

Kees Homan, Theo van den Doel



Preparing the Austrian Forces for the 21st Century

Beiträge zur Sicherheitspolitik

Mit der Einrichtung der so genannten Bundesheerreformkommission im Herbst 2003 sollten Grundlagen für die Reorganisation des Österreichischen Bundesheeres erarbeitet werden. Der im Juni 2004 fertig gestellte „Bericht der Reformkommission – Bundesheer 2010“ sieht im Wesentlichen eine aufgabenbezogene Neuausrichtung der Streitkräfte auf ambitionierte Auslandseinsätze vor. Im Bericht, der auf der Sicherheits- und Verteidigungsdoktrin basiert und das Konzept zur Teilstrategie „Verteidigungspolitik“ zugrunde legt, wurden keine sicherheitspolitischen Vorgaben zur Begründung des ambitionierteren Auslandseinsatzes erarbeitet, sondern vielmehr Konsequenzen für die Streitkräfteentwicklung aus den genannten Grundlagen abgeleitet. Der Nutzen von Auslandseinsätzen für Österreich konnte bislang weder in den strategischen Konzeptionen noch in den wissenschaftlichen Beiträgen ausreichend dargestellt werden.

Die Direktion für Sicherheitspolitik im Bundesministerium für Landesverteidigung hat in einem Begleitprojekt zur Bundesheerreformkommission erstmals versucht, diese Frage systematisch aufzubereiten, und auch entsprechende Empfehlungen an die Reformkommission übermittelt, wobei die wichtigsten Ergebnisse im Bericht eingeflossen sind. Wichtige Einzelbeiträge dieses Projektes werden nachträglich in der Reihe „Beiträge zur Sicherheitspolitik“ zugänglich gemacht.

Kees Homan und **Theo van den Doel** sind Senior Research Fellows am Netherlands Institute for International Relations Clingendael in Den Haag.

Impressum

Beiträge zur Sicherheitspolitik

Herausgeber und für den Inhalt verantwortlich:
Brigadier Mag. Gustav E. Gustenau

Gesamtredaktion: Mag. Walter Matyas

Textredaktion: SIB

Korrektorat: Doris Washiedl, Melitta Strouhal

Eigentümer, Verleger und Hersteller: Büro für Sicherheitspolitik
des Bundesministeriums für Landesverteidigung

Alle: Amtsgebäude Stiftgasse 2a, 1070 Wien
Tel. (+43-1) 5200/27006, Fax (+43-1) 5200/17068

Druck und Endfertigung:
Akademiedruckerei Landesverteidigungsakademie

ReproZ Wien

*Die Autoren geben in dieser Studie ausschließlich ihre persönliche
Meinung wieder.*

Dieser Text erscheint nur in elektronischer Form.

Aktuelle Informationen zu Publikationen des Büros für Sicherheitspolitik und
der Landesverteidigungsakademie finden Sie im Internet:

<<http://www.bundesheer.at/wissen-forschung/publikationen>>

Büro für
Sicherheitspolitik

Table of Contents

1. Summary	3
2. Arguments for Austria's Military Contribution to International Peace and Security	12
3. Austria's Need for National Defence and the Validity of the Present Structure and Organisation of the Armed Forces	14
4. Austria's Military Contribution to International Peace and Security: How Much is Enough?	23
5. Austria and its Involvement in International Security Organizations	35
6. The Political Ambition of The Netherlands and Its Contribution to International Peace and Security	47
7. Final Conclusions and Recommendations	54
Appendix: Dutch Participation in International Operations Abroad	57

1. Summary

The security situation on the European continent has improved and the zone of stability has been broadened, due to the enlargement of NATO. The presence of NATO and EU forces in the Balkans supports regional stability. At the same time, new risks are threatening the European democracies. The events of 9/11 have drastically changed our security situation. The new security risks do not respect national borders or neutrality. The concept of territorial defence has lost its validity and has to be replaced by a comprehensive security approach. The classic division between internal and external security becomes more and more irrelevant. The primary role of national armed forces has changed. The threats to national interest have to be dealt with far away from one's own national borders. The military and civil operations in Afghanistan and Iraq underline these developments. The new risks require a different attitude and adequate answers. Individual countries cannot accomplish the job. It, therefore, takes a common effort to meet these new threats.

The UN acknowledges that it is not well-equipped and capable of conducting missions of another nature than the classical peacekeeping operations. In the near future, the UN and other organisations will call upon NATO and the EU for assistance. The foundation of the NATO Response Force (NRF) is a further step to meet the new security requirements. National long-term commitments are a prerequisite for NATO's success in the near future.

The Foreign, Security and Defence Policy of the EU will be boosted by the approval of the Constitution in 2004. The security clause, which is part of the Constitution, opens new challenges for small states to reduce their vulnerability. At the same time, the member states will be committed to a qualitative contribution to EU defence capabilities. This will also have consequences for Austria's defence policy.

To determine Austria's military contribution to international organizations, four questions have been addressed in this CCSS-study. First, what determines the political value of the Austrian Armed Forces

on the national level? The second question deals with Austria's international contributions. What determines the political value of the military contributions to international organizations (EU, UN, NATO, and OSCE)? The third question deals with the missions of these organizations and with what is expected from Austria? The fourth question will be answered by an overview and insight into the political motives for the review of the Dutch security and defence policy.

1.1. The Political Value of the Austrian Armed Forces on the National Level

The threat of the Cold War period does no longer exist and the situation is irreversible for the near future. Only as a result of a radical change of political intentions, a residual conventional military risk is conceivable. On the European continent, only Russia can develop the military capabilities for that. If this is the case, it is likely that NATO will deter this development. At the time a direct conventional threat to Austria's territory is less likely. The geographical position of Austria makes an imminent deliberate violation of Austrian airspace unlikely. Nevertheless, the events of 9/11 have shown that rigid control of national airspace is necessary. This is Austria's responsibility. Besides that, Austria has to face the risks of long-range ballistic missiles, even from regions outside Europe, which can threaten its airspace and territory in the near future. It is only the USA, NATO and the EU that address these issues of high priority. The best way for Austria to secure its interests is active participation in these institutions. Participating in and contributing to NATO's Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) might be an option. The most feasible non-conventional threats to European, and therewith Austrian, society are international terrorism, organised crime, etc., which makes a comprehensive security approach necessary.

In 2004, when some of Austria's neighbours will become members of the European Union and will gradually be meeting the requirements of the Schengen acquit, outer border control will diminish and be limited to the Swiss border. When we take into account the risks of organised crime, international terrorism, etc. and the requirements of the EU to control the outer borders, professionalisation in carrying out this task cannot be ruled out. If this is the case, the need for conscripts will strongly decrease and become more questionable.

The military infrastructure of a nation is vital for its own national interests as well as for its allies. Therefore, it is necessary that the military and strategic civilian infrastructure is protected. For that purpose (semi-)active, light equipped units should be available. Most of today's societies cannot function without an adequate overall communication and data network. The armed forces have to take measures ahead of time to make their communication and data systems less vulnerable for cyber crime. The armed forces have the manpower and tools and equipment to support the national first responder services if there is a national disaster. They are follow-up forces, in case there is a lack of capacity and/or special equipment is needed.

The armed forces should be capable of fulfilling special missions as part of a comprehensive security approach. Without any doubt, the fight against terrorism has increased the need of having such units available. The required capacity and quality depends on the risk analysis and the contingencies. Since Austria committed itself to the Solidarity Clause as mentioned in the Draft European Constitution (Article 42), this will have consequences for the contingencies and the required capacities. If a country is much involved in international operations against international terrorism, its homeland can also become a target for the adversaries. In Austria, there is no clear policy as to what extent the Ministry of Defence and the armed forces with their capacities should be involved. The host nation support task is only of relevance in the event of a multinational operation in which the territory of Austria is involved. Most of

the time it is primarily logistic and surveillance units that are involved in providing such host nation support. Mostly, reserve or semi-active (on call) units are designated for this task. Only looking at the military capacity required for Austria's homeland, we can conclude that there is a surplus of units and the present organisation and structure are strongly determined by national defence tasks. To meet the new European challenges, Austria has to adapt its defence policy. Restructuring, reorganising and increasingly professionalising the Austrian Armed Forces will be unavoidable.

1.2. Austria's Military Contribution to International Peace and Security

In order to serve their national interests and to extend their influence, there are two basic strategies for smaller states. One strategy is to intensify co-operation with a major power (multilaterally and/or bilaterally). This strategy lends strong support to the major power in the decision-making process within the organisation. The other strategy is to balance the influence of the major powers in international organisations through co-operation among the smaller states. In practice, most of the time, it is a combination of the two strategies, that is used by the smaller states. The enlargement of the EU as well as of NATO will also have consequences for the role of small states. The enlargement of the EU in 2004 makes stronger co-operation among smaller states more and more likely and sometimes necessary to serve their national interests.

At the same time, it cannot be ruled out that, with respect to some issues, the major powers will form a 'core group'. One of those issues will be the European Security and Defence Policy. It is up to the members, therefore, also to Austria, whether or not to join that 'core group'.

1.3. The Political Ambition

The political ambition of a country in international affairs can be described as the level of participation or its profile in foreign policy. The armed forces can be used, more so than before, as a tool of foreign policy. It depends on the political ambition, how much a country is willing to contribute. The political ambition of a country is not determined by one or two elements only, rather a whole set of aspects ('soft and hard') is responsible for a country's ranking in international organisations. The most important aspects are as follows: Firstly, the country's size and the number of its inhabitants as well as its level of (economic) development. Secondly, there is also a relationship between the political ambition and the geo-strategic position of a country. Thirdly, also 'soft' factors, like political ideology, play a role. In some countries, there is a political mainstream of intervening in international affairs when, e.g., human rights are being violated. Some like to intervene by giving humanitarian aid. The drive for a country's political ambition can also be based on the keyword in international relations, namely solidarity. This factor is fundamental. The system of international organisations can only survive through solidarity. If there is no solidarity among its members, the system may fall apart. Solidarity only makes sense when it is combined with meaningful and practical steps. It is not about paying the cheque only. The position of neighbouring countries and the behaviour of a country's key partners also influence the level of ambition. For Austria, the level of participation and the kind of profile chosen by (EU) neighbours like the Czech Republic, Hungary, etc. are important. It is not in Austria's interest to be outstripped politically by smaller countries in the region. Above all, the relationship with the largest neighbour Germany is important. It can serve as input for Austria's ambition level.

Austria wants to cover a fair share of the international burden. This attitude should be a major factor in determining the input for the political ambition level. Therefore, Austria's ambition, on the long way towards an ESDP, has to be further defined. If Austria wants to become a relevant partner in this field, it should contribute with proportional quantity and quality. This requires an expeditionary force, with modern equipment, well-trained personnel for operations that can be supported far away from Austria's territory. This may also have consequences for the defence expenditures and the debate on conscription. To extend its influence, Austria could also look for strategic partners. The best strategy is to choose partners depending on the respective issue at hand, i.e. tailor-made partnerships for different political and military purposes.

When all these considerations are taken into account and balanced out, one may conclude that, with regard to Austria's position, a medium political profile meets the national interest of the country. When we look at the present posture of the Austrian Armed Forces and Austria's record with regard to international peace support operations, we might rate the political ambition as low-profile with low to medium risks. A low profile country focuses on stabilisation and reconstruction operations only. When a country goes for a 'high profile', it is able and willing to contribute to combat operations. For obvious reasons most countries are likely to opt for a low to medium profile, with the emphasis on defensive or offensive means. Adopting a medium profile, a country could focus on its own niche capabilities (specialisation) or contribute to pools of capabilities. In general, one might argue that the military contribution of a smaller country serves its national interests. The political benefits depend on several elements: The international organisations (UN, NATO, EU) involved, the country's record, and the influence of 'co-operation-partners' within the involved organisation.

1.4. Conscription: a Restriction for the Political Ambition?

Since the early nineties some European countries have abolished conscription. There are many reasons for that. The new complex tasks of the armed forces require a professional army. Due to the evolution of technology, future military operations will be even more sophisticated than today. It is inefficient to use conscripts for these tasks. One cannot rule out that in the near future the European Army Corps will be based on career soldiers only. If that is the case, those countries whose armed forces are heavily dependent on conscripts are limited in their contribution, which might run against the national interests.

1.5. Austria and its Involvement with International Security Organisations

1.5.1. The United Nations and Austria

Peacekeeping is still an important activity in our insecure world. Throughout 2003 there were 13 ongoing UN peacekeeping operations, with approx. 42,000 military and civilian police. Since the Security Council is now prepared to issue more robust peacekeeping mandates, there is an increasing need for armed troops with the necessary equipment. There is a trend to larger contingents from Asian and African countries. The European countries were more reticent. Austria demonstrates its strong bond with the UN by making major contributions. To date, approximately 50,000 Austrians have served in UN peacekeeping missions all over the world. Austria is now contributing to UNFICYP, UNMEE, UNIMOG, UNTSO and UNDOF. Austria is also a member of the SHIRBRIG.

1.5.2. The European Union and Austria

The EU has to make much progress in building up its military capabilities. The biggest shortfalls are in the field of logistics (air and sealift capacities, communications equipment, etc.).

Such gaps are a problem because they limit the scope of any autonomous mission that the EU may wish to undertake. To put an end to the deficiencies, the European Capabilities Plan (ECAP) was formulated in December 2001. The ECAP consists of 18 multinational panels which can propose solutions to the deficiencies that have been identified. The document takes a holistic view of security, talking about hunger and underdevelopment as causes of instability and conflict. It also mentions the link between failed states and organised crime (Somalia, Afghanistan).

The development of the ESDP will give the EU the necessary means and capabilities as well as efficient decision-making structures for civil and military crisis management. Austria wants to make an appropriate contribution in terms of quantity as well as quality to the headline goal. Austria emphasises the importance that the member states have to improve their military capabilities to carry out crisis management operations. Since Austria's influence in the decision-making process of the EU is limited, it focuses on certain foreign policy issues that are of particular importance for geographical or other reasons. Austria is in favour of introducing the community method into the CFSP. At least qualified majority voting should be extended in the field of CFSP.

When the European Constitution is agreed on by the member states, Austria is bound to a Solidarity Clause and can opt for enhanced co-operation and/or permanent structured co-operation. This is a political choice with consequences for the armed forces. Without any doubt, when military missions are on the political agenda, the EU will put pressure on its members, including Austria, to contribute. This kind of peer pressure should not be underestimated. Austria should, therefore, consider what kind of military profile has to be chosen, with the aim of contributing to the security and defence policy of the Union as a credible partner.

1.5.2. The OSCE and Austria

Austria considers the OSCE to be a useful international organisation which is based on the concept of comprehensive security and on common values and which, through its missions and institutions, such as ODIHR, is engaged in the solution of specific problems. It views field operations as a central asset of the Organisation. Austria emphasises that global security without the protection of and respect for human rights is inconceivable and that the human dimension must continue, in particular also in the fight against threats like terrorism, in order to play an important role in the work of the OSCE. Austria supports the further strengthening of the OSCE, especially in the areas of early warning, conflict prevention, civilian crisis management and post conflict peace-building.

1.5.4. NATO and Austria

Austria considers NATO to be not only a classical military alliance but a comprehensive security community based on democratic values, making a crucial contribution to peace and security worldwide. Austria consistently promotes the further development of its relations with NATO, within the framework

of the tailored co-operation programme. It wants to make full usage of the possibilities offered within the framework of PfP.

Austria advocates close and trustworthy co-operation between the EU and NATO. Austria regards close co-operation between the EU and NATO, in the spirit of a strategic partnership, as a prerequisite for the success of the ESDP. After completion of the second enlargement round of NATO, the whole territory of Austria will be surrounded by NATO member states. Although NATO membership remains an option, none of the political parties in Austria is in support of it at the moment.

1.6. A Passive or an Active Austrian Security and Defence Policy?

Looking at Austria's present capabilities and input, its political ambitions can be rated as 'low' (in some areas as 'low/medium'). Austria already has the capability to contribute with valuable modules to (UN) peacekeeping operations. But Austria's ability to sustain operations in remote regions is limited. By adopting the EU Security Strategy it may be assumed that Austria will enhance its political ambitions in the field of military capabilities. A medium profile ambition should reflect Austria's economic ranking, regional position and credibility. This not only requires a transformation from territorially oriented armed forces to expeditionary armed forces but also the necessary financial funding. One of the principles of Austria's defence policy is to enable the Austrian Armed Forces to take part in the whole spectrum of the Petersberg tasks, in a multinational framework, with up to a brigade or brigade equivalent. An Austrian contribution of brigade size could be taken into consideration or a task force of the land forces consisting of a core that is predominantly Austrian, supplemented by foreign support and combat support units. The Austrian land forces should be capable of creating a brigade or brigade task force for operations in an international context at the higher end of the force spectrum.

