

## **NEW PRIORITIES IN FOREIGN POLICY OF THE EU'S SECURITY**

**Meri Kraja**

Justice Department, Faculty of Law, "WISDOM" University, Tirana, Albania,  
Email: meri81al@yahoo.it

### **Abstract**

Throughout its short and rich history the European concept has undergone through impressive changes. Safety has always been a key concept in the history, but never with the same intensity as during the Cold War, especially in the post September 11<sup>th</sup> world. The special focus of this paper will be on the latest and most significant development, the gradual removal and the detachment of the internal and external borders from the national and the European physical borders. By increasing and rationalizing thus the security in the EU, by creating interactions, collaborations and structures in the architecture of the European security not even planned from the visionaries of the European project. The Lisbon Treaty extends the EU's role in the inclusion of disarmament operations, military advice and assistance, and help to restore stability after the conflict. The treaty also creates the opportunity for better cooperation between Member States that want to work together on the defense area. Nowadays it is clear that there is no longer a European security, but some European securities. This paper aims to analyze the current situation of the EU's CFSP and questions how EU can advance the stated priority objective of its foreign policy of "effective diversity". Other aspects which arise from the basic conclusions of this paper, deal with the fact that the EU now, in order to not affect this objective, must improve its internal and external representation, such as what should be the participation of the European citizens in the foreign policy? And what do the bells ring for nowadays?

**Keywords:** *Security, militarization, Power, Civil, Military, European*

### **Introduction**

EU has a foreign policy and security, which has gradually developed over the years and today makes it possible for the 28 member states to speak with a single voice on the world stage. The European Union is actively engaged in the fight against major risks. The responsible bodies for the implementation of politico-military operations are: Political and Security Committee, the EU Military Committee, the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (Civcom) and the European Union Military Staff (EUMS).

These bodies are answerable to the Council and are based in Brussels. These tools are the ones

that give substance to the common security and defense. Thus the EU can carry out the tasks it has set itself – humanitarian, peacemaking and peacekeeping missions.<sup>1</sup> European integration process involves not only a field of national development but in the form of a spiral adhesive little by little touches all areas of the country, by penetrating to the heart of the concept of state sovereignty. In this paper we will try to analyze the relationship of “security” and its transformation in recent years, as well as the participation of European citizens in foreign policy on security and defense. Policy harmonization and standardization of European security does not only reveal a security feature, but also the so-called multiple security.

The Lisbon Treaty created the European diplomatic service, naming it the European Foreign Service Action. A union cannot reach a bypass already open debate on democracy. It is a necessity that should be imposed today, as the crisis necessitates tough and significant decisions which should be explained and motivated.

### **Implications of the post-Lisbon “Under the umbrella of the EU”**

Jean Monnet wrote in his memoir, "Nothing is possible without men, but nothing lasts without institutions. If institutions function well, they may collect and convey the wisdom of successive generations". However, the rules were designed for a much smaller EU and an EU that should not face global challenges such as climate change, global recession or international crime outside EU borders. The committee has potential in addressing these problems, but it can do so only if improves its own way of functioning.

The main aim of the Lisbon Treaty is the modernization and democratization of EU institutions. It therefore created the new position of High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/ Vice-President of the Commission, to promote the activities of the EU on the international stage and to better protect the interests and values of EU abroad. Catherine Ashton began its work in this position in 2009. External security policies to protect Europe and is not intended to organize a European army that would replace national armies of the Member States. There is no question to be reset in the European Community project for protection. The objective of European defense is limited. It has to do with joining the military capabilities of member states, which retain full control of their military in national elections.

The European Union is gradually asserting itself as an actor not only regionally but also in the global security, capable of having a plurality of different tools (economic, political, diplomatic and military, and -last but not least - a soft power, capable of attracting third countries identified in the European area of freedom, economic prosperity and stability).

From the moment the EU has gained a bigger role on issues such as security and defense, the debate over the legitimacy and “*democratic control*” has included these sectors. If parent basic characteristics of that which we call “democratic deficit”- referring to the decision making processes of the EU - apply to the security and defense sectors, the latter nevertheless differentiates from other areas because of some elements.

In the first row, security sectors are supranational defense, and characterized by a higher level of secrecy.

