't.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** Pooling and sharing doesn't always make things more efficient, this is part of the problem.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** You must have seen the A400N, frankly, may it fly safely.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** It's part of the problem.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** This brings us, this should bring us to the transatlantic relationship to NATO, because actually, it is NATO that, excuse the pun, is calling the shots now, in the Baltic. I mean, the EU as security provider, or ESDP or CFSP, is playing nothing, no role whatsoever in the Baltics, in reassuring the Allies. Of course it's NATO, but you wonder, how much longer the United States will accept this demilitarisation of Europe, in terms of, they want, the Americans want to be a serious foreign policy player, they want Europeans to do the burden share, they want Europeans to get the business finished in the Balkans.

**MARTA DASSÚ:** Yes, they said so very clearly since a very long time. I guess the alternative is not clear, not even to the United States, because after all, they also need Europe, so it's a difficult balancing act. But looking to the future of the US European relationship, I think that [unclear] is

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

important, the trade and investment partners, this is a point I guess you make in the paper, and 2015 will be really a key year for that. I would like to underline the importance of that, because either we are able to build up the score and to renew if you wish, transatlantic relationship at the core of this liberal order we would like to enlarge, or it would be a really much more difficult.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** I agree with that point, I just want to say that I think to say that NATO is looking after the Baltics and Europe isn't, I mean as you well know Judy, NATO is made up mostly of European countries, which are committing under the latest [unclear] Action Plan, both commitments and are starting to put a few troops in there, tripwires, etc etc. So to my point of view, I thought the Wales Summit actually worked quite well in that sense, it was difficult, but it has led I think to a shift institutionally, certainly amongst militaries and defence ministries, to start to think differently about European commitments to actually hard security in Europe, through NATO however, not through the EU.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Actually I am glad you raised this issue, the Wales Summit. What was most interesting was not the Wales Summit per se, it was the debate taking place in Finland, and in Sweden, and what's happening in the Northern Tier of Europe. It's not just about Ukraine or the Baltics, it's about the Arctic Circle. Now, which brings us in, and Jan, this is an old hobby horse of mine, I mean this paper is about foreign policy, but also a successful foreign policy requires a shared perception of threats. Have you reached that stage in Europe yet?

**JAN TECHAU:** No, I mean it's quite obvious in Europe that we haven't, neither in the EU or in NATO, and NATO, I think political pressure is easier to channel, if you will, that in the EU, so you can create unity even when you have diverging views. But across Europe not, the Ukraine is a good example, but not only, people in the South look at things different from the North and East and West. We have those divides and we can't just poke them away.

This is why, Fabrice knows this, that is one of my hobby horses as well, that both my recommendations to the NATO Sec Gen and also Miss Mogherini would be, to make themselves the advocates of a shared threat assessment, and in the sense that they also risk, antagonising some of their client member states by making a suggestion of what the shared threat is. If you feed it into a working group, and have all 28 and both organisations agree, what you will get is something that will be very thin. But if you have one of the leading people just go out there and say, this is what I suggest is our shared threat, then you get a debate because some will disagree. Again, the shared threat perception is a lot about process, and I think we need daring people suggesting what the threat is, so that we can actually rub ourselves against it, whereas what we have now is a least common denominator, which means nothing.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** Especially as the response, certainly in Eastern Europe, Central Europe, will need to be across a spectrum of security in which maybe NATO, including its European members are playing at hard end, the EU is playing at the softer end, and then there's some blending in the middle, in police forces, in gendarmeries, anti corruption border surveillance, ultimately the response is going to have to be NATO plus EU, so as Jan is saying, if you are not sharing the assessment, how are you going to end up with the outcome?

**JAN TECHAU:** This is also where I thought where Sec Gen Rasmussen, in the last couple of months of his tenure, where he antagonised a lot of people in the member states by being very very strong on Russia, where you can disagree or you can agree with him, but the point is that there is somebody who is making a claim, and then you can actually argue with it, and thereby it becomes that much clearer.

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

That's why I was actually thankful to him, not so much because of the point he made, even though I happened to share his assessment, but because he actually dared saying something, and there is a striking absence of people daring to say something on these things.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** It's calling for clear leadership and clarity. Justin, you wanted to come in...