The general opinion is that smaller countries will not be able to maintain relevant armed forces in the future, without international co-operation. Increasing the efficiency of the European defence expenditures in their totality by improving international co-operation is an important condition for strengthening the European Union's military capabilities. Austria should look into the possibilities of bi-national or multinational agreements in the field of operational co-operation, pooling and co-operation with respect to materiel. The co-operation options include logistics, with emphasis on strategic lifts, and precision munitions - areas which could be of interest for the air force.

Based on political and military documents and statements, one may conclude that Austria has the political ambition to play a relevant role in those international security organisations. As a result, Austria's rather passive foreign policy has further moved towards a more assertive policy by adopting the principle of solidarity and by committing military capabilities to the ESDP. This policy recognises that the security of Austria and the EU are inseparably linked and that the ESDP should be of priority for Austria.

Austria's current military capabilities are not in balance with its international position and political ambitions. Looking at Austria's military capabilities, the nature of its present deployments and its contributions to the ECAP and the Capabilities Commitment Catalogue, Austria's political ambitions with regard to its land forces can be rated as 'low' and with regard to some specific capabilities as 'low/medium'.

Austria already has the capability to contribute to peacekeeping operations with valuable modules, as it has frequently shown in UN operations. But Austria's ability to sustain operations in remote regions is

limited. In addition, Austria has capabilities very suitable for homeland defence, which also have an inherent value for more demanding expeditionary operations.

By being involved with the ECAP and adopting the EU Security Strategy – which commits the EU to becoming a more active, more capable and more coherent global actor – it may be assumed that Austria will enhance its political ambitions with regard to its military capabilities and will opt for a medium profile.

A medium profile ambition should reflect Austria's economic ranking, regional position and credibility. This not only requires a transformation from territorially oriented armed forces to expeditionary armed forces but also the necessary financial funds. Austria's defence budget falls behind when compared with that of countries, like Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands.

An alternative in the framework of a medium profile which might be considered is the establishment of a battle-group size force which can respond to a crisis with appropriate transport and sustainability. This force should have the capacity to operate under a Chapter VII mandate. It would be deployed in response to a UN request to stabilise a situation or otherwise meet a short-term need, until peacekeepers from the United Nations, or regional organisations acting under a UN mandate, can arrive or be reinforced.

1.7. Bi-national and Multilateral Co-operation

There is the general opinion in Europe that smaller countries, like Austria, will not be able to maintain relevant and affordable armed forces in the long term, without far-reaching international co-operation. Intensifying co-operation is necessary to reduce the current fragmentation of the European defence efforts. Increasing the efficiency of the totality of the European defence expenditures by improving international co-operation is an important condition for strengthening European military capabilities. In international military co-operation there is much to be gained in the areas of finance (economies of scale, balanced burden sharing), politics (strengthening relationships, transparency, experience with co-operation), and the military (increasing interoperability, access to resources which a country does not possess, procurement and capability maintenance). These advantages increase proportionally to the co-operation intensity. However, co-operation will not necessarily result in savings in the short term – “nothing ventured, nothing gained”!

The disadvantages of military co-operation are to be found primarily in the loss of the autonomous decision-making authority, which increases as co-operation becomes more intense and eventually leads to task specialisation (exchange of tasks). Extensive research of European countries has made it clear that, in the short term, there is no political will and that there are currently no possibilities in Europe for making bi-national or multinational agreements, concerning task specialisation. The best possibilities for further co-operation in the short term can be found in the least drastic forms of co-operation, such as pooling (e.g. the European Air Group) and materiel co-operation (e.g. NH-90 helicopter).

Austria should look into the possibilities of bi-national or multinational agreements in the field of operational co-operation, pooling and co-operation with respect to materiel. Since Austria's national tasks can be seen as the minimum level for its co-operation options, it is important to identify these national tasks.

Suitable countries for co-operation that Austria should consider are Germany and Hungary. Austria should look into the possibilities of bi-national brigades or bi-national battle-groups. Another option to consider is that of bi-national headquarters.

1.8. The Political Ambition of the Netherlands and its Contribution to International Peace and Security

The Netherlands largely depends on the international context with regard to its security, prosperity and welfare. The aim of the Dutch government is to help build a just world with safeguards for its security and welfare. A strong European Union and a strong transatlantic Alliance, therefore, have been cornerstones of the Dutch policy for many years.

The influence of a medium-size country is obviously limited, but it should not be underestimated. Dutch companies are among the largest foreign investors in the world. The Netherlands is an important player in terms of international economic developments. While a country's importance is to a large extent a given and its authority must be built over the time, the international influence is the most dynamic factor which the Netherlands can use to strengthen its position.

The Dutch Armed Forces are more involved internationally now than in the past. International co-operation is indispensable, when facing the current security risks. That is why the Netherlands acts in its own national interest. Bilateral and multinational military co-operation with allies and partners have been further strengthened in the past several years. NATO and the EU are the most important institutional frameworks for co-operation. NATO is the most important pillar of the Dutch security policy and epitomises the transatlantic connection. To maintain good transatlantic relations is essential for Dutch security.

The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) has become a driving force in Dutch defence policy during the last years. This European orientation is founded on the idea that closer European co-operation offers new possibilities to remove the greatest hindrance in achieving an effective European crisis response capability – namely, the fragmentation of European defence activities.

Any Dutch military unit can be deployed for peace operations, crisis management operations and other international operations. The Netherlands want to actively promote more intensive defence co-operation among the European countries. The Dutch government has the ambition to take part in expeditionary operations with its armed forces. This requires high-quality units that are largely self-sustained in the area of logistics and carry out military operations at a relatively great distance.

The main instrument used by the Dutch government in analysing whether or not to take part in a peace support operation is the so-called 'Toetsingskader' or Review Framework. This is a list of points, which was presented by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Defence to the Lower House, in June 1995. The 'Toetsingskader' is used to provide a better structure for consultations between the government and the parliament and to improve the quality of decision-making.

1.9. Conclusions and Recommendations

There is no conventional threat to Austria's territory foreseeable in the near future. The risks, which are recognised, can be countered in the best way by multinational co-operation. From the security point of

view, there is no clear reason to maintain the military capacity for territorial defence alone. Austria is willing to contribute to the whole spectrum of the so-called Petersberg tasks. Austria's national interest is served best by using two options: membership and active participation in and contribution to international organisations, like the EU, while at the same time co-operating with different strategic partners. The consequence of this view is that Austria has to opt for an expeditionary force, which meets the qualities to support EFSP and NATO missions. There is a big difference in education, training, equipment and availability of military forces for expeditionary missions compared to those primarily used for missions on the own territory. A contribution with expeditionary forces to the fight against international terrorism makes the own territory more vulnerable. This aspect should be part of a comprehensive security approach.

It is likely that professionals will take over the border control in the near future. If that is the case the need for conscripts will strongly decrease and the relevance of conscription will become questionable. At the same time, one cannot rule out that, in the near future, the EU-Army Corps will be based only on professional soldiers. Austria should evaluate its present policy on conscription and develop a long-term strategy in order to be able to contribute to organisations, like the EU and NATO in a professional way.

From the spirit of Austria's political and military documents and statements one can conclude that Austria has the political ambition to play a relevant role in those international security organisations. 'Solidarity' is a key word in Austria's foreign and security policy. This should find reflection in the level of Austria's political ambition (medium profile). To implement this ambition, the Austrian defence organisation should be capable of contributing on a permanent basis to the EU-Army Corps and NATO's peace support operations. Austria has lower defence expenditures in comparison to other small countries, like Sweden or Finland. Only a higher defence budget would make larger international contributions more realistic.

Austria has a strong commitment to the UN and is still playing an important role in the field of Chapter VI peacekeeping operations. The UN expects Austria to continue to participate in this kind of operations. The OSCE has become an important player in the field of conflict-prevention and post-conflict peace-building. Austria is expected, on request, to take part in OSCE missions with observers and to make troops available for peacekeeping operations. NATO has expanded its traditional role of collective defence with peace support operations and the fight on terrorism. With the enlargement of NATO the political dimension has increased in importance. Austria uses the PfP to promote its own security. Austria is supposed to continue to contribute in an appropriate way to UN-mandated, NATO-led peace support operations.

There is the general opinion in Europe that smaller countries will not be able to maintain relevant and affordable armed forces over the long term, without far-reaching international co-operation. Intensifying co-operation is necessary in order to reduce the current fragmentation of the European defence efforts. Increasing the efficiency of the totality of European defence expenditures by improving international co-operation is a prerequisite for strengthening the European military capabilities.

The disadvantage of military co-operation is the loss of autonomous decision-making authority. This increases as co-operation becomes more intense (e.g. task specialisation). Research on European countries has made it clear, that there is no political will for making bi-national or multinational agreements with regard to task specialisation, in the near future. The short-term possibilities for further co-operation can be found in areas, such as pooling (e.g. the European Air Group) and procurement (e.g. NH-90 helicopter).

The Dutch Armed Forces were transformed into an all-volunteer force in the 90s, while being simultaneously restructured and downsized. According to its ambitions and its commitment to the international community, the Netherlands is willing and able to participate in a maximum of three peacekeeping operations with battalion-size units or equivalent. For operations at the higher end of the spectrum the Netherlands can contribute a brigade or a task force of the land forces consisting of a core that is predominantly Dutch, or equivalent. Dutch decisions on participating in international peace support operations are based on a 'Toetsingskader' or Review Framework.

Austria should look into the possibilities of bi-national or multinational agreements in the field of operational co-operation, pooling and co-operation with respect to materiel. As Austria's national tasks can be seen as the minimum level for co-operation options, it is important to identify what these national tasks are.

As a result of its political ambitions and according to its medium profile, Austria should contribute with land forces on brigade-level to operations at the higher end of the force spectrum. Another option is a task force of the land forces, consisting of a core that is predominantly Austrian and includes a number of modules (headquarters and manoeuvre battalions) supplemented with foreign support and combat support units. An alternative within the framework of a medium profile, which can be taken into consideration, is the establishment of a battle-group sized force which can respond to a crisis with appropriate transport and sustainability. This force should have the capacity to operate under a Chapter VII mandate. It would be deployed on request of the UN to stabilise a situation or otherwise meet a short-term need until UN-peacekeepers or other military acting under UN-mandate, arrive.

At the lower end of the spectrum of force the Austrian armed forces should be capable of participating in two operations with contributions in battalion strength or equivalent.

Suitable countries to consider for co-operation are Germany and Hungary. Austria should also look into the possibilities of bi-national brigades or bi-national battle-groups. Another option to give thought to would be bi-national headquarters.

Once the EU Constitution has been agreed upon, Austria will have to consider whether or not to opt for enhanced co-operation and/or permanent structured co-operation. This political choice will have consequences for the restructuring, education, training and equipment of the Austrian Armed Forces.

2. Arguments for Austria's Military Contribution to International Peace and Security

2.1. General

Although the enlargement of NATO has broadened the zone of stability towards eastern and southern Europe, the events of 9/11 have drastically changed our security situation. The new security risks do not respect national borders or neutrality. The concept of territorial defence has lost its validity but has to be replaced by an overall concept of a comprehensive security approach. The classical division between internal and external security is becoming increasingly irrelevant. The primary role of national armed forces has changed. The threats to national interests have to be dealt with far away from one's own national borders. The military and civil operations in Afghanistan and Iraq underline these developments.

The new risks require a different attitude and adequate answers. Individual countries cannot accomplish the job on their own. Only through common efforts these new threats can be met.

Due to the drastic changes in European security, the role of international organisations has become paramount. On the European continent neutrality or non-alignment has, in practice, lost its meaning. Europe has become a global player and the European countries cannot deny that. It seems to be paradoxical, but the nation-state can only survive by becoming an active partner in international organisations.

The enlargement of the European Union and NATO in 2004 was a milestone in the history of these Treaty Organisations. For the few countries that are left outside membership has not been ruled out but could be a matter of time. Once a country is a member of these organisations, an active attitude is preferable to a passive one, as the latter might be adverse to national interests.

As a result of the Brahimi Report, the UN acknowledges that it is neither well enough equipped nor capable of conducting missions other than classical peacekeeping operations.¹

Therefore, in the near future, the UN, but also other organisations, such as for instance the OSCE, will call more frequently upon NATO and the EU for assistance. NATO is already doing its job in Afghanistan and Iraq will probably be its next mission. The recent EU operation in Macedonia and the expected take-over of the NATO operation in Bosnia underline these developments.

The foundation of the NATO Response Force (NRF) is a further step towards meeting the new security requirements. Conflict prevention requires an active posture. National contributions, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively, are a prerequisite for NATO to succeed in the near future.

The Foreign Security and Defence Policy of the EU will be boosted by the approval of the Constitution in 2004. The Security Clause, which is part of the Constitution, opens new challenges for small states to reduce their vulnerability. At the same time, the member states will be committed to an active contribution to EU defence capabilities. This will have also consequences for Austria's security and defence policy. In addition to the Solidarity Clause, the member states can opt for closer co-operation, which, de facto, makes it a mutual defence clause. Even those countries that want to take over more responsibility can opt for closer and permanent structured co-operation. It is up to the members, to what extent they want to commit themselves. Also Austria has to make a decision on this vital security subject, as it is directly linked to the national interest and political ambition of the nation-state.

In the earlier report "The European Union's Foreign Security and Defence Policy and Austria's Ambitions"², a broad conceptual approach was outlined, serving as a tool for the debate about the future of the Austrian Armed Forces. The questions about the size and composition of the armed forces for homeland defence as well as the question of what kind of forces Austria will contribute to international peace and security will have to be answered, as a next step.

2.2. Four Main Questions

In this study, four main questions will be addressed. First, what is the current rationale for 'homeland' (national) defence? In other words what determines the political value of the Austrian Armed Forces on the national level?

¹ Brahimi-report, UN, New York, 2000.

² Clingendael Centre for Strategic Studies, June 2003.

The second question refers to Austria's international contribution. What determines the political value of military contributions to international organisations, like the EU, UN, NATO and the OSCE? Do small countries really matter? What could the Austrian government's parameters be for such contributions? How should the new situation be faced politically? Should the political decision-making process be adapted? In what way will an international military contribution be judged? Is there a political difference between a contribution to the military and the civil dimension of security? Benchmarking with some other countries can serve as a tool to provide more insight into solving these complex political questions.

The third question deals with the missions of international organisations, such as the EU, UN, NATO and OSCE. How will they develop in the near future? What do they expect from their members? Are they well enough equipped to carry out their operations? Is there a balance between quantity and quality in the contributions of the member states? What are their deficiencies? Which organisations are leading, when it comes to maintaining or stabilising peace and security? What can Austria contribute? What would be the consequence if Austria takes a passive stand? This chapter will deal extensively with the question of a future European defence and the Draft European Constitution in which closer co-operation on security and defence is one of the main subjects.

The fourth question will be answered by an extensive overview and insight into the political motives and considerations of the Dutch government in order to review its security and defence policy. Main questions, such as the political ambition level, the suspension of conscription, the relevance of reserve units, the transformation process and the present structure and composition of the armed forces will be addressed.

Conclusions and recommendations will round off the study. The recommendations may be considered an input for the political debate on Austria's military contributions to international organisations as well as to the extent, the armed forces should contribute to homeland defence. Once the political decision is made, a study, based on a quantitative approach should provide models for the Austrian Armed Forces to meet the security challenges of the 21st century.

3. Austria's Need for National Defence and the Validity of the Present Structure and Organisation of the Armed Forces

3.1. General

In the last decade the security environment in Europe has drastically changed. The old threats no longer exist. That situation is irreversible in the near future. Establishing new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe has contributed to the overall security on the European continent. The east enlargement of NATO and the EU has increased the zone of peace and stability. This development also influences Austria's situation positively. As a result of the new circumstances, neutrality and non-alignment have lost their value on the European continent.

The events of 9/11 have shown that security risks have to be counteracted far away from national borders. Otherwise they will become a real and imminent threat to Western democracies.

Today, the security of a nation-state and its vital interests can be better served by membership in an alliance than by stand-alone arrangements. Without any doubt, common defence is preferable to individual defence. During the Cold War, only common defence could secure the territory of Western Germany. The threat to Turkey's territory during the wars against Iraq could only be deterred by the contribution of NATO members. Other than the USA and Russia, no European country can manage its security on its own.

In most of the countries the changed security environment has already led to a review of their security and defence policies. As a result, armed forces have been adapted to the new circumstances. In 2001, the Austrian Parliament approved the new Austrian Security and Defence Doctrine.³ Neutrality has been replaced by solidarity. This fundamental change does have consequences with regard to Austria's international engagement and contributions.

