

## Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

## Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES

CSC 27

EXERCICE / EXERCISE NEW HORIZONS

**THE EVOLUTION OF A EUROPEAN SECURITY IDENTITY:**  
**IMPLICATIONS FOR CANADA**

By

Lieutenant-Commander Christopher Richards

April 2001

*This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.*

*La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.*

THE EVOLUTION OF A EUROPEAN SECURITY IDENTITY:  
IMPLICATIONS FOR CANADA

ABSTRACT / RÉSUMÉ

This paper addresses the implications to Canada of the evolving European progress to develop a common defence capability. The author reviews the evolution of this progress, focussing on the emerging European Security and Defence Identity within NATO and the Common European Security and Defence Policy within the European Union. The author shows that while these potentially divergent initiatives are intended to enhance European defence capabilities, they may also adversely affect the effectiveness and preeminence of NATO and the viability of the transatlantic link. The author illustrates how Canada may be affected by these evolving European developments and provides a range of measures that may be taken to mitigate the potential consequences to Canada.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the Cold War, European defence was provided through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization<sup>1</sup> (NATO). The end of the Cold War, however, initiated an examination of the validity of NATO and the context in which it operated. This change in the strategic environment heralded new opportunities and new risks.<sup>2</sup> While Europe has adopted a path to greater integration in security and defence, NATO has maintained the obligation to collective defence and the reinforcement of the transatlantic link. NATO has also developed a political role, including increased political and military partnerships, cooperation and dialogue with other

---

<sup>1</sup> The North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington in April 1949, created the NATO Alliance for collective defence as defined in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The Treaty is of infinite duration and now links 17 European countries, the United States and Canada.

<sup>2</sup> Changes in the Euro-Atlantic strategic landscape were reflected in NATO's 1991 Strategic Concept.

states, including Russia, Ukraine and Mediterranean Dialogue<sup>3</sup> countries, and a continued openness to the future accession of new members. During the 1990s, a number of arrangements were also introduced to facilitate joint collaboration and initiatives between NATO, the Western European Union<sup>4</sup> (WEU) and the European Union<sup>5</sup> (EU). These arrangements facilitated the opportunity for the European allies to assume greater responsibilities for defence, including the development of the European Security and Defence Identity<sup>6</sup> (ESDI) within the NATO Alliance.

The idea of a common defence capability within Europe was introduced as part of the Treaty on European Union<sup>7</sup> in 1992. Since that time, the EU has been taking important decisions in its efforts to strengthen its security and defence dimension. One decision is the development

---

<sup>3</sup> The Mediterranean Dialogue is an integral part of the Alliance's cooperative approach to security and is based on the recognition that security in the whole of Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean region. The Dialogue was launched in 1994. Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia initially joined the Dialogue. Algeria became a participant in February 2000. The Dialogue is aimed at creating good relations and better mutual understanding throughout the Mediterranean, as well as promoting regional security and stability. It provides for political discussions with the participating countries.

of a Common Foreign and Security Policy<sup>8</sup> (CFSP) within the EU that includes the framing of a common defence policy. The extent to which the CFSP will be integrated with the ESDI and the role of the United States in future European security arrangements has yet to be determined. While the importance of the US to European security is traditionally assumed mutually beneficial, the advantages and extent of future US involvement is a matter of disagreement between European Governments.

The development of an enhanced European defence capability is presently evolving within two separate and distinct contexts. On one hand, European defence is being enhanced through the ESDI to allow for greater European autonomy within NATO and to make a more effective military contribution to the NATO Alliance and its missions. On the other hand, a defence capability is also being developed as the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) within the EU. There is a concern that this evolving capability will undermine the effectiveness and preeminence of NATO and the viability of the transatlantic link. This potential evolution, away from a Euro-Atlantic approach to defence to a more focussed European approach, has significant consequences for NATO and NATO member countries. It is clear that the development of both ESDI and ESDP will directly affect European nations. Canada, as neither a European member of NATO nor a member of the EU, will also be affected by these evolving developments. Canada's interests, however, favour the strengthening of the NATO Alliance through the development of a European military capability that promotes the continuing importance of NATO and its transatlantic link.

---

<sup>8</sup> The CFSP is the 'Second Pillar' of the EU. The Treaty on European Union Pillars of Intergovernmental Cooperation are the European Community, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Justice and Home Affairs (JHA).

This paper will highlight aspects of the evolving ESDI and ESDP issues and will illustrate that these initiatives have potential consequences for Canada. An overview of European post-Cold War progress towards a common defence capability, the divergent evolution of ESDI and ESDP and the potential consequences for NATO will be discussed. While the development of a common European defence capability will directly affect European nations, this paper will illustrate that the concurrent evolution and development of the ESDI and ESDP initiatives will also have potential implications for Canada.

#### EUROPEAN PROGRESS TO DEVELOP A COMMON DEFENCE CAPABILITY

Advancement towards European economic and political union has been, and continues to be, an ongoing and evolving process. A plan for a European Defence Community (EDC) began in the 1950s and continued through to the development of the CFSP in the 1990s. Since the end of the Cold War, the strengthening of European security and defence has progressed rapidly, being a focus of effort in both NATO and the EU.

In 1991, the member states of the European Community decided that the Treaty on European Union, also known as the Maastricht Treaty, should establish a CFSP. As such, when the Treaty was signed on 7 February 1992, it included “the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time lead to a common defence.”<sup>9</sup> It also established a functional relationship between the WEU and the EU. On 19 June 1992 at Petersberg near Bonn, WEU Foreign and Defence Ministers considered the implementation of the Maastricht Declarations

---

<sup>9</sup> Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty), Maastricht Germany Art. J4, para 1.

and took a major step forward in defining the WEU's operational role. The WEU member states declared their preparedness to “make available military units from the whole spectrum of their conventional armed forces for military tasks conducted under the authority of WEU”.<sup>10</sup> The types of military tasks were defined for military units of WEU member states, and included “humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.”<sup>11</sup> Missions of this kind are now referred to as ‘Petersberg Tasks’.

