

Lecture given by Jim Cloos: CFSP resources (Luxembourg, 30 November 2006)

Source: L'apport de la PESC à l'action extérieure de l'Union européenne (discours pour l'Université du Luxembourg)/Université du Luxembourg, cycle de conférences, semestre d'hiver 2006-2007 / Jim Cloos, prise de vue : François Fabert.- Luxembourg: CVCE [Prod.], 30.11.2006. CVCE, Sanem. - VIDEO (11:27, Couleur, Son original).

Copyright: (c) Translation CVCE.EU by UNI.LU

All rights of reproduction, of public communication, of adaptation, of distribution or of dissemination via Internet, internal network or any other means are strictly reserved in all countries.

Consult the legal notice and the terms and conditions of use regarding this site.

URL:

http://www.cvce.eu/obj/lecture_given_by_jim_cloos_cfsp_resources_luxembourg_30_november_2006-en-e21e1f3f-14d9-43b4-a0c4-b4992cc77a82.html



Last updated: 05/07/2016

Lecture given by Jim Cloos: CFSP resources (Luxembourg, 30 November 2006)

[Jim Cloos] I should like to say a few words about resources. If you want to pursue a foreign policy, whether as a state or as an organisation like the European Union, you need resources. Now, as I said at the beginning, the European Union, or Community, has always had a lot of financial resources and funding for providing assistance. If you take 'Heading 4', as they say in budget jargon, which broadly speaking covers external economic aid, and if you add to this the EDF (European Development Fund), which is not actually included in the budget but amounts to the same thing, you end up with a figure of around 7 billion euros per year. That's quite a lot of money. And of course if you add to that what the Member States are spending on a bilateral level, it's ten times more. You need to keep a sense of proportion, but it's a lot.

For example, we invested something over 4 billion in the Balkans between 2002 and 2004 (I can't remember the exact figure), not counting the EIB money, which Philippe Maystadt may have told you about. This is quite a substantial sum. But it's not enough. What we have been developing recently — and I would like to spend a few minutes talking about this — are crisis management instruments, because in reality (I know that someone is bound to ask me this question, so I'll say this straight away) the common foreign and security policy and the European security and defence policy are not in competition with NATO. They are mainly focused on crisis management, which is all to do with the famous Petersberg Tasks (I don't know if you are all familiar with the history of WEU and so on), which were included in the Treaty: peacekeeping, peacemaking to a certain extent, evacuation in the event of a crisis, and so on. So they are essentially a tool for this.

They use both civil and military instruments, and this is what immediately distinguishes them from NATO, which does not do civil crisis management. So these are all things we are currently developing. I talked earlier about the 'Headline Goal' for troops, and we are also doing something similar at a civil level, with the police and judges, so that we can send judges to certain countries. I'll give a few examples of this in a moment. We are also currently developing the concept of 'battlegroups', which involves the Member States, individually or in groups of two, three or four, providing Europe with 'battlegroups' of around 1 500 men, fully equipped and on standby to intervene if necessary with all the communications, transport, etc. needed. We're having a few problems with the transport, but we're working on it.

So all this is currently being put in place. But perhaps more importantly, we haven't just created structures and capacities, we have started to actually do things, to launch operations. The first operation dates from 2003, and was a police operation that we took over from NATO ... sorry, from the UN, a UN police operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina. It was the EU which carried out this operation, and even now we still have over 500 police officers there to manage the situation and to provide the local police with help and training. These may be small things, but they really count. Since then we have launched around 15 operations in three years.

Now, I won't list all these operations — you can find them on the Council website — but I'll try to tell you about the three objectives we are pursuing. The first is to support a peace process. Let me give you two examples. First of all, I've already talked about the police operation in Bosnia, but we also have a military operation in Bosnia, with more than six thousand troops. This is an operation known as 'ALTHEA' that we took over from NATO, and it's very important for monitoring the implementation of the 1995 Dayton Agreement.

A second example, which there has been a lot of talk about recently, is the peace agreement between the rebels in Aceh, in Indonesia, and the Indonesian Government. This conflict, which has cost tens of thousands of lives — it doesn't get much attention in Europe, but it's been going on for over thirty years — is between Aceh, a province in north-west Indonesia, and Jakarta. What happened was that Martti Ahtisaari, the former Finnish President, started to mediate between the two sides, and one day he came to see Javier Solana and told him 'I think I can get an agreement, but I need us to be able to send a monitoring and observation mission there in a month's time'. We launched this 250-man operation, together with the ASEAN countries, within three weeks, in August.