In the following chapter the Austrian Security and Defence Doctrine is analysed, which will lead to an appreciation of Austria's security today and provide the material for national defence needs as such. The focus of that chapter is limited to armed forces needed on Austria's territory alone.

3.2. The Austrian Security and Defence Doctrine: An Analysis

3.2.1. Security

The Security and Defence Doctrine is based on the model of comprehensive security. A broad security approach is needed to safeguard Austria's vital interests. The military aspect in relation to the security of Austria's territory is only one aspect of the doctrine.

The security of Austria and that of the EU are inseparably linked. This is a fundamental principle. It underlines the commitment of Austria to the European Union.

Remark: This principle of the security doctrine has consequences. Once, the EU Constitution is approved by the member states, a 'military assistance clause' will be part of it. By then, Austria's commitments will be reaching far beyond its national borders.

The Austrian constitution does not limit the nature of the military contribution. The constitutional amendment adopted in 1998 paved the way for Austria's military contribution within the whole spectrum of the so-called Petersberg tasks.

Remark: This implies active participation in peacekeeping and peacemaking (combat) operations. This policy should find reflection in the capacity, training and education of the Austrian Armed Forces.

For the future of Europe it is important that the US continues its engagement and that the security relations between Russia and the EU or NATO respectively develop in the right way.

Remark: In conclusion one can say that the transatlantic link, best demonstrated by NATO, is also vital to Austria's security.

³ Austrian Security and Defence Doctrine, BPD, Vienna, 2002.

In the medium and long term, European security may be threatened by a spill-over of armed conflicts from the regions in the periphery of or bordering on Europe.

Remark: Looking at the geographical position of Austria, it is not likely that these kinds of threats will reach its territory.

Only as a result of a radical change of political intentions, a residual conventional military risk is conceivable.

Remark: It would take at least ten years before such a threat would become imminent. On the European continent only Russia can develop the military capabilities needed for that. Developing such capabilities will hardly be possible without violating the CFE-Treaty. However, it is likely that NATO will try to deter such a development. Under these circumstances an imminent direct conventional threat to Austria's territory is not very likely. It is also in the interest of Austria that NATO remains a vital political and military organisation which is broadly supported by its present and future members.

Austria also has to face the risks of long-range ballistic missiles, even from regions outside Europe, which can threaten its territory in the near future.

Remark: It is also in the interest of Austria that adequate control regimes stop the proliferation of ballistic missile technology as well as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It is only the USA, NATO and the EU who address these issues, giving them high priority.

The most feasible non-conventional threat to European and Austrian society is international terrorism, organised crime, cyber crime and regional and local conflicts resulting in uncontrolled mass migration. This needs a comprehensive approach and different strategies.

Remark: This should also be reflected in a comprehensive security strategy. This approach has replaced the former main task, i.e. the classical defence of national territory.

In all cases the use of military force remains an instrument of last resort and may only be applied in accordance with the principles of the UN-Charter.

Remark: Therefore, it is feasible that the Austrian government will contribute with military units in out-of-area operations only if they are approved by the UN.

3.2.2. Defence⁴

The defence policy considers all military aspects to secure the vital interests of Austria. The armed forces are an instrument to reach that goal. Their primary mission is to safeguard Austria's sovereignty and to defend its society against threats from outside. The military capacity should also reflect Austria's position within the international community. The armed forces should be capable of contributing to conflict prevention as well as to crisis management operations.

⁴ Sub-Strategy Defence Policy, July 2003. Eine Sicherheitspolitik für das 21. Jahrhundert, OIES, December, 2001.

To meet the new requirements, the organisation, structure and composition of the armed forces have been changed in the last decade. The 'old army' was based on wartime scenarios, large-scale mobilisation and the concept of self-defence and consisted of a rather large component of reserve units. It has been replaced by a smaller army which consists primarily of active units and is less dependent on reserve units.

Remark: This review process is ongoing, as the security environment is developing, calling for a permanent update of the security and defence policy, which also has consequences for the armed forces. Considerations and recommendations for Austria's military contributions to international organisations, in particular to the EU, and the consequences for its armed forces are discussed in chapter 4.

3.3. The National Tasks of the Austrian Armed Forces

According to the Sub-Strategy of the Austrian Armed Forces, the army and the air force have following tasks, directly related to the defence of the national territory:

- To secure and to control the territory (land and airspace) of Austria;
- To secure the military infrastructure;
- To counter cyber-crime with the aim of securing communication on state level and throughout the country by safeguarding civil communication networks;
- To provide disaster relief in Austria;
- To conduct special missions in Austria;
- To provide Host Nation Support for foreign military units.

Remark: If Austria committed itself to the Solidarity Clause mentioned in the Draft European Constitution (Article 42), this would have consequences for the force contingents as well as the capacities needed. This task, related to the Solidarity Clause could be added as an additional task.

3.3.1. Territorial Defence (Task 1)

The concept of territorial defence is still part of Austria's defence doctrine. Besides the active units (two mechanised brigades and three infantry brigades), a large reserve component of 20 reserve battalions still exist.

Remark: The current risk analysis does not suggest specific threats to Austria's territory. There is no conventional threat at the moment whatsoever and, therefore, also not foreseeable for the near future. Since the demise of the Warsaw Pact classical border defence has lost its value. The need for large reserve components is no longer given. The general risks that are recognised can best be countered through multinational co-operation. Therefore, from the security perspective, there is no real reason to maintain the present military capacity for territorial defence alone.

The task of the air force is to secure Austria's airspace. The Eurofighter (18), which will enter into service in 2005 and replace the Saab 'Dragon' and air defence assets will fulfil this task.

Remark: Looking at Austria's geographical position, imminent deliberate violations of Austrian airspace are unlikely. Nevertheless, the events of 9/11 have shown that rigid control of national airspace is necessary. Also, uncontrolled proliferation of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction can become a realistic threat to Western Europe and, therefore, also to Austria's territory in the near future. These risks require a common approach by Western institutions, like NATO and the EU. The best way for Austria to defend its interests is active participation in these institutions. Participating in and contributing to NATO's Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) might be an option.

Border control is a task which belongs to the Ministry of the Interior. Nevertheless, the armed forces support and facilitate the execution of this task by providing approximately 2000 conscripts on a permanent basis.

Remark: In 2004, when Austria's neighbours, like Slovenia, Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Hungary become members of the European Union and are gradually meeting the requirements of the Schengen acquis, the border protection task will lose in importance and eventually be limited to the Swiss border.

When we take into account the risks of organised crime, mass migration, international terrorism, trafficking of women and drugs, and the EU border control requirements, a professionalisation of the border control cannot be ruled out. If this is the case, the need for conscripts will greatly decrease and might be put into question altogether.

3.3.2. Military Infrastructure (Task 2)

The military infrastructure of a nation is vital for its own national interests as well as for its allies.

Remark: The events of '9/11' have shown that the military infrastructure of a country is one of the potential targets of terrorist attacks. For more than one reason it is necessary that the military infrastructure (airfields, barracks, pipelines, ammunition stocks, communication networks, military assets, etc.) is protected. In case of an alert, appropriate measures will have to be taken by the defence organisation. For that purpose CCSS recommends (semi) active, lightly equipped military units which should be available in the right amount and of adequate quality.

3.3.3. Cyber Crime (Task 3)

Most modern societies all over the world cannot function without an adequate overall communication and data network. Governments, armed forces, police, first aid services, electricity and nuclear power plants, rail traffic, private companies, individuals etc. are heavily dependent on communication- and data networks. In case of a large-scale breakdown of these networks, governments cannot function and the social order will be disrupted.

In first place the armed forces have to take measures beforehand to make its communication and data systems less vulnerable to cyber crime. Secondly, in case of an emergency, the armed forces should be capable of supporting the communication of governmental bodies and civil agencies by using their own infrastructure.

Remark: This requires management and maintenance of the communication infrastructure by a specialised unit that is part of the defence organisation.

3.3.4. Disaster Relief (Task 4)

In general the armed forces are the best-equipped organisation to play an active role in contingencies, in cases of a national disaster (floods, forest fires, large-scale railway and aeroplane accidents, chemical accidents, ecological accidents, etc.).

Remark: The armed forces have the manpower and all the tools and equipment to support national first aid services if there is a national disaster. They are a follow-up force, in case there is a lack of capacity and/or if special equipment (e.g. helicopters, NBC units, etc.) is needed. Even in a situation where there is no national disaster, though the situation requires a long-term effort which cannot be managed with civil capacities, the armed forces (due to their manpower and capacity) are usually the only organisation which can provide the required services. For example, in the Netherlands the military units (all services, including the Marine Corps) were deployed for several months to support civil agencies and state-authorities during the foot and mouth disease in 2001.

Due to the increase in international terrorism and the use of a-symmetrical tactics by terrorist groups, which does not exclude the use of chemical or biological weapons, the availability of specialist military units, like NBC-units, is important.

In general, providing disaster relief is not an argument in itself for the existence of armed forces. It is the manpower and the unique capacity, primarily used for executing their main defence tasks which makes the armed forces most capable of fulfilling a complementary task in case of disaster. Besides the national task, the EU is developing a policy for disaster relief. The aim is to create 'civil protection units' which can act on behalf of the EU in case of disaster. These units have to assist and support EU member states as well as countries outside the Union in case of disaster. Austria could offer some units (e.g. NBC units and/or other special units) to the EU. Participating in this EU pool of civil protection units has consequences for availability, training, skills and deployment of such units.

3.3.5. Special Missions (Task 5)

The armed forces should be capable of fulfilling special missions as part of the National Security Concept, which would require operations of different types. In cases, where it cannot be ruled out that a certain level of force has to be used, the authorities will deploy special unit(s) instead of regular police units.

Remark: Special unit(s) can also be used for the purpose of protecting and safeguarding special objects (soft and hard targets). Without any doubt, the fight against terrorism has increased the need for the availability of such kinds of units. The required capacity and quality of such unit(s) depends on the risk analysis and the contingencies related to it. In Austria there is no clear policy with regard to what extent the Ministry of Defence and the capacity of the armed forces are to be involved in the fight against terrorism. To determine the right capacity, this subject needs further attention and clarification by the government.

3.3.6. Host Nation Support (Task 6)

The Host Nation Support task is only of relevance in case of a multinational operation in which the territory of Austria is involved. Most of the time logistic and surveillance units are primarily involved in providing host nation support. In most of the countries reserve or semi-active (on call) units are designated for this task.

3.4. The Present Capabilities and National Tasks

3.4.1. Capabilities

Manpower. The total strength of the armed forces is 35,000 personnel (including 17,000 conscripts). This manpower is shared between the army (28,000, including 14,000 conscripts) and the air force (6,000, including 3,000 conscripts). The manpower of the reserve component is about 90,000.

Main units. Army: three infantry brigades and two mechanised brigades. One infantry brigade is specialised in mountain operations. Air force: 18 combat aircraft (Eurofighter as of 2005) and air defence assets (76).

3.4.2. Comparing National Tasks and Military Capacity

When we take the threat and risk analysis into account, there is no conventional threat (except for the proliferation of ballistic missiles) to Austria's territory in the near future. So, the main task of defending the national territory only is neither a realistic one for infantry and mechanised brigades nor for the air force.

The required capacity for national tasks includes military units and support capacities to ensure:

- (1) the security of military infrastructure
- (2) disaster relief
- (3) special missions
- (4) an independent communication network
- (5) host nation support (if applicable)
- (6) border control (declining).

For the above mentioned tasks, light infantry units, logistics (including helicopter transport) and communications units are required as well as specialised units, like NBC and water supply and water treatment units. The aim of this study, however, is not to develop a new organisation or structure for the armed forces. Nevertheless, in general terms we may conclude that the capacity of 1–2 light infantry brigade(s) (including support elements) are sufficient to fulfil the national tasks.

Securing Austria's airspace is an important national task in guaranteeing the integrity of the territory. This task can only be carried out effectively within a multinational framework (AWACS, NATO). The present and future capacity of the Austrian air force can be used for that purpose. One squadron will be sufficient to execute this task.

3.4.3. Structure and Capacity of the Armed Forces

The present structure, organisation and capacity of the armed forces are strongly determined by their national defence tasks (territorial defence). When we take the risk analysis into account, there is an overcapacity for national tasks at present. Yet, a comprehensive security approach is not in place. The protection of civil infrastructure, which is vital for the functioning of Austria's society, also requires military planning for that purpose. To be able to define the total capacity needed for the Austrian Armed Forces, the military contribution to international organisations, in particular to the EU, has to be analysed. This question is discussed in chapter 3 and 4.

3.5. Review of the Austrian National Security Concept?

The present Austrian national security concept, in general, meets the present international requirements, but there is still a gap between the concept and its implementation. The concept stated that the security of Austria and the EU are inseparably linked, but the consequences of this basic principle are not yet made operational. The events of 9/11 have clearly underlined the need for a comprehensive security approach, which covers the new threats, emerging from international terrorism. At the same time, Western countries have to defend their national interests far away from their territorial borders. For this purpose there is a need for an expeditionary warfare capacity. Small states only have the option to realise their national interest in a multilateral framework.

The contribution to the EU is in line with Austria's present political ambitions but the operational effectiveness, like many other national contributions, can be questioned. In most cases the international risks have to be counteracted far away from Austria's territory. If Austria really wants to contribute to European security (the EU and NATO) in a meaningful way, it has to reconsider its defence policy. Austria has to make a choice between armed forces which can serve as an expeditionary force in all possible scenarios or armed forces which can only be used in the lower force spectrum. The latter are primarily useful in classical peacekeeping operations (Chapter VI, UN Charter) or as a stabilisation force (tasks as a police force), such as in Bosnia. The expeditionary force can be characterized as mobile, flexible and robust. Such forces are well trained, have a high level of interoperability and modern equipment and are supported by new technology⁵.

3.6. Evaluation

The EU has become a global player, and so have its members. The territory of the member states, the security of their citizens and the welfare and prosperity of the whole Union can best be protected by an effective contribution to the European Security and Defence Policy. This goal can only be reached if the member states meet the defence requirements of today, i.e. by armed forces that are able to execute operations far beyond own national borders and have the training, equipment and the skills to do their job in an effective way.

The Security and Defence Doctrine of Austria should emphasise more clearly that the national armed forces have two main tasks: Firstly, to defend the integrity of the national territory, applying an overall comprehensive security concept. One should recognize that there is a link between the international

⁵ See also the Solana paper: A Secure Europe In A Better World, European Security Strategy.

engagement of a country in the fight against international terrorism and the security of the own territory. The homeland of a country with active military participation is more vulnerable to so-called ‘catastrophic terrorism’. The second task is to defend national interests far away from Austria’s borders by contributing to international peace and stability. When we take the present security analysis into account, one can conclude that the second task will become more and more important in the near future. One should differentiate between the capacity and skills needed for the implementation of a comprehensive security approach and the capacity and skills needed for international military contributions, as this has consequences for the organisation, structure, training, equipment, mindset, etc. of the Austrian Armed Forces. The present army is not ‘designed’ to act in such a way. Force transformation, restructuring, professionalisation, etc. are needed and have to be put on the political agenda (See chapter 4).

At the same time, some forces can also contribute to the disaster relief policy of the EU. For that purpose a special EU organisation with civil protection units will be created.

With regard to national tasks, forces are primarily used for the protection of military and critical civil infrastructure, host nation support and disaster relief. These forces do not need extensive training or a high degree of interoperability. In line with the risk analysis, their operational readiness is low, which can be different if a country is internationally engaged in the fight against terrorism (Madrid, 3/11). In most cases (on call) reserve units, such as the Dutch National Reserve Force, can fulfil these tasks. Other units of the armed forces can, of course, also fulfil these tasks, but should do so only in addition. These units are equipped and trained for expeditionary tasks and are overqualified for executing such tasks. Some units, such as logistic units (transport, water supply, communication, NBC, etc.) can also fulfil security tasks at home, unless they are internationally committed. This way, the same set of forces can be used for tasks at home and abroad.

For some security tasks (special missions) special units, like Special Operations Forces, the Military Police, etc. can be used. The criteria for using these units instead of police units are, in general, an expected use of force, the need for special equipment (like personal protection, armoured vehicles, etc.) and special skills. The law should regulate the use of this type of military force (circumstances, approval, etc.). The employment of such forces requires close co-operation between the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Internal Affairs, and the Minister of Defence.

3.7. Conclusions

- A review of security and defence policies is needed, due to the changed security environment on the European continent and the dramatic events of 9/11. In most of the European countries the outcome of this process confirms that the security of the nation-state and its vital interests can better be provided when being a member of a political alliance or union, instead of making stand-alone arrangements. Today, the national interests have to be defended by contributing to international organisations which conduct military and civil operations far away from one’s own national borders.
- The security of Austria and that of the EU are inseparably linked. This is a fundamental principle. It underlines the commitment of Austria to the European Union.
- The Austrian constitution does not limit the nature of military contributions. Austria is willing and able to contribute to the whole spectrum of the so-called Petersberg tasks.
- There is no conventional threat to Austria’s territory foreseeable in the near future. The risks which are recognised can best be countered by multinational co-operation.