A subsequent milestone was accomplished at the January 1994 NATO Summit in Brussels. At the Summit, NATO gave its support for the development of the ESDI and expressed its willingness to make Alliance assets and capabilities available for WEU operations. This measure opened the way to a significant reinforcement of the WEU's operational capabilities including the introduction of “separable but not separate capabilities” for WEU-led operations.<sup>12</sup> These initiatives were aimed to make a more coherent and effective contribution to Alliance missions and activities, to reinforce the transatlantic partnership and to allow European allies to act by themselves as required.

---

<sup>10</sup> Western European Union Council of Ministers Petersberg Declaration (Bonn, 19 June 1992) Section II para 2.

<sup>11</sup> Petersberg Declaration, Section II para 4.

<sup>12</sup> NATO Press Communiqué M-1(94)3 11 January 1994, paragraph 6. Declaration of the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 10-11 January 1994.

In June 1996, the NATO Foreign and Defence Ministers met in Berlin and Brussels respectively and agreed “to build a European Security and Defence Identity within NATO”.<sup>13</sup> The Berlin decisions led to the preliminary establishment of arrangements between NATO and the WEU to make use of NATO assets and capabilities for possible operations under the WEU’s political control and strategic direction. The subsequent 1997 Amsterdam Treaty established the WEU’s capacity to provide the EU with access to an operational capability. This Treaty, ratified in May 1999, called for enhanced EU-WEU cooperation. It also referred to the possibility of integrating the WEU into the EU. Notwithstanding these bi-institutional arrangements, the focus of an operational defence capability started to shift away from the WEU after the December 1998 Saint Malo Summit between the British and the French. The two governments declared their intention to strengthen the EU’s credibility and to improve European defence capabilities within the framework of the EU.

The decisions at the April 1999 NATO Summit in Washington and at the later Cologne European Council meeting in June 1999 prepared the way for a direct EU-NATO relationship. NATO stated its readiness to support the European Union; in particular by defining and adopting the necessary arrangements for ready access of NATO assets and capabilities by the EU. The decision was aimed to “enable European Allies to make a more coherent and effective contribution to the missions and activities of the Alliance as an expression of shared responsibilities; to reinforce the transatlantic link; to assist the European Allies to act by themselves as required through the readiness of the Alliance, on a case-by-case basis and by

---

<sup>13</sup> NATO Press Communiqué M-NAC(DM)-2(96)89 13 June 1996. Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Defence Ministers Session, Brussels. (Referring to the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Berlin, 3 June 1996).



consensus.”<sup>14</sup> The collective assets and capabilities of the Alliance would be made available for operations “where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged”.<sup>15</sup> In Cologne, the European Council launched the Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP) to be developed in conjunction with the CFSP. Commonly referred to as ESDP, it committed itself to ensuring that it has at its disposal the capabilities needed to take decisions on the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks. It referred to two kinds of operations: EU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities, and EU-led operations without access to NATO assets and capabilities. The introduction of ESDP also assumed that many of the functions of the WEU would be transferred to the EU including the crisis management role of the WEU as detailed in the Petersberg Tasks. In December 1999, this expectation was confirmed at the EU Helsinki Summit. The European Council attempted to establish the crisis management function of the EU and decided that political and military structures and a rapid reaction force would have to be introduced by 2003. Subsequent meetings and summits have further defined the framework of these agreements and the modalities through which they will be implemented.

## EVOLUTION IN TWO CONTEXTS

The end of the Cold War brought about both idealistic and pragmatic visions for NATO and European security. The United States had a clear and well-developed vision of NATO’s position within the ‘new world order’. It involved both the politicization of NATO, by turning it into the main institutional forum for East-West dialogue, and the extension of NATO’s area of influence. France’s vision favoured developing the WEU as an autonomous arm of the EU that

---

<sup>14</sup> The Alliance’s Strategic Concept, Part III para 30. The Strategic Concept was approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. 23-24 April 1999.

<sup>15</sup> NATO Press Release NAC-S(99)64 24 April 1999. Washington Summit Communiqué Parts 9 and 10.

would increasingly assume responsibility for European security.<sup>16</sup> The development of ESDI as a solid European pillar to introduce greater balance into transatlantic relations was at the center of French foreign policy. Although this initiative was promoted to reinforce NATO as a whole, France's preoccupation with the creation of ESDI gave the impression that the actual agenda was a form of European autonomy. At the other end of the scale was the argument as to whether NATO had any future at all.

After the Kosovo air campaign, the EU realized the extent of its reliance on the US military and its subjection to US strategic whims.<sup>17</sup> The lessons of Kosovo illustrated that the European members of NATO had an urgent need to progress from their dependency on Washington. Former US Secretary of Defence William Cohen reinforced this view when he observed that, "although its combined defence spending approached 60% of that of the US, Kosovo showed Europe could only deploy forces equal to approximately 10% of what the US could manage."<sup>18</sup> While the Kosovo air campaign highlighted the inadequacies of the Europeans' fighting forces, it also generated criticism of US unwillingness to share information or to let European governments take part in decision making.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Jolyon Howorth, "French Defence Reforms: National Tactics for a European Strategy," Brassey's Defence Yearbook 1998, (London: Brassey's UK), 134.

<sup>17</sup> Nadia Mushtaq Abbassi, "Security Issues Between the US and EU within NATO", Strategic Studies, (Autumn 2000) Vol. XX No. 4: 98.

<sup>18</sup> Sidney Bearman, ed. "Western Europe: Shadow and Substance", Strategic Survey 1999/2000, (London: Oxford University Press, May 2000), 100.

