

## COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY; IS IT A RIVAL OR A PARTNER FOR DEFENCE POLICY OF NATO?\*

In the basis of the integration studies which came into in Europe after The World War II., there already laid the searches for the security problem. On this account, before the EEC has been established, in 1950, an interference to institute a European Army under common command, named *Pleven Plan* had begun. The studies that have been made to establish European Defence Community could not have chance to be implemented because of the France Parliament' s veto dated 30 August 1954. In this context, the *Fouchet Plan* (1961-1962) - that can be supposed as a second essay – had also been unsuccessful.<sup>1</sup>

In the progressive periods, in the process that goes from the Community to the Union, anyway the economic integration had been completed and political integration had been unavoidable. At the top of the subjects of the political integration, there was the Common Foreign and Security Policy ( CFSP ), that would make EU the unique sound in the foreign policy and the world.

The gap in the defence area during the European integration process has been tried to be filled by the Treaty of Brussels that has been signed in 1948, between France, England and BENELUX countries. However the founder members who understood the insufficiency of the defence concept that had been formed by the Treaty of Brussels needed to reorganize the treaty. In this context, with the Treaty of Paris, dated October 1954 which reorganized the Treaty of Brussels, Western European Union – WEU had been established. The Text of the Modified Brussels Treaty dated 1954 which had been the basis to the WEU, introduces the common defence concept of Europe. The Article 4 of the Treaty clearly expresses that WEU means a structuring that is dependent to NATO and that foresees a steady cooperation with the organization more than an independent military defence organization identity ( Text of the Modified Brussels Treaty, 1954 ).<sup>2</sup>

However this should also be explained that, WEU could not earn an effective defence organization identity from that date forward it had been established. Despite the comprehensive frame that has been foreseen in the Treaty of Paris, WEU had to survive under the shadow of NATO.

The situation highlights that WEU used to be consistent with NATO until 1984 but from that date forward, it had moved with the aim to be a separate security organization. Especially in the Rome Declaration dated 27 October 1984 those had been emphasized that WEU should commit a more property mission and meet the crisis regions except Europe.

---

\* Prepared by Att. At Law Eda HİLALOĞULLARI – Bursa Bar Association - Bahçeşehir University Law Faculty - EU Public Law and EU Integration Master Program - 2007

<sup>1</sup> ÖZCAN, Dr. Mehmet, “ *EU Foreign and Security Policy* ”, 2004  
<http://www.turkishweekly.net/turkce/makale.php?id=18> ( 07.01.2007 )

<sup>2</sup> ARIKAN, Dr. Harun, “ *The Efforts of the EU to Change the Identity of ‘ Economical Giant – Political Dwarf ’* , EU Common Policies and TURKEY, p. 375, 2003, Beta Edition - İstanbul

Later, the stipulation of the condition of WEU should be strengthened more as the “Europe Wing” of NATO, displays the European State’ s stability to build up a separate security identity.

It stands out that for the European countries which spent the Cold War period under the umbrella of the NATO and acted together with NATO in the mean of security, this period is a preparation term for the studies to build up European Security and Defence Identity.<sup>3</sup>

In this frame, it would be possible to say that Europe that during the Cold War period limited its security requirement in global mean with NATO and in continental mean with WEU lived this period focusing the social – economic and cultural development.

By the end of the Cold War that made its mark on the period after the World War II until the 1990’ s, as in the world also in Europe it had begun to be discussed the requirement to make fundamental changes in the security system.<sup>4</sup> In the new Europe security structuring, the concept change of NATO and the enlargement period, the structures called European Security and Defence Identity and “ Europe Army ” stood in the forefront.

For that period the most organized and experienced structuring over against all these threat components was NATO and also today NATO maintains its effect over the Europe security.

EU had chosen to warrant the security of its region itself after the Cold War and showed it by adding CFSP to its columns in the Treaty of Maastricht, as it was waiting impatiently.<sup>5</sup> About the relations with NATO, there had been behaved delicately however a dream of an independent defence voice had been given on all occasions. The important place of NATO over the Europe security until the post Cold War can not be ignored. Hence the Europe’ s building its own defence system will require great expenses, there had been some hesitations about the approach of the member states to this matter.