- From a security point of view, there is no clear reason to maintain the military capacity for territorial defence only.
- When professionals will be carrying out border control tasks in the near future, the need for conscripts will greatly decrease. The importance of conscription will become questionable.
- The most feasible non-conventional threats to Austrian society are international terrorism, organised crime, cyber crime and uncontrolled mass migration.
- Due to the absence of a conventional threat in the near future, the need for a large component of reserve units is questionable.
- The use of military units for special missions has to be analysed further. The use of this type of force has to be regulated by a law.
- To fulfil national defence tasks as part of a new comprehensive security concept, it is expected that the capacity of 1–2 light infantry brigade(s) (including support elements and some specialised units, like NBC) will be sufficient.
- Securing Austrian airspace is a national task which can only be effectively carried out within a multinational framework. A part (approx. 1 squadron) of the present and future capacity of the air force can be used for that purpose.
- With its present capacity Austria can also contribute to the EU-pool of civil protection units, aimed at supporting EU-member states and other countries in disaster relief operations.
- An important task of the Austrian Armed Forces is their military contribution to international peace and stability. This meets Austria's national interests.
- Austria's international military engagement also has an impact on its national security. This should be part of a comprehensive security strategy.
- One should differentiate between the capacity and skills needed for missions on one's own territory and the capacity and skills needed for international military contribution. This will have consequences for the organisation, structure, training, equipment, mindset, etc., of the Austrian Armed Forces.
- The present army is not 'designed' to act as an expeditionary force. Force transformation, restructuring, professionalisation, etc. are needed and should be part of Austria's political agenda.
- The total capacity required of the armed forces strongly depends on Austria's military contributions to the EU, NATO and other international organisations.

4. Austria's Military Contribution to International Peace and Security: How Much is Enough?

4.1. General

In this chapter the role small powers play in international relations will be analysed. What determines the role of a country in international relations? How is national interest defined? What kinds of parameters are directly related to the political ambition of a country? In what way can the political ambition be made more valuable? How can these parameters be translated into concrete action? In what way can armed forces be used as an instrument in foreign policy? What is the rationale for today's conscription?

Does national conscription restrict the political ambition and international engagement? What is the surplus value if a small country contributes to international organisations with military units? Does it benefit from it? Does its contribution really matter? Is there a difference between Austria's defence expenditures and military contributions and those of other comparable EU-countries? All these questions will be addressed in this chapter.

4.2. Small Powers in International Organisations⁶

Membership in international organisations is based on equal rights and duties but in practice some member states are more equal than others. This is not the law of the jungle but the distribution of power in international politics. Inside as well as outside international organisations, there is a difference between the major powers (UK, France, Germany) and the smaller ones (Denmark, Belgium, etc.). Nevertheless, membership in an international organisation is not dictated but the free choice of every nation that meets the admittance criteria. The choice of membership in an international organisation is primarily based on the national interest of a country. Most of the time small states depend on international organisations, especially in the field of security. In general, their options are limited and related to the quality of their contributions. Sometimes they can use a 'window of opportunity' (chairmanship, occasional events) to increase their influence. They are net-consumers and, in general, they do benefit from their memberships. Therefore, they accept that the larger powers have the main say but they expect to be heard as well.

In order to serve their national interests, extend their influence and avoid neglect, there are two basic strategies for smaller states. One strategy is to intensify the co-operation with a major power. This can be practised within the organisation as well as bilaterally. This strategy leads to a strong support of the major power in the decision-making process within an organisation. For many decades, until today, the Netherlands have successfully applied this policy within NATO. The Dutch have always taken a posture close to US policy. Within the Alliance they were well known as 'faithful' ally. This kind of policy approach was more or less also adopted with regard to the EU. In the mid-nineties the Dutch policy, regarding the European Union, aimed at staying as close as possible to the German-French axis. This does not rule out that sometimes, depending on the subject, there can also be a need for ad-hoc coalitions.

The other strategy is to balance the influence of the major powers in international organisations through co-operation among smaller states. This kind of strategy, 'caucusing of smaller states', is also used by the Netherlands. A practical and recent example is the discussion within the EU concerning the fulfilment of the rules of the Stability Pact, which was questioned by Germany and France. Some smaller states tried to collectively counter this negative development. But this case also shows that it is not in the national interest of a small state to criticise the behaviour of a major power too strongly and publicly. In another way, this was also demonstrated with the German opposition to the U.S.A., regarding the war in Iraq. However, in practice, most of the time it is a combination of both strategies, that is used by the smaller states. In general, it is not in the national interest to criticise a major power in public too often, above all, when this power is a neighbour and an important economic player.

Another approach to analyse which attitude in foreign policy would serve the national interest of a small country best is the so-called 'regime theory'. This theory differentiates between the so-called 'im-

⁶ Heinz Gärtner, *Small States and Alliances*, Vienna, December 2000. K. Hane and B. Soetendorp (ed), *Adoption to European Integration. Small States and the EU*, London, 1998. Otmar Höll (ed), *Small States in Europe and Dependence*, Vienna, December 1983. David Vital, *The Inequality of States*, Oxford, 1967.

posed' regimes and the 'negotiated' regimes. An 'imposed' regime functions at the mercy of hegemonic leaders. The 'negotiated' regime has a certain degree of autonomy, insofar as it is based on the shared interests of many participants and is able to operate relatively independently from hegemonic states. Austria's influence on imposed regimes depends on its relationship to the major power(s), while its influence on negotiated regimes is, in general, proportional to the national input. Nevertheless, if they act in concert, the involved countries can expand their influence in a disproportional way. Austria can also benefit, when taking an active stand in these organisations and co-operating with like-minded countries.

In general, one may conclude that small countries benefit from active participation in supra-national or multilateral organisations, because all the members are 'equal' and the rules of procedures do not award a special status to the major powers or make exceptions for them. It is in such kinds of organisations that the influence of the major powers can be balanced.

The enlargement of the EU as well as of NATO will also have consequences for the role of the small states, especially in the EU. The decision-making process, however, is still under review, but the EU enlargement of 2004 makes closer co-operation among smaller states more and more likely and sometimes necessary to serve their national interests.

At the same time, due to the admission of ten new members and the time required for their integration process, it cannot be ruled out that with regard to some issues the major powers, especially France, Germany and the UK will form a 'core group'. One of such issues will, without any doubt, be the European Security and Defence Policy. It is up to the members whether they want to join this core group or not. Also Austria has to make a political decision whether it will join this 'core group' or not. If it does, it will have consequences for its military contributions and the required capacity of its armed forces. If Austria does not join this group, it may harm its national interests, which, in the long run, could also have consequences for (future) defence and security co-operation with Germany.

4.3. National Interest

The term "national interest" is frequently used, though often in a vague way. The reason for that is that there is no clear and accepted definition of it. It is a subjective concept, as are the different notions of 'taste' or 'beauty'. However, without any doubt, every nation has its own national interest. The Foreign Office of the United Kingdom has, as its leading motto, "the interest of Our Country is our guiding principle".⁷ According to Alfred T. Mahan, "Self-interest is not only a legitimate, but a fundamental cause for national policy".⁸ This 'national or self-interest' is mostly not limited to 'hard targets' (e.g. security and economic factors) only but also concerns 'soft targets' (e.g. promoting human rights). Every government can list its own interests and set priorities to put them into practice. State sovereignty, internal and external security, social and political stability and economic security are key elements of the national interest and vital to the existence of a state. It depends on the national political debate and the profile of the political parties whether the national interest is a vivid concept, used as a dominant tool in daily foreign policy or not.

The national interest can also be served by looking at the interests of others. In his message to the Congress President Truman stated, "No nation, of course, can undertake policies, which are not squarely

⁷ Henri Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, London, 1994, p. 95.

⁸ Charles Beard and G.H.E. Smith, *The idea of national interest*, New York, 1934, p. 43.

and solidly based on national self-interest. But world leadership calls for policies which serve as a bridge between our own objectives and the needs and inspirations of other free people”.⁹

To make it practicable, the national interest can be used as a tool in foreign and security policy. It is, for example, in Austria’s national interest that its neighbours become members of the EU and NATO, as it promotes stability and the values and standards of the EU in the region, which benefits Austria’s position. In another way, military contributions to the EU or NATO in specific operations, e.g. in the Balkans, could serve Austria’s national interest. Because it is in Austria’s interest that the Balkan region is not an open playground for international crime, but becomes stable, peaceful and prosperous.

To determine Austria’s contributions to international organisations, a practical interpretation of Austria’s national interest may support the politicians in solving this political question. Therefore, the national interest should be part of the ‘checklist’ in the decision-making process with regard to international military contributions. If the government considers making a military contribution to a peace support operation, it should explain what kind of national interest is concerned.

In conclusion we can say that the national interest – in particular security, territorial integrity and economic development – of a small country, like Austria is best served by actively participating in the EU and other multinational organisations, like NATO.

4.4. Considerations Regarding the Political Ambition

A country’s political ambition in the international arena can generally be described as the level of participation or profile in foreign policy. Like football, some go for the world champion cup, others are satisfied with playing in the European cup and in some cases there are football clubs which have less ambition and are happy to play in their own national league only.

As a result of the changed security situation in Europe, national armed forces are not in first place dedicated to national defence. There is a lack of real military threat. This gives the nations new opportunities to contribute with their armed forces to international peace and stability and most of the force capacities of the Western European countries are used for that purpose. Due to that situation, armed forces can be used, to a greater extent than before, as a tool of foreign policy. It depends on the political ambition how much a country will contribute with its armed forces and how much political and military risk it will take.

The choice of the participation level is not always a free choice. It is also influenced by the expectations of other countries. This expectation can be based on the historical record of a country in international affairs or its regional role. The political ambition of a country is not determined by one or two elements only but by a whole set of aspects (‘soft and hard’) that determine a country’s ranking in international organisations. Some of those elements cannot be judged objectively but they do count. Some countries have a clear profile, while others do not and choose a different level of political ambition for each main issue in foreign policy. This kind of behaviour has its disadvantages. It is difficult to count on these members in advance. However, a consistent profile is preferable to a day-to-day policy.

What are the aspects that determine the political ambition? First of all it is the size of a country and the number of its inhabitants, its level of (economic) development and the military capacity (the hard power) to support its foreign and security policies. In Europe, France, the United Kingdom and, to a

⁹ Truman’s message to the American Congress, March 6, 1952.

lesser degree (due to a lack of hard power), Germany are examples for that. For many reasons (political, economic, strategic) it is in their national interest to play an active role in foreign and security policy. On the other hand, smaller countries expect a leading role of these countries. They rely on these major powers. Therefore, the political ambition is also influenced by the expectations from other countries. Naturally, we all expect a high political profile from large powers.

Secondly, there is a relationship between the political ambition and the geo-strategic position of a country. The geo-strategic position of Germany between East and West requires an attitude in international affairs that differs from that of a country of the same size, located in the periphery of the continent. Due to its geographic position, a medium-size country, like the Netherlands is heavily dependent on the transit of goods through its main ports. It is in the Dutch interest to develop a high political ambition in the relevant international bodies in order to maintain this situation which is vital to its national economy, because multilateral organisations serve the Dutch national interest and ‘protect’ smaller countries against the ‘discretion’ of major powers. On the other hand, the presence of international organisations in the Hague (International Court of Justice, International War Tribunal, OPCW, etc.) also commits the Netherlands to support the missions of these organisations.

Thirdly, ‘soft’ factors, like political ideology, can be an input for a country’s political ambition. In some countries, there is a political mainstream, which likes to intervene in international affairs, when e.g. human rights are being violated. Some like to intervene by providing humanitarian aid when there is an internal conflict in a faraway country. In countries, like the Netherlands, the drive for international engagement is part of its Constitution. Promoting the international order and promoting and maintaining international peace and stability as mission for the armed forces are part of it.

The drive for a country’s political ambition can also be based on the keyword in international relations, namely solidarity. This factor is fundamental. One could argue that a system of international organisations can only survive on the principle of solidarity. If there is no solidarity among its members, the system can fall apart. Solidarity goes further than an annual transfer of money to the treasurer of the organisation. Solidarity means that a country will contribute in general, because it is not only essential for its own credibility, but also for the credibility and the survival of the involved organisation. Solidarity only makes sense when combined with meaningful and practical steps. It is not just paying the cheque. Solidarity by ‘speak’ is the easiest way out, but does not really count.

Of course, solidarity can be expressed in different ways. A country can contribute to the military security dimension and/or the civil one. But, without any doubt, the contribution to the military dimension has politically more impact than the civil one. It depends, of course, on the country and its desired political profile. But a country that wants to be an active member in the EU and/or NATO cannot limit its contribution to the civil dimension only. Even if a country contributes with military forces, it makes a difference what kind of contribution is delivered. A country’s structural choice of a contribution which is less risky (such as contributing logistic and medical units) deserves less international admiration than the contribution of infantry units or Special Operation Forces. In general terms one can say that a contribution to the civil aspects of security does not add much value to the political profile of those countries which have opted for a medium or high profile (high risk). If a country has opted for a low profile, the contribution to civil aspects fits with the profile and can support it.

In practice, ‘solidarity’ as a policy cannot be used in isolation. It is also related to the credibility record of a country. Solidarity without a meaningful contribution undermines a country’s credibility in international relations. It diminishes its political influence and, in the long run, makes itself less relevant in the debate within these organisations.

Aside from its size and number of inhabitants, geo-strategic position, regional role, historical record, economic ranking, other countries' expectation, political ideology and level of solidarity and credibility, a country can also use public opinion as an input for its political ambition. Opinion polls can serve as a tool for that. In the mid-nineties, the political ambition of the Central and Eastern European countries to acquire membership in the EU and NATO was largely driven by public opinion. In some countries, the military intervention in Bosnia, and later in Kosovo, was enforced by public opinion. In 1995 the government of the Netherlands developed a set of criteria to make the political decision-making process with regard to military contributions to peace missions more transparent and accountable. The criteria which were approved by parliament serve as a tool to make more objective decisions possible. Solidarity and commitment to international organisations and key partners are part of it. At the same time it should prevent any military contribution from being based on the people's indignation or emotional feeling alone. In chapter 5, the so-called 'Toetsingskader' (Review Framework) will be further analysed.

The position of neighbouring countries and the behaviour of a country's key partners also influence the level of ambition. For Austria, it is of importance what kind of participation level and what kind of profile is chosen by its (EU) neighbours, like the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia. It is not in Austria's interest to be outstripped politically by smaller countries in the region. All the neighbours of Austria, except Switzerland, are members of NATO and the EU. Especially NATO membership influences these countries' foreign policy and their political ambitions. Looking at their present involvement in NATO, their military operations and their ambitions, one can expect that those countries will upscale their military participation level as soon as circumstances (GDP, socio-economics, defence restructuring, etc.) permit. Therefore, it cannot be ruled out that the neighbouring NATO-countries will, in the near future, develop a medium profile, both within NATO and the EU. Austria should consider that as a major point in its foreign and security policy and its regional co-operation, in the intermediate to long term. Above all, Austria's relationship with its largest neighbour, Germany, is important and can serve as input for Austria's ambition level. The foreign and security policy of strategic partners cannot be opposed. The crisis in the transatlantic relations, as a result of the different views on the war in Iraq, can serve as an example.

To conclude this paragraph, *Solidarity* is the key word in Austria's foreign and security policy. Austria's solidarity is incompatible with the exclusive focus on offering 'good offices' or 'niches in security policy'. Austria would have to shoulder a fair share of the international burden. This attitude should be a major part of the input for its political ambition level. Therefore, in the long run, Austria's ambition with regard to the EU and the development of its security and defence policy has to be further defined. If Austria wants to be an active and relevant partner in this field; it should contribute in proportional quantity and quality and not limit itself to contributions for civil purposes and/or contributions in which no risk is taken. Such a political attitude requires modern equipment and well-trained professional forces for sustained operations far away from Austria's territory. That situation does not yet exist, however. To reach that goal an update of the present defence policy is recommended. This may also have consequences for the defence expenditures and the debate on conscription. To extend its influence, Austria could also look into combined efforts with different strategic partners. The best strategy is to choose partners on an issue-related basis. Austria can choose different partners for different purposes. As an example, for political and military reasons, the Austrian Air Force could choose Germany to co-operate with in a Eurofighter Task Force. This choice would strengthen Austria's position in international organisations, like the EU, in which Germany plays a dominant role.

