

## THE EVOLUTION OF THE EUROPEAN SECURITY DEFENCE POLICY (ESDP) IN THE CONTEXT OF THE DYNAMIC GLOBAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

Ovidiu MOȘOIU\*, Gabriel-Florin MOISESCU\*, Mihai VIȚALARIU\*

\*“Henri Coanda” Air Force Academy, Brasov, Romania

**Abstract:** *The ESDP allows the EU to develop military and civilian crisis management and conflict prevention capabilities at international level, helping to maintain peace and security under the Charter of the United Nations, according to its economic and demographic strength. In fact, the ESDP has not involved the creation of a European army, but it has evolved in a consistent and coordinated manner with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Instead, a consensus can be reached between the member states, by the content of the Treaties, which could gradually lead to the emergence of a common defense, including a common European army, this being stipulated in the latest EU Treaty of Lisbon.*

**Keywords:** *ESDP, EU Treaties, mission, security, defense, strategy.*

### 1. COVERAGE OF CFSP / ESDP IN THE EUROPEAN UNION TREATIES

With the adoption of the *Treaty of Maastricht* (February 1992) and the creation of the European Union, the European security and defense dimension has developed more pronounced features. The institutional transformation that the European Economic Community has been through by the new treaty allowed the EU to assume the Common Foreign and Security Policy - CFSP (pillar II), which also included „a potential framework for a common defense policy” that „would have lead in time to common defense”. For the first time since the end of the Second World War, the European security and defense dimension qualified for a legal framework that would allow institutional development. Under these auspices, the Western European Union (WEU) became part of the EU development, being actually, the main instrument for implementing decisions and actions with defence implications.

Soon after the adoption of the Treaty of Maastricht, the foreign and defense ministers of WEU were meeting in Germany, in Bonn (June 1992, Petersberg Hotel), to analyze how the organization will be responsible for the

Treaty. The Declaration adopted on that occasion stated that the range of tasks which the WEU would meet: humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping missions and tasks for combat forces during the course of crisis management operations (later known as the *Petersberg tasks*). Following this decision, the WEU was involved in the next period in a series of missions such as: the monitoring mission embargo against Yugoslavia (1993 - on the Adriatic Sea and on the Danube), the support for the EU Administration Mission in Mostar - 1995; the contribution to the police training mission in Albania MAPE - 1999-2001; the demining assistance mission in Croatia - 1999-2001.

*The Treaty of Amsterdam*, adopted in 1997, brings new dimensions to the Common Foreign and Security Policy. Thus was created the post of High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy, and the European Council have gained increased competence in defining strategic guidelines on security and defence. At the same time, the Treaty of Amsterdam included the status of the EU as beneficiary of the WEU capacity (compared with the preceding provisions which regarded the EU to appeal to the assets and capabilities of the WEU). Consequently, the EU took over the Petersberg

tasks that were included in the Treaty, thereby expanding the size of the Security and Defence at the level of the Union.

The tragic events held in the Balkans have reiterated the need to assume a much more assertive role by the EU in managing security issues in Europe, including the perspective of developing the European defence capabilities. In this context, during the *Franco-British summit at Saint-Malo (December 1998)*, both states have decided to launch an initiative designed to strengthen the EU profile on security and defence. In these circumstances, for the first time, the Joint Declaration on European Defense, adopted by the two heads of state at St. Malo, clearly outlined the need for the European Union „to have the capacity for autonomous action, backed by credible military forces, by means of deciding their use and by the necessary training in order to respond to the international crises”. It also provided that „the Union would create the appropriate structures, the ability to analyze situations, the sources of intelligence and the capacity for its own strategic planning”. Escalation of the crisis in Kosovo has created preconditions for *Europeanizing* the bilateral Franco-British initiative, the German Presidency of the EU Council taking responsibility for its implementation in the European Union.

This approach has managed to capture the support of EU Member States in order to create a consolidated security and defence dimension of the Union. In this meaning *the European Council in June 1999, which took place in Cologne (Köln)*, adopted the political platform of action so that “the European Union would have the ability to conduct autonomous action, backed by credible military forces, appropriate decision tools and availability of using them in order to respond to international crises without prejudice to NATO”. To achieve this goal there were adopted several measures regarding the EU institutional adaptation such as: the nomination of J. Solana to the post of High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy and General Secretary of the EU Council; the creation of structures responsible for managing the EU security and defence issues - Political and Security Committee - PSC, Military Committee (EUMC) and Military Staff

(EUMS); regulation of the consultation system by conducting regular meetings of the EU General Affairs Council.