<sup>19</sup> "Shadow and Substance", 100.

An essential part of ESDI concerns the improvement of European military capabilities. The NATO Alliance's Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) is designed to ensure the effectiveness of future multinational operations across the range of NATO missions. From the NATO perspective, the DCI and the efforts of the EU to strengthen European capabilities are mutually reinforcing. The strengthening of ESDI through DCI would therefore enable the European allies to make a stronger and more coherent contribution to NATO. It would also permit them to take the lead in cases where it is agreed that the full weight of NATO military power is not needed.

Within Europe, differing interpretations of the objectives of ESDP have emerged. For France, ESDP is a European project that involves, under certain circumstances, making use of an Atlanticist instrument: NATO. From the French perspective, Europe can only become an international actor through the CFSP and France can only become an international actor through Europe.<sup>20</sup> For the UK and some other nations, ESDP is a means of safeguarding the Atlantic Alliance, which involves making use of it as a European instrument.<sup>21</sup> Since the April 1999 Washington Summit, NATO has also supported ESDP within the EU as a means to strengthen the CFSP. These discrepancies of definition are more than nuances. They constitute a significant divergence in the interpretation of European defence. Ambassador Vershbow, US Permanent Representative on the NATO North Atlantic Council, questioned whether "ESDP [is] primarily a political exercise, the latest stage in the process of European construction or [a] goal

---

<sup>20</sup> Howorth, Brassey's 134.

<sup>21</sup> Stuart Croft et al, "NATO's Triple Challenge", International Affairs, (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs July 2000) Vol. 76, No. 3: 506.

to solve real-world security problems in Europe.”<sup>22</sup> Depending on one’s perspective, ESDP could prove to be either a dynamic and effective tool for dealing with Europe’s changing security needs, or an ineffective tool for managing crises and a catalyst to increase transatlantic tensions.

There is also a concern that an increased focus to build up capabilities that the EU lacks could result in European states individually becoming overstretched and unable to meet their commitments to NATO. At the Helsinki Summit in December 1999, the Council of the EU established a Headline Goal for EU Member States in terms of their capabilities for crisis management operations. The Headline Goal, to develop an EU Rapid Reaction Force (RRF) of 50,000-60,000 troops, will be used for the agreed ‘Petersberg Tasks’. Able to deploy within 60 days and be sustainable in theatre for at least one year, the RRF capability is a substantive indicator of the EU’s resolve to develop a common European policy on security and defence. Efforts to strengthen NATO's capabilities and the European Union's desire to improve European capabilities, however, are tenuous. It was recently acknowledged that the European members of NATO might not be increasing their capabilities in the way they had pledged. Indeed, Alliance officials admitted on 3 March 2001 that the often-quoted statement that eleven European countries were increasing real defence spending was “not strictly accurate”.<sup>23</sup> In reality, internal NATO briefing papers have quoted only six of its sixteen European members as planning real defence spending increases over the next five years.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, it appears that some European nations are looking for a collective security architecture that excludes the US -

---

<sup>22</sup> Ambassador Alexander Vershbow, “European Defense: European and American Perceptions”. Remarks to the Western European Union Institute for Security Studies Transatlantic Forum, Paris, May 18, 2000.

<sup>23</sup> NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson, “Statement to the Press,” 5 Dec 2000.

<sup>24</sup> David Wastell and Julian Coman, “America Duped by Claims of European Defence Spending,” Electronic Telegraph Issue 2109 4 Mar 2001.

permitting them to make decisions independent of US influence. Concerns have been voiced that this may lead to a decoupling of Europe's security from that of its other NATO allies, a duplication of effort and capabilities, and discrimination against those allies who are non-European Union members.<sup>25</sup>

The stability of Europe remains a central concern for Canada. As stated by the Minister of National Defence, Mr. Art Eggleton, in December 2000: "NATO (is) the principal body for consultations and coordination of policy on issues affecting the North Atlantic community of nations. It embodies the transatlantic link, which is essential to our collective security and defence...parallel EU capabilities and structures might undermine or hamper the role of NATO as the principal forum for North Atlantic security ...our countries maintain only one set of forces and operate from one defence budget."<sup>26</sup>

With the launching of the ESDP and the Headline Goal, the ESDI has been challenged. Throughout the early 1990s, the United States and Great Britain favoured NATO and left European security ambitions to political declarations. However, the advent of ESDP, as a means to strengthen the CFSP, commits the EU to actually building a military capability. It still remains to be seen, however, whether NATO's DCIs will complement or compete with the EU's Headline Goal and whether European nations have the resolve to increase defence budgets to address true capability shortfalls.

---

<sup>25</sup> Francois Heisbourg, "European Defense Takes a Leap Forward," NATO Review, (Web Edition Vol. 48. No. 1, Spring/Summer 2000).

<sup>26</sup> Speakig

## DISPARATE TRANSATLANTIC VISIONS

While US officials have welcomed initiatives to improve European military capabilities, they have cautioned the EU against steps that could undermine NATO. The consensus within the US is that the transatlantic security arrangement must become more balanced if it is to remain intact and the creation of EU defence structures and processes must complement NATO. As such, they must conform to the Strategic Concept agreed at the 1999 Washington Summit and adopt the DCI to improve European defence capabilities. Paradoxically, while the US has made it clear that it wants its allies to spend more on their own defence, European leaders sense US reluctance to yield the authority to take initiative in security matters to the Europeans.<sup>27</sup>

To the Americans, Europe's plan for a common defence poses two potential problems: unnecessary duplication of NATO assets and discrimination against European states that are not EU members. US Ambassador Vershbow cautioned the EU "to uphold the principle of 'separable but not separate' forces rather than duplicating existing capabilities and structures."<sup>28</sup> With continued flat or declining defense budgets in most of Europe, redundant structures would be a budgetary strain, a source of angst for the taxpayer and a duplication of resources. An increased focus on building up capabilities that the EU lacks could result in European states becoming overstretched and unable to meet their commitments to NATO. The US concern was stated by former US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott on 7 October 1999: "We do not

---

<sup>27</sup> "Shadow and Substance," 102.