When all these considerations are taken into account and brought into balanced, one can conclude that a *medium political profile* meets Austria's national interest best. When we look at the present postu-

re of the Austrian Armed Forces and their record of international peace-support operations, we can rate the present political ambition as low profile with low-medium risk.¹⁰ On the other hand we can conclude that this political ambition is in line with the presently available capabilities of the Austrian Armed Forces.

To implement a new political ambition with a higher international profile, the Austrian defence organisation should be capable of contributing to the EU-Army Corps and to NATO peace support operations on a permanent basis. A more practical correlation of the political ambition and the required capabilities (type of force and required assets) is worked out in Table 1 below. Austria should fit itself in the third tier (medium profile, medium risks) or second tier (option 2).

If a country is able and willing to take political and military responsibility for an operation it can serve as a lead nation. A country can serve as a framework nation if it is only able and willing to participate in an operation. For example, the Netherlands served as a framework nation in operation UNMEE, while the UN had full political responsibility. The U.S.A. is a lead nation in Iraq. It takes full political and military responsibility.

¹⁰ CCSS Report “The European Union’s Foreign Security and Defence Policy and Austria’s Ambitions”, p. 31.

Table 1: Political Ambitions

Political ambition	Required force	Examples of required assets
Low profile, low risk (5 th tier).	No capabilities for expeditionary warfare; limited capabilities for stability operations	Light infantry for stability operations, lift
Low profile, medium risks (4 th tier) Present situation of Austria	Niche capabilities for expeditionary warfare	The aforementioned assets plus niche capabilities, such as mountain troops, special operations forces, medical units, NBC protection
Medium profile, medium risk (3 rd tier) Recommended ambition for Austria (Option 1)	Focused toolbox for defensive expeditionary operations and (combat) support.	The aforementioned assets plus niche capabilities, such as air defence, ballistic missile defence, RPV, UAV, mine hunters.
Medium profile, high risk (2 nd tier) (Spain and Italy) Recommended ambition for Austria (Option 2) (‘framework nation’)	Focused toolbox for offensive expeditionary operations. (elements of) Brigade taskforce or Battle Group concept	The aforementioned assets plus frigates, fighters, submarines, initial entry forces, such as air manoeuvrable brigades and marines and follow-on forces, such as mechanised and infantry brigades and the capability to provide the backbone of a peace keeping operation
High profile, high risks (1 st tier) (France, United Kingdom, The Netherlands) ‘Lead’ or ‘framework’ nation	Broad toolbox for expeditionary warfare	The aforementioned assets plus the capability to provide the backbone of a combat operation at division plus level
Global responsibilities (U.S.A.) ‘Lead nation’	Full spectrum expeditionary capabilities	The aforementioned assets plus strategic assets, such as satellites, strategic bombers and the means to provide the backbone for coalition operations at army corps level.

4.5. Explanation

There is a narrow link between the capabilities of the armed forces and the options of political profiles. If a country opts for armed forces which can only conduct classical peacekeeping operations and/or can only act as a stabilization force, the political profile will not exceed the level ‘low’. If a country decides to have armed forces with warfare capabilities it can opt for a medium or high profile. So, the chosen political profile has a direct influence on the choice of the nature of the armed forces: stabilization force or expeditionary force.

Within Europe, the United Kingdom and France are likely to remain the most potent European countries. Second tier countries are Spain and Italy but after restructuring they will enter the top league. The Netherlands is still a first tier country but it is questionable if this position can be maintained, as a result of a decreasing defence budget (as of 2003) and the downsizing of its defence capacity.

For obvious reasons most countries are likely to opt for a low to medium profile, with an emphasis on defensive or offensive means. Adopting a medium profile, a country could concentrate on a focused toolbox or specialization. It could focus on its own niche capabilities, contribute to pools of capabilities, or transfer part of its budget to collectively owned capabilities. In all these different options the battalion

is the military building block, mostly used. The brigade level (headquarters) serves as the level which conducts operations. There is no appropriate task foreseen for the division level. Network Enabled Operations (NEO) will redefine the notion of combined operations. The military concepts will have to be adapted. The future size and composition of the Austrian Armed Forces have to be determined in a separate study.

In practice, small countries have two basic options. A focused toolbox requires a country to specialize in a specific type of force. A country specializing in niche capabilities will focus on complementary capabilities for expeditionary warfare and stabilization operations. Capabilities could be brought into a pool of multinational capabilities. Both options (medium profile with medium risks and medium profile with higher risks) will more or less fit Austria's political ambition.

4.6. Evaluation

Option 1 (Austria)

A low-profile country focuses on stabilization and reconstruction operations only. Without any doubt, these operations are very useful and necessary but the risks, both in military and in political terms, are very low. This option also has political consequences, in the sense that close military and security co-operation with countries of the same profile is more realistic. Long-term co-operation with high-profile countries can become more questionable. The military and interoperability gap between these countries can become too wide. The term 'stabilization operation' must not be seen too narrowly. They can be different in nature. The nature of the operation can change from a risky one to a non-risky one, during its course. The present stabilization operations in Iraq can be qualified as risky, while the operations in Bosnia and Kosovo can be rated as non-risky. So, there is a close connection with the profile and the military and related political risks, which in general terms, are lower in a stabilization operation than in an enforcing operation.

Option 2 (Austria)

When a country opts for a high profile, it is able and willing to contribute to combat operations. This choice is, in political terms, more risky. At the same time it requires armed forces which are capable of conducting expeditionary operations. Related to such a profile is the question of whether a country also wants to take responsibility as a lead nation in an operation. It goes without saying that only those countries with a medium to high profile are in a position to lead 'stability or combat' operations.

4.7. Conscription: a Restriction for the Political Ambition?

Since the early nineties some European countries abolished general conscription and more countries are taking that step. This is a historical change in European history. There are many reasons for it.

In first place, the implementation of the CFE Treaty and the radical security change in Europe has led to a force reduction in all of Europe. This reduction in manpower diminishes the need for conscripts. It also broadens the gap between the group of young men who were called up for their army service and

those who were left out. In some countries this development provided a new input for the social and political debate on conscription.

Secondly, governments have reviewed their foreign and defence policies. In the old concept of territorial defence and war of attrition with large-scale operations a large number of active and reserve soldiers were needed. These 'contingency plans' have now become history. The need for conscripts has diminished. Some countries became very active in peacekeeping operations, conducted in far away countries. This has nothing to do with the defence of the national territory, which was the basic reason for general conscription. The justification for general conscription has become increasingly shaky. In the Netherlands an additional argument was provided by a parliamentary resolution, according to which a conscript can be sent into a peacekeeping mission only upon his own consent. This resolution restricted the government's foreign and security policy and its political ambition.

Thirdly, the new complex tasks of armed forces require professionals. Due to the evolution of technology, future military operations will be even more sophisticated than today. Because of their short time of service, the use of conscripts for such tasks is inefficient. But, of course, every nation has its own history and tradition. To take a decision on whether to maintain or abolish conscription, the opinion of society is very important. But in the end, the politicians have to decide whether conscription is a feasible option for the future or not.

Experience in the U.S.A., the United Kingdom and also the Netherlands has shown that the transformation from a conscript army to an all-volunteer force is a complex and long-term process. The first transition phase takes at least 5 years. It is more than a simple replacement of a conscript by a volunteer force. It requires a totally different attitude, first of all of the military itself. There is no one-fits-all recipe. The process is influenced by different elements, such as demography, education, labour market, social aspects, tradition, and motivation and last but not least, political ones. Once the decision is made, the transformation and adaptation process takes at least five years. This should be taken into account when political contingencies are developed.

Besides the above mentioned reasons, one cannot rule out, that in the near future a European Army Corps will be based only on professional soldiers. If this is the case, it could create a problem for those countries whose armed forces heavily depend on conscripts. In such a situation the defence policy of the country has severe restrictions with regard to its contribution to European security. It limits the political ambitions of the government, which could harm the national interest.

4.8. Influence within International Organisations: Does Military Contribution Really Matter?

The Netherlands changed its policy of neutrality at the end of the forties and opted for active participation in international organisations. The government, at that time, was convinced that this position served Dutch national interests best. From that time on, the Netherlands has been strongly involved and became one of the founding fathers of the United Nations, the European Economic Community (EEC, the predecessor of the EU), the WEU and NATO. Within NATO, during the sixties and the seventies, the record of the Netherlands was very good. But even today, this has not really changed. The Dutch are considered a 'faithful' ally. This is the result of a consistent security and defence policy and a credible contribution to NATO's common defence and, currently, to NATO's peace-support operations in the Balkans and in Afghanistan. It also has to do with its policy towards the U.S.A. which is a dominant and mostly the

decisive member within the Alliance. The Dutch have benefited from this 'bandwagoning'. Some observers are of the opinion that the influence of the Netherlands within NATO is not proportional to its size.

But the Netherlands also had other experiences. In 1994, during the UNPROFOR missions in Bosnia, the Netherlands was one of the largest contributors to UNPROFOR. The ad-hoc temporary political group, the so-called 'Contact Group' which was founded to co-ordinate the Balkan policy did not accept the Netherlands as a member.¹¹ Germany was part of the group, even though it did not contribute with troops at the time. So, in practice, the political influence of the Netherlands was disproportionately low compared with its military contribution. Looking back, one cannot rule out that this has damaged Dutch national interests. The Dutch government took this as a lesson learned and made this element part of its so-called 'Toetsingskader'. If a small country contributes substantially to a peacekeeping mission, it should make sure that its political influence can be exercised in a proportional way!

In the European Union, the development of the Foreign Security and Defence policy is progressing. The record of EU military missions is modest and limited, though sometimes underestimated. The EU monitoring mission in the Balkans is still successful and has been of great value. The security policy of the EU, including the defence component, can only become a success, if the member states play an active role and contribute at least in a proportional manner. Small countries are already benefiting from contribution of the big powers. To avoid a free-rider position, small countries have to make up their minds. The scale of operations (battalion size) cannot be an obstacle for their contribution. Without any doubt, in the near future, when the security and defence policy of the EU reaches maturity, the political relevance of the military commitment of the member states will increase.

As a result of the evaluation of UN peacekeeping missions and the limitations of the UN system, the UN will increasingly rely on regional organisations for its peacekeeping operations. NATO, as a military organisation, is most capable of doing the job. In the near future, for those countries which are not NATO members, the importance of this organisation for their national security and defence policy will increase. UN-solidarity can also be expressed by contributing to NATO operations.

In conclusion we may say that the military contribution of a smaller country supports its national interests. The political benefits depend on several elements: the international organisation involved (UN, NATO, EU), the country's record and the influence of 'co-operation partners' within the involved organisation.

¹¹ The USA, Russia, United Kingdom, Germany, France and Italy were represented.

4.9. Benchmarking: Finland, Sweden, The Netherlands and Austria, Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands and Austria

	Size (square km)	Inhabitants (millions)	GDP ranking	GDP per capita
Finland	338,145	5.1	48	28493
Sweden	449,964	8.8	33	27309
The Netherlands	41,526	16.1	19	29966
Austria	83,858	8.2	34	28168
	Defence budget (billions \$)	Defence expenditure per capita (\$)	Defence expenditure as % of GDP	Manpower in pko
Finland	2.3	450	1.5	920
Sweden	4.3	488	1.8	800
The Netherlands	7.2	447	1.5	2000
Austria	2.5	304	1.0	900

Source: Military Balance 2003–2004; GeographyIQ.com and NATO Handbook

When we look at the defence expenditures (percentage of the GDP) in relation to the general level of prosperity of a country's inhabitants (GDP per capita) and also take the total of inhabitants into account, one can conclude that Austria rates lower in defence expenditure compared with countries, like Sweden, Finland and the Netherlands. When we make a comparison between the defence budget of the respective countries and the active manpower in peacekeeping operations, we can conclude that Austria makes an adequate contribution within the limits of its defence budget. However, in this respect we always have to also take into account the quality of the contribution and the level of participation (classic peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, expeditionary warfare, etc.)

4.10. Conclusions

- Small countries benefit from active participation in supra-national or multilateral organisations, because all the members are 'equal' and the rules of procedures do not provide for a special status of major powers or make exceptions for them.
- The role of smaller states in international organisations can be served by a strategy of intensifying co-operation with a major power and/or balancing the influence of these powers by co-operation among the smaller states themselves.
- Austria's national interest is served in the best way by using two options: membership and active participation in and contribution to international organisations, like the EU and, at the same time, co-operating with a strategic partner(s).
- The present ranking of Austria's political ambition is 'low profile'. However, 'solidarity' is a key word in Austria's foreign and security policy. This should be reflected in the level of political ambition. Its economic ranking, its regional position, its credibility and its policy of solidarity require (at least) a medium profile ambition.

- Contributing to the civil dimension of security only, which is less risky, does not add much value to the profile of a country. This is especially the case with a country which opts for a medium or high profile.
- In practice, Austria has a choice between two options. A focused toolbox for mainly defensive operations or a toolbox for expeditionary offensive operations. To implement this ambition, the Austrian defence organisation should be capable of contributing, on a permanent basis, to the EU Army Corps and to NATO peace support operations.
- In an additional study, based on the ‘battalion building block concept’, the future size and composition of the Austrian Armed Forces have to be determined.
- The need for conscripts in Austria will decrease in the near future. At the same time one cannot rule out, that in the near future a European Army Corps will be based only on professional soldiers. If this is the case, Austria has to review its conscription policy. One should take into account that the first phase of a transition to a volunteer army takes at least 5 years.
- An international military contribution of a smaller country supports its national interest. The political benefits depend on several aspects and should not be viewed on a short-term basis alone.
- Austria’s defence expenditure may be improved, when we take other small countries, like Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands as an example. A larger defence budget makes a larger international contribution more realistic.

5. Austria and its Involvement in International Security Organizations

5.1. General

In this chapter the international organizations – the UN, the EU, the OSCE and NATO – which Austria is involved in will be analyzed. What are the main changes in the positions and roles of those organizations? What is Austria’s position and role towards those organizations and what do those organizations expect from Austria? Finally some options to fulfil Austria’s political ambitions are proposed.

5.2. The United Nations and Austria

Main developments

Some commentators have stated that the invasion of Kosovo without a mandate of the Security Council has marked the beginning of the end of the United Nations. It has been clear that many Bush administration officials seem to view the UN either as an irrelevant or as a dangerous constraint for U.S. national interests. But despite all vicissitudes, two of the UN core features have survived. It is a forum where all states, including the great powers, talk to each other on a continuous basis. And when the Bush administration was seeking another Security Council resolution, encouraging other countries to send troops to Iraq, it seemed clear that the UN still retains something which even the world’s sole superpower finds difficult to do without: the ability to create broad coalitions in an atmosphere of trust and legitimacy.

Beyond the Security Council itself, the UN's ongoing relevance is evident in the work of more than two dozens of organizations, comprising the UN system. Those organizations have an unmatched potential in addressing problems that, if left unattended, are conducive to creating an environment that generates the exact same security threats that the international community is currently fighting.

Peacekeeping is still an important activity in our instable and insecure world. Throughout 2003 there were 13 ongoing UN peacekeeping operations, with approximately 42,000 military personnel and civilian police. The trend to larger contingents for traditional peacekeeping operations, being made available by Asian and African countries, continued, whereas the European, North and Latin American countries remained more reticent in this respect.

Robust Chapter VII operations, which cannot be conducted by the UN, due to a lack of military capabilities and command and control, have been delegated, in practice, to regional organizations, like NATO and the EU or ad-hoc coalitions.

Key players in the UN are the permanent members of the Security Council. As a hyper-power with frequent unilateral policy decisions, the United States is more and more using the UN only when it is in its national interest.

Evaluation

Although the role of the UN in maintaining international peace and stability is in question, its role is still relevant, due to its many other organizations in the field of traditional Chapter VI peacekeeping operations and in delegating robust Chapter VII operations to other international organizations or ad-hoc coalitions.

Austria's Position

Six months after regaining its full independence with the ratification of the State Treaty on 14 December 1955, Austria became the 70th member of the UN. Austria attributes central significance to the role of the UN in safeguarding world peace and international security. Austria considers the UN with its proven record in international norm setting and its operational experience as the natural centre for multilateral co-operation. UN policy is a central part of Austria's foreign policy and Austria has been strongly committed to the global organization's work. Austria has held numerous leadership positions in the UN and has been a regular member to important commissions and bodies of the UN, such as the Commission on Human Rights.

Austria also demonstrates its strong bond with the UN through major contributions, mainly battalions, to the work of the organization. To date, approximately 50,000 Austrians have served in UN peacekeeping missions all over the world. Currently, Austria is contributing to UNFICYP (Cyprus), UNMEE (Ethiopia/Eritrea), UNIMOG (Georgia), UNTSO (Middle East), and UNDOF (Syria). Austria has been a full member of the Standby Forces High Readiness Brigade (SHIRBRIG) for peacekeeping operations under Chapter VI of the UN Charter, since 1997.