## 2. HELSINKI HEADLINE GOAL - THE MILITARY COMPONENT OF ESDP

Decisions adopted by the European Council in Cologne, *marked the practical beginning of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)*, institutional developed as part of the EU Pillar II - Common Foreign and Security Policy. Under these auspices, the Finnish Presidency of the EU Council (July-December 1999) has claimed responsibility for the structured development of ESDP. In this respect, *the European Council in Helsinki (December 1999) adopted the overall objective of ESDP - Helsinki Headline Goal (HG 2003)* which aimed at making for the EU a set of forces and capabilities to enable the Union to conduct Petersberg missions. From this perspective, Member States committed themselves to create, by 2003, an EU Rapid Reaction Force (corps level, military forces which can achieve the level of 15 brigades, around 50-60.000 people, equipped with C2, logistics, combat support, naval and air elements), capable of deployment within 60 days, and being able to be maintained in the theater for at least a year.

In essence, the ESDP involves developing an autonomous decision-making capability, and where NATO as a whole is not engaged, launching and coordinating military operations under the authority of the EU, as response to crisis situations, the employment of resources by Member States to such operations based on sovereign decisions. The latter view outlines that the ESDP is an intergovernmental process, ESDP political control being exercised by the heads of state and by the government of the member states, and the financial control being exercised by national parliaments.

Since the European Council meeting in Helsinki, there has also been addressed the issue of the EU institutional capacity to facilitate the decision-making process, this leading to an agreement regarding the establishment of permanent political and military bodies like - the Political and Security Committee, the Military Committee and Military Staff.

In late 2000, the French Presidency of the EU Council organized the first Conference of Commitment to meet Helsinki Headline Goal, which later developed the first EU Force Catalogue, including offers made available by the member states. Following the analysis of the EU members commitments made by the Military Staff, it was revealed that, in quantitative terms, the necessary forces was covered, however, existing shortcomings in various areas such as strategic air transportation, C3I, information and others. To address these issues, in November 2001 was launched a new initiative - *the European Action Plan Capacity (ECAP)*. The working philosophy of ECAP process was based on assuming greater responsibilities by the member states, by coordinating the activity of some analysis mini-structures (panels, developed now into project groups - PG) whose objective was to provide solutions to eliminate deficiencies. Following the ECAP evaluations, in May 2003, there was held a new Conference of Commitment where member states were required to structure their commitments by running specific programs, focusing on areas identified as deficient.

Simultaneously, the European Council in Nice (December 2000) adopted new measures in terms of the ESDP institutional development by integrating masse structures and functions of WEU in the European Union. There were also established the principles underlying the institutionalization of cooperation mechanisms in defence and security with third countries but also with other international bodies like NATO and the UN.

The tragic events of the 11<sup>th</sup> of September 2001 have also influenced the wording of the EU response to such threats. In this sense the European Council in Seville (June 2002) decided to extend the range of Petersberg tasks in order to include the combating terrorism. At the same time, the EU-NATO relationship has become an institutionalized identity through the adoption of the NATO-EU agreements, in December 2002, in Copenhagen, regarding the EU access to NATO assets and capabilities, other than national ones, to conduct operations under the leadership of the Union. Known as the „*Berlin plus*” *Agreements*, they provided: guaranteed access of the EU to NATO’s planning

capabilities, to conduct an operation; the presumption of availability for the EU to NATO's collective capabilities and resources; the identification of the European Command options for DSACEUR during the running of an EU operation with recourse to NATO assets and capabilities.

The conclusion of such arrangements permitted, in March 2003, the launch of the first EU military operation - Concordia (FYROM) and then the post-SFOR operation, Althea, in Bosnia-Herzegovina (December 2004).

*The strategy of European security*, drawn up by the high representative of ESDP, Javier Solana, the document guidelines the strategy of internal and international security of the European Union. Known under the name of „*A safe Europe in a better world*”, the strategy has been approved, in 12 December 2003, by the European Council in Brussels. Regarded by many specialists as a response to National Security Strategy of the United States in September 2002, the document says, to ensure an European effective security, in a world in which more than covered by the globalization processes, is urgently needed the existence of close cooperation both within Europe and beyond it, because „*no nation is capable of coping with the complex challenges of our days*”. Appearance of challenges is punctual, strategy identifying as major threats to address Europe: terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; regional conflicts; waned states; organized crime.

The European Union will act to ensure the safety and actively promoting their own values, by: expanding area of security in the vicinity Europe; strengthening international order; adoption of appropriate responses to the outlined threats. We can say that ESDP has been defined and developed on the fundamentals of challenges and threats (as) valued at the early '90. But, from that moment, many concepts in the field of security have changed. After 11 September 2001, major threats addressed to security are no longer defined in Europe after the conflict criteria between states or ethnic groups, but the global insecurity level, where risks are showing much more difficult to define, identifiable, such as those related to international terrorist

organizations, use weapons of mass destruction, etc. They may cause mutations, deviations from the traditional sense of crisis management missions.

