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Abstract: The Common External Security Policy (CESP) is based on political integration and promotes E.U interests in relation with third parties. In 1993, through The Maastricht Treaty, CESP becomes a pillar of the E.U. and is based on five fundamental principles. After the first revision of the Maastricht Treaty (Amsterdam, 1997), the President of the E.U. Council, along with the External Affairs Commissioner and the High Representative for CESP represent the E.U. at a diplomatic level on the international stage. This representation has been confirmed through the Constitutional Treaty established in 2004, and the Lisbon Treaty in 2007 as well. The E.U. has also created new institutions to support this representation. At the moment, CESP is facing major issues. The first challenge is the European-American anti missile shield, along with the standoff between Russia and N.A.T.O. / O.T.A.N. and the European Union, the standoff currently threatens Europe’s economic and social stability, through division. Another crisis which CESP faces is the illegal immigration crisis, which has at least two major causes: Islamic State terrorism and poverty in countries across Asia and Eastern Africa. The massive exodus of Syrians, a never before seen phenomenon, has divided Europe again, based on how the matter should be addressed, leading to the conclusion that there is no political unity in the E.U. The expansion of the European Union is another CESP concern, as economic integration is paramount, i.e. the creation of a larger market, within the global economy and ensuring Europe’s political stability. Of special interest is the Neighbouring Policy of the European Union, which includes many regions. The E.U and the U.S. are not the only actors involved, but also Russia, Turkey, and many poorer and smaller states which aspire towards a better standard of living..
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1. Introduction

Sixty years ago, due to global threats, the E.U. was created as a project of peace, and an influencer of the global stage, as it is to this day. The E.U. is not a military block, it does not pose a military threat, it only has a Common Security Policy, i.e. member states openly discuss the external policy of the E.U. Through several expansions, the E.U. has become the largest block in the global economy, and has a common external economic policy for all 28 member states. Thus, it presents itself in front of the global community as a single political and economic unit. CESP is a very sensitive area, based on political integration, promoting E.U. interests and the interests of member states in relations with third party countries.

The Maastricht Treaty effectively meant the passing from an economic and social integration to a political integration, meaning CESP. CESP is a bridge towards the total integration of European communities, based on the cooperation of all member states (Prisecan, 2004). There have been several attempts, at a European level, to create a common defense policy; all of them were unsuccessful. In 1950 for instance, there was a French idea to create a supranational structure for defense, but this failed, although there was enough political will to support the concepts of common external policy and common defense policy. In 1954, the Western European Union (WEO) was founded, in order to prove the viability of cooperation in issues such as policy and security among Western states and to strengthen the policy of Europe within NATO. There were rumors that the WEO ceased to exist because it was inefficient, but this is completely untrue.

The WEO originated within the Brussels Treaty in 1948, and was reactivated in 1984 in order to create a European Defense Identity, on the basis of collaboration between E.U. members and the European pillar of NATO. In 1970, through the Unique Western European Act, the extended European Cooperation Initiative is created, with the purpose of sharing information, consulting and cooperation. This institution operated until 1993, although results have been modest.

In 1987, the WEO Council, formed from External Affairs Ministers and Defense Ministers managed to converge Europe’s defense policy within its NATO pillar. In 1992, the Ministers of External Affairs and Defense have released the ‘Petersberg Statement’, through which actions to prevent conflicts are undertaken, in cooperation with the OSCE. Another important event took
place in 1994, when the WEO Council released the ‘Kirchsberg Statement’, which offers countries in the West and East of Europe a partnership position.

2. CESP - Pillar of the Maastricht Treaty

The Maastricht Treaty in 1993, sets the WEO as an important part of the E.U.’s policy, the armed hand of the European Union, transforming it into an essential pillar of NATO. Also in the Maastricht Treaty, in Article 11, the five main principles of the CSEP are being highlighted, meaning: the defense of common values, strengthening of the security of the E.U., maintaining the peace and security at an international level, promoting international cooperation, developing democracy and the rule of law.