Finally, Vienna serves as one of the three headquarters of the UN, hosting several UN offices. Vienna has also gained an excellent reputation as a major international conference centre, hosting a large number of conferences and meetings under the auspices of the UN.

Conclusions

Austria has a strong commitment to the UN.

Taking into account the important role Austria has played and still plays in the field of traditional Chapter VI peacekeeping operations, the UN expects that Austria will continue to participate in this kind of operations.

5.3. The European Union and Austria

Main Developments

Although, for long time, a civilian-only organization, the EU is now in the process of developing a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). This process was sped up substantially last autumn. It, therefore, bears the potential of becoming another security organization in Europe.

National sovereignty still remains the main obstacle to develop Europe militarily. The problems are well known: first, the discrepancy within the EU between interventionist and abstentionist states and between the specific military strength of each of them; second, the different perceptions of power among the member states and third, the question of big and small, which can be kind of a red flag in all debates on the future organization of a more political EU.

The EU has yet much progress to make in building its military capabilities. The biggest shortfalls are in logistics: EU members lack sufficient air-lift and sea-lift capacities; transportable docks, communications equipment and headquarters; and in intelligence-gathering satellites, aircraft and UAVs. But there are also some serious shortfalls at the higher end of military operations, such as the suppression of enemy air defence, combat search and rescue and precision-guided weapons.

To make an EU Rapid Reaction Force of approximately 100,000 troops a reality, the European Capabilities Plan (ECAP) was agreed upon in December 2001, in order to correct the shortfalls. The ECAP consists of 18 multinational panels that can propose solutions to the deficiencies that have been identified. Due to the great number of deficiencies, until at least 2010, the EU will – except for small-scale operations – have no capabilities for autonomous military actions.

The discussion on EU headquarters has ended in an agreement on setting up a small cell of operational planners at SHAPE, NATO's headquarters near Mons. This cell is to work on ensuring a smooth relationship between the EU and NATO on "Berlin Plus" operations, when the EU borrows NATO assets. The EU military staff which currently mainly consists of 'strategic planners' will be complemented by a new planning unit with civil/military components. This unit is to help with the planning of EU civilian operations as well as civil/military operations. It has also been agreed that when the EU conducts an autonomous EU mission a national headquarters will normally be in charge.

An important initiative by Great Britain and France within the EU is the proposal to respond to requests from the UN with regard to smaller operations, like Operation Artemis in Bunia, Congo. The EU should be capable and willing to deploy within 15 days to respond to a crisis in an autonomous operation. The aim should be to establish coherent and credible battle group-size forces, each around 1,500 troops, provided by a single nation or through a multinational or framework nation force package with appropriate transport and sustainability. These forces should have the capacity to operate under a Chap-

ter VII mandate. They would be deployed in response to a UN request to stabilize a situation or otherwise meet a short-term need until peacekeepers from the United Nations, or regional organizations acting under a UN mandate, can arrive or be reinforced.

The Draft Treaty for establishing a “Constitution for Europe” contains some important articles in the field of security. The “Solidarity Clause” demands that member states act jointly if one of them is a victim of terrorist attacks or natural or manmade disasters. This clause originated from the desire to give more substance to the notion of solidarity and common security, if threats emerge on the Union’s territory. The clause would not apply to the defence of territorial integrity. Rather, it would apply to threats from non-state entities.

Most member states lack the manpower, equipment and the necessary coordination and command structures for organizing a rapid response. Consequently, member states may benefit from a European pool of specialized civilian or military civil-protection units, undertaking joint training and intervention coordination programs, so as to facilitate more effective intervention in the event of disasters within the EU. Commissioner Barnier further elaborated this proposal first presented by the Convention’s Working Group on Defence. In an interview with *Libération* he proposed a Euro Corps which would consist of a force made up of specialized and mobile national and regional units for dealing with catastrophes, storms, earthquakes or large-scale fires.

The Draft Constitution contains also far-reaching provisions for defence cooperation. First, the Council of Ministers may entrust the implementation of a task, within the Union’s framework, to a group of member states, in order to protect the Union’s values and serve its interests (Article 40.5). As solidarity is one of the values of the EU, the article is of relevance for the Solidarity Clause.

Second, member states whose military capabilities fulfil higher criteria and who have made more binding commitments to one another in this area, with a view to most demanding operations, shall establish structured cooperation within the Union Framework (Article 40.6). Military and civil assets could be used outside the Union for peacekeeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including the support of third countries in combating terrorism on their territories (Article III-210).

Third, until a common defence is established, closer cooperation should be established with regard to mutual defence. If one or more member states, participating in this closer cooperation is/are attacked “the other Member States shall give aid and assistance by all means in their power, military and other, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter” (Article 40.7).

A recent important event in the field of European security was the adoption of a European strategy by the European Council, in the document “A Secure Europe in a Better World” (ESS), in December 2003.¹²

The document sets out three key objectives for the EU:

- Contributing to stability and good governance in Europe’s immediate neighbourhood;
- Building an order on effective multilateralism and
- Tackling the threats, old and new.

¹² *A Secure Europe in a Better World, European Security Strategy*, Brussels, 12 December 2003.

The document takes a holistic view of security, talking about hunger and underdevelopment as causes of instability and conflict. It mentions the effect of climate change and energy dependence as well as the link between failed states and organised crime, known from the Balkans, Somalia and Afghanistan.

But it also takes a close look at the newer threats of terrorism and WMD and, crucially, the possible nexus between the two – an issue at the heart of America’s post-9/11 and post-Saddam preoccupations.

The ESS demonstrates to the Americans that the EU is starting to think about these issues in a tougher way and states boldly: “The transatlantic relationship is irreplaceable.

The European Council also adopted the EU strategy against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which is a crucial element of the security strategy.

One of the main problems with EU foreign and security policy is the requirement of unanimity. Key players in determining EU foreign policy are Germany, France and the UK, and to a lesser degree Italy and Spain. It is expected that also Poland will become a key player in the near future.

Evaluation

What are currently the main contributions of the EU to preventing or solving conflicts? In the field of preventive action, the EU is especially strong in its economic support. When countries in Europe are involved, the EU can exercise substantial diplomatic pressure, for instance by offering (or threatening to refuse) membership.

If the EU succeeds in establishing a real and credible common foreign, security and defence policy in the long term, it could also take over more substantial tasks that NATO is currently carrying out or when the US is not prepared to act. This not only applies to preventive action but also to crisis management in general. The recently adopted EU Security Strategy would enable the EU to develop a comprehensive strategy for (potential) conflicts, which could involve political, diplomatic, economic, financial and military aspects. If it does, the EU would be the only European organization that is able to adopt such a comprehensive strategy by itself.

In the field of crisis management during a period of conflict, the EU can impose economic sanctions. With regard to diplomacy the EU can also play a suitable role. If the EU lives up to its headline goal, set at Helsinki, it could also take over NATO tasks in Europe. The same applies to post-conflict measures, where the EU will become an alternative to NATO. With regard to civilian tasks, the EU can deal with economic reconstruction and civil administration, provided that the EU lives up to its ambitions with regard to civilian capabilities.

It has to be emphasized that in the field of ESDP much progress has been made last autumn. The issue of headquarters was solved, the document “A Secure Europe in a Better World” was adopted, and new ways of military cooperation within the Union are possible.

Austria’s Position

Looking at Austria’s position and role within the EU, it has, first of all, replaced the concept of an autonomous security policy by the principle of European solidarity. It considers the security of Austria

and the security of the European Union as inseparably linked to each other and wants to participate actively in the ESDP in the spirit of solidarity.

Based on the principle of solidarity, Austria considers it to be very important that the EU is in a position to carry out civilian and military crisis management operations. Therefore, Austria welcomes the conclusion of the so-called “Berlin Plus” agreements between the EU and NATO, which considerably buttressed the strategic partnership between the two organizations in the field of crisis management.

Since the ESDP is currently pursuing the aim of giving the EU the necessary means and capabilities as well as efficient decision-making structures for civil and military crisis management, Austria wants to contribute appropriately, in terms of quantity as well as quality, to the headline goal and capability goals of the EU. Austria emphasizes the importance that EU member states improve their military and civilian capabilities to carry out crisis management.

Since Austria has less weight within the EU decision-making process, it focuses on certain foreign policy issues that are of particular importance for geographical or other reasons. Austria has, for instance, been particularly involved in western Balkan issues. Austria is trying to make an appropriate contribution to the capabilities goals of the EU and is/has been participating with personnel in all three EU crisis management operations (EUPM in Bosnia and Herzegovina, CONCORDIA in FYROM and ARTEMIS in Congo).

In order to avoid divisions within the EU, such as during the Iraq crisis, Austria is in favour of the introduction of the community method into the CFSP. At least, qualified majority voting should be extended in the field of CFSP.

In the field of defence Austria supports the provisions (Article I-42) of the Solidarity Clause. Austria especially welcomes that the Solidarity Clause’s scope of application also comprises natural and man-made disasters.

Austria is in favour of the establishment of a European Armaments, Research and Military Capabilities Agency, as foreseen in Article III-312. Austria furthermore supports the proposed closer cooperation of a group of member states in the field of mutual defence, since this would be an important step towards a Common European Defence.

Nevertheless, the reaction of Austria to the declaration issued by Belgium, Germany, France and Luxembourg, after their “Mini Summit” on 29 April was cautious. Although Austria supports most of the proposals of the four member states, it would consider their implementation outside the constitutional framework of the EU detrimental to the European integration process. Fearing further tension with the U.S.A., Austria was rather sceptical about the proposal to set up a ‘nucleus collective capability’ in Teruren. But this issue was solved last autumn and, as was mentioned, in a satisfactory way.

Conclusions

The EU has the ambition to become a global key player in the field of security and defence.

With the ECAP, the EU is building its own military capacity which still has severe shortcomings.

The Draft Treaty for establishing a “Constitution for Europe” opens new ways of military cooperation within the EU.

Austria's security is inseparably linked to the security of the EU.

Austria is supposed to make a fair and relevant contribution to the EU headline goal's military capabilities goals. This should also include the participation in a possible European pool of specialized (civilian and) military civil-protection units and participation in structured cooperation. Without any doubt, when military missions are on the agenda, the EU will put pressure on its members, including Austria, to contribute. This kind of peer pressure should not be underestimated. Austria should consider what kind of military profile has to be chosen with the aim of contributing, as a credible partner, to the security and defence policy of the Union.

5.4. The OSCE and Austria

Main Developments

Immediately after the end of the Cold War, expectations with regard to the OSCE ran quite high. Many thought that the OSCE could be the nucleus of a pan-European security system which would overcome the East-West divide by supplanting existing security organizations, including – in the eyes of some, in particular – NATO. This raised the question about the relationship of the OSCE with the other remaining regional security institution in Europe: NATO. But after the events of 1989, most former adversaries embraced NATO as the organization that symbolized the defence of Western values and freedom against a totalitarian threat.

As a result, the institutional development of the OSCE never came close to empowering it to play a leading role in promoting European stability. Nevertheless, the OSCE has grown in the nineties from being a periodic platform for dialogue between East and West into a permanent organization with specific tasks in the European security environment. One characteristic of the OSCE is that it is pan-European and trans-Atlantic. Another characteristic is the broad concept of security. In this concept security and stability are directly linked to economic prosperity, democracy and pluralism and respect for human rights. Those two basic characteristics still mark the OSCE and set it apart from other security organizations.

The OSCE is seldom discussed in the media and is virtually unknown to the public. Yet, unlike NATO, the OSCE has special capabilities to prevent conflicts and deal with conflict situations in Europe and Eurasia. Over the last decade, the OSCE has helped end the civil war in Tajikistan, constrained conflicts in Georgia, Macedonia, and Moldova and played a major role in building a civil society in post-conflict Bosnia and Kosovo.

During the 1990s the CSCE, later the OSCE, evolved to meet the challenges of internal conflicts in weak states emerging after the break-up of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Gradually the centre of attention of the OSCE has moved eastward, as the concern over the Balkan conflict has given way to conflict prevention in the Caucasus, Central Asia and Eastern Europe.

The 1992 Helsinki Document provided the OSCE with the option of conducting peacekeeping operations. Either the OSCE can undertake its own peacekeeping operations, or it can provide the mandate for another organization to implement a relevant OSCE decision, while retaining overall political guidance and control. Although there seems to be consensus within the OSCE that the option of OSCE peacekeeping needs to be retained, experiences in the nineties showed that OSCE peacekeeping is not very likely.

One of the main problems the OSCE is facing nowadays is the sceptical, if not negative, attitude of the Russian Federation and a number of other former republics of the Soviet Union towards the OSCE. The Russians, in particular, are complaining about their subordinate position and are increasingly making a stand against what is presented as the Western domination of the OSCE.

Evaluation

In the field of preventive action, the OSCE has established a good reputation with deployments and the HCNM with preventive diplomacy and political institution building tasks. The ambitious OSCE security concept, the role of consensus in its decision-making, and its internal focus provide the organization with a comparative advantage in this field.

With regard to post-conflict measures, the OSCE can play a role in the field of disarmament and confidence-building. The organization can also deal with, for example, freedom of the media, elections and the political aspects of institution-building.

Austria's Position

Austria considers the OSCE as a useful international organization which is based on the concept of comprehensive security and common values and is engaged in the solution of specific problems, through its missions and institutions, such as the ODIHR.

Austria emphasizes that global security without the protection of and respect for human rights is inconceivable and that the human dimension must continue, in particular also in the fight against threats, like terrorism, so that the OSCE can play an important role.

Another issue which Austria considers important is a lasting stabilization of south-eastern Europe and its integration into European structures. The OSCE is playing an important supportive role, in particular through its mission and the manifold activities, aimed at strengthening and reforming the civil structures and realizing the European perspective of south-eastern Europe.

Austria also attaches great importance to the fight against trafficking in all its aspects and to enhanced OSCE attention to the problems of anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia and discrimination. It is necessary to combat these tendencies, also in the context of the new threats. In that respect, Austria fully supported the adoption of the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century which states that OSCE members will also pay more attention to combating terrorism and organized crime.

Austria supports the further strengthening of the OSCE, especially in the areas of early warning, conflict prevention, civil crisis management and conflict follow-up.

Conclusions

The OSCE has become an important player in the field of conflict-prevention and post-conflict peace building.

With regard to defence, Austria is expected to take part in OSCE missions with observers and to make troops available for peacekeeping operations, upon request.

5.5. NATO and Austria

Main developments

After the end of the Cold War, some analysts expected NATO to disappear, as its ‘main threat’, the Warsaw Pact, had collapsed. However, they probably did not take the common transatlantic identity that had developed among the Alliance members into account. One has to keep in mind that NATO has never been a classical defence alliance only, although the political component of the Alliance was less dominant during the Cold War.

The end of the Cold War brought a series of NATO decisions, beginning in London (1990) and culminating in Brussels (1994), through which NATO moved to downplay its war fighting elements and instead emphasizes its collective security elements. After the Cold War, NATO launched several Partnership for Peace (PfP) program initiatives and expanded them throughout the 1990s.

Although NATO’s enlargement has received much public attention, NATO’s transformation in the 1990s is probably the more important of the two steps NATO has taken. Created as an organization, dedicated to the collective defence of its members, NATO has now expanded its mission to include conflict prevention and conflict management throughout Europe, also beyond the boundaries of the NATO treaty area. In both its enlargement and its transformation, NATO has been driven primarily by political imperatives – that is, not by a sense of direct threat but by an environment-shaping agenda of democratisation and integration

The Prague Summit has made it clear that new threats, such as international terrorism, have become a central concern of NATO member states.

The Prague Summit also adopted the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC) which builds further on the Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI), set up in 1999. DCI resulted in identifying 58 deficiencies. But the PCC is limited to four areas:

- Defence against chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear attacks;
- Secure communications, command and control and ‘information superiority’;
- Improving interoperability and combat power of deployed units and
- Rapid deployment capability and sustainability of armed forces.

The military deficiencies of the EU and NATO are largely identical and relate to the transformation of the armed forces into rapidly deployable units, with an emphasis on expeditionary (out of area) operations. The four PCC objectives fit hand in glove with the ECAP deficiencies.

Evaluation

In the field of preventive action NATO can exercise substantial diplomatic pressure, and if necessary, also preventively station troops in an area of conflict and threaten the use of force.

In the field of crisis management, during a period of conflict, NATO is, for the time being, the only respected military player in this field, who is capable of leading robust Chapter VII operations.

Post-conflict-measures mostly require a robust military presence, as was shown in the Balkans. For the time being, this can be provided or at least headed by NATO.

