

EU Common Foreign and Security Policy: the Case of Civilian CSDP

Yi Sun

JEL Classification: F50; F55

Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) of the European Union consists two dimensions of missions: the military CSDP and the civilian CSDP. The former serves strategic military missions through Military Planning and Conduct Capability. The latter is developing more and more prominently under nowadays complex global politics and focuses on crisis management and conflict prevention. The coordination and nexus of military-civilian missions contribute together to international peace and security. The civilian CSDP addresses problems such as terrorism, crimes, poverty, human rights, law reform, climate change, sustainable energy, cyber security, corruption, trade, justice and human affairs (JHA), just to mention.

The civilian CSDP aims at peacekeeping and international security through an approach of “pre-emption, empowerment and resilience, rather than risky and costly intervention”¹. The EU has deployed 34 civilian missions of CSDP such as the rule of law mission in Kosovo since 2008, the border assistance mission in Libya since 2013, the advisory mission in Iraq since 2017, and many other less known and relevant examples. The Civilian CSDP Compact was renovated in April 2018 after the conclusions of European Council, aiming to set up a more flexible, integrated, adaptable and fast CSDP. Meanwhile, there are challenges that EU faces while developing and implementing a civilian CSDP, such as how to allocate the recourses, whether the member states are willing to fulfill their recruitment commitments, how to coordinate among different member states, and to consider the more relevant tasks. Liberal intergovernmentalism may provide a theoretic approach to analyze the challenges.

Liberal intergovernmentalism was proposed by Professor Andrew Moravcsik based on adaption and development of intergovernmental institutionalism. The three core elements of liberal intergovernmentalism are: “the assumption rational state behavior; a liberal theory of national preference formation, and an

¹ [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/630295/EPRS_BRI\(2018\)630295_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/630295/EPRS_BRI(2018)630295_EN.pdf)

Yi Sun*(✉)

Graduated at UIBE University, Beijing, China

Boston College, Massachusetts, USA and ending this year at Freie Universität Berlin in International Relations

email: yisun17@yahoo.com

intergovernmentalist analysis of interstate negotiation”² This theory argues that the integration is a result of bargains and negotiations on two levels - among domestic interest groups and among the member states in EU, influenced by factors such as economic interests, relative power of institutions, and reliable promises. The negotiations have three stages: national preference formation, intergovernmental negotiation and institutional delegation.

To apply liberal intergovernmentalism into the case of negotiations of Civilian CSDP, negotiations take place in both domestic and international levels and undergo the three stages. Firstly, domestic interest groups seek for their own social, economic educational, researching and new technologies interests where to integrate and compete with each other, contributing to the national preference formation.

Secondly, after setting the national preference and interests, the states will act as main actors in transnational negotiations, for example, revise the compact terms or budget. Again, mentioning the case of the Baltic Sea region countries, such as Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, we can perceive how they were cautious about the civilian and military development of CSDP because fearing that it may weaken the NATO and trans-Atlantic relations. However, they did not want to object to EU biggest members such as France or Germany. Therefore, these Baltic Sea region countries maintained that they would support the civilian and military CSDP on the condition that “this would lead to an increase in defense spending and a boost in military capabilities, and would not duplicate NATO.” Finland was an active participant in the debate of CSDP as it viewed the integration through CSDP contributes to its own national security. Czech Republic were very supportive of the development of CSDP as well³. These different national preferences set up the standing points for negotiations and make it challenging to develop and implement civilian CSDP as different states have their own concern and interests.

Thirdly, the states will seek institution delegation, settling negotiations and reaching agreement through international institutions. This is a decision process. In this case, European parliament takes the role of institution delegation. It announces the Civilian CSDP Compact in November 2018, “following up on the December 2017 European Council (...) and after consultations with EU Foreign Affairs, Interior and Justice Ministries, the Commission and other stakeholders”⁴. The parliament has called for the debates and negotiations through summits or council meetings such as The December Summit on CSDP, European Parliament’s May 2018 conclusion for strengthening civilian Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP), and etc. The EU leaders have to make decisions and detailed guideline on the strength of civilian CSDP. However, supranational institutions have limited influence on states, who are rational actors focusing on their own interests and avoiding risks. Whether the member states will uphold to the Civilian CSDP Compact will be a question in its implementation.

² <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.463.7692&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

³ <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/osw-commentary/2017-06-28/csdps-renaissance-challenges-and-opportunities-eastern-flank>

⁴ Nicoletta Pirozzi, The Civilian CSDP Compact A success story for the EU’s crisis management Cinderella? European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS), October 2018

My findings are that CSDP is really the achievement of a political drive in EU toward both military and civilian dimensions and actions to make credible Europe as a major Security and Defense actor in EU and in the international regional crises. The civilian dimension of missions gives EU added-value in conflict management and peacekeeping. However, the integration of EU still faces various challenges, both internally and externally.

GSDP was a “Cinderella” story but now it has been put into an action plan. As quoted from Nicoletta Pirozzi , “Civilian CSDP will need three essential elements to succeed: (1) a renewed and credible strategic framework; (2) adequate operation - al capabilities; and (3) a solid commitment by relevant stakeholders”.