EU which declared its wish to build up CFSP by the “ Single European Act ” that came into force in 1987, displayed its seriousness about this matter by the Treaties of Maastricht that had been signed in February 1992 and came into force in 1 November 1993 and Amsterdam<sup>6</sup>. With the thought that a common defence platform may form in the future, WEU had been tried to integrate to the European Union.

---

<sup>3</sup> [www.nato.int/issues/nato-eu/index.html](http://www.nato.int/issues/nato-eu/index.html) - 12k ( 30 December 2006 )

<sup>4</sup> [www.nato.usmission.gov/dossier/NATO\\_EU.asp](http://www.nato.usmission.gov/dossier/NATO_EU.asp) - 10k ( 02 January 2007 )

<sup>5</sup> “ *What is the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU?*”, “ *What is the European Security and Defence Policy?* ”, [www.deltur.cec.eu.int/ab-guvenlik06.html](http://www.deltur.cec.eu.int/ab-guvenlik06.html) ( 04 January 2007 )

<sup>6</sup> ARIKAN, Dr. Harun, “ *The Efforts of the EU to Change the Identity of ‘ Economical Giant – Political Dwarf’* ”, EU Common Policies and TURKEY, p. 379, 2003, Beta Edition - İstanbul

Common Foreign and Security Policy ( CFSP ) that had been legalized with the Treaty of Maastricht in 1993 is in fact not a product of a new understanding. The European states those tried to rebuild themselves from the beginning of 1950' s, attempted to act together in the matter of defence and in this frame in 1952 the six countries that established the European Coal and Steel Community ( ECSC ) had signed the European Defence Community Treaty.

Under the above mentioned information, it will be appropriate to touch on the viewpoints of the Union' s towering countries to the CFSP and how the CFSP discuss in the frame of the Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties.

### **Germany and CFSP**

In 2 October 1991 America Foreign Minister James Baker and his Germany colleague Hans Dietrich Genscher, announced in their common published declaration that NATO is still the most important organization in Europe security by emphasizing that “ NATO will study in the security identity that exists in the unity, with its existing structure that encourages the responsibilities of Europe and comprises the desires of Europe”.<sup>7</sup>

As it is above mentioned, Germany thinks that NATO is the corner stone of Europe Security and a new developing Europe defence system must act together with NATO. In fact we can associate this approach with Germany' s defence budget. Germany that grew rapidly after the merger, will survive as the most important financial source of Europe defence system. Germany that does not want to handle this matter, wants to take the advantage of NATO' s existing benefaction for a long time too.

### **France and CFSP**

To say that France has always been over against USA from a historical point of view will not be wrong. France President of Republic Jacques Chirac' s thought of “ Europe Defence Power will work coordinated with NATO but anyhow will be independent ” proves that. France led the group that defend the opinion “ Europe should have an independent defence system and should break up the monopoly of USA ”.

In fact this attitude of France predicated on times immemorial. Ancient President of Republic Charles de Gaulle used to define most of NATO' s activities and the composed headquarters as an attack to France' s sovereignty. As a result in 1 July 1966, France pulled back from the military wing of NATO and deported the NATO connected forces.

---

<sup>7</sup> Alfred van Staden, ‘After Maastricht: Explaining the Movement towards a Common European Defence Policy’, *European Foreign Policy: EC and Changing Perspectives in Europe*, (Sage Modern Politics Series, London: 1994), s. 153.

Furthermore, France is one of the most important weapon producers of Europe. In this context, France's desire, to use its weapon industry plays a big role in its Anti-American attitude. Europe security system's surviving independent from NATO means for France to have a wide weapon market.<sup>8</sup> With this attitude France departs from Germany. Germany stands with NATO's surviving by adapting the changes. For Germany there is no alternative instead of NATO in the post Cold War Europe security. France Chief of General Staff insisted in 27 May 2001 that EU Active Reaction Force should have its own planning permanent staff independent from NATO.

General Jean-Pierre Kelche declared the different thoughts of France from Germany by saying " France saw that with the reason of the balance of power inside NATO hauled away from USA towards Europe, the military capacity of EU must be increased. "<sup>9</sup>

### **England and CFSP**

In recent years, England acts an attitude that gets closes to the behaviour of France in security matter. In 1998 at the Saint-Malo Summit England laid the foundation of Europe Security and Defence Policy with France. Here, England's part that departs from France again focused on the relations with USA and NATO. England emphasizes on all occasions that Union must act in coordination with USA in security policies. We may say that England in this deadlock will go after different fundamental strategic aims to build 21. century security and defence policy.