**JUSTIN VAÏSSE:** Well, no, just to reinforce the point about the fact that many European members of NATO sent troops and fighter jets to Poland and other countries to enforce the sovereignty over their air space, but also just for reassurance. More generally, we should not start from the premise that it would be a given that we would share threats, because we don't share the same threats. I mean, when you are in Portugal or in Ireland, you don't share the same threats as when you are in Lithuania, right, and when you're Spain or Italy, in terms of migration, or when you're France or Germany or the UK in terms of foreign fighters, you don't share the same threats.

When you have very active trade relations with Asia, you are not exposed to the same extent to piracy off the coast of Somalia or to other disruptions. So it takes effort to agree on a common definition of the threats, and it takes solidarity. I think it's more about solidarity, it's not like a geopolitical or intellectual disagreement, it's just reality, where we don't exactly share the same threats, but how do we bridge that, and how does your vulnerability becomes mine so we can work jointly.

**JAN TECHAU:** But even that is not being said in this town, that we don't share our threats, you know, everyone has this lukewarm agreements that we share some threats here somehow, but neither does that mean anything on yes, we do share them, nor does it mean a lot on the no, we don't share. But this is a great statement, I like this, no, we don't share, now let's work around this next solidarity argument, I think that's a constructive way of going about it, instead of just kind of eerie silence.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Before we open this discussion out onto the floor, I've got one quick but very important question, which is a central element of this paper, the role of China. Sitting around here, do we see China as a competitor, a threat, an opportunity? It's not clear, I would like to hear how you see China.

**JUSTIN VAÏSSE:** I am happy to take the first stab at it. I guess it's all these things at the same time, and that's why we need diplomats, right, because it's just to manage complexity. If we could summarise the complexity of foreign policy to the cherished simplicity of just one bumper slogan, [unclear] Politik or Containment, etc, it would be nice, but we can't. It's just reality, we can't, we have too many interests, interwoven interests, and China in particular has too much importance in too many issues for us to reduce it to just one catchphrase. What I think we should always sort of keep sight of is that the world that Europe has created, once again it's this issue of norms and narrative, and that the US and Europe in particular, but others as well, have created over all these decades since 1945, is a world in which we feel comfortable, in which we are able to prosper, etc.

China has been able to prosper in that very world. That's really important, but it doesn't feel comfortable in that world. I think on many different issues, China thinks that world, that order is Western, and that it won't do justice to its growth, to its legitimate claims etc. So it is both taking advantage of this world, and that's good, and being a stakeholder on some issues, and challenging it and contesting it on some others.

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

So I'm not saying we should resist that by all means, I'm just saying that we should be clear about what the norms, what the rules of the road for the future are, so that the world remains rather comfortable for Europe.

**MARTA DASSÙ:** I think there are two important points on China moreover. The first one is that China is entering Europe with important investments in infrastructure, energy, etc. etc., so this not only a problem of what do we do as Europe in East Asia, which is the traditional way of looking at that, we have China here in Europe.

The second point is Africa, because Africa is a bit of a wound in the paper, if I may say so. But China and Africa is a real problem, our relationship with the US will be important if we look to Africa together, and there is an important point concerning energy diversification. For instance, one of the lessons he and I drew from the crisis with Russia is to try to reconvert to new sources of oil and gas in Africa, playing a sort of North/South card instead of an East/West one, and this is in agreement with the US, so this is changing completely the geopolitics of energy.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** Just one very quick one about China. Again, one of the good things I think about this paper is the extent to which it really brings this issue up, puts Europe in its true context, as it does through many of the aspects. It does point quite a bit to the China risks, what if it collapses, territorial disputes, I think one thing we need to think about is what if China succeeds as well? If it carries on and they manage themselves, the weight of China is massive and interestingly, I think it gets a bit to Justin's points, China has interests in a rules based order. Ultimately, China may play more on the rules agenda with Europe than America might.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Very interesting. Now I want to talk to the audience. Now, I am taking bunches of three questions. One, identify yourselves, two, short and to the point question, I'm not going to encourage statements. Gunek first, Ewe second, this lady is second, and this gentleman there is first. Gunek first, please identify yourselves.

**EUGENIUSZ SMOLAR:** Eugeniusz Smolar, Warsaw, Foreign Policy Analyst. It's a good preparation for the meeting with the European Policy Planners which I am going to have in half an hour. I would concentrate and would like to ask you, before we go and to have an apparent policy towards China, which we don't, we have a trade policy, we don't have a policy towards China. It reminds me of a song Jacques Dutronc [?] sang, [French] armour, armour, armour, the EU ambassador to China has told me that his big success was to force DGs to inform him about the delegations coming to China, not to mention [unclear].