Concerning the common security policy, the E.U. is inspired from the policy of WEO, and is an integral part of the development of the European Union. So, the main responsibility of the UEO was common defense, until the institution was dismantled, 50 years later (Prisecan, 2004). The first overhaul of the Maastricht Treaty came with the Amsterdam Treaty. Here, the intergovernmental reunions were replaced by reunions of the External Affairs Ministers and Defense Ministers of member states. These meetings were chaired by the General Secretary of the Council of Ministers, who is also the High Representative for CESP.

Together with the presidency of the Council and the Commissioner for External Affairs, the High Representative of CESP represents the European Union at a diplomatic level on the international stage. An important moment for CESP was at the Brussels summit in 2003, where the E.U. decided on its limited military independence. European leaders presented an accord concerning the European defense in which military exercises would be held by E.U. forces. This accord concerning the defense of Europe was important because it allowed the Continent to finally have a unified military force. The defense cell was to be under the orders of the E.U. Ministries Council, and of the High CESP Representative; concerning the limited military independence, the U.S. opinion was that it ‘must not double NATO efforts’. The compromise between the U.S. and Europe was also signed in Brussels, where the WEO was dismantled. The Center for Coordination of Military Operations of the E.U. could intervene on a regional level, should the Commanding Departments of national states could not face a crisis situation.

In 2004, the signed Constitutional Treaty brings a significant innovation, the creation of the job of Minister of External Affairs, which was
supposed to take on the prerogatives of the High CESP Representative, as well as the prerogatives of the Commissioner for External Affairs of the E.U. The Lisbon Treaty in 2006, also known as the 2007 Reform Treaty, kept the High Representative of CESP position, because the position of Minister of External Affairs was rejected by Britain (M. Dragoi, 2013).

3. Current CESP challenges

In such a context, the main issues which the CESP currently faces are the European-American anti missile shield; illegal immigration; E.U. expansion, the E.U.’s Neighbouring policy, the stability of Western Balkans and others.

One of the main issues which the CESP currently faces is the anti missile shield, and this is a very sensitive issue because it causes a major rift between the Russia on one hand, and the U.S./ N.A.T.O. on the other. This threatens European economic and political security. This phenomenon can lead to a new arms race, with unwanted effects: economic sanctions, embargos, higher prices for raw materials, as but also money to support military programs.

Both the U.S./N.A.T.O. and Russia claim that their national security relies on control of their national airspace, through military capabilities such as the ability to stop ballistic missiles. After the September 11, 2001 attacks, the U.S. announced Russia that it will pull out of the non-nuclear weapons pact, and will build anti missile shields. Differences of opinion between Russia and U.S./N.A.T.O. on these shields are based on the fact that each party has its own defense strategy. The Americans claim the shields are meant to protect U.S. soldiers on duty in Europe and other theaters of operations, U.S. soil, but also that of N.A.T.O. member countries, in order to defend them from medium-ranged missiles which can come from the Middle East or even North-East Asia. The Americans also claim that the shield is not designed for attacks or a nuclear offensive from Russia, although NATO has come terribly close to the borders of Ukraine.

In this context, Russia claims that the purpose of the anti missile shield is to discourage its nuclear programs, because there is no threat from Iran and North Korea on Europe. Still, Russia considers the West as a potential enemy, and demands NATO to stop advancing towards its borders, and aims to become the leader of Central and Eastern Europe, thus expanding its influence such as it was in the former soviet sphere of influence; this in turn
would imply that the West acknowledges Russia’s claims for security as legitimate.

In conclusion, Russia believes that it is in a vulnerable state, as it feels it is surrounded by N.A.T.O. bases with troops deployed close to its borders. N.A.T.O. member states, particularly in Eastern Europe, on the other hand, believe that the anti missile shield should be directed in such a way so as it must offer protection from a potential Russian threat.