USA that had been the insurance of Europe security during the Cold War period intend to continue its hereby feature. By using to the expressions of " By the common security policy that works as a mechanism inside NATO, European allies can generate earnings from NATO common values and capacities " in the near future in a USA Defence Ministry report, the approach of USA to a Europe common defence policy had been displayed.

USA declared his approach<sup>10</sup> about a Europe defence identity that is independent from USA and so NATO by saying that they don't want to see a Europe Defence and Security Identity that forms inside NATO and grows out of NATO and at last that develops away from NATO.

---

<sup>8</sup> AYDOĞAN, Metin, Where are we in the European Union?, Kumsaati Edition, p. 347, 2003-İstanbul

<sup>9</sup> C. Schofield, M. Smith, 'EU Force will not Need NATO, Says French Military Chief', *Daily Telegraph*, 28 March 2001, ss. 1-2.

<sup>10</sup> United States Department of Defence, *Strengthening Transatlantic Security: US Strategy for the 21st Century*, Washington, DC: Department of Defence 2000.

## ■ Maastricht Treaty and CFSP

It is needed to emphasize the two important institutional base and policy priority of the CFSP, those constituted with the Maastricht Treaty. As the primary politic priority, European Union planed on to make the CFSP and the EU diplomacy in the area of foreign politic and security more effective in international system. To constitute a more effective Europe Security and Defence Identity with the mechanism of WEU could be considered as the other policy primary of EU.<sup>11</sup>

As to the article J.1(2) ( new article 11) of the Maastricht Treaty, the targets of CFSP are expressed as below:

- To save the common values, fundamental benefits and independency of the union,
- To strengthen the security of the union and the member states,
- To save the peace and to strengthen the cooperation towards Declaration of the United Nations, the principles of Charter of Paris and the aims of Helsinki Final Charter,
- To develop international cooperation,
- To develop and strengthen the democracy, rule of law and the respect to the human rights and fundamental rights and freedoms (Article J.1(2), Treaty on European Union).

EU Treaty is a treaty that displays the characters and the aims of CFSP. Therefore two new foreign policy instruments called “ common attitude ” and “ common action ” had been dedicated. However the “ unanimity ” principle that takes place in application, renders the partnership in these matters discussable. Only in common action matter in application, the qualified majority had been adopted. Thus, has been received the go ahead on a defence identity that will be constituted ahead had been received.<sup>12</sup>

With Maastricht Treaty, the politic cooperation borders of Europe Politic Cooperation had been crossed and the entrance of the cooperation in the security area into the authorization area of Union had been supplied. With the treaty, a common security policy had been foreseen that comprises all the subjects related to union’ s security including constituting a common defence policy progressively. In other words ESDP had been a part of CFSP. Furthermore, it had been emphasized that WEU is an indispensable part of EU integration period.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> OAKES, Mark, European Defence: From Pörschach to Helsinki, Research Paper 00 / 20, International Affairs and Defence Section, House of Commons Library, London, [www.parliament.uk/common/lib/resarch/rp2000/rp00-020.pdf](http://www.parliament.uk/common/lib/resarch/rp2000/rp00-020.pdf) ( 26 December 2006 )

<sup>12</sup> BİLECEN, Halil, “ EU Common Foreign And Security Policy From The Treaty of Maastricht To The Present Time ”, International Law and the Policy Magazine, Volume 1, Number 1, pp. 8-9, 2005 - İstanbul

<sup>13</sup> ÖZCAN, Dr. Mehmet, “ *EU Foreign and Security Policy* ”, 2004  
<http://www.turkishweekly.net/turkce/makale.php?id=18> ( 07.01.2007 )

The article J4 ( 4 ) of Maastricht Treaty emphasized that hereby policy that will be followed by EU will not effect the original character of some of the member states' security and defence policies however for some members, it should be in consistent with the common security and defence policy that had been determinated in frame of NATO. Furthermore, in WEU Declaration dated 10 December 1991 the relationship between WEU-NATO displayed clearly. In this context, WEU will not be an alternative for NATO but to be an instrument that will strengthen the Europe wing. Thus WEU' s development as the EU' s defence and NATO' s Europe wing had been foreseen. ( Article J. (4) ). In 1992, WEU has confirmed the responsibility of NATO and limited its operations with Petersberg missions.

