{} DURCHD8
Clarity in Contested Narratives

Illustration: © sabinemescher

From Capability Substitution to Decision Control

A structural companion to "Managing the Transatlantic Divorce"

This paper is written as a structural companion to a recent European Policy Centre analysis examining Europes transition toward greater strategic' responsibility in transatlantic security.

Executive Summary

Europe is undergoing a strategic transition shaped by growing uncertainty in the transatlantic security relationship and sustained

external pressure. A recent European Policy Centre analysis, *Managing the Transatlantic Divorce*, outlines the central challenge of replacing longstanding U.S.-anchored capabilities and leadership structures as Europe moves toward greater responsibility. This paper examines the structural conditions under which such a transition remains governable in practice.

The transition currently underway differs from earlier phases of European security adaptation. It is compulsory rather than elective, nonlinear rather than sequential, and embedded in ongoing operational realities. Capability development, institutional adjustment, and strategic reorientation occur in parallel, under time pressure and without the benefit of a permissive environment. As a result, transition itself has become a source of systemic risk.

Under these conditions, time functions as a dominant constraint. Decision windows compress, external interpretation accelerates, and delays alter outcomes rather than merely postponing them. While material capabilities can be developed over extended horizons, decision authority is exercised in real time. Where structures are unable to authorise and implement decisions at the required pace, formal strength does not translate into practical agency.

The paper therefore shifts analytical attention from outcomes to decision control under load. Decision control is defined by the interaction of authority, coherence, and implementability. When these conditions are met, decisions retain binding force. When they degrade, systems may continue to produce decisions while losing the ability to shape effects.

Experience in transitional systems suggests that loss of control rarely occurs through sudden failure. Instead, it emerges through recurring structural patterns, including latency substitution, diffusion of authority, fragmentation of coherence, and implementation stall. These patterns interact and reinforce one another, gradually shifting systems into a mode where decisions exist without reliably producing outcomes.

Against this background, the paper argues that transition requires validation. Validation does not assess the desirability of policy choices or prescribe institutional arrangements. It determines whether proposed changes preserve the capacity to decide and act under realistic conditions of time pressure and sustained load. Without such validation, reforms risk improving form while undermining function.

The analysis does not address what Europe should decide next. It frames the conditions under which future decisions—whatever their content— either retain binding force or do not.

Section I – The Nature of the Transition

Europe is undergoing a strategic transition that is neither elective nor temporally isolated. The debate triggered by growing uncertainty in the transatlantic relationship has moved beyond questions of reassurance and signalling toward questions of substitution, autonomy, and structural responsibility. What receives less systematic examination, however, is the character of this transition itself.

The current transition differs fundamentally from earlier phases of European security adaptation. It is not sequenced, in the sense of moving from assessment to reform and then to implementation. Nor is it bounded, either geographically or institutionally. Instead, it unfolds under continuous pressure, shaped simultaneously by external conflict, internal political divergence, and shifting expectations among partners and adversaries alike.

Three features distinguish this transition.

First, it is forced rather than chosen. While debates about European strategic responsibility have existed for decades, the present phase is driven by external developments that compress decision space. The question is no longer whether Europe should assume greater responsibility for its own security, but how this assumption occurs under conditions not of its own making.

Second, the transition is non-linear. Capability substitution, institutional adaptation, and strategic reorientation occur in parallel rather than in sequence. Decisions taken in one domain immediately condition options in others. As a result, partial adjustments generate system-wide effects, often before their implications are fully understood.

Third, the transition is embedded in ongoing operational realities. It does not take place in a permissive environment that allows for trial, reversal, or prolonged deliberation. Instead, it unfolds alongside active security commitments, contested threat perceptions, and sustained external pressure. This alters the risk profile of transition itself.

Taken together, these characteristics mean that Europe is not simply planning a future security posture; it is attempting to transform while already in motion. In such conditions, the central challenge is not conceptual clarity about end states, but the ability to sustain coherent decision-making throughout the transition process.

This observation does not prejudge the direction or outcome of Europe's strategic evolution. It establishes the baseline condition under which current debates, proposals, and reforms are taking place: a transition that is compulsory, concurrent, and exposed.

Understanding this condition is necessary for assessing whether existing structures, processes, and assumptions are adequate—not in principle, but under the specific pressures that now define Europe's security environment.