These requests come from Poland, Estonia, Latvia, countries which see the threat of a Russian intervention. Germany claims that reorienting the shield is a useless taunt on Moscow, while France is undecided. The shield’s base location in Deveselu, Romania, is a threat to Russia, so Romania and Poland can possibly remain targets for an attack by Russia.

Romanian officials claim that the anti missile shield from Deveselu is not pointed at any state, and is an ‘exclusively defensive’ one. Romania’s accord with the U.S. concerning the anti missile shield expressly states that ‘it cannot be used in other means than those noted in the United Nations Charter’ and that it has non-nuclear and non-dangerous capabilities, in addition to being under the direct supervision of able Romanian authorities (the Ministry of External Affairs’ State Secretary).

A major problem with which the CESP is illegal migration. The number of immigrants which want to reach Europe has surged. The phenomenon has not been documented before, and has two major causes; the terrorist activities proliferated by the Islamic State, in the Middle East and the state of poverty of countries within North-East Africa. Civilians within these areas is threatened by systematic torture, inhuman treatments and slavery, breaking of conflict’s rules of engagements, etc. Terrorism is a considerable cause, because it is a challenge for the entire world, not just Europe.

The E.U. supports the fight against terrorism, participating to the efforts of the international community to prevent regional conflicts. The massive exodus of Syrians divided Europe, as some countries believe these waves threaten their economic and social stability. Other states aim to help the refugees, as part of their spirit of human solidarity. We believe the division of Europe in front of this challenge proves the lack of political unity in the E.U.

Another challenge is given by the expansion of the E.U. There have been voices which proclaimed that the adhesion of Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia impacts the European cohesion structure in a negative way.

The former French president claimed that this statement is ‘malicious’. The expansion towards the East has ‘an economic importance’
and represents a strong market, with tremendous economic and scientific importance. The former British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, stated, concerning the E.U., that ‘the idea of a united Europe, working together is existential in order for our nations to be strong enough to keep our place within the world’. In the opinion of European specialists, ‘after three waves of expansion’, between 2008 and 2013, the E.U. has developed ‘expansion tiredness’. This phenomenon has been advanced while considering the possible adhesions of new countries, such as Serbia, Moldova, Macedonia or Turkey. As an expansion priority, the Balkans area is sighted: Bosnia and Herzegovina, FYR Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro. A further perspective of the CESP is not capable of ensuring the stability of the entire system.

The stability of the Western Balkans is monitored by CESP. The E.U. signed a preferential commercial accord with seven countries in the Western Balkans, namely: Albania, Bosnia, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia. The accord allows almost all exports from this region of Europe to enter the E.U. without customs tax or limits on the others. These states benefit, through the Stability and Association Pact, from peace and stability within the region.

These commercial accords with the European Union sustain the political stability and economic progress across the region. Without this accord, the region’s political stability would be affected. In order to promote the stability and required reforms, the CESP has developed a European Neighbouring Policy. The following countries are included in the Eastern region: Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova. In order to solve crises within this area, which is under the influence of Russia, it is required that a political environment is developed, where the U.S. and Russia take part in order to ensure a global partnership.

The European Neighboring Policy includes the Black Sea Region as well. Through the adhesion of Romania and Bulgaria to the E.U., this area becomes a part of the E.U. The initiative in this region consists of sectorial programs, to develop the free traveling of persons, energy, transportation, environment, maritime policies, fishing, sciences, technology, etc.

Promoting the Eastern Partnership, formed by the Ukraine, Moldova as well as other three countries, i.e. Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia along with the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and the Northern Dimension have as purpose the strengthening of economic relations and the development of strong political relations across Europe. Europeans believe the E.U. has to be involved more in annihilation of global threats.
In conclusion, the E.U. is facing major crises. The current CESP is not able to address them anymore, and as such, it cannot ensure economic and political stability across Europe. The E.U needs political unity. Thus, for the E.U., it is essential to create a Ministry of External Affairs with a Minister of External Affairs who must express a unique European opinion on the international scene.
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