



European Security, European Defence

Mike Redgrave
michael.redgrave@port.ac.uk



The Transatlantic Connection

'After the war with Europe weak and demoralized, America became its supranational government in military matters. The President of Europe lived in Washington'

Calleo (1967, p.139)

Calleo, D.P. (1967) *Europe's Future: The Grand Alternatives.*

The Transatlantic Connection

- NATO created in 1949
- Binds the US to the (collective) defence and the security of Western Europe
- Presidential Consensus



How do you solve a problem like the Donald?

- NATO's existence – as it stands – brought into question by Trump
- Interview in New York Times (21/7/16)
http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/22/us/politics/donald-trump-foreign-policy-interview.html?_r=1
- Europeans must pay more or the US might quit the organisation
- Consequences?

US-Russian Relations

- Defined first by the Soviet Cold War era
- Re-defined by the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of Soviet communism
- And re-defined again by the emergence and the leadership of Putin





US-Russian Relations

- Hard to predict in the future
- Putin is confident he can mislead and outmanoeuvre a Trump presidency
- Heartened by Trump's statements over NATO
- And any further fracturing between Washington and Europe



Where does this leave Europe?

- The picture post Brexit – when and if it does finally occur (and the triumph of Trump)
- Continuing political upheavals and uncertainties undermine any unified approach
- Currently, talk of renewing European security cooperation
- France and Germany in the lead

Reviving Military Cooperation

EU Foreign Policy Chief

Frederica Mogherini

Proposed the setting-up of a new HQ in Brussels

Facilitate “battlegroup” operations to mount military interventions in specific crisis scenarios

Suggested UK exit would re-energise initiatives and policies left mostly dormant from the late 1990s

A federalist objective





Antecedents

- ❖ The concept of an autonomous European force is hardly new
- ❖ Dates back to the years immediately after the end of WW2
- ❖ But the existence of NATO and the wider relationship between the US and Europe has been one of the barriers in its way
- ❖ Amongst others

Early, failed attempts

- ✓ 1948: Brussels Pact – formation of WEU comprising UK, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg

Provided an impetus for creation of NATO

Two failures – both dedicated to common defence:

- ❑ Pleven Plan: early 1950s – foundations of a European Defence Community (EDC)



- ❑ Fouchet Plan (early 1960s)





Pleven Plan

- Did not win crucial support of the British
- Came on the heels of the creation of NATO
- Looked to contain, manage and even direct any West German re-militarization
- Failed to win vital endorsement of France's National assembly



Fouchet Plan

- Seen as an attempt to capture European defence by France
- Perceived as a political strategy hatched by de Gaulle to largely further France's national interests
- Other members of the original six reject, especially with the UK on the outside

EPC

- European Political Cooperation (EPC) 1970, first attempt to coordinate a European foreign policy
- Enjoyed mixed, limited success
- Foreign policy remained largely an issue of sovereignty
- Crucially, did not include any provision for cooperation of security and defence

CFSP

A European project

- Maastricht: Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) inspired largely by Kohl and Mitterrand
- One purpose: to deepen integration
- Key objective: to become a truly international actor

CFSP

- The Treaty states that 'The common foreign and security policy shall include all questions relating to the security of the Union, including the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time lead to a common defence'



International environment

- Early 1990s – end of Cold War era
 - Disintegration of the Soviet Union
 - Liberation of Soviet ‘satellites’
 - Implosion of FRY and ethnic conflicts in the Balkans
 - The formalisation of the European Union
 - Awareness of new range of risks and threats
- Requires ‘new European security architecture’ one in which the EU must determine its role
- Systemic necessities



EU as a security actor

- EU needed to define and create means by which it could fulfil a variety of security requirements
- How would it achieve this?
- As a part of NATO (ESDI)?
- Or as a distinct entity in its own right but on what terms?
- And as a reflection of whose interests?

Amsterdam Summit

June 1997 Amsterdam Summit incorporates the 'Petersberg Tasks' into the CFSP.

Petersberg Tasks:

- humanitarian and rescue tasks
- peace-keeping tasks
- tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking



Anglo-French Cooperation

December 1998 St Malo Declaration - UK and France agree that the EU must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces. This move effectively ended the UK's historic opposition to militarising the EC/EU. Desire to build a Common European and Security Defence Policy (CESDP)

Developments

June 1999 Cologne Summit - The European Council adopts a declaration on strengthening a common position on European security and defence, provides for new political and military bodies to be set-up.

December 1999 Helsinki Summit - Establishes a military 'headline goal': Member-states to be able, by 2003, to deploy forces of 50,000-60,000 within a 60 day period and sustain operational capability for at least one year. This force becomes known as the ERRF (European Rapid Reaction Force).

These moves triggered some American concerns, with NATO seen as being at least partially threatened by events.

Developments

December 2000 Nice Summit

- Efforts to continue the momentum on building commonality on security and defence issues are matched by efforts to mollify the US.
- The EU's security and defence policy was institutionalised for the first time and recognised in Article 25 of the Treaty of Nice
- Strong emphasis is placed upon the role of a new body: the Political and Security Committee (PSC)
- The European Union Military Committee (EUMC) and the European Union Military Staff (EUMS) are strengthened

Developments

- Nice produces a statement which says that the EU will only act 'where NATO as a whole is not engaged'
- Statement reflects UK concerns in particular
- If this meant that NATO could not wield a veto on EU military operations, it also maintained an important principle: that NATO had the first right of refusal to act militarily.

The 9/11 effect

The 9/11 Effect

- The Belgium Presidency, the Commission President and even the High Representative were largely sidelined
- Blair, Chirac and Schroeder (the informal directorate at the heart of European foreign and security policy) held one separate meeting and tried to hold another much to the displeasure of other EU leaders
- British start to cool enthusiasm over CESDP
- Britain speaks for itself in terms of being 'shoulder to shoulder' with US

The Iraq issue

Analysing the flaws: CESDP (and CFSP) with reference to Iraq

- Reveals massive disparities in approach between EU members
- Starkly illustrates structural failings and weaknesses in CFSP/CESDP – no in-built mechanisms to promote absolute commonality
- Likely to be affected by enlargement – the Eastern Europeans deeply Atlantacist
- Not helped by US administration – talk of a ‘new Europe’ supplanting an ‘old Europe’
- Made CESDP as both a political and military project look extremely vulnerable



Developments Post Iraq

- The development of a European Security Strategy (ESS)
- Attempt to define a particularly European (EU) approach and identity
- Additional goal: to heal the rifts from the Iraq war



Problems and Barriers

- Pre-Brexit, UK's tendency to offer unconditional support to the US –

What happens now?

- Added to which, the stance of the Eastern Europeans
 - Resistance to militarism as a solution to major problems
 - Compounded by the massive economic downturn of recent years



Conclusions

- For some seventy or so years key matters of European defence and security have tied-in US interests
- US guarantor of peace
- A Trump presidency threatens that position and the US role
- A British foreign policy that alienates itself from European objectives is another major imponderable