<sup>28</sup> Ambassador Alexander Vershbow, "ESDI: Berlin, St. Malo and Beyond – Remarks to the Western European Union Institute for Security Studies," Paris, January 28, 1999.

want to see an ESD[P] that comes into being first within NATO, but then grows out of NATO and finally grows away from NATO [and] could eventually compete with NATO.”<sup>29</sup>

While a stronger European partnership could enhance the capabilities of NATO, its future effect on the transatlantic security link has yet to be determined. The Clinton administration approved of enhanced European capabilities and an incremental change in institutions, but resisted “any shift that might upset NATO traditions and America’s position of primacy within the Alliance.”<sup>30</sup> The Americans, therefore, have addressed ESDP with cautious support. Early US support was articulated by Strobe Talbott: “There should be no confusion about America’s position on the need for a stronger Europe...we are not against; we are not ambivalent; we are not anxious; we are for it. We want to see a Europe that can act effectively through the Alliance or, if NATO is not engaged, on its own. Period, end of debate.”<sup>31</sup> Just over one year later, a joint statement between US President Bush and UK Prime Minister Blair expressed their combined support for the ESDP and mirrored previous statements, affirming that “NATO will remain the essential foundation of transatlantic security.”<sup>32</sup>

Although the UK government believes that NATO requires a strong European pillar, there is a significant difference of opinion between the UK and France. The UK speaks of the

---

<sup>29</sup> Quoted in Richard Norton Taylor, “US Says its NATO Load is Too Heavy,” The Guardian 7 October 1999.

<sup>30</sup> Charles A. Kupchan, “In Defence of European Defence: An American Perspective,” Survival, (Summer 2000), Vol. 42 No. 2: 17.

<sup>31</sup> Strobe Talbott, “The State of the Alliance: An American Perspective,” Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott - Speech to NATO Foreign Ministers, Brussels. December 15, 1999.

<sup>32</sup> “Joint Statement by President Bush and Prime Minister Blair,” Office of the Press Secretary, Camp David, Maryland, 23 February 2001.

strengthening of NATO, whereas the French speak of a re-balancing.<sup>33</sup> Proposals and plans for autonomous European intelligence, command and control, strategic lift and a strategic planning capacity which France has unceasingly promoted is at odds with a cooperative approach with NATO. French insistence that ESDP is a European project which cannot allow itself to be constrained by Atlanticist restrictions, has engendered US fears that ESDP is the ‘thin edge of the wedge’ leading to an overt transatlantic split of NATO. To prevent Europe and NATO from heading in disparate directions, the Americans called for clear institutional linkages between the EU and NATO. French efforts to delay the development of EU-NATO ties until the EU’s own efforts were more advanced, however, only served to increase US anxieties.<sup>34</sup> The French position was motivated by a desire to distance the EU from American and NATO influences and to allow the EU to emerge as a global security actor to rival the dominance of the United States.

A potential polarization between the US and the EU on security and defence issues would leave Canada ‘caught in the middle’. As one of the two non-European NATO members, Canada’s position towards ESDP supports “the primacy of the NATO Alliance as the primary body for consultations and coordination of policy on issues affecting the North Atlantic community of nations”.<sup>35</sup> As the Honourable Art Eggleton later stated in Munich, “the range of security challenges before us will require greater commonality of purpose if we are to resolve

---

<sup>33</sup> Jolyon Howorth. “Britain, France and the European Defence Initiative,” *Survival*, (Summer 2000) Vol. 42 No. 2: 45.

<sup>34</sup> Kupchan 19.

<sup>35</sup> Speaking Notes for the Honorable Art Eggleton, Paris France, December 7, 2000.



them successfully. Yet, instead of commonality, we could see the emergence of duality – of two solitudes – within the Alliance.”<sup>36</sup>

## CANADA-EU RELATIONSHIP

The overall EU-Canada relationship is based on three main documents: the 1976 Framework Agreement for Commercial and Economic Cooperation; the 1990 Transatlantic Declaration on EU-Canada Relations; and the 1996 Joint Political Declaration on EU-Canada relations and Joint EU-Canada Action Plan. The 1990 Transatlantic Declaration sets out the institutional framework that forms the basis of the biannual Canada-EU Summit meetings and biannual Ministerial meetings. The last EU-Canada Summit was held in Ottawa on 19 December 2000, which resulted in a Canada-EU Joint Statement on Defence and Security. At that Summit, Canada welcomed the “decisive progress” made in the elaboration of ESDP and at the Meeting of the European Council at Nice, France.<sup>37</sup> The Joint Statement noted the support for the rapid implementation of permanent arrangements between NATO and the EU. It also added that Canada and the EU agree to meet quarterly, at expert level, to discuss the full range of security and defence issues of mutual concern.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Speaking Notes for the Honorable Art Eggleton, Minister of National Defence to the Munich Conference “Transatlantic Relations and European Security and Defence Identity.” Munich Germany, February 3, 2001.

<sup>37</sup> At the Nice European Council of 7-9 December 2000, the Heads of State and Government of the 15 Member States concluded the Intergovernmental Conference on Institutional Reform by reaching agreement on the draft of a new treaty. This will amend the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties establishing the European Communities and the Protocol on Enlargement of the European Union. The amendments will come into force when the Treaty of Nice has been ratified by all the Member States in accordance with their respective constitutional rules.

<sup>38</sup> “EU-Canada Summit: Joint Declaration on the ESDP,” 19 Dec 2000.