This operation is going extremely well, the agreement is holding, and it is a huge success that is not getting the attention it deserves, in my opinion. Again, in comparison with what the Americans are doing — they are sending I don't know how many tens of thousands of troops — it's not much, but it's having a far from negligible effect, and I can assure you that it's totally changed the way people look at the European Union in this region. Our relations with the Indonesians have completely changed because of this relatively small operation. And there are other examples of supporting peace processes.

The second objective we are pursuing with this type of operation is to avert a real crisis. Let me give you two more examples. First, there was an operation called 'Concordia' involving only 500–600 troops, so it didn't cost much at all, in Macedonia, or should I say the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (it's all a bit complicated because of our Greek friends). We carried out this operation, working closely with NATO — we have special arrangements with NATO here that I won't go into in detail — and I think it prevented a civil war in that country. Obviously, not much was said about it because the civil war never happened, but it cost the European Union, and particularly the people of Europe, much, much less than a civil war would have done. So this was a very good example.

A second example was operation 'Artemis' in Congo (the DRC) in 2003, when Kofi Annan called Jacques Chirac and Javier Solana and said: 'We have a UN operation running in Congo, particularly in the east of the country, in Bunia and the whole of that region. We're no longer in control of the situation and we're worried that things could get seriously out of hand; there could even be genocide. Do something to help us out here. In the meantime we'll send reinforcements and draw up a new mandate for MONUC', which is still there and is an extremely important operation, mainly carried out by the French under the European flag. The European flag was very important, since it was politically difficult for the French to carry out this operation because of its rather difficult relations with Uganda, Rwanda, etc. These neighbours needed to play along.

The European flag helped a lot, and of course there were Swedes, British, French, and so on. We sent around 2 000 troops there for six months, and said: 'We won't be staying'. During those six months, we stabilised the situation, we trained Bangladeshi troops for the UN, we negotiated in New York to give these UN troops a stronger mandate and then we left. But we are still very much involved in Congo. I'm sure you will have seen that there has been a second operation that is coming to an end now, led by the Germans, but with Polish, French and Spanish involvement. The purpose was to prevent things from getting out of hand during the elections. Well, the situation now is still not very stable, of course, but this is the first time that this country has had proper elections and we helped to stabilise things.

There is also obviously a lot going on behind this operation. The Commission is working very hard in promoting a lot of development and so on. It's very important that all this is seen as a whole. I often say that if you look at the ESDP operations in financial terms — there is a budget heading for the CFSP — the figure currently stands at EUR 102 million, which is nothing. Next year it is to increase to 150 and the year after to 200 or 300, but this is still peanuts compared with the overall budget.

As I often point out, this is well under 1 % of what the EU spends on external economic assistance, but that less than 1 % means that the remaining 99 % can be spent so much better. Why? If your country is notorious for being politically unstable, you're not going to develop. If your country is in a state of civil war, you're not going to develop, or you're going to do what people have been doing for decades, which is to throw billions and billions down black holes. This is the way I look at it. It is ... how can I describe it, it's a missing link, an extra string to our bow in terms of European measures. And I think it works rather well.

The third objective that we are pursuing with these operations is 'nation-building', or in other words training the police. We are training the police in Palestine, for example. By the way, I forgot to mention when I was talking about supporting peace agreements that we have created a crossing point — another one of those small but extremely important things — at Rafat, between the Palestinian territory and Egypt, so that Palestinians can leave Gaza, which they have been virtually unable to do for years. And we have Europeans monitoring all this. There are a lot of very complicated problems here, but it is yet another example of how practical Europe can be.

So, this nation-building — what are we doing, exactly? Well, we are training the police in Bosnia, and we are training police forces in other areas, too. We have sent a small team to Georgia for several months, to help them to construct a proper judicial system. And there are plenty of other examples ... We are carrying out 'security sector reform' in Congo and other countries. These are extremely practical things that don't get enough attention, in my view, and that tend not to be seen in the overall context of the EU's external activities.