Austria's Position

Austria considers NATO to be not just as a classical military alliance but as a comprehensive security community which is based on democratic values and which renders a crucial contribution to peace and security worldwide through its stability-oriented policies.

Austria promotes consistent further development of its relations with NATO within the framework of the tailored co-operation programme. It wants to make full usage of the possibilities of co-operation and dialogue offered within the framework of the Partnership for Peace Programme.

In a framework document, signed in February 1995, Austria expressed its intention to work for the achievement of the aims underlying the Partnership for Peace programme. From 1995 to 2001, Austria took part in the NATO-led multinational peace operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina (IFOR/SFOR) as a PfP partner. Since autumn 1999, Austria has participated in the Kosovo operation (KFOR). Since 1997, the framework of enhanced Pfp" has made provisions for all partners to achieve interoperability within the whole spectrum of peace support operations, i.e., including peace-enforcement through combat operations.

Austria's participation in IFOR, SFOR, KFOR and also in ISAF prove that the level of interoperability is increasing. Austria is also actively involved in the work of the European Partnership Council's (EAPC) Pfp political consultation forum.

Austria advocates close and reliable co-operation between the EU and NATO. Austria considers shaping the ESDP within the EU framework to be an essential step in European and Euro-Atlantic security. As a non-NATO EU country, Austria has a clear focus on using the tools offered by Pfp and particularly the EMOP for improving interoperability and, possibly at a later stage, for defining additional capabilities, both in the EU and the NATO-Pfp framework. It considers it unaffordable to adopt an additional and detailed force planning process within the EU. Close co-operation between the EU and NATO in the spirit of a strategic partnership is regarded to be a prerequisite for the success of the ESDP by Austria.

NATO's enlargement process was welcomed by Austria as a contribution to strengthening the security and stability in Europe, which is also in Austria's interest.

After the completion of the second enlargement round of NATO, the whole territory of Austria will be surrounded by NATO member states. Although NATO membership remains an option, according to the latest Austrian security and defence doctrine, none of the parties represented in parliament is supporting Austria's NATO membership, at the moment. The fact that 'neutrality' still enjoys high popularity within the Austrian population (according to various polls more than two thirds of the Austrians still favour neutrality), certainly is a decisive factor in the reluctance of the Austrian parties to favour NATO membership.

Conclusions

NATO has expanded its traditional role of collective defence by peace support operations and the fight against terrorism. It has also enlarged its area of operations.

By enlarging NATO's political dimension, NATO has increased in importance.

Austria uses PfP to promote its own security, while membership in the Alliance is still a domestic 'non-starter'.

Austria is supposed to continue to contribute in an appropriate way to UN-mandated, NATO-led peace support operations.

5.6. Conclusions

The experiences made in the 1990s have made it clear that preventing or solving conflicts can only be achieved by co-operation between the UN, the EU, the OSCE and NATO.¹³ Although there is competition and rivalry among those organizations, such co-operation takes place and there is mutual reinforcement. Nevertheless, the present security architecture can still be considerably improved.

Based on political and military documents and statements, it can be concluded that Austria has the political ambition to play a relevant role in those international security organizations. As a result, Austria's rather passive foreign policy has further moved towards a more assertive policy by adopting the principle of solidarity and by committing military capabilities to the ESDP. This policy acknowledges that the security of Austria and the EU are inseparably linked and that the ESDP should have priority for Austria.

Austria's current military capabilities are not in balance with its international position and political ambitions. Looking at Austria's military capabilities, the nature of its present deployments and its contributions to the ECAP and the Capabilities Commitment Catalogue, its political ambitions with its land forces can be qualified as 'low', and with regard to some specific capabilities as 'low/medium'.

Austria already has the capability to contribute with valuable modules to peacekeeping operations, as it has frequently shown in UN-operations. But Austria's ability to sustain operations in remote regions is limited. In addition, Austria has capabilities very suitable for homeland defence which also have an inherent value for more demanding expeditionary operations.

Without any doubt, when military missions are on the agenda, the EU will put pressure on its members, including Austria, to contribute. This kind of 'peer pressure' should not be underestimated. By being involved in the ECAP and adopting the EU Security Strategy – which obliges the EU to become a more active, more capable and more coherent global actor – it may be assumed that Austria will enhance its political ambition in the field of military capabilities and opt for a medium profile.

A medium-profile ambition should reflect Austria's economic ranking, regional position and credibility. This requires not only a transformation from territorially oriented armed forces to expeditionary armed forces, but also the necessary financial funds. Yet, also in relation to comparable countries (Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands) the defence budget should be increased.

¹³ See *Military Cooperation in Europe, Possibilities and Limitations*, Advisory Council on International Affairs, No. 31, The Hague, April 2003.

One of the principles of Austria's defence policy is to enable the Austrian Armed Forces to take part in the whole spectrum of the Petersberg tasks within a multinational framework, with up to a brigade or a brigade equivalent.

In line with its political ambition, it would be recommendable for Austria to contribute with land forces on brigade-level to operations at the higher end of the force spectrum to reach a medium profile. Another option would be a task force of land forces, consisting of a core that is predominantly Austrian and includes a number of modules (headquarters and manoeuvre battalions), supplemented with foreign support and combat support units.

An alternative to the medium-profile framework, which might be taken into account, is the establishment of a battle-group sized force which can respond to a crisis with appropriate transport and sustainability. Such a force should have the capacity to operate under a Chapter VII mandate. It would be deployed in response to a UN request to stabilize a situation or otherwise meet a short-term need, until peace-keepers from the United Nations, or regional organizations acting under a UN mandate, could arrive or be reinforced.

Binational and Multilateral Co-operation

There is a general opinion in Europe that smaller countries, like Austria, will not be able to maintain relevant and affordable armed forces in the long term, without far-reaching international co-operation. Intensifying co-operation is necessary to reduce the current fragmentation of Europe's defence efforts. Increasing the efficiency of the total of the European defence expenditures by improving international co-operation is an important condition for strengthening the European military capabilities.¹⁴ In international military co-operation there is much to be gained in the areas of finance (economies of scale, balanced burden-sharing), politics (strengthening relationships, transparency, experience with co-operation), and the military (increasing interoperability, access to resources which a country does not possess, procurement and maintenance of capabilities). These advantages increase proportionally to the co-operation intensity. However, co-operation will not necessarily result in savings in the short term: "nothing ventured, nothing gained".

Disadvantages of military co-operation are to be found primarily in the loss of the autonomous decision-making authority, which increases with the co-operation becoming more intense, and eventually leads to task specialisation (exchange of tasks). Extensive research among European countries has made it clear, that there is no political will and that there are no actual possibilities in Europe for making bilateral or multinational agreements concerning task specialisation, in the short term. The best possibilities for further co-operation in the short term can be found in the least drastic forms of co-operation, such as pooling (e.g. the European Air Group) and materiel co-operation (e.g. NH-90 helicopter).

Austria should look into the possibilities of bi-national or multinational agreements in the field of operational co-operation, pooling and co-operation with respect to materiel. As much as Austria's national tasks can be seen as a minimum level for co-operative options, it is important to realize what these national tasks are.

¹⁴ Kees Homan, 'Gaudi or Le Corbusier? A European Security Architecture', in: Alfred van Staden, Jan Rood, Hans Labohm (Editors), *Canons and Canons, Clingendael Views of Global and Regional Politics*, Royal van Gorcum, 2003, p. 257–260.

Suitable countries for co-operation for Austria to consider are the neighbouring countries Germany and Hungary, but also Italy and Spain might be options for different purposes. Austria should look into the possibilities of bi-national brigades or bi-national battle-groups. Another option to consider would be that of bi-national headquarters.

Last but not least, the fulfilment of Austria's political ambitions in the field of defence can be hampered by its conscript system. In some European countries, the combination of downsizing the armed forces, participating in expeditionary operations and increasingly advanced technology have led to the abolishment of conscription. Experience with this complex process has shown that it will take at least five years for the Austrian Armed Forces to transform into an all-volunteer force.

6. The Political Ambition of The Netherlands and Its Contribution to International Peace and Security

6.1. General

Depending on the criteria used, both Austria and the Netherlands can be considered small or medium powers. In this chapter Dutch foreign, security and defence policy is analyzed. What are the foreign policy objectives of the Netherlands? How did the Dutch Armed Forces start their transformation process in the nineties? What are the main tasks of the armed forces and what are the political ambitions? And how are national participation decisions in international peace support operations made?

6.2. Dutch Foreign and Security Policy

The Netherlands is an open society and its internationally oriented private sector feels the consequences of a changing world sooner and more acutely than other countries. For its security, prosperity and welfare the Netherlands largely depends on the international context.

The aim of the Dutch government is to help build a just world with safeguards for its security, prosperity and welfare. A strong European Union and a strong transatlantic Alliance have, therefore, been cornerstones of the Dutch policy for many years. The government furthers these goals by pursuing its five key foreign policy objectives:¹⁵

- strengthening the international order;
- promoting peace, security and stability;
- intensifying European co-operation;
- working to achieve sustainable poverty reduction and
- promoting bilateral relations.

There is general agreement that those objectives serve the Dutch national interest – a concept which is applied in a broader sense and with an eye to the long term. Dutch foreign policy incorporates and integrates these dimensions of the national interest.

¹⁵ *Policy Agenda 2004*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague, 2003.

The degree of success the Dutch government achieves in realising its objectives not depends only on the effectiveness of the instruments employed but also on the way in which the Netherlands positions itself.

The importance of a medium-size country, like the Netherlands, is obviously limited but should not be underestimated. The Dutch economy is the sixteenth largest in the world – similar in size to the combined economies of the ten new EU member states. Dutch companies are among the largest foreign investors worldwide. The Netherlands is and remains an important global player in terms of international economic developments.

Politically, too the Netherlands has steadily increased its international authority over the past decades. It figures prominently in the efforts to promote international peace and security (with The Hague being the judicial capital of the world), disarmament and arms control as well as human rights. The Dutch Armed Forces make a substantial contribution to crisis and conflict management operations. Moreover, since the 1950's the Netherlands has been a leading advocate of European integration, as a means of guaranteeing stability and preserving common values and norms.

The Netherlands has been among the vanguard of sustainable poverty reduction, for many years. It is the sixth largest donor in the world and achieved the best total score in the coherence index of the Centre for Global Development. This index evaluates the efforts of OECD countries in the areas of aid, trade, direct investment, environment and migration, as well as peace and security.

These priorities are and remain important constants in foreign policy, as they have their own intrinsic values. The Netherlands' efforts in these areas enhance its authority in the international arena. This authority is not a given but requires constant maintenance. It also creates obligations which, in principle, should not be eroded by an undue preoccupation with national affairs.

While a country's importance is to a large extent a given and its authority must be established over the time, influence is the most dynamic factor that can be used to strengthen the position of the Netherlands. Importance and authority contribute to influence but they are insufficient by themselves to effectively foster foreign policy. Preserving and expanding influence is, therefore, a permanent task, key to which are integrated policy, regional approach, effectiveness and coherence as well as innovative ideas combined with professional diplomacy and optimally equipped national and international networks. In short, this means delivering quality and making necessary resources available.

6.3. Dutch Defence Policy in the Nineties

After the end of the Cold War, massive threats gave way to a wide variety of diverse risks. Today, large parts of the world are characterised by instability and insecurity. In this changing security environment, Dutch defence planning came to be no longer driven by threats but by interests, ambitions and capabilities. Since the end of the East-West confrontation, the Dutch government published three White Papers on Defence: *Restructuring and Downsizing, Dutch Armed Forces in a Changing World* (1991), *A Different World, A Different Defence, White Paper on Priorities* (1993), and *Defence White Paper 2000* (1999).

In view of the new security environment, the Netherlands decided, in the beginning of the nineties, in principle to be prepared and able to contribute to a broad spectrum of peacekeeping and peace-enforcing activities in an international context. Crisis management quickly gained in importance and became formally codified in 1993 as the second main task of the armed forces. Nevertheless, the sense of increased

safety in the western part of Europe called for a series of budget reductions, often referred to as 'peace dividend'.

In spite of the budget reductions, the mobility and effectiveness of the armed forces was improved in the nineties by creating an air manoeuvre brigade with armed and transport helicopters, by expanding the transportation fleet and by procuring a landing platform dock for maritime operations and strategic sea lifts.

After careful consideration the Dutch government decided, in 1993, to place the armed forces on an all-volunteer footing. Direct deployability of units for crisis management operations had been the determining factor in this decision, as conscripts could not be deployed outside NATO territory without their personal consent. Another rationale was that the percentage of eligible draftees called up for active duty decreased to 20 % and, as a result, social acceptance for conscription as an institution diminished.

After a transition period, as of 1 October 1997, there were no more conscripts serving in the Dutch Armed Forces. Nevertheless, conscription has formally remained in existence, thus enabling conscripts to be called up, should a severe threat arise again.

As a result of the efficiency-operation, which started in November 1994, the Defence Interservice Command (DICO) was established. DICO services vary from pay administration, facility management and automation to transport provision, medical care and recruitment and selection. Other measures were the re-evaluation of standards and the privatisation of some defence institutions, such as the Defence Technical Documentation Centre.

6.4. Main Tasks of the Armed Forces¹⁶

The armed forces in an international context

The Dutch Armed Forces are internationally involved more than in the past. International co-operation is indispensable, when facing the current security risks. That is why the Netherlands acts in its own interest when it actively invests politically and militarily in those international security organisations in which it participates. The important thing for the Netherlands is to contribute to international efforts which fit in with its capabilities and ambitions.

Bilateral and multinational military co-operation with allies and partners have been further strengthened in the past several years. The Alliance and the European Union are the most important institutional frameworks for co-operation. The Netherlands has committed itself to contributing actively to the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC) during the NATO Summit in Prague in November 2002 and the European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP) of the European Union as well as in other contexts.

NATO is the most important pillar of Dutch security policy and epitomizes the transatlantic connection. Good transatlantic relations will continue to be essential for Dutch security in the future. The Alliance is considered to be the most important organization to ensure Dutch security and to nip any threat that might arise in the bud. Furthermore, NATO is an important forum for political consultation and for the harmonisation of defence plans.

¹⁶ Most information in this paragraph is based on 'Prinsjesdag'-letter to Parliament, 16 September 2003.

The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) has become a driving force in the Dutch defence policy over the last years. This European orientation is founded on the idea that closer European co-operation offers new possibilities to remove the greatest hindrance to achieving effective an European crisis response capability – namely, the fragmentation of European defence activities.

The Netherlands attaches great importance to the further development of the ESDP, including civil crisis management tasks. In the opinion of the Netherlands, the member states of the EU must possess the military and civil resources to give the policy some teeth and to carry out Non-Article 5 Crisis Response Operations. This approach is in line with the existing co-operation within NATO and is, in fact, an important supplement to it. From a Dutch point of view, there is no question of conflict between NATO and the EU. The Netherlands has been one of those calling for a satisfactory organization of co-operation between the EU and NATO.

Mutual trust is essential for international co-operation. Examples of existing co-operative arrangements are the integrated German-Netherlands Army Corps Headquarters; the air force's co-operation in the European Air Group (EAG), the Deployable Air Task Force (DATF) with Belgium, the Extended Air Defence Task Force (EADTF) with the United States and Germany, the Admiral Benelux with Belgium and the UK/NL Amphibious Force with the United Kingdom.

The armed forces in a national context

The Dutch Armed Forces have a long tradition of operating in a national context. With the resources available to them, the armed forces provide aid to the civil power and assist the civil authorities when asked to do so.

The importance of national tasks has been demonstrated in recent years and was codified as the third main task of the armed forces in the Defence White Paper 2000. The armed forces have been called upon repeatedly in dealing with disasters and incidents, such as the rapid dissemination of animal disease, like swine fever, foot-and-mouth disease and, most recently, bird flu, the threat of flooding and the fireworks disaster in Enschede.

The armed forces assist civilian authorities in other areas as well, for example, in border control, police and security functions on civilian airport premises, providing military helicopters for search-and-rescue and for the transport of sick and wounded persons during emergencies and offer capacities for casualties caused by large-scale incidents, disasters and terrorist attacks with biological weapons.

The threat of international terrorism has cast a new light on the tasks of the armed forces. From the perspective of the Ministry of Defence, the most important measures taken include strengthening the Military Intelligence and Security Service, the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee and the Special Support Units of the Marine Corps, the establishment of an Inter-Service NBC Centre of experts and the establishment of an operational NBC company in the Royal Netherlands Army.

6.5. Tasks of the Armed Forces

Today, the core tasks of the Dutch Armed Forces are the following:

- protecting the integrity of national and Alliance territory, including the Netherlands, Antilles and Aruba;

- advancing the international rule of law and stability and
- assisting the civil authorities in the context of law enforcement, disaster relief and humanitarian aid, both nationally and internationally.