## ESDI AND ESDP: IMPLICATIONS FOR CANADA

Canada's link to Europe for defence and security matters is provided through the NATO Alliance. As such, the development of a greater European defence capability through ESDI, which leads toward the strengthening of the European pillar of the transatlantic Alliance, is fully supported.<sup>39</sup> While a stronger European capability infers a stronger NATO, any procedures, arrangements or measures that have the potential to weaken NATO are of serious concern to Canada. Arrangements that will be established between NATO and the EU must reflect Canada's longstanding contribution to European security and membership in the Alliance. Otherwise, because ESDI and ESDP can imply a European independence from the US, it should not automatically infer an independence from Canada. Canada must ensure that its unique position as the other non-European ally will not be ignored.

Consultative Arrangements. Canada has encouraged the EU to be as inclusive as possible for the participation of non-EU countries in the decision-shaping process for future EU-led operations, where NATO as a whole is not engaged.<sup>40</sup> An inclusive attitude towards non-EU allies would avoid divisions between EU and non-EU members of the NATO Alliance and would recognize that all allies may have an interest in future EU-led operations. As a transatlantic member of the Alliance and an active contributor to peacekeeping and peace support missions throughout the world, Canada maintains an interest in European security developments. As such, the Canadian Government has signaled its potential interest to

---

<sup>39</sup> Ambassador David Wright, "Canada, ESDI and ESDP", Paris Transatlantic Forum, 18 May 2000.

<sup>40</sup> "Canada, ESDI and ESDP", 18 May 2000.

participate in future EU-led operations.<sup>41</sup> As a potential contributing nation, Canada would expect to have the same rights and obligations regarding the planning and conduct of the operation with other participating states. As stated by Ambassador David Wright, "...where NATO's assets and capabilities are to be loaned to the EU, all allies should be offered an 'open door' to participate in all phases... allied troop contributors should be included in decisions that affect the conduct of the operation."<sup>42</sup> The EU Presidency Conclusions for the EU Council in Fiera, Portugal in June 2000 outlined the involvement of non-EU countries in EU crisis management. The conclusions stated that "other European States engaged in political dialogue with the Union and other interested States, may be invited to take part in EU-led operations" and "welcomed the interest shown by Canada."<sup>43</sup> While the EU has acknowledged the possibility of Canadian participation, the modalities for participation have yet to be agreed. Although Canada and the European Union later agreed that they will "intensify their consultations in times of crisis,"<sup>44</sup> it is unlikely that this alone will satisfy Canada's requirement for involvement in the decision-making and planning process for future EU-led operations. Without agreed modalities for participation in the planning aspects of an EU-led operation, it is unlikely that Canada would agree to participate.

---

<sup>41</sup> The first overt indication of interest to potential participation was signaled by Canada during the NATO/WEU Political/Military Crisis Management Procedural Exercise (CMX/CRISEX 2000) in February 2000.

<sup>42</sup> Ambassador David Wright, Canadian Ambassador to NATO, "Canada, NATO and European Security." Presentation to the Atlantic Council of Canada, Ottawa, 16 November 2000.

<sup>43</sup> Presidency Conclusions of the Fiera European Council, Addendum I, 19-20 June 2000.

<sup>44</sup> As agreed by the European Council at Nice in Dec 2000, as referred to in the Canada-EU Joint Statement on Defence and Security.

NATO Assets and Capabilities. The discussions between the EU and NATO concerning the potential modalities for the use of NATO assets and capabilities in EU-led operations are of particular interest to Canada. As Ambassador David Wright stated, “it is obvious that Canada would not agree to modalities that would leave NATO with no control over their use.”<sup>45</sup> A week later, at the Summit of NATO Foreign Ministers in Florence Italy, Canada was noted in the Final Communiqué in an effort to ensure there would be no loss of control over any assets it assigns to NATO. It stated, “for EU-led operations involving the use of NATO assets and capabilities, modalities will need to be agreed if Canada chooses to participate.”<sup>46</sup> Six months later, Ambassador Wright reinforced the Canadian position by stating that, “we will have to be satisfied with the arrangements between the EU and non-EU NATO members before we could approve the release of NATO assets and capabilities for any specific operation.”<sup>47</sup> The Honourable Art Eggleton elaborated further when he stated that the NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft “includes a sizable Canadian component [and that] we are the third largest contributor to the system. It would be politically unacceptable to Canada to have CF personnel transferred to EU command without oversight by the North Atlantic Council of the role and manner of deployment of those forces.”<sup>48</sup> There can be no expectation that NATO or any individual state such as the United States or Canada would be willing to release military assets to the EU by some form of ‘automatic’ right. As stated by US

---

<sup>45</sup> “Canada, ESDI and ESDP,” 18 May 2000.

<sup>46</sup> NATO Press Release NAC-1(2000)52, Para 29. Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council Final Communiqué. Florence Italy, 24 May 2000.

<sup>47</sup> “Canada, NATO and European Security.” 16 November 2000.

<sup>48</sup> Stated by the Honourable Art Eggleton to the WEU Parliament Assembly and the Interim European Security and Defence Assembly, Paris France, December 7, 2000 and at the Munich Conference “Transatlantic Relations and European Security and Defence Identity,” Munich Germany, February 3, 2001.

Ambassador Vershbow, “as much as we are trying to ‘assure’ access and to indicate that there's a ‘presumption of availability’ of NATO assets, there will still have to be a decision by the NATO Council. Therefore, it is in the EU's interest to make sure that the non-EU players are comfortable with the policy that they are being asked to support.”<sup>49</sup> On one hand, Canada has been recognized as a potential contributor of assets and capabilities in EU-led operations. On the other hand, appropriate arrangements for consultation and participation of ‘third states’ to contribute to EU crisis management have yet to be determined.