The question is, is not less the better in our new approach to the foreign policy? We should stop the silly war of institutions, I hope that this Commission will be better streamlined than the previous one, but actually, the competition between different parts of the Commission and the EU has prevented us from doing a job. Full stop, so any ideas on that, so co-ordination. Second if I may....

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** No, I'm sorry, everybody else will have a chance. No, I'm sorry, no. I'm sorry Eugeniusz, they will answer your question though.

**ROSA BALFOUR:** Thank you, Rosa Balfour from the European Policy Centre. I think I need to give you a paper that I've just written precisely on this, arguing that doing less is not better on foreign policy. What I wanted to say, the first thing about Eastern partnership, Justin, you said it was the antechamber to accession. I think a lot of countries felt that it fell short of being the antechamber of accession, and actually the EU has been carrying this ambiguity for a whole decade, between the

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

Orange Revolution and last year, and ambiguity has harmed EU policy, as well as the countries. I think that ambiguity is actually one source of fragmentation, because it underlies the different perceptions, number one.

Number two, if the Arab Spring and Crimea have not jolted the EU into becoming more conscious of the need to be a global actor, what will, that's for everyone.

**ROBERT VAN DE ROER:** My name is Robert van de Roer. I'm a diplomatic commentator, trainer of CEOs and formerly a journalist. Thank you for your great insights, but let's humanise for a moment. Mogherini is widely perceived as a diplomatic rookie, perhaps that's the reason why she was chosen. I would like to hear the view of the panel if the problem is her lack of experience.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Okay thank you. Three great questions. Eugeniusz, we will take Eugeniusz's question first, less better, stop the competition of the institutions and Jan, I can't ask Stefan, he's not on the panel, maybe we should ask him, we can ask him if he wants to, but we should kick off with Jan's question, then we go onto Rosa's question about if you haven't learnt anything from the Arab Spring, and then the third one is Mogherini lacking experience.

**JAN TECHAU:** I think Eugeniusz had two questions, is less better and how to stop the civil war, there are two, so Eugeniusz, you are safe. Is less better? No, only if you can really clearly prioritise, which is one of the big problems of this town, because you know, not prioritising is the way to create consensus. If you want to do less and focus on two or three or four things, then you will have a super better discussion about what these two or three or four things should be. That might be healthy, but in absence of this, I'm afraid that we probably should have to focus on a whole kind of bandwidth of issues.

Rosa, what will jolt the EU into becoming a bigger player? I really don't know, but I think it comes back to one of the answers that I gave earlier, I think the real pain of this has not been felt. This has not been existential yet, neither economically nor security wise for us, and if you are a cynic, you can say well learning through pain is the only method.

Also the Americans haven't really abandoned Europe yet, so the pressure is low still for Europeans, if we're honest, we are kind of artificially topping the pressure up, because we think it's super important, but you know, the bulk of people don't think it's particularly high.

Finally, Mogherini's lack of experience, I listened to her during the hearings. I found her, for the inner logic of this bubble that we're in, I found her very very convincing, she was strong, enormous communication skills, great way to deal with the people, exactly the messages that people here wanted to hear, parliament and so on.

I had a meeting with her yesterday actually, and it was fantastic, really great. Is the weight there to bring to the negotiating table the kind of battle weight that you need, the resilience, and the super toughness, it's something that we haven't seen yet, so it's hard to say. But I think we should get away from this talk, how weak she is, how inexperienced she is and all this, and get into this kind of, give this lady a chance, she's clearly ambitious, she wants something, she's demonstrated this, now let her do it.

**MARTA DASSÙ:** Federica, if I may restate, underline this point, because first of all, foreign policy is her field, since the very beginning. She is 40 something, and she has been working in foreign policy for

## *Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

twenty years now. Then she has been working for the Foreign Office department of the Democratic Party of [unclear] in Italy, which is in any case, a school for foreign policy, even if with a certain bias clearly.

