

SPEECH BY AMBASSADOR FRANCOIS BUJON DE L'ESTANG

EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY (ESDP) AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES AND NATO

I would like to thank Dr. Hamre and Simon Serfaty for this excellent initiative taken by the CSIS.

From St. Malo to today, some apprehension has been expressed on Capitol Hill regarding European security and defense policy. This apprehension has been largely due, I believe, to misconceptions and lack of understanding of our intentions and our objectives. Perhaps terminology has not helped either, with the European predilection for ominous acronyms.

After the excellent presentations of my British and German colleagues, there is little left to add. However, there is only one thing worse than a European conspiracy: a French-inspired European conspiracy. According to a rather popular theory in Washington, ESDP is a dark and dangerous plot organized by France to finally break up the Atlantic Alliance with the unknowing complicity of its blind European partners. Therefore, people are undoubtedly paying close attention to the current French Presidency of the EU. Let me spend a few minutes to shed some light on our plans until December 31, and briefly go over the goals—and achievements—of our current presidency in order to dispel and doubt that might still be lingering in your minds.

1. To quote Lord Robertson, ESDP is about three things: capabilities, capabilities and capabilities. I wholeheartedly subscribe to this assertion, for at least two reasons: first of all, France has always prided itself, on a national level, with a strong commitment to robust defense capabilities, and our present forces are there to show it—it is only natural that we attempt to pursue our European endeavor with the same priority. Second, because capabilities are the key to the success of ESDP, in terms of political credibility of course but also in terms of our military objectives.

Let me tell you what our projects are in terms of capabilities:

As you all know by now, at Helsinki, last December, the fifteen heads of State or Government set themselves two series of targets in terms of military capabilities.

On the one hand, the quantitative so called "head-line goals" (60,000 troops rapidly deployable, self-sufficient for a whole year with the necessary air and naval support);

On the other hand, qualitative targets regarding collective capabilities in areas such as command and control, intelligence and strategic transport. What we are doing today is to transform these political objectives into concrete goals, in a very detailed manner. In political objectives into concrete goals, in a very detailed manner. In other words, the dozen or so lines in the Helsinki conclusions on capabilities have, thanks to an alchemy performed by EU military planners with input from their NATO colleagues, turned into some 50 pages of specific requirements.

This allows us to match up what we need to what we currently have, and of course measure the gaps, which we will aim to close at the Capabilities Commitment Conference, to be held in Brussels next November 20 by Defense Ministers of the 15. This event will allow each member State to make pledges toward meeting these requirements. We also aim to decide, before the end of our Presidency, on a European review mechanism that will allow us to continue narrowing the

gap until 2003, and more generally to review the nature and composition of European military forces.

Just to give you a flavor of this work, which suddenly makes all of these debates very real: the Defense Ministers of the 15 agreed, two weeks ago, that in order to fulfill the Helsinki objectives the EU needed: 80,000 troops in order to allow for a simultaneous contingency and still be able to project 60,000 as agreed (allowing for rotations, this means of course 200,000 to 230,000 troops); 300 to 350 fighter planes; some 80 combat ships . . . these are just some of the elements in this catalogue of forces that have been agreed. I could also mention strategic lift, UAVs, amphibious landing ships . . .

I would like to mention in passing that, as you can see, we are not just aiming at operations on the low end of the peace-keeping spectrum as I have sometimes heard. Does this mean that we would be able, in 2003, to carry out an operation such as "Allied Force" entirely by ourselves? Of course not—and it would be dangerous to create such expectations. But the imbalance between U.S. and European forces which we witnessed last year would be substantially reduced—and 2003 will be an important stepping stone on the path to such a capability, which we need to keep as a longer-term goal in order to be prepared for all non-article 5 contingencies.

3. I often hear people complaining about the fact that the EU is not working to improve its capabilities, but just creating new institutions. This is inaccurate on both counts: as I have just pointed out, we are actively working on reinforcing our capabilities. As for institutions, I would agree with Sir Christopher that we are re-organizing, not multiplying European institutions. As we have reiterated at the last European Councils, our goal is to develop an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises". The capacity to take decisions and to conduct EU-led military operations requires the adequate political-military decision-making structures, procedures and expertise. During our Presidency, we are working hard in order to allow these new EU structures (the Political and Security Committee, the Military Committee and the Military Staff) to get up and running in their permanent configuration, taking over from their interim one. These bodies are analogous to those that existed in the past in the WEU, and which will be disbanded.