Section II – Time as the Dominant Constraint

If the current transition is compulsory, non-linear, and embedded in ongoing operational realities, then time ceases to be a neutral parameter. It becomes a structural constraint that shapes what can be decided, implemented, and sustained.

In earlier phases of European security adaptation, time functioned primarily as a planning horizon. Delays were costly, but rarely decisive.

Today, the situation is different. Decisions are taken—or avoided—within compressed windows in which postponement itself alters outcomes. Under such conditions, time is no longer a resource to be managed; it is a limiting factor that defines the boundary between agency and loss of control.

This shift is not theoretical. It is observable in the pace at which events acquire political meaning, in the speed with which external actors respond to perceived hesitation, and in the narrowing of option spaces once narratives and expectations solidify. Decision cycles that remain calibrated to annual reviews, multi-stage consultations, or sequential alignment processes struggle to keep pace with environments where critical interpretation occurs within days or weeks.

Importantly, time pressure does not affect all domains equally. Material capabilities can, in principle, be developed over longer horizons. Decision authority, however, is time-sensitive. Once a window for authoritative action closes, subsequent decisions—even if technically sound—operate under altered conditions. They become reactive rather than shaping, constrained rather than enabling.

Time compression also interacts with internal dynamics. Divergent political calendars, coalition processes, and institutional sequencing increase latency precisely when latency carries the highest cost. What previously appeared as manageable friction becomes a multiplier of risk when decisions must be taken under sustained pressure.

In this sense, time functions as a meta-constraint. It does not replace other strategic variables, but it governs their interaction. Capability substitution, institutional reform, and strategic reorientation are all conditioned by whether decisions can be authorised and acted upon within the relevant window. Where this is not the case, transformation efforts risk producing formal change without corresponding agency.

Recognising time as the dominant constraint does not imply inevitability or decline. It clarifies the environment in which current choices are made. Any assessment of Europe's ongoing transition must therefore ask

not only what is being changed, but whether the structures responsible for change can operate at the speed the environment now demands.

This question leads directly to the issue of decision control under load.

Section III – Decision Control Under Load

The combination of a forced transition and compressed time horizons shifts attention away from outcomes and toward the conditions under which decisions are made. Under sustained pressure, the decisive question is not whether decisions exist, but whether they retain control over effects once taken.

Decision control, in this context, should not be confused with formal decision-making. Systems can continue to produce resolutions, communiqués, and policy documents while simultaneously losing the ability to shape events. Control exists only where decisions are authorised, coherent across levels, and executable within the time available.

Three conditions are central.

First, authority. Decisions must be attributable to a recognised authorising level that is accepted as legitimate by those expected to implement them. Under load, authority is tested less by legality than by clarity. Where authorship is ambiguous or distributed across overlapping mandates, implementation slows and responsibility diffuses. The system continues to speak, but it no longer commands.

Second, coherence. Decisions must align across political, institutional, and operational layers. Under normal conditions, divergence can be managed through sequencing and compromise. Under time pressure, however, misalignment becomes immediately consequential. Signals intended for internal accommodation are interpreted externally as hesitation or division, narrowing the range of feasible follow-on actions.

Third, implementability. Decisions that cannot be translated into action within the relevant window fail to stabilise authority or coherence. Implementation capacity is therefore not a downstream concern, but a constitutive element of control. Where delivery lags persistently behind commitment, credibility erodes and future decisions lose binding force.

These conditions are mutually reinforcing. Authority enables implementation; implementation validates authority. Coherence reduces friction and preserves time; loss of coherence consumes it. When one condition degrades, the others tend to follow, often with little warning.

Under load, this interdependence becomes critical. Decision systems designed for deliberation and inclusion may continue to function procedurally, yet fall below the threshold at which decisions shape outcomes. At that point, control is not gradually weakened but qualitatively altered. Decisions remain visible, but their effects are determined elsewhere.

Understanding decision control under load therefore requires shifting the analytical lens. The relevant measure is no longer the presence of decision-making structures, but their capacity to operate coherently, authoritatively, and at speed in an environment that penalises delay.

This perspective does not imply institutional failure. It reflects a change in operating conditions.

Section IV – Structural Failure Patterns in Transitional Systems

When decision control degrades under load, it rarely does so through a single visible breakdown. More often, it erodes through recurring structural patterns that emerge when systems designed for stability are exposed to sustained pressure. These patterns are not the result of poor

intent or isolated misjudgment; they arise from the interaction between institutional design and a changing operating environment.