Second, these policies require faster decision making processes, as decision-making in the European level faces unexpected crises. Security policy and defense - with all the changes that have been made over the years - remains an intergovernmental policy. In particular, without a European army, foreign policy and defense security must rely on national forces that are distributed to national governments, and as required to join later “under the umbrella of the EU”. Every state has the right to decide or not troops for various missions of the EU. Should differentiate at this point and various public opinions of member states of the EU!

For example, 59% of Britons are found to be in favor of armed intervention, while 83% of Italians and 79% of Spaniards are against. One can assume at this point that the legitimacy and democratic control policies for external security and the protection of the EU can be guaranteed within national level. But the move could create a series of problems. First, to be considered modus operandi of national parliaments of different countries of the EU, and secondly, there are many political and institutional problems that do not leave the place a national democratic control of security in foreign policy and defense.

The Lisbon Treaty clarifies the role of the EU in the field of foreign and security policy common. Decisions on security issues will continue to be approved unanimously by the Member States of the EU. Missions, which the EU has taken off its territory, have been for peacekeeping purposes, conflict prevention and strengthening international security in the context of the United Nations Charter. The Lisbon Treaty allows Member States to make available to the EU in its possibilities civil and military, which are necessary for the implementation of common policies on defense and security, and defines the role of the European Defense Agency. This agreement for the first time introduced the clause (the voluntary nature) when a Member State is the victim of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or caused by man. The ambition of a Europe-wide approach to security is expanded into a complex that includes national cultures, institutional norms, political agendas, perceptions of local and global needs, all in an effort to create a standardized and legal access, institutional and technical threats facing Europe today.

In our time, it is clear that there is no longer a European security, but some European securities. The nature of evaluation of safety and uncertainty has contributed to a fragmented evolution of European approaches to the challenges.

Adapting the European institutions to this new reality has been difficult, hampered by the extensive variations in cultures of law enforcement, border control, intelligence and diplomacy and, not least, the new cultures of fear and care. This shift to a new security environment has simultaneously brought a shift in the focus areas of security thinking in Europe and, as a consequence, a change of roles of security institutions, facilities of their responsibility, with European partners.

## **Aspirations and raised alarm bells**

There should be paid attention to the Lisbon Treaty in two different moments. First, while the Lisbon Treaty innovations enhance the institutional role of the EU in foreign policy and security, the issue of external representation should be further expanded,(Service beyond establishing the European External Action). With the acquisition of an international legal personality of the EU, the term “European Union”, has replaced the term “European Commission” in various forums. This marks the moment in which the EU takes a more political character similar to “features of the state”. But beyond the symbolism of the name, there are many complex and fundamental issues to be addressed.

Second, the question arises how the EU can advance the stated priority objective of its foreign policy of “effective diversity”.

It is increasingly evident that the EU now, should improve its external representation.

Thus, the EU problems are part of wider international concern for a more effective global governance.

UN system already has almost 200 member countries, including the EU-s plan to expand further, at least in the Balkans, from 28 member states (now Croatia) to over 30 or such. One must recognize that the integration of EU member states in the field of defense has not made significant progress in recent years, while somewhat has disappointed aspirations raised by the Lisbon Treaty. But why, then seek possible steps forward? The main reason is really simple: public budgets are no longer able to fund the “status quo” inefficient . Most European countries have been hit by the economic crisis, and policy tightening has cut the defense budget as much as other sectors of public expenditure, and there is no prospect to grow in the future.

Some alarm bells for Europe on defense today might be:

- The first refers to the progressive loss of operational capability of the armed forces in Europe, mainly due to the increasing difficulty of national budgets to continue to finance the required investments, the transformation and the training of the forces and the onerous missions International. The fragmentation of the national expenditure makes this crisis faster and deeper.
- The second is related to the problems created by bad implementation of the Treaty of Lisbon. We are in the presence of a missed opportunity, responsible for the progressive loss of international credibility is strategic of the EU, despite the many commitments and responsibilities even today Guaranteed by individual European countries in the absence of a common policy framework and decision-making tools.
- The third concerns the appearance of cooperation in the field of research and technology, dominated by increasing confusion of programs and of institutional actors and the consequent dispersion of resources, with the prospect of a rapid loss of technological

capabilities and innovative industrial on the part of all the European countries.

- The fourth focuses on the difficult issue of how to keep alive a European industrial base highly competitive and able to meet the needs of the armed and defense policies and security. Despite an initial rationalization of major European companies, remains the structural identity of national different industrial bases. This dimension is proving quite insufficient, especially in a market increasingly globalized international.