Duplication of Capabilities. The development of EU structures for crisis management operations should strengthen and not detract from NATO’s ability to address Euro-Atlantic security challenges. However, the development of a permanent military structure in the EU that closely resembles NATO’s integrated military structure was approved at the Nice European Council in December 2000.<sup>50</sup> ESDI could also lead to a duplication of capabilities. It is possible, but improbable, that European allies could develop separate capabilities that enable them to act without the use of US or NATO assets. However, given the decline of European defence budgets, this capability is unlikely in the near term and will provide non-EU NATO nations, including Canada, influence over how NATO assets are used in a potential EU-led

---

<sup>49</sup> Remarks by Ambassador Alexander Vershbow, U.S. Permanent Representative in his presentation “Next Steps on European Security and Defense: a US View” delivered at the conference “The Development of the Common European Security and Defense Policy: The Integration Project of the Next Decade”, organized by the Institute for European Policy (Bonn and Berlin) and The Representation of the European Commission in the Federal Republic of Germany Berlin, December 17, 1999.

<sup>50</sup> Building on the guidelines established at the Cologne European Council and on the basis of the Presidency's reports, the European Council in Helsinki set the target of establishing new political and military bodies and structures within the Council to enable the Union to ensure the necessary political guidance and strategic direction to such operations, while respecting the single institutional framework. The new permanent political and military bodies, as approved at the Nice European Council, will be gradually established within the Council: a standing Political and Security Committee (PSC); a Military Committee (MC); and a Military Staff (MS).

operation. A concomitant failure of European NATO nations to develop appropriate NATO capabilities through the DCI may lead to US accusations of failing to adhere to the agreed strategic concept and a setback to the transatlantic link.

Defence Planning. There is a need to avoid separate EU and NATO planning systems that could lead to different standards for the EU and other allies' forces. As ESDI is meant to deal with 'Petersberg Tasks', the peacekeeping capabilities of EU member nations may be given priority over warfighting capabilities. This undesirable situation could harm the cohesion of NATO. A two-tier Alliance could potentially result, where the US and perhaps a few European Allies are able to conduct high-intensity operations while the rest of the Allies focus on the low end of the spectrum. This would weaken the ability of NATO to work together in a major crisis unless there is an institutional link established between the EU and NATO for defence planning. As The Honourable Art Eggleton has emphasized, "to be excluded from strategic planning would be politically unacceptable."<sup>51</sup> Defence planning is one of the institutional relationships that can link the members of NATO, the EU and other like-minded nations.

Article V Obligations. Of direct concern to Canada, as a NATO member, is the unity of the NATO Alliance and that the Alliance remains the organization of first choice when it comes to ensuring security in Europe. NATO must not become "the organization of last resort, a sort of insurance policy for European security, a safety net if crisis management evolves into Article 5."<sup>52</sup> The six non-EU European countries, as well as the United States and Canada, have an

---

<sup>51</sup> "Transatlantic Relations and European Security and Defence Identity", February 3, 2001.

<sup>52</sup> "Canada, ESDI and ESDP," 18 May 2000.

Article V obligation and commitment to eleven of the fifteen members of the European Union. It is conceivable that an EU-led operation could be transitioned to a NATO operation if a deteriorating crisis threatens regional stability or the stability of a member state. An EU-led operation could also deteriorate into an Article V situation. In that situation, Canada would become belatedly involved as the non-EU NATO Allies are under a treaty obligation to come to the defence of their EU NATO partners. This transition may prove to be difficult if the EU does not afford a degree of transparency to NATO during its operation.

NATO Consensus. A related concern is the inevitable compromises that would take place to reach a consensus within the European pillar of NATO, undoubtedly posing a problem to forging a NATO consensus between Europe, Canada and the US. NATO's ability to consider emerging problems could be complicated if the EU members of NATO were to form a caucus and arrive at NATO meetings with firm consensual European positions. This issue was raised during the Clinton administration in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Franklin Kramer, Assistant Secretary of Defense, noted, "...there can be no question of an 'EU Caucus' inside NATO. NATO decisions must continue to be reached in real collective discussion, so that NATO will remain ... the principal forum for security consultation."<sup>53</sup> This concern was also identified and addressed by The Honourable Art Eggleton who stated, "...anything that would weaken a full partnership - such as an EU caucus within NATO exclusion or marginalization by a EU caucus within NATO is not an option for the Alliance."<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Franklin D. Kramer, Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (Subcommittee on European Affairs) on "NATO and European Capabilities", 9 March 2000.

<sup>54</sup> Speech to the WEU Parliament Assembly and the Interim European Security and Defence Assembly, Paris France, December 7, 2000.

At a later presentation, he emphasized that, “Canada would have serious difficulties with anything that weakened NATO’s current consultative practices and consensus-based decision-making.”<sup>55</sup> To Canada, the solidarity of the NATO Alliance is of prime importance.

## THE WAY AHEAD FOR CANADA

There is a range of measures that officials can take to mitigate the consequences to Canada of the ESDI and ESDP issues that have been identified as a concern. In general, measures should concentrate on promoting the Canadian perspective to issues, especially those developments that may affect the transatlantic relationship.