But no, I agree with Jan that she can be good in theory, provided that what she had to do is doable. From this point of view, I think that the real point is whether she will be able to implement this new cluster system, to be the chief of the Rolex. If she succeeds on that, we will have a bit more and a bit better foreign policy.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** One question that hasn't been picked up, just on the neighbourhood policy, say from my impression, I'm not a student of neighbourhood policy, but I think it's not the ambiguity about enlargement, because you have to be ambiguous in a way about enlargement, because there's no political support other than to be ambiguous. But it's not being sufficiently political about the process, of its value, and this was visible in Ukraine. We can talk more about it, but I think it's the lack of political sense behind it, too technical, not [unclear] enough.

But on what will push the EU into being awake, well where I'm sitting from, I'm quite impressed, I think the response to Russia has been very impressive, to Ukraine. 28 Countries agreeing on sanctions that carry real cost, in the middle of a recession, when a lot of people don't feel the pain and don't feel it's existential, I think a lot of politicians have gone out on a limb, I will put Angela Merkel at the top of them, and I think it's impressive actually. So I think we're actually doing okay.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** I'm not going to say whether I agree or disagree. Now we've got three, the gentleman there with his hand up, the gentleman there with the glasses and you are the third, please.

**ALAN BOWMAN:** Alan Bowman, I'm with the Canadian mission to the EU here, but I just left the Canadian Foreign Ministry's policy planning staff, so I endorse everything Justin says about the importance of the role of these officers within foreign ministries.

I promised that I would stop staying the word narrative when I left the policy planning staff, but I will make an exception today. Justin spoke quite a bit about the Western narrative being in danger in the emerging, the fact that we are losing the fight on norms, on human rights, on trade, on all kinds of issues. But there were a few solutions, there were a few ideas as to what we do about it. The Americans are proposing TPP and TTIP as an effort to sustain those norms. Will there be any original ideas coming out of the new Commission on that particular front? Thank you.

**GIOVANNI GREVI:** Giovanni Grevi with FRIDE. First question, very quick, we are in a world of different pulls and powers, not necessarily in a world of blocks. Are we moving towards a world of blocks, in your view, and in this context in particular, how do you read developments and trends on Chinese Russian relations, and that does it imply for Europe. Second, piggy backing on this one very quickly, what is the selling point of Europe in these diverse worlds. It is a question that goes back to the question of narrative, but in particular in terms of Europe's selling points, if any, thank you.

**JO COELMONT:** Jo Coelmont from the Egmont Institute and for the Royal Higher Institute of Defence, so indeed military, and so my question will be no surprise. It's about indeed the military. I can read in your annex that there's this element, invest in European capabilities. That is correct, but if you want to invest, the first question that you encounter is to do what? Now if we look a little bit further on, it's mentioned that security sector reform should be the trademark for European Union. That is fine, but it is also mentioned that this includes police, judicial and military, and in that order. So that's also fine, and the only task that I see further on is cyber, cyber is important, but then again,

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

the military is not to be the *primus inter partes*. So if the question is, I have to invest as a military, and looking through this annex, I only have to hire additional people for the cyber. So my question is, is operations of crisis management, autonomous operations of crisis management for the European Union a task or not? I think that is rather important, if we want to save our transatlantic relationship and if we want to save NATO, thank you.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Great crop of questions, thank you. Jan, can I leave you with the crisis management question?

**JAN TECHAU:** The answer to the question, yes, I think autonomous operations should be the goal. I know that the NATO only school would not like that message, but I think this is important because not only does it make us less dependent on the United States services, it will also make us more interesting for the United States as an ally. So it cuts both ways, there is no, you know, becoming more independent from the US, you know, because then we can do what they don't like, it's actually because it makes us more interesting as an ally. That's what we need to invest into.

I think it's very clear what we want to do with these investments, we need these, we have seen interventions in the last few years in our immediate neighbourhood, we need to be better at those, and we need to be able to do crisis management, perhaps even a longer distance, and we need to do security sector reform which requires forces, and we perhaps even need to have the occasional little deterrent force here or there. But even though, I will leave that mostly to NATO. So I think when you actually look to the essay, when you look at the second page I think, not just at the annex, I think we're talking about this autonomous capability which we think is really important.

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** Maybe just something on blocks very quickly, and Europe's selling point, because that was put together. On blocks, maybe we should just be short about this, because my instinct is no. I just don't think we're going into a world of blocks. I think these are axis of convenience, to use the phrase that's been used before, whether it's [unclear] China, Russia, North America, I don't think we're going into a world of blocks, don't see it. So let's just stop on that point.