I might add that those new institutions that are being created are those which fulfill the objective of allowing consultation and cooperation with NATO and with non-EU countries, two goals that I know are very dear to many of those here today, as they are indeed to us. Under our Presidency, we have already held a joint meeting between the North Atlantic Council and the Interim Political and Security Committee (and there will be more to come), as well as several meetings of the newly set up joint working groups between the EU and NATO. These are needed to address, in a pragmatic and solution-oriented way, the issues that the two organizations need to work out together (access to NATO assets, information security, etc.) and to work out the elements of the long-term EU-NATO relationship. We have also set up an inclusive forum for the 15 European non-EU partners and, within this forum, for the 6 non-EU NATO allies. Several meetings have also already been held in the

two months that have gone by since we took up our presidency. These countries will, of course, be closely associated to the November Capabilities Commitment Conference.

One final word: after having gone into such detail into our current projects, just to give you a taste of how complex this whole endeavor is and how seriously we are taking our task, I wouldn't want the trees to hide the forest.

The crucial element to bear in mind is that we are at a turning point in the history of the European Union, of the Atlantic Alliance and of transatlantic relations. There is much at stake, both for the future of the EU's foreign and security policy, and therefore for our ability as Europeans to play our role on the world stage, and for the transatlantic link as well. We have taken the full measure of what is at stake and are pleased to see that quarreling and suspicion have given largely given way, on this side of the Atlantic, to a better understanding of our common interests and our shared objective.

#### BRIAN BENCZKOWSKI

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, at the end of this session of the 106th Congress Brian Benczkowski will be leaving my staff. Brian has worked on the Hill since his third year in law school. He stared as an intern while still in law school, served as the senior analyst for judiciary issues for the Senate Budget Committee, and worked closely with my general counsel to develop, and enact, over the President's veto, the Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995.

Brian was my counsel for the second round of Whitewater hearings and was part of the team for the historic impeachment trial of President Clinton. Brian worked on Juvenile Justice legislation, and helped me take on the Mexican drug lords.

He learned the highway, airport and other infrastructure needs of New Mexico as well as any Highway and Transportation Secretary in any Governor's cabinet. He was knowledgeable on immigration issues and helped my case-workers with the really tough, but worthy immigration problems that are a daily fact of life in a border state. Just to prove that Brian had a soft side, he was my staff person for Character Counts during the 106th Congress.

Brian was instrumental in drafting the claims process legislation for the victims of the Cerro Grande fire. From the date that the fire first started to the day that the President signed the bill, complete with the \$640 million to pay the claims, was fifty days. It is a good legislative product, and it proved that the delegation and the Congress could be bipartisan and act expeditiously in an emergency.

Brian is a talented lawyer, a caring and hard working member of my staff.

For a young man raised in Virginia, taught the law in Missouri with parents now living in Connecticut, he has made many New Mexico friends, developed a taste for green chile and amassed an understanding of the border. At one point I remarked that his

Spanish was as good as any other staff member in my office.

So what is it that such a talented young man would choose to do when leaving Capitol Hill?

Banking legislative assistants and counsels with backgrounds in securities often end up at the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commodities Futures Trading Commission or at one of the Wall Street firms. However, the typical career path wouldn't do for this untypically talented young lawyer. He is going to New York to work for the first, real sports stock market.

This new sports stock market will list the baseball and other trading cards of today's marquee athletes and major league sports rising stars. Just like any major stock exchange, the exchange is a market maker. Just like E-trade or Ameritrade people will have sports brokerage accounts.

Brian is a baseball fan, former baseball player and a font of knowledge when it comes to sports. As a former minor league baseball player myself, I know baseball and am a fan of most other sports. ESPN was a great invention that adds to most men's enjoyment of life, sports and the pursuit of happiness. Hopefully, this new sports stock exchange will add another dimension to the way we all follow sports.

Many of us share a passion for sports, but very few of us get to take that passion, and merge it with the law, get an impressive title like assistant general counsel, receive a pay check and stock options. However, Brian is going to do

just that at thePit.com. I wish him and his new company every success.

---

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 7:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Kellaher, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Kellaher, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

---

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until the hour of 5 p.m. on Monday, October 30, 2000. I further ask consent that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two

leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business until 7 p.m., with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator REID, or his designee, from 5 to 6 p.m.; Senator DOMENICI, or his designee, from 6 to 7 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

#### PROGRAM

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 5 p.m., with up to 2 hours for morning business, with Senators REID and DOMENICI in control of the time.

Under the previous order, there will be a vote on a continuing resolution at 7 p.m. That will be the first vote of the day. However, other votes may be necessary during tomorrow evening's session. Good-faith negotiations are ongoing, and it is hoped that an agreement can be finalized this week.

---

#### RECESS UNTIL 5 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:58 p.m., recessed until Monday, October 30, 2000, at 5 p.m.