As Europe’s defence capabilities evolve, Canada should seek to enhance other linkages beyond the quarterly expert level meetings that have been agreed with the EU to discuss a range of security and defence issues of mutual concern. Canadian perspectives on strategic international concerns must continue to be articulated with individual EU member nations through substantive bilateral meetings. The establishment of institutional links between the EU and NATO must continue to be encouraged by Canada. As separate bureaucracies with overlapping memberships, the EU and NATO may develop divergent positions on transatlantic and international issues unless mechanisms are in place to contribute to a harmonized perspective. Conceivably, this may place NATO member countries in juxtaposed alliances. Although eight of the nineteen NATO members are not in the EU, the EU must be encouraged to include them in regular discussions of common security issues. Effective crisis prevention often depends on a joint approach using a variety of military and political levers. It is therefore

---

<sup>55</sup> “Transatlantic Relations and European Security and Defence Identity.” February 3, 2001.



important for both organizations to be involved from the outset to determine the appropriate crisis management mechanisms to be used. As proposed by Ambassador David Wright, “Regular meetings at 23 (the 19 NATO members and 4 EU neutrals or put another way, the 15 EU members and 8 non-EU Allies) would provide both organizations with an enhanced ‘early warning’ capacity. It would enable us to compare notes on an emerging crisis and to consider [appropriate] measures.”<sup>56</sup> The majority of ESDP discussions that concern the potential involvement of ‘third-nations’ revolve around the role of the six European non-EU NATO countries. As such, Canada must continue to promote its unique position as only one of two NATO nations, which is neither European, nor a member of the EU.

Accordingly, Canadian officials must continue to encourage the development of a comprehensive Framework Agreement between NATO and the EU to promote transparency and predictability between the two organizations. Modalities concerning the availability and use of NATO assets and capabilities and arrangements for allied participation in EU-led operations will optimize the advantages of both organizations and reinforce transatlantic ties. Mechanisms must be established that allow non-EU members to be involved in decision-making for any mission in which they are taking part.

While Europeans seek autonomy through ESDP and do not wish to accept an actual or implied subordination of the EU to NATO<sup>57</sup>, they should recognize the benefits that NATO can provide. Future EU military capabilities should not attempt to duplicate the assets and

---

<sup>56</sup> Ambassador David Wright, “Canada, NATO and European Security.” 16 November 2000.

<sup>57</sup> Stuart Croft et al, International Affairs, 509.

capabilities that already exist within the NATO Alliance. While a duplication of planning staffs, capabilities and headquarters may allow the EU to cease its dependence on NATO, the cost of such an endeavour would be prohibitive. To mitigate the potential problem of parallel structures and to facilitate the participation of non-EU Allies, former US Secretary of Defence Cohen proposed “a collaborative approach that meets the needs of both NATO and the EU...taking the form of a ‘European Security and Defense Planning System’ or ‘ESDPS’.”<sup>58</sup> Canada also proposed the concept of joint NATO-EU defence planning as a solution.<sup>59</sup> Given the decline of most European defence budgets, Europeans should be encouraged to focus on enhancing their military capabilities through the DCI, not on the development of parallel structures and institutions. Such a goal will enhance the capabilities of NATO, support the transatlantic link and afford Europe with a voice and influence commensurate with its capabilities.

## CONCLUSION

The evolution of a strengthened European security and defence capability has progressed rapidly over the past decade and will keep evolving for the near future. During this time, NATO and the EU will continue to tackle the fundamental challenges of developing a strengthened common European policy on security and defence. While the progress towards a common European defence capability will directly affect European nations, the concurrent evolution of the ESDI and ESDP initiatives will also have implications for Canada, as a member of NATO and as a nation. As illustrated, the differing interpretations and divergent objectives of ESDI and ESDP will affect NATO and its relationship with the EU. Within NATO, the relationship

---

<sup>58</sup> Secretary of Defense William Cohen at the Informal NATO Defense Ministerial Meeting at Birmingham, U.K., 10 October 2000.

<sup>59</sup> “Transatlantic Relations and European Security and Defence Identity”, February 3, 2001.

between the EU and non-EU member states will be dependent upon whether the EU develops the CFSP in a spirit of cooperation and compromise with NATO. Additionally, the development of cooperation and transparency between the EU and NATO is an essential precondition to ensure that the movement towards improved European defence does not harm the transatlantic link. Specifically for Canada, the ongoing development and course of emerging NATO-EU and EU-Canada consultative arrangements will be germane to Canada's potential participation in future EU-led operations. Despite the past pronouncements, differences of interpretation and intention between concerned parties do not yet provide a clear indication of how these relationships will develop.

Canada must continue to enunciate its concerns in international forums that any procedures, arrangements or measures that have the potential to weaken the NATO Alliance are of serious concern to Canada. Canada must ensure that its unique position as the other non-ents 4f e8Tj35969o0

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbassi, Nadia Mushtaq. "Security Issues Between the US and EU Within NATO." Strategic Studies. Vol. XX Number 4 (Autumn 2000).
- Bearman, Sidney, ed. "Western Europe – Shadow and Substance." Strategic Survey 1999/2000. London: Oxford University Press, May 2000.
- Clay, Clemens, ed. NATO and the Quest for Post-Cold War Security. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Cohen, Secretary of Defense William. Remarks as Prepared for Delivery by Secretary of Defense William Cohen at the Informal NATO Defense Ministerial Meeting at Birmingham, U.K. 10 October 2000.  
[<http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2000/s20001010-secdef.html>]
- Croft, Stuart. "The EU, NATO and Europeanisation: The Return of the Architectural Debate." European Security. Vol. 9 Number 3 (Autumn 2000).
- Croft, Stuart., et al. "NATO's Triple Challenge." International Affairs. Volume 76, Number 3 (July 2000).
- "Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council." NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 10-11 January 1994. NATO Press Communiqué M-1(94)3 11 January 1994, paragraph 6.  
[<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1994/p94-003.htm>]
- Duke, Simon. The Elusive Quest for European Security - from EDC to CFSP. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Eggleton, the Honourable Art. "Speaking Notes for the Honourable Art Eggleton Minister of National Defence to the Munich Conference on Transatlantic Relations and European Security and Defence Identity." Munich Germany, 3 Feb 2001.
- Eggleton, the Honourable Art. "Speaking Notes for the Honourable Art Eggleton Minister of National Defence to the WEU Parliamentary Assembly and the Interim European Security and Defence Assembly." Paris, France 7 December 2000.  
[[http://www.dnd.ca/eng/archive/speeches/07dec00Paris\\_s\\_e.htm](http://www.dnd.ca/eng/archive/speeches/07dec00Paris_s_e.htm)]
- "EU-Canada Summit: Joint Declaration on the ESDP." Ottawa, 19 Dec 2000.  
[[http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/canada/summit12-00/esdp\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/canada/summit12-00/esdp_en.htm)] and  
[<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/english/geo/europe/eu/defence-dec2000-e.html>]
- "European Security and Defence in the Transatlantic Agenda." EU/US News: A Review of Transatlantic Relations. Vol. II Number 4, April 2000.