## **How could provide Europe a more active participation of citizens?**

The problem of democratic control over EU policy is made more urgent by the rise of European powers in the fields of action of the security and defense policy and requires an enhanced role of the European Parliament and a greater collaboration inter-parliamentary. It is observed today is an urgent need to build and spread a culture of true strategic European Security and defense sector by European citizens.

Europe has long made a call for greater cooperation between the European Parliament and National Parliaments.

This would give “people-s representatives” not only more voice in the field of foreign policy and defense, but also more responsibility in decision making.

Another deficiency that is evidenced today and a lot less convenient communication in the field of foreign policy and the protection of politicians and citizens.

At this point we believe that: continuous increase of communication, information and participation in the fields of security and defense, through a direct engagement of national and European parliamentarians (for example, being involved in their ongoing debate pre-election and their electoral programs), would be an ambitious goal to reach the maturity of public opinion regarding such sensitive topics such as: management of key aspects concerning security, defense and immigration, the armed forces; etc..

Increasing the role of the European Parliament and national parliaments in policy making can be done for example through:

1. A Parliamentary Assembly,
2. Restructuring mechanism that currently governs the decision-making phase of foreign policy, in order to strengthen the role of Parliament
3. Creating a Protection Committee within the European Parliament;
4. Forecast similar themes in programs and discussions of supranational political parties and not only;
5. Towards Greater attention issues making estimates for Concrete Proposals Regarding European Parliament security in Foreign Policy.

A good way is to include individuals and increase network Excellence in discussions about topics such as foreign policy, capable of including public awareness and political decision making.

And this can be achieved through:

1. Parliamentary auditions open to the public;
2. Organization of a media network dedicated to these topics;
3. European ad hoc projects,
- 4 Development of informative debate and open confrontation between youth, academia, and various institutions

The Lisbon Treaty created the European diplomatic service, but a union cannot reach a bypass already open debate on democracy.

It is a necessity that should be imposed today, as the crisis necessitates tough decisions and significant, which should be explained and motivated for the public.

## **Conclusions**

The most recent development and most significant in the reality of European security and the shift is gradual detachment of border security from internal and external national and European physical limits. As we have seen, this shift has had two main effects. First, it has continued to fulfill an ambition main European project moving legitimacy and functionality of security services at European level.

By increasing and rationalizing thus ensuring security in the EU. Secondly, it has created interactions, collaborations and structures in the European security architecture unpredictable neither of European visionaries project.

Implementation of appropriate mechanisms that ensure democratic legitimacy and control in the areas of security and defense policy is a primary condition for the EU. But the deployment of national troops in missions under the control of the EU makes undoubtedly important role enhancing the power of the European Parliament. It has been more in evidence and the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, which has created new institutions in the field of foreign policy, security and defense, in particular the High Representative / Vice-President of the European Commission and External Action Service European, in which intergovernmental and supranational elements are interconnected in order to strengthen the coherence of external action of the EU.

Since military technology becomes ever more sophisticated and expensive, EU governments increasingly must consider joint work in the production of weapons, especially now when they are trying to reduce public spending to overcome the financial crisis. Therefore, if their armed forces should carry out joint missions outside Europe, their systems must be inter-operational and their equipment should be relatively standardized. Also, for a greater democratization and European national parties should make an extra effort to expand and enable more effective communication with the public about the objectives and means of foreign policy for the common safety, trying to establish a direct dialogue on major European issues.

## Rererences

- J. Peter Burgess, *European Affairs and Security* , Magazines Institute for Democracy and Mediation, Nr. 16, Tiranë 2010.
- Neill Nugent, Macmillan, *The Government and Politics of the European Union*, 1999.
- Y. Doutriaux CH. Lequesne, *Institucionet e Bashkimit Evropian*, Botimi I 5-të, Papyrus, Tiranë 2007.
- F. Raspadori, *La politica estera dell'UE: istituzioni e strumenti di pace*, Morlacchi, Perugia 2007.
- R.Soin, *Political Europe. History, crises, developments and prospects of integration proces.* Papyrus, Tiranë 2008.
- Bigo Didier,“*Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease*”, Alternatives, 2002.
- Accordo quadro sulle relazioni tra il Parlamento europeo e la Commissione europea*, Official Journal of the European Union ,L 304, 20 Nentore 2010.
- S.Bana, E.Canaj, *European Union Law*, Arbëria 07, Tiranë, 2009.