Four such patterns are particularly relevant in the context of Europe's current transition.

The first is latency substitution. As time pressure increases, systems frequently compensate for delayed decisions with accelerated communication. Statements, declarations, and procedural updates fill the space where authoritative action is not yet possible. While this may preserve the appearance of responsiveness, it does not preserve control. On the contrary, early communication without binding effect often stabilises external interpretations before internal decisions are authorised, constraining subsequent options.

The second pattern is authority diffusion. Under stress, responsibilities tend to spread across levels and actors rather than consolidate. This diffusion is often unintended, driven by efforts to maintain inclusivity or manage political risk. Over time, however, it produces ambiguity about who decides, who speaks, and who escalates. Decisions remain formally valid, but their enforceability weakens as implementation actors navigate overlapping signals.

A third pattern is coherence fragmentation. Divergent priorities, threat perceptions, and temporal horizons are a normal feature of complex political systems. During transition, these differences are typically managed through sequencing and compromise. Under compressed timelines, however, accommodation mechanisms become strained. Fragmentation then manifests not as open disagreement, but as lowest-common-denominator outcomes, informal opt-outs, and parallel tracks that dilute collective effect.

The fourth pattern is implementation stall. As commitments accumulate, administrative, industrial, and operational capacities are stretched. Delivery timelines slip, programmes are restructured, and benchmarks are revised. While such adjustments are often justified individually, their cumulative effect is to weaken the link between decision and outcome.

Once this link erodes, authority and coherence follow, as future decisions are met with scepticism.

These patterns tend to interact. Latency substitution invites external interpretation, which amplifies authority diffusion. Authority diffusion complicates implementation, increasing the likelihood of stall. Fragmentation consumes time, reinforcing latency. The result is not sudden collapse, but a gradual shift into a mode where decisions exist without reliably producing effects.

These failure patterns are characteristic of transitional systems operating under pressure. Recognising them provides a basis for assessing whether ongoing reforms and adjustments strengthen decision control, or merely alter form while leaving underlying vulnerabilities intact.

Section V – Why Transition Requires Validation

The structural patterns described above raise a problem that is often left implicit in debates about Europe's ongoing transition. While proposals and reforms are routinely assessed in terms of intent, alignment, and internal consistency, they are rarely evaluated against the conditions under which they must actually function.

In stable environments, this omission carries limited risk. Systems have time to adjust, correct, and compensate. Under transitional pressure, however, unvalidated change can degrade control even when it appears directionally sound. Measures intended to strengthen autonomy, resilience, or capability may inadvertently increase latency, diffuse authority, or overload implementation capacity.

The core issue is that transition itself becomes a source of risk. Each additional layer of coordination, each new procedural safeguard, and each partial reform alters the balance between authority, coherence, and speed. Without a means of testing these effects, systems rely on assumption rather than evidence to judge whether change improves or undermines decision control.

Validation, in this sense, does not mean approval or endorsement. It refers to the ability to determine, in advance, whether a proposed adjustment preserves the capacity to decide and act under realistic conditions of load. This requires shifting attention from declared objectives to operational consequences: not what a reform is meant to achieve, but how it behaves when time is constrained and pressure sustained.

At present, most assessments of transition focus on content. They ask whether Europe is acquiring the right capabilities, aligning with the right partners, or adopting the right strategic concepts. What receives less systematic attention is whether the structures through which these changes are implemented remain governable as complexity and tempo increase.

This gap matters because control failures are often misinterpreted. When outcomes fall short, explanations tend to focus on political will, external interference, or insufficient resources. Less attention is paid to whether the system crossed a threshold beyond which decisions could no longer translate into effects, regardless of intent.

Introducing validation as a layer does not require new end states or additional commitments. It requires recognising that, under current conditions, not every form of change is an improvement, and that some adjustments may reduce agency even as they increase activity.

Validation provides a means to distinguish between reforms that strengthen decision control and those that merely rearrange it.

Section VI – Implications for Europe's Ongoing Transition

If transition requires validation to preserve decision control, then several implications follow for how Europe's current trajectory should be understood. These implications do not prescribe outcomes, nor do they privilege particular institutional arrangements. They arise directly from

the interaction between time pressure, structural complexity, and the patterns of failure identified earlier.