- Flockhart, Trine, ed. From Vision to Reality – Implementing Europe’s New Security Order. Boulder: Westview Press, 1998.
- Gordon, Philip H. “Their Own Army? Making European Defense Work.” Foreign Affairs. (July/August 2000).
- Heisbourg, Francois. “European Defense Takes a Leap Forward.” NATO Review, Vol. 48. No. 1, (Spring/Summer 2000).
- Heisbourg, Francois. “Europe’s Strategic Ambitions: The Limits of Ambiguity.” Survival, The International Institute for Security Studies Quarterly. Volume 42 Number 2 (Summer 2000).
- Howorth, Jolyon. “French Defence Reforms: National Tactics for a European Strategy” Brassey’s Defence Yearbook 1998, London: Kings College Centre for Defence Studies, (1998).
- Howorth, Jolyon. “Britain, France and the European Defence Initiative.” Survival, The International Institute for Security Studies Quarterly. Volume 42 Number 2 (Summer 2000).
- “Joint Statement by President Bush and Prime Minister Blair”, Office of the Press Secretary, Camp David, Maryland, 23 February 2001.  
[[http://www.usis.it/file2001\\_02/alia/a1022309.htm](http://www.usis.it/file2001_02/alia/a1022309.htm)]
- Kramer, Franklin D. Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. “NATO and European Capabilities.” Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (Subcommittee on European Affairs) 9 March 2000.  
[[http://www.usembassy.it/file2000\\_03/alia/a0031011.htm](http://www.usembassy.it/file2000_03/alia/a0031011.htm)]
- Kupchan, Charles A. “In Defence of European Defence: An American Perspective.” Survival, The International Institute for Security Studies Quarterly. Volume 42 Number 2 (Summer 2000).
- Lord Robertson, NATO Secretary General, “Statement to the Press”, 5 Dec 2000.  
[<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2000/s001205b.htm>]
- Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Defence Ministers Session Brussels, 13 June 1996.  
NATO Press Communiqué M-NAC(DM)-2(96)89.  
[<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1996/p96-089e.htm>]
- Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council Final Communiqué. Florence Italy, 24 May 2000. NATO Press Release M-NAC-1(2000)52, Para 29.
- “Strengthening European Security and Defence Capabilities.” NATO Fact Sheet (Updated 15 Dec 2000). [<http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/dev-esdi.htm>]

- “Presidency Conclusions of the Fiera European Council.” Fiera Italy, 19-20 June 2000.  
[<http://europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/june2000/index.htm>]
- Talbott, Strobe. “The State of the Alliance: An American Perspective.” Speech to NATO Foreign Ministers, Brussels. December 15, 1999.  
[<http://www.nato.int/usa/state/s991215a.htm>]
- Taylor, Richard Norton. “US Says its NATO Load is Too Heavy.” The Guardian. (7 October 1999). [<http://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,3910173,00.html>]
- “The Alliance’s Strategic Concept.” Washington D.C. 23-24 April 1999.  
[<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm>]
- “Treaty on European Union.” (Maastricht Treaty), Maastricht Germany, 1992  
[<http://europa.eu.int/en/record/mt/top.html>]
- “Washington Summit Communiqué.” NATO Press Release NAC-S(99)64 of 24 April 1999.  
[<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm>]
- Wastell, David and Julian Coman, “America Duped by Claims of European Defence Spending.” The Electronic Telegraph. Issue 2109, 4 Mar 2001 [[www.telegraph.co.uk](http://www.telegraph.co.uk)]
- “Western European Union Council of Ministers Petersberg Declaration.” at Bonn Germany, 19 June 1992. [<http://www.weu.int/eng/comm/92-petersberg.htm>]
- “Western Europe: Shadow and Substance.” Strategic Survey 1999/2000. London: Oxford University Press, (May 2000).
- Wright, Ambassador David. “Canada, ESDI and ESDP: Notes for an Address by his Excellency Mr. David Wright Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Canada to NATO at the Paris Transatlantic Forum.” 18 May 2000.  
[<http://www.nato.int/canada/speech/s000518a.htm>]
- Wright, Ambassador David. “Canada, NATO and European Security.” Presentation by Ambassador Wright to the Atlantic Council of Canada, Ottawa. 16 November 2000.  
[<http://www.nato.int/canada/home.htm>]
- Vershbow, Ambassador Alexander. “ESDI: Berlin, St. Malo and Beyond” – Remarks to the Western European Union Institute for Security Studies. Paris, January 28, 1999.  
[<http://www.nato.int/usa/ambassador/s990128a.htm>]
- Vershbow, Ambassador Alexander. “European Defense: European and American Perceptions” Remarks to the Western European Union Institute for Security Studies Transatlantic Forum. Paris, May 18, 2000. [<http://www.nato.int/usa/ambassador/s20000518a.htm>]

Vershbow, Ambassador Alexander. "Next Steps on European Security and Defense: a US View." Delivered at the Conference "The Development of the Common European Security and Defense Policy: The Integration Project of the Next Decade." Berlin Germany, December 17, 1999. [<http://www.nato.int/usa/ambassador/s991217a.htm>]