Let me say something about Europe's selling point because this is a very interesting question, and having returned a number of years ago now from the US and moved back to Europe, I think it's the only part of the world that has discovered a way so far, and is fighting to sustain it, and I hope it does, of delivering socially just or socially minded prosperity. This is a really, really difficult thing to do, and we were able to do it partly because we in Europe were ahead of the curve, and we had industrialisation before many others and then the deals that had to be done after the Second World War, so that we wouldn't have the kind of extremist politics that emerged in the inter war years, meant that we then came up with a different system, American Ways A Winner was able to be more capitalistic and still entrepreneurial about its social system, whereas I think in Europe, governments had to strike deals with their publics.

Now we're struggling to sustain them. But we've got it now, even if we had to cut back and be more selective and so on, it is an amazing example for other parts of the world, that they come and look at and try see. So to fight for it, and to sustain it I think is one of the most powerful things that we can do. Also I believe that Europeans have very positive views of the value stuff, that Judy mentioned earlier, of what human dignity, individual rights, democracy, all of the positive things that can bring about life, but in a way, because we're not so powerful, we can't impose it.

Because we can't impose it, we don't try to impose it, and actually, that ends up being a strength. So people at what Europe's achieved, they look at at least what it aspires to, they're a bit worried as to

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

whether we're going to survive our existential crisis right now, of demography and structural problems, but if we can, that's pretty powerful.

I think in today's world, where it's very hard to make a change happen from instigation, it becomes a powerful narrative, so I'm quite optimistic on Europe.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** That's very thoughtful Robin, especially in the light of what happened at the Romanian elections. To be fair, we didn't [unclear] invest, the new Commission, that would take a long time, nobody knows, but [unclear] hasn't really come up with anything yet, Giovanni. Another group of three. One at the back, way over here, and somebody over here too. Jessica is first.

**JESSICA MATHEWS:** Just listening to this conversation as an American and reading the paper as an American, it strikes me that one thing that is perhaps not as prominent here as I think it should be, is that the United States badly needs Europe as a strategic ally, and as a strategic actor. We went through this period of, I call it semi madness, in the uni polar moment, US is going to rule the world, the book store is full of books that had the word empire in the title, thank Heaven we are gone from that.

The reaction to that was the lead from behind, pull back, there are maybe issues where we don't need to be the team captain, we can just be a player, or even on the bench. This could be a perhaps more sustainable role, and sustainable role for the United States, after seventy years of really being the central pillar of the world.

The pull back approach certainly hasn't succeeded. Either the world isn't ready for it, or maybe it never will be, I don't know. But this leaves the United States, I think, in limbo in thinking about its role in the world. It is very grey. Nobody quite knows, and it's more than just the fatigue of two unsuccessful wars. So to me, one answer to it is that the US needs to share this role with somebody, and the somebody is the EU, or Europe. Europe individually, because where else in the world is it?

So I heard maybe in Robin's early comment, I agree that no foreign policy can be stronger than a country is at home, or a group of countries, I agree with that, but I thought I heard perhaps an argument that the original European ambition to create this extraordinary collection of countries with a very high standard at home, still is pre-eminent. But then I thought to myself, but that will never be over, right. So that means, is Europe ever going to be ready to be a strategic actor.

So I'm trying to provoke maybe a more open confrontation of this question.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Thank you very much. We're running out of time, and we've got our three authors here. This is your chance if you want to come in on any of the points, Stefan says, Stefan Lehne says no, Daniel says no, they've all got very shy, Uli. Okay, then I will take two more questions, and I would like Jessica's to be done first. The gentleman at the back.

**DAVID VAN DUSEN:** David van Dusen, University of Leuven. On page nine, I read, this has already been quoted, the EU has no interest in accommodating a neo Imperialist power in its Eastern neighbourhood. I'm curious if anyone can honestly deny that this describes Turkey very well. It seems to me that the paper takes a very 20th century approach to Turkey, rather than a 21st.

**KAROLY BANAI:** Karoly Banai, former Hungarian Ambassador, currently a PhD candidate. Bearing in mind the way Russians use energy to penetrate into central and eastern Europe, my

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

question is, is there any chance for a unified EU common energy strategy, or at least the expression of solidarity, bearing in mind the diverse or different national interests in this field?

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Jessica has raised a very important issue about even if the Europeans in fact understand the malaise that America is going through, Jan, do you want to dwell on this issue, it's just so complex?