CFSP that initially displayed with Maastricht had been criticized seriously because of the performance that he showed in the international conflicts happened in Europe and soon its efficiency had started to be discussed.

In this frame, in view of the events that happened in the old Yugoslavia, the ineffectiveness of the Union in the defence policies same as foreign policy and the surviving situation that the union continues to need the international organizations such as NATO, UN for the solutions of the problems displayed the deficiency of the regulations those have been made by Maastricht. On this account, in Amsterdam Treaty there had been important changes about the institutional structuring of CFSP.

#### **Amsterdam Treaty and CFSP**

In 20 century, the end of the crisis that had been lived in the east Europe and the deficiency of EU against this next occasion rendered necessary to make changes in foreign policy. Against the view that the security of EU is in the hands of NATO, against the thin voice of EU during the Yugoslavia crisis caused to discuss where is EU in the foreign policy matter.

France and England came together in Saint-Malo Summit in 4 December 1998 and published a common declaration to implement the principles of the Amsterdam Treaty – that had been signed in 1997 - in European Security and Defence Policy. Here it is emphasized that “ with the aim to respond the international crisis, there is a need to constitute a military supported operational unit having the union' s autonomous action capacity”. Thus, it is possible to say that has been laid the foundation of the ESDP. However it is deliberately behaved and it is expressed that the constituting unit must be in consistent with NATO.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Text of Joint Declaration on European Defence, UK-French Summit, St. Malo, 3-4 December 1998, Paragraph 2

The main aim that had been brought by the Amsterdam Treaty: “In the areas of foreign policy, security and defence, to build common strategic frame and to constitute an effective ESDP independent from the USA controlled NATO.”<sup>15</sup> However the brought novelties - as it had been seen in the before mentioned Yugoslavia crisis- had been deficiency for an effective ESDP. That will not be wrong to say that the Amsterdam Treaty – we said that was a hope – could not bring the novelties that we can call reformal for EU’ s common attitude.

In this frame by considering the changes that had been made by Amsterdam Treaty, it is seen that as in the Maastricht, there had made a rather deliberate regulation and a common European Defence could not be foreseen here too. However this should also be expressed that Amsterdam Treaty for the first time gave authorization to Europe Council to build the common defence.

The foreign policy period that started with the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty continued with 1999 Köln and Helsinki Summits and with Feira, Nice and Laeken Summits this policy lasted with stability.

In Köln Summit, a “ European Military Power ” had tried to be constituted as it will not enter in NATO’ s action area, with the aim of international affair’ s solutions and to intervene to crisis regions. Also it is foreseen that this structuring will act in a way that will contribute international peace and stability.

In Köln Summit, the required participation and cooperation forms in the decisions towards security and defence policy decisions related to constitute European Military Power, had been tried to be determined.

According to this determination, it is possible to analyze EU operations into two categories as the operations that can be realized without appointing NATO’ s opportunities and sources and that NATO’ s necessary talents an be used. The border of the intervention that will be realized on the basis of EU Military Power is the crisis regions those will be in Europe. The regulations that will be in realized commonly with NATO can be based on the decisions that NATO took in 1999 Washington Summit. In the fiftieth year meetings, NATO member EU countries’ expression that EU intends to act independent in security and defence matters and the thought of USA will stay ineffective to prevent Europe Armed Power caused NATO to take in 1999 Washington Summit institutional respects overpowered decisions that both parties would accept.

In EU Helsinki Summit that realized in 10–11 December 1999, in consideration of the decisions taken faced discussions related to “ crisis management ” in frame of common security and defence policy. It is decided that a security unit will be constituted that will be able to intervene crisis regions representing EU, in case NATO is not totally a part.

---

<sup>15</sup> ARIKAN, Dr. Harun, “ *The Efforts of the EU to Change the Identity of ‘ Economical Giant – Political Dwarf’* , EU Common Policies and TURKEY, 2003, Beta Edition - İstanbul

As to the said decision the configure of a military force that will be constituted until 2003, would be ready in 60 days and would stay on duty for one year, be composed of 50–60 thousand people had foreseen and the aim of this security unit had been determined as fulfilling the Petersberg Missions. Furthermore the EU' s will to use NATO opportunity and talents for the construction of this form, has caused a difficult problem that even today it is not simple to be solved. However the conspicuous matters are, emphasizing that the constituting military unit that will fulfill the Petersberg missions in Helsinki Final Charter should be sensed as “ European Army ” and indicating that NATO as a component that could correspond the security needs in Continental Europe.<sup>16</sup>

With the dissolution of the system that gained NATO “ legitimization and function ”, the future of an on paper maintaining partnership' s pragmatism had been discussed. As a result, the will to preclude USA from Europe' s new security architecture, increased the different benefit perceptions between the old partnerships.