To carry out these tasks, in accordance with the current defence policy, the armed forces must be capable of the following:

- general defence in a NATO context, which may involve participation, for a limited duration, in a peace-enforcement operation with a brigade or, as appropriate, a task force of land forces consisting of a core that is predominantly Dutch or its equivalent (e.g. a maritime task group to a maximum of five frigates, two squadrons with 18 fighter aircraft each, or a combination of these units)
- sustained participation in a maximum of three peace operations, involving contributions at battalion level or its equivalent (e.g. a squadron of fighter aircraft or two frigates)
- national military tasks, such as the protection of the integrity of national territory, coastal waters and air space
- civilian government tasks, such as police tasks carried out by the Royal Marechaussee (border control, mobile monitoring of aliens and security on aviation premises) and providing military assistance to carry out civil government tasks
- safeguarding the territorial integrity of the Netherlands, Antilles and Aruba and carrying out civil tasks, such as coastguard duties and the fight against drugs.

The following political principles determine the composition of the Dutch Armed Forces:

- the composition and equipment of the armed forces need to be geared towards the threat and security risks, as expected to arise in the near future; in view of the variety of risks and threats;
- the Netherlands must be willing and able to contribute to diverse operations for the protection of NATO territory, peacekeeping and crisis management;
- the Netherlands will only deploy its armed forces beyond the Kingdom of the Netherlands' border in an international context (NATO, UN, OSCE, EU and ad hoc coalitions) and
- the contributions will consist of modules which fit in as well as possible with contributions from other countries.

The Netherlands does therefore not have to possess armed forces which are capable of any possible military activity. Any combat-ready Dutch unit can, in principle, be deployed for peace operations, crisis management operations and other international operations and the Netherlands will actively promote more intensive co-operation in defence among European countries.

6.6. Transformation to Expeditionary Armed Forces

The Dutch government has the ambition to take part in expeditionary operations with its armed forces. This requires high-quality units that are largely self-sustained in the area of logistics and carry out military operations at a relatively great distance from their home bases. The reduced threat of a large-scale attack against Alliance territory and the increased necessity of (being capable of) reacting quickly to conflicts have led to the decision to transform to virtually fully active armed forces that can be deployed rapidly anywhere in the world.

The Dutch Armed Forces must be able to continue to operate effectively, as changes in military operations will most likely continue. The most important changes in the military operational environment to which the Dutch Armed Forces should adapt are:

- Flexibility, as the operations of armed forces can no longer be captured in fixed templates;
- Operational effectiveness, because the political leadership and society will continue to demand that the deployment of military units produces positive results quickly;
- Joint operations to influence primarily the power relationships on the ground, which requires capabilities in all dimensions of military operations – land, sea and air – to contribute to achieving that objective;
- Essential operational capabilities, relating to timely availability of units, reliable intelligence, rapid deployability, effectiveness of deployment, advanced command and control, logistic support, and self-protection,
- Network-centric operations which require a high level of interoperability of weapons and sensors and of information and communication systems;
- New weapons, like precision weapons, directed energy weapons and non-lethal weapons and
- Unmanned and semi-autonomous systems which reduce risks for one's own personnel.

6.7. Review Framework for Peace Support Operations

National participation decisions on international peace support operations are, in most countries, made on a case-by-case basis. Some governments have formally codified this principle, e.g. in a Defence White Paper. The 'case-by-case' clause is usually inserted to stress that participation will never be automatic, that the national government retains the sovereign right to decline an invitation to participate. Over the years national governments and departments have developed a certain 'crisis template' that serves as a benchmark for assessing new crises.

The main instrument, used by the Dutch government (and, albeit at a later stage, by the Lower House) for analysis, is the so-called 'Toetsingskader' or Review Framework. This is a list of points, which was presented by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Defence to the Lower House in June 1995. Dutch national decision-making involves the government, parliament, the Chief of Defence Staff and the Commanders in Chief of the Services. The 'Toetsingskader' is used for providing better consultation structure between government and parliament and improving the quality of the decision-making.

The Fourteen-Point Review Framework of 1995 includes the following political and military points of attention:

Political desirability

- Deployment of military units will take place if it is in the interest of the Netherlands and/or the advancement of international rule of law;
- Deployment must be in accordance with international law and must be based preferably on a clear UN-mandate or mandate of another international organisation;
- (...) factors like solidarity, credibility and the sharing and distribution of responsibility, burdens and risks play a role;

- (...) a multinational approach has our preference, to ensure the willingness to take part in international operations in the long run and
- Deployment (...) is never automatic. The Dutch government decides on a case-by-case basis on the participation in an international operation. There must be enough public and parliamentary support.

Military feasibility

- The aim of an international operation, written in the political mandate, must be translated into a concrete military mission;
- The government must assess whether the political and military goals of the operation can be reasonably met. Operational characteristics of the conflict play an important role in that respect;
- Adequate political and public support is necessary (...) it must be prevented that the burden of an international operation is carried solely by small states (...). This can be prevented by spreading the participation over a group of states. Another possibility is to arrange for the relief of the units (...) and reasonable sharing of the financial burden;
- Determine the units (...) which are available;
- The Dutch units must operate in a clear chain of command (...);
- The risks for the deployable personnel must be assessed as accurately as possible (...);
- The Rules of Engagement (...) must be formulated unambiguously (...) and must make an effective execution of the mission possible (...)
- Adequate financial accommodation of the operation (...) must be guaranteed; and
- Every affirmative commitment to any participation must contain a term (duration). There should also be an exit-strategy in place and at least one big country should participate in the operation. After expiry, Dutch participation will be terminated or require a new decision.

Parliamentary involvement in the national decision-making process has gradually increased over the past twenty years. The existing practice has been codified and a new article – Article 100 – has been introduced into the Constitution. This article obliges the government to inform parliament as soon as possible, when it considers participation and is the anchor for information, regular consultation and feedback.

The Framework was revised in 2001 to amend insufficient communication structures between government and parliament.

6.8. Conclusions

The key foreign policy objectives of the Netherlands are: strengthening the international order, promoting peace, security and stability, intensifying European co-operation, working to achieve sustainable poverty reduction, and promoting bilateral relations.

After the end of the East-West confrontation, the Netherlands started a transformation process of its armed forces towards expeditionary operations.

Among the tasks of the armed forces, that of conducting peace operations and supporting national civil authorities has greatly gained in importance. Over the past years, Dutch units have made an active contribution to a large number of peace operations.

The Dutch Armed Forces were transformed in the nineties into an all-volunteer force, while simultaneously being restructured and downsized.

In keeping with its ambitions, capabilities and commitment to international involvement, the Netherlands is willing and able to participate in a maximum of three peacekeeping operations with battalion-size units or their equivalent. For operations at the higher end of the force spectrum the Netherlands can contribute a brigade or a task force of land forces, consisting of a core that is predominantly Dutch or their equivalent.

Dutch participation decisions on international peace support operations are based on a 'Toetsingskader' or Review Framework.

7. Final Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1. Final Conclusions

7.1.1. Security and Defence

The changes in the security environment resulted in a review of the security and defence policies in most European countries. The outcome of this process confirms that the security of the nation-state and its vital interests can better be provided by membership in a political alliance or union, instead of stand-alone arrangements.

- The security of Austria and that of the EU are inseparably linked. This is a fundamental principle. It underlines the commitment of Austria to the European Union. The Austrian constitution does not limit the nature of the military contribution. Austria is willing and able to contribute to the whole spectrum of the so-called Petersberg tasks. Austria's national interest is served in the best way by using two options: membership and active participation and contribution to international organisations, like the EU and, simultaneous co-operation with a strategic partner(s).
- There is no conventional threat to Austria's territory foreseeable for the near future. The risks which are recognised can be countered in the best way by multinational co-operation. From a security point of view, there is no clear reason to maintain the military capacity for territorial defence alone. The events of 9/11 have shown that there is a need for a comprehensive security approach to protect the national territory and its citizens against the new risks. At the same time it underlines the need of defending national interests far away from national borders by militarily contributing to international organisations. A substantial military contribution in the fight against terrorism has consequences for a comprehensive security approach. The total required capacity for the armed forces strongly depends on Austria's military contribution to the EU, NATO and the UN.
- The Austrian Strategic Concept meets the international requirements, but there is a gap between the concept and its implementation. Austria has to make a choice with regard to its defence policy. Will it opt for an expeditionary force or a stabilisation force? The final choice depends on the level of political ambition which has to be chosen by the Austrian government.
- When professionals will be responsible for border control in the near future, the need for conscripts will decrease strongly. The relevancy of conscription will become more questionable. At the same

time, one cannot rule out that in the near future a European Army Corps will be based only on professional soldiers. If this is the case, Austria has to consider reviewing its conscription policy.

7.1.2. Political Ambition

- In the spirit of the political and military documents and statements of Austria one can conclude that Austria has the political ambition to play a relevant role in those international security organisations. The present ranking of Austria's political ambition is 'low profile'. However, 'solidarity' is a key word in Austria's foreign and security policy. This should be reflected in the level of political ambition. Its economic ranking, its regional position, its credibility and its policy of solidarity require (at least) a medium-profile ambition. To implement this ambition, the Austrian defence organisation should be capable of contributing to the EU-Army Corps and NATO peace support operations on a permanent basis. This may also have consequences for defence expenditures. Austria falls behind, when we take the defence budgets of other smaller countries, like Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands into account. Only a bigger budget would make an extended international contribution more realistic.
- Austria's current military capabilities are not in balance with its international position and political ambitions. Looking at Austria's military capabilities, the nature of its present deployments and its contributions to the ECAP and the Capabilities Commitment Catalogue, Austria's political ambition with its land forces can be qualified as 'low'. With regard to some specific capabilities it can be rated 'low/medium', as the air force may contribute to offensive operations with ground attack aircraft and air-to-air missiles. Austria's ability to sustain operations in remote regions is limited. In addition, Austria has capabilities very suitable for territorial defence, which can also be restructured for more demanding expeditionary operations. One of the principles of Austria's defence policy is to enable the Austrian Armed Forces to take part in the whole spectrum of the Petersberg tasks in a multinational framework with up to a battle group or a battle group equivalent.
- The neighbours of Austria (excluding Switzerland) are ambitious in their contributions to international peace and security. They are already showing active participation in NATO. As soon as the circumstances (socio-economic, defence reform, etc.) have changed in a more promising way in most of these countries, they will opt for at least medium profile level.

7.1.3. International Organisations and Austria

- Austria has a strong commitment to the UN and is still playing an important role in the field of Chapter VI peacekeeping operations. The UN expects that Austria will continue to participate in this kind of operations.
- Austria's security is inseparably linked with the security of the EU. Austria is supposed to make a fair and relevant contribution to EU military capabilities.
- The OSCE has become an important player in the field of conflict-prevention and post-conflict peace-building. Austria is expected, on request, to take part in OSCE missions with observers and make troops available for peacekeeping operations.
- NATO has expanded its traditional role of collective defence with peace support operations and the fight against terrorism. Through the enlargement of NATO the political dimension has gained in importance. Austria uses the PfP to promote its own security. Membership in the Alliance is still a do-

mestic ‘non-starter’. Austria is supposed to continue to contribute in an appropriate way to UN-mandated, NATO-led peace support operations.

7.1.4. Bi-national and Multilateral Co-operation

- There is the general opinion in Europe that smaller countries, like Austria, will not be able to maintain relevant and affordable armed forces in the long term, without far-reaching international co-operation. Intensifying co-operation is necessary to reduce the current fragmentation of the European defence efforts. Increasing the efficiency of the totality of the European defence expenditures by improving international co-operation is an important condition for strengthening the European military capabilities.
- Disadvantages of military co-operation are to be found primarily in the loss of authority of autonomous decision-making which increases as co-operation becomes more intense and eventually leads to task specialisation (exchange of tasks). Research among European countries has made clear, that there is no political will in Europe for making bi-national or multinational agreements concerning task specialisation in the short term. The best possibilities for further co-operation in the short term can be found in the least drastic forms of co-operation, such as pooling (e.g. the European Air Group) and procurement co-operation (e.g. NH-90 helicopter).

7.1.5. Dutch Security and Defence Policy: Political Ambition and the Armed Forces

- The key foreign policy objectives of the Netherlands are: strengthening the international order, promoting peace, security and stability, intensifying European co-operation, working to achieve sustainable poverty reduction and promoting bilateral relations.
- The Dutch Armed Forces were transformed in the nineties into an all-volunteer force, while simultaneously being restructured and downsized.
- According to its ambition and its commitment to the international community, the Netherlands is willing and able to participate in a maximum of three peacekeeping operations with battalion-size units or their equivalent. For operations at the higher end of the force spectrum the Netherlands can contribute a brigade or a task force of land forces, consisting of a core that is predominantly Dutch or equivalent.
- Dutch decisions on participating in international peace support operations are based on a ‘Toetsingskader’ or Review Framework.

7.2. Recommendations

- Taking Austria’s position into account, it should contribute a fair share to the ESDP. In this respect there are two possible causes of action.
- Firstly, in accordance with the ‘Solidarity Clause’, Austria has to participate in a credible way in the European pool of specialised civilian and military units.
- Secondly, if Austria opts for an expeditionary force, it has two basic options. Option 1 is an Austrian contribution with land forces to operations at the higher end of the spectrum of force (brigade-level). This contribution is recommendable for a medium profile. This co-operation is embedded in the permanent structured co-operation mentioned in the concept of the EU Constitution (art. 40.6). An alternative within this option is a task force of land forces, consisting of a core that is predominantly

Austrian and includes a number of modules (headquarters and manoeuvre battalions) supplemented by foreign support and combat support units.

- Option 2, which can also be considered, as contribution to permanent structured co-operation, which would be an alternative within the framework of a medium profile. It is the establishment of a battle-group sized force, which can respond to a crisis with appropriate transport and sustainability. This force should have the capacity to operate under a Chapter VII mandate. It would be deployed in response to a UN request to stabilise a situation or otherwise meet a short-term need until peacekeepers from the United Nations, or regional organisations acting under a UN mandate, can arrive or be reinforced.
- At the same time, at the lower end of the spectrum of force, the Austrian Armed Forces should be capable of participating in two operations with contributions in battalion strength or equivalent.
- Austria should look into the possibilities of bi-national or multinational agreements in the field of operational co-operation, pooling and co-operation in the logistic field. As much as Austria's national tasks can be seen as a minimum level for co-operative options, it is important to realise what these national tasks are.
- Austria should choose different partners for different purposes. Suitable countries for Austria to consider for military co-operation are Germany, Hungary, Spain and Italy. Austria, as a small state can benefit from its defence co-operation with a major power, like Germany. Hungary is a likely partner as a neighbour and because of its regional position. But also Italy and Spain should not be ruled out. Austria should look into the possibilities of bi-national brigades or bi-national battle-groups. Another option to consider would be bi-national headquarters.
- Austria should evaluate its present policy on conscription and develop a long-term strategy to be able to contribute in a professional way to organisations, like the EU and NATO. If Austria chooses to contribute to more demanding tasks, it is hardly likely to contribute with military units consisting of conscripts.
- Austria has to consider, once the EU Constitution is agreed upon, whether it wants to opt for enhanced co-operation and/or permanent structured co-operation. This political choice will have consequences for the restructuring, education, training and equipment of its armed forces.
- Once Austria has chosen a political ambition level, including the appropriate budget level, the future size and composition of its armed forces can be determined.

Appendix:

Dutch Participation in International Operations Abroad

At the moment, 2460 troops are on foreign deployment in the following countries (figures as of 31 December 2003):

951 military personnel in the Balkan region, including:

- 944 troops in Bosnia (SFOR)
- 2 military personnel in Italy
- 2 military personnel in Kosovo (HQ KFOR, EUMM)
- 3 military personnel in Macedonia (OSCE)

1173 military personnel as the stabilisation force in the Iraq region

38 troops in operations, related to the international fight against terrorism, including:

Enduring Freedom:

- 4 military personnel in the United States (HQ Central Command)
- 2 military personnel in Coalition ANA Training TF in Afghanistan

and ISAF:

- 03 military personnel in Afghanistan (ISAF)
- 3 military personnel Sperwer support

266 military personnel for UNMIL:

5 military personnel in Monrovia

261 military personnel Hr. Ms. Rotterdam

12 military personnel in the Middle East (UNTSO) 1 military person in Moldavia (OSCE). In addition 18 military personnel are designated for NATO Operation Active Endeavour:

* 18 MPA Det Sigonella, Italy. And there are currently units designated as strategic reserve. These can be deployed rapidly.

* 3 military personnel also for SFOR (5-day response)

* 8 military personnel for ISAF IV