**JAN TECHAU:** Yes, I would love to leave this to Justin, because he is the man to answer it. I can only think if there are two kind of repositories of populations at large that feel responsible for more than just themselves in the world, it is actually North America and Europe in the end, without trying to talk this down, I was just at a conference in Brazil, at a security conference, biggest security conference in Latin America, interesting debates, but not at all a sense of, very very consumerist response, very very, what can they do for us instead of what can we do for them. I'm generalising. But if you are looking for the two strong repositories for global stability, it needs to be us and the United States. I am very old school on this, and if we make ourselves weak and don't do anything to come back stronger, then the world is in trouble, not just us.

**JUSTIN VAÏSSE:** Just to finish on what Jan was saying, I would have two sorts of provisos. The first one is, that is true, but we shouldn't take this point too far, because the retort or the reply would be, ha ha, you are thinking that you are being generous and universalist when you are thinking of the others, when you are only catering to your own interest, and you use international law, you bend it when it suits you, and then you blame us for bending it etc. So I'm with you on that, that we should be really careful about how it plays elsewhere.

The second things is, because of what you said, I slightly disagreed with one point in the paper about, you know, leaving more space to emerging countries in unilateral institutions. Of course at some point we need to do that, but we shouldn't do that in just under just any circumstances or hastily, I would say. We should think really hard on how we do it, how we devolve them of power, because we should, because not all of them, and once again, it's just what you said, not all of them are so, will be as much guardians of the interest that multilateralism represents as we have been, and so self defacement should not be hasty for fear of endangering once again that world of norms that we share in.

On Jessica's point, you know, I guess we've seen tides of American introvism and extrovism. There was retrenchment and pull back in the 50s, in the 70s, perhaps in the 90s it's debatable, but certainly in the 2010s. But we've not left that world where the US is dominant. For me, in spite of everything I said about the new balance of power etc, it's still a world where the US leads and gets to the point that Jan was making earlier, that is to say, one reason why Europe has not developed more defence is because it was provided by the US, and so the US was both asking us to get the dope, and giving us dope. I'm not saying that the US is to blame for that, I'm just saying that the conditions that were created induced a sort of anaesthesia in terms of defence.

So will Europe ever be a strategic actor you asked? From my perspective, but once again, I'm repeating what Jan said, it will become when the absence or when the cut or when the pull back from the US will be more dramatic and will force Europe to be one.

Unfortunately I've become very pessimistic about Europe being able to sort of create more of an autonomous hard power instrument, absent a very strong external incentive to do so, and the US pulling back would be one, more threat, more existential threat from the East could be another one. Barring that, I think we will still be in a sort of in-between situation.

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

**ROBIN NIBLETT:** On the US thing as well, on Jessica's point, I agree with her analysis, the flow, I mean your comment about the bench, the problem of trying to come back from the bench, it's hard for somebody on the bench to become captain again, if I'm taking the metaphor in that way. Once people look that you're in two minds, no, you take this one, no I'll step back up as leader, you psychologically, people get used to a different flow of power, relationship and others can fit in. So I think we are in a more complicated space.

We as Europeans are not going to repivot or rebalance to Asia in the same way as America has been pulled to do, and I think that is a bit of a strategic disconnect on a key strategic priority for the United States. I think that Europe, I'm afraid, to fit your final point, is self focussed at the moment, inevitably so, but I think Europeans look at Americans and say, well Americans are pretty self focussed as well. They look at the way the Congress has stymied to a certain extent, Obama's capacity for action, but also most Europeans have been pretty disappointed that President Obama's multilateral instincts don't seem to have translated into an internationalism that we can connect with, as much across the board as Europeans thought they were going to connect. He's ended up being more of a domestic president than most Europeans perhaps expected.

There is a sense of associating, let's get outside this room, but in many electorates, including amongst some of the far right or far left on extremes, but going into the middle, there's a sense of associating America with the bad side of globalisation. Whether it's NSAness, whether it's the negative side of TTIP, investor state dispute settlement mechanisms, a lot of the anti TTIPness, to the question that was asked earlier, is emerging from this, but it's kind of American rules that are going to undercut the precautionary more social approach that Europeans have used to protect their citizens and to develop their system of government.

So actually, the one issue that really we do need to succeed on, and I agree with others, is TTIP, at least for going forward, is at the moment becoming a thorn in the relationship rather than an opportunity. I think ultimately we need to make TTIP succeed and we as Europeans mustn't fail on our support on Ukraine and our role in Russia. Otherwise if we can't work in our neighbourhood and America is having to work on Asia, we're going to be pumped.