Moreover, the draft of EU Constitution is not broadening the area missions of "Petersburg" type, the remaining humanitarian missions concentrated in the area aimed at avoiding emergence of regional conflicts. Proposals to add the operations of disarming and military guidance, for conflict prevention and the post-conflict stabilizing seem rather clarifications brought missions of „Petersburg" type, and not an extension of them. Also, plans promoted during the Spanish presidency for the reconfiguration of ESDP have been disputed, repeatedly, both by Great Britain, and the other members, in which opinion the fight against terrorism must continue to remain a NATO responsibility. Thus, counter terrorism has not been added to „Petersburg" type missions, but was drawn up a passage in the Constitution, under which the mission of this type „*can contribute to the fight against terrorism*".

As is clear from the European security strategy, the Union does not want to use military force against terrorism, as preventive action to end. EU acted more in favor of flexibility, which would allow some small groups of military operations to lead the fight ad hoc and effective. Appearance of flexibility has led to the idea of a structured cooperation between members, according to military capabilities each with their suitability for missions to be fulfilled. Applying this principle, has led to creation groups of struggle (battle groups), operational in 2007 (showing similarities with NATO response force), to serve as stimulus and model for the EU members which are in the process of development of their capabilities.

According to their mandate transmitted through the security strategy, member states have decided, the European Council in June 2004, adopting a new approach as regards the development process of European capabilities in security and defense. From this perspective, the overall objective was adopted by the new EU (Headline Goal 2010 - *HG 2010*) aimed at EU steps focusing on improving quality of defense capabilities, and adaptation to the requirements through security strategy.

In a concrete way, *HG 2010* covers:

- growth of interoperability of the forces EU has available, also the consolidation of dislocation capacities and the support of them;
- broadening spectrum of missions that EU will perform in spirit with the security strategy to include some types new operations such as disarming, assistance to member countries in combating terrorism and reform the security sector;
- develop the capabilities of rapid reaction force (*battle groups*) of the EU, also on the decision-making plateau (Objective that the decision to launch an operation can be taken within 5 days), as well as how to deploy in the theatre (maximum 10 days from adoption of the decision).

ESDP also includes, in accordance with the decision of the European Council meeting in Santa Maria da Feira, the creation by 2008 (the objective having 2010 as horizon), a civilian rapid reaction force made up of some 5,000 police officers, which be able to carry 1,000 of them within 30 days, for crisis management activities in areas such as policing, humanitarian aid, restoration of service of administrative and legal structures, activities search - rescue, monitoring elections, human rights, etc.. Activity institutionalization in the area of prevention of conflicts, consolidating peace and internal stability of states, areas or regions in crisis or at risk of seizures was made by, before the summit in Feira, the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management as a fourth permanent body of ESDP. Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management submits information, recommendations and opinions Political and Security Committee.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we can state that since its creation, in 1999, the ESDP has made important and unexpected progress, establishing itself as an irrefutable reality of the European integration process. The way ahead still remains long and tortuous. Nowadays, the debate on the future development of ESDP involves numerous stakes like: the problem of coherence between civil and military means, the relationship between ESDP

and NATO, the issue of democratic control of the European Parliament, the issue of financing the ESDP, the issue of the EU military capabilities and of the national defense budgets. In reality, these stakes turn back to a substantive issue, this being in fact quite simple, regarding the quality of the European defense integration and of the foreign policy.

Once the ESDP was created, the question of its relationship with NATO has turned to be particularly acute for a number of reasons. Among those are: the clear definition of the European states intervention frame, more exactly under NATO or outside NATO; the rigorous establishing of the value added by ESDP in relation with NATO.

The European Security and Defense Policy seek above all to promote greater complementarily and better coordination between different national defense policies in order to avoid duplication of functions at European level.

The promotion of a restructure of the military budgets of the member states, the rationalization of the existing resources, a better coordination in terms of equipment, a timid opening of the defense markets represent important objectives of the ESDP. In fact, such ambitions are aimed at strengthening military capabilities, today

too fragmented, and at encouraging greater investment in defense.

## REFERENCES

1. Maastricht Treaty;
2. Amsterdam Treaty;
3. Bianchini, S., *Problema Iugoslavă*, Editura BIC ALL, București, 2003, pp.177-179;
4. Concluziile președinției Consiliului European în declarația privind întărirea PESA, [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/kol2\\_en.htm#an3](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/kol2_en.htm#an3);
5. Berlin plus agreements, [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004\\_2009/documents/dv/berlinplus\\_/berlinplus\\_en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/dv/berlinplus_/berlinplus_en.pdf);
6. European Security Strategy, <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/eudocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf>;
7. Guvernul României, Departamentul pentru integrare euroatlantică și politică de apărare - "Politica europeană de securitate și apărare", București, 2006;
8. Anghel, P., *Instituțiile europene și tehnici de negociere în procesul integrării*, București 2005;
9. Headline Goal 2010, <http://www.Consilium.europa.eu/eudocs/cmsUpload/2010%20Headline%20Goal>.