In EU Council Summit that has been realized in Nice new decisions had been taken to render the CFSP aims more applicable. The integration of WEU with EU had been realized. Furthermore in this Summit, in accordance with the before taken decisions in Feira Summit, new regulations about contribution and participation of the NATO member states which are not EU member and EU candidate states into the military operations that will constitute in leadership of EU, have been accepted.<sup>17</sup>

In brief, in frame of the development realized post-Maastricht and in the Europe integration period it can be alleged that EU had realized important developments in constituting a NATO independent Europe Security and Defence Policy. The period that started with the Europe Defence Community had been legalized into the legal basis and in accordance with the decisions taken in Saint-Malo Declaration, Köln, Helsinki, Feira, Nice and Copenhagen Summits, particular principle, aim and institutional structuring had been constituted. According to that it is possible to say that EU, with ESDP – even limited – constituted a NATO independent military force.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> OJANEN, Hanna, “ *The EU and NATO: Two Competing Models for a Common Defence Policy* ”, JCMS 2006, Volume 44, Number 1. pp. 57–76

<sup>17</sup> European Council, Presidency Conclusions, Nice 7 – 9 December 2000, Annex VI: Presidency Report on the European Security and Defence Policy

<sup>18</sup> ARIKAN, Dr. Harun, “ *The Efforts of the EU to Change the Identity of ‘ Economical Giant – Political Dwarf’* ”, EU Common Policies and TURKEY, p. 383, 2003, Beta Edition - İstanbul

## Conclusion

Despite a more powerful Europe policy is rather popular between Europe governments and people, the most important question; if this development will be as a supplemental component to NATO or as a rival for NATO is still unanswered. The cultural difference in two shores of Atlantic complicates a supplemental partnership between European Union and NATO ever and anon. However, after the dissociations those displayed when the forces leading USA occupied Iraq in 2003, four partnerships ( Germany, France, Belgium and Luxemburg ) except Brussels discussed seriously about constituting an autonomous EU military headquarter in Tervuren, this is also a clear indication.<sup>19</sup>

Theoretically, could be expressed that there is not any necessity for NATO and European Union be rivals. In this frame, NATO should stay as a fundamental entity that its members built over their collective defence; the talents of the European Union should be more developed as it will contribute European' s self security.

This should also be expressed that EU is rather willing to constitute CFSP especially in recent ten years. However, both the Yugoslavia sample both Iraq Crisis showed that the steps taken in this matter have serious deficiency. It seems that the problem in the matter of representing a common attitude will continue with the new members.

In this frame, the dissociation that EU – who has an allegation to be a global actor - had displayed in Iraq Crisis shows how deficiency is it in the matter of CFSP. New members could not be adapted to the union. For the new members' - that almost acted independent and were on the USA side - adaptation to the Union, the required legal regulations have not been succeeded and the deficiencies in this matter have been corresponded.<sup>20</sup>

EU as a Union that has almost 30 members – with the new members – it has a vital importance for to determine a common foreign policy for the future of the Union. However with the today-existing structure does not seem possible to take the authorities from the national capitals in middle term.<sup>21</sup> In this context, could be said that, EU will be in a view of “ quiet ” and “ unarmed ” Super Union for a long time.

---

<sup>19</sup> PONSARD, Leonel, “ *A New Age in Defence Policy* ”, <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2004/issue3/art3.html> ( 07 January 2007 )

<sup>20</sup> BİLECEN, Halil, “ EU Common Foreign And Security Policy From The Treaty of Maastricht To The Present Time ”, *International Law and the Policy Magazine*, Volume 1, No 1, p. 18, 2005 - İstanbul

<sup>21</sup> BİLECEN, Halil, “ EU Common Foreign And Security Policy From The Treaty of Maastricht To The Present Time ”, *International Law and the Policy Magazine*, Volume 1, No 1, p. 18, 2005 - İstanbul