**MARTA DASSÙ:** If I can follow up on that very briefly, I think that TTIP is very important for geopolitical reasons, more than for economic reasons, the role of Germany becomes very important. We didn't talk at all about specific countries, that after all, make most of European foreign policy. I would say that Germany really is the key country to look at. I consider the way in which Germany is reshaping its foreign policy is promising, from a certain point of view, but certainly we have a problem between Germany and the US, and this will be crucial.

Lastly, a point which is a bit different one, but we have to see at the European Union as a static actor in my view, in a couple of years, we could have a totally different situation, for instance, if the UK decides to leave the European Union, that will make a huge difference for our foreign policy and defence. So I mean, the European Union can evolve in different ways. It's important to keep the eye open on that. Especially I think that the way in which we could more efficiently deal with neighbourhood is to go back to the old idea of concentric circles, but I think this would be really important.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Yes, thank you Marta, glad you brought up that issue. The question of Turkey, and then haven't forgotten the Russian energy issue. The question on Turkey, are we looking at Turkey 21st century through a 20th century lens? What do you mean?

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

**DAVID VAN DUSEN:** What do I mean? Well I mean, it's quite well known that the [unclear] the question was honestly inspired by the fact that last night I was at a policy conference of the European parliament with Yesidis and Syrians, Christian and Kurds, there was this absolute unanimity that most the most inimical state actor in the region, worse than Saudi Arabia and Qatar is Turkey, and the facts on the ground all confirm this. It's quite well known that there's a kind of expansionist ideology that has come in with Erdogan, which is making itself felt in Syria and elsewhere, and there is nothing said critically of Turkey.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** So essentially the paper didn't pay attention specifically to the Turkish issue.

**DAVID VON DUSEN:** Well, it took a very very strong position apropos of Russia, and none....

**JAN TECHAU:** General sentence I guess on Turkey, because we have huge discussions in Carnegie on Turkey with Marc Pierini and Sinan Ülgen being our scholars in this field, and I think Turkey, it's not entirely clear to most of us yet, that this is one of the big strategic challenges of the future, for the reasons that you have named, but also, even if it became more of the old Turkey again, that was more West friendly, it would still be a huge and humungous strategic task for us to take on. That's number one, and the second thing is Marc Pierini says that we are running the risk of having a deeply ideologically antagonistic player on our South Eastern flank, deeply ideologically antagonistic to the West, big growing country, strong country, and we haven't found an instrument yet to counter that. That's all I can say, that's very general, but if you want to have a deeper discussion on this, contact us and we will get you connected to the right people.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Thank you for answering your own question. As always, Russian energy. It's an interesting debate, we will see how far, this is a big issue, the energy security, what's going to happen, if [unclear] union, are we diversifying enough?

**MARTA DASSÛ:** In theory, we say we would like to have an energy union, so we are very ambitious, we need to comply with all the provisions of the internal market. The internal market is fragmented, energy costs are becoming a comparative disadvantage, it's very clear. We have our industry migrating to the US, because the energy costs are too high. I would say two major points are really important, security diversification and the completion of the internal market. From this point of view, one request we could address to Jessica, is try to push for having energy within TTIP, because otherwise there is no point for us. We have to have an agreement in which we recognise some specific advantages.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** So room for two more questions, two short questions please. That's great, last word from our guests, Jan you want to give a last word, you're not even charging for this paper.

**JAN TECHAU:** But we've created strategy fatigue in this room, and that's exactly what we didn't want to create, I hope that this is really the starting point. I would just say one final thing, a huge thank you to my co authors. I am here, the only one, who has actually been an author, but there is of course Stefan and Daniel and Uli who are here, and was a member of the experience, thanks a lot for your great input and to everybody who joined us. Some of you came to our expert sessions are in the room, and that was a great exercise, thanks for helping us making this possible.

**JUDY DEMPSEY:** Jessica, thanks very much for coming over for this, it's great to get this very special American view, because we really need to be reminded so often of this, maybe there's not enough Americans at these, and Canadians Monsieur, thank you very much for coming, thank you

*Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery*

very much Jan, thank you Justin, your job is safe. Thank you Robin, Chatham House, we welcome the sponsors, Marta, very nice to see you again, thank you very much all of you, thank you.