First, not all reform is additive. In a compressed environment, additional processes, coordination mechanisms, or layers of oversight can reduce rather than enhance control. Each adjustment consumes time, redistributes authority, and places new demands on implementation capacity. Without validation, it is difficult to distinguish between reforms that strengthen the system and those that increase its fragility under load.

Second, capability development and decision control operate on different timelines. Material capabilities can be planned, procured, and fielded over extended periods. Decision control, by contrast, is exercised in real time. Where the pace of structural change outstrips the system's ability to authorise and implement decisions coherently, capability gains risk remaining politically non-deployable. The result is a widening gap between formal strength and practical agency.

Third, institutional continuity should not be conflated with control continuity. Existing structures may remain intact and active while their capacity to shape outcomes erodes. Regular meetings, formal consensus, and stable mandates can coexist with declining effectiveness if decisions consistently arrive too late, lack clear authorship, or fail to translate into action. In transitional conditions, stability of form does not guarantee stability of function.

Fourth, external environments penalise delay and ambiguity. In a multipolar setting, hesitation is not neutral. It is observed, interpreted, and used by others. Internal processes calibrated for deliberation may generate external effects that cannot be reversed once expectations and narratives have solidified. Validation therefore serves not only internal coherence, but external credibility.

Finally, transition under pressure narrows the margin for error. Opportunities for learning through trial and adjustment diminish as windows close more quickly. Decisions taken without an understanding

of their control implications can lock systems into trajectories that are difficult to correct. This increases the importance of assessing, in advance, whether proposed changes preserve the ability to decide and act when conditions are least permissive.

Taken together, these implications suggest that Europe's ongoing transition is as much a question of governability as of direction. The challenge is not simply to move toward greater responsibility, but to do so without crossing thresholds beyond which decision control degrades.

This observation does not resolve debates about Europe's future role. It reframes them. Before accelerating transition, systems must be able to determine whether they remain governable under pressure.

Section VII – Control Validation as a Structural Requirement

The preceding sections converge on a single conclusion: under current conditions, the central risk of Europe's transition is not misalignment of intent, but loss of decision control during execution. If this is the case, then validation cannot remain an afterthought or an implicit assumption. It becomes a structural requirement.

Control validation, as used here, does not imply prediction or optimisation. It is not a substitute for political judgment, nor does it resolve substantive disagreements about strategy or priorities. Its function is narrower and more fundamental: to determine whether a given configuration of structures, processes, and responsibilities remains capable of producing authoritative, coherent, and executable decisions under realistic load.

This requirement emerges directly from the dynamics described earlier. When time functions as a dominant constraint, when authority and coherence are interdependent, and when implementation capacity is finite, structural changes alter the system's behaviour in ways that are not always intuitive. Measures intended to strengthen coordination can introduce latency. Efforts to broaden legitimacy can diffuse authorship.

Attempts to accelerate delivery can overload execution pathways. Without validation, these effects become visible only after control has already degraded.

Validation is not about correctness of policy, but about governability of transition. It asks whether proposed changes preserve the minimum conditions under which decisions retain effect. Where those conditions are not met, debates about objectives become secondary, as the system lacks the means to realise them.

Importantly, validation operates independently of institutional form. It does not privilege one organisational model over another, nor does it assume that existing arrangements are either sufficient or deficient. Its relevance lies in its ability to cut across domains—political, institutional, operational—without collapsing them into a single metric. What it evaluates is the interaction between them under pressure.

Validation serves a protective function. It helps prevent well-intentioned reforms from producing unintended losses of agency. It also provides a common reference point in environments where responsibility is distributed and where no single actor has full visibility of system-wide effects.

Control validation therefore does not compete with existing assessment practices. It complements them by addressing a dimension that is often implicit and rarely tested: whether the system, as configured, can still decide and act when conditions are least forgiving.

This completes the analytical arc of the paper. It does not address what Europe should decide next. It frames the conditions under which future decisions—whatever their content—either retain binding force or do not.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Schütz, T., & Mölling, C. (2025). *Managing the Transatlantic Divorce: A roadmap towards a European way of war*. European Policy Centre. https://www.epc.eu/publication/Managing-the-Transatlantic-Divorce-A-roadmap-towards-a-European-way-o-62bd58/