

THE FEDERAL TRUST

for education & research

enlightening the debate on good governance

European Policy Brief

April 2008 • The Federal Trust, 31 Jewry Street, London EC3N 2EY • www.fedtrust.co.uk

the
Global Policy
Institute

Policy Analysis in a Changing World

The EU's Member States and European Defence

Jeannette Ladzik, Federal Trust and Global Policy Institute

This brief reviews the range of views of EU member states on the most important ESDP provisions in the Lisbon Treaty: permanent structured cooperation, the mutual assistance clause, the mutual solidarity clause, the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and the President of the European Council. Permanent structured cooperation is intended to allow those Member States “whose military capabilities fulfil higher criteria and which have made more binding commitments to one another in this area with a view to the most demanding missions shall establish permanent structured cooperation within the Union framework”. The purpose of the solidarity clause is to ensure mutual assistance to help countries deal with a terrorist attack, a natural or man-made disaster. By contrast, the mutual assistance clause binds all member states to provide aid and assistance “by all means in their power” in the event of another Member State becoming a victim of armed aggression, without prejudicing the neutrality or relationship to NATO that some Member States may enjoy. The roles of the High Representative and the President of the European Council are more vaguely described in the Treaty, but are in general intended to give greater coherence and continuity to the Union's actions in the fields of external and defence policy.

Member states have been grouped into five different basic categories – Central and Eastern European, Mediterranean, Benelux, neutral/non-aligned and the so-called ‘big three’. Denmark is not included in any of these groups, because of its opt-out from ESDP.

Central and Eastern European States

Since the end of the Cold War, Central and Eastern European countries have pursued two primary political objectives: membership of the EU and membership of NATO. They have achieved both these goals, but membership of NATO and the EU has sometimes placed these states in situations where their links to the US and their new obligations to fellow EU member states have come into conflict. While for the Central and Eastern European states the EU has grown in importance in many domains, the US and NATO are still seen as essential for ensuring security in the region. ESDP can and should on this analysis only complement the actions of NATO.

EDITOR'S NOTE

This is one in a series of regular *European Policy Briefs* produced by the Federal Trust. The aim of the series is to describe and analyse major controversies in the current British debate about the European Union.

We welcome comments on and reactions to this policy brief. Other Policy Briefs are available on the Federal Trust's website, www.fedtrust.co.uk.

Brendan Donnelly (Director, Federal Trust)

When Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia joined the EU in 2004, the attitudes of 'old' EU member states towards ESDP had already been formed quite independently of the interests of the Baltic states. The approach that traditional border lines and territorial defence issues are history is far less appropriate a view in the context of the Baltic region, where Russia maintains pressure on the Baltic states. From the Baltic states' point of view, other EU member states show little interest in their problems with Russia, regarding them merely as bilateral issues. Therefore, Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia see NATO as the only guarantor of Baltic security. As any weaknesses or divisions within NATO would undermine their security, the Baltic states are against the creation of structures within ESDP which would duplicate NATO structures. Consequently, Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia are generally cautious about ESDP innovations in the Lisbon Treaty. During the Convention and the 2003/2004 Intergovernmental Conference (IGC), they were concerned primarily with making sure that none of the ESDP provisions would undermine NATO. The Baltic states strongly argued against the mutual assistance clause in the Convention as in their view it would duplicate the work of NATO and add nothing to the real security of European states. At the IGC, the Baltic governments, together with Britain and the other Central European states, insisted that the following passage be included in the mutual assistance clause: "Commitment and cooperation in this area shall be consistent with commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which, for those states which are members of it, remains the foundation of their collective defence and the forum for its implementation". Another provision of the Lisbon Treaty of which Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia are still suspicious is the non-rotating Presidency of the European Council. They fear that a permanent President would favour the bigger EU member states. In the Convention, a coalition of small and medium-sized EU countries lobbied to retain the 6-month rotating Presidency system but was unable to resist the pressure brought to bear by the larger member states.

Among the Central and Eastern European states, the Visegrad countries – Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia – had the most concerns over the European Constitution and Lisbon Treaty. The Polish and Czech governments held the view that the EU could function on the basis of the current treaties. During the Convention, Poland was in particular against the mutual assistance clause and the development of permanent structured cooperation as it feared they would amount to the unnecessary duplication of structures and capabilities between ESDP and NATO, thus weakening NATO. Poland's position softened somewhat after, in the 2003/2004 IGC negotiations, the concepts of mutual assistance and structured cooperation became more inclusive and NATO-friendly. Polish representatives to the Convention had also been wary of the inclusion of other provisions, in particular the solidarity clause. They argued that if such a clause were used in response to a terrorist attack, its application would have to be limited to dealing with the effects of a given attack on the territory of a member state. These concerns too were, in the event, addressed; the draft Constitutional Treaty of June 2003 stating of the solidarity clause that "the EU and its member states shall assist a member states in its territory".

Hungary is more supportive of ESDP than its fellow Visegrad countries, thanks in particular to its geographic proximity to the Western Balkans, a region which would benefit from increased security through ESDP.

Slovenia was the only Central and Eastern European country that was against the US-led operation in Iraq. The attitude of Slovenia towards ESDP is certainly more positive than the position of the Baltic states, Poland, Czech Republic and Slovakia. In Slovenia's view, ESDP instruments are necessary for the EU to live up to its potential to solve crises and to accept its share of responsibility for global stability. Slovenia agrees, however, with the Baltic states and Poland that ESDP is not an alternative to NATO and should never become one. Slovenia supports the provisions on ESDP as they are included

in the Lisbon Treaty although it warns that the post of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy should further defined before the post is first taken up.

Bulgaria and Romania held only observer status in the Convention and 2003/04 IGC and so were unable to influence the decisions taken there as strongly as the other 10 acceding states which had by then concluded accession negotiations with the EU. Nevertheless, both Romania and Bulgaria have supported all ESDP innovations since the Convention, perceiving participation in ESDP as a way of increasing their foreign policy potential and realising their national interests.

The Mediterranean Countries

In three Mediterranean countries – Spain, Portugal and Italy – a change of governments took place after the negotiations in the Convention and the subsequent IGC. These newly elected governments were more sympathetic to closer European cooperation on security and defence than had been their predecessors.

The Spanish general election of March 2004 occurred in the wake of the terrorist attack in Madrid. As a reaction to the attack, the EU heads of states and government declared at the European Council summit on 25 March 2004 that they would "act jointly against terrorist acts in the spirit of the solidarity clause" contained in the draft Constitutional Treaty. Due in particular to the persistence of the Basque terrorist organisation ETA, the Spanish government had championed this clause during the Convention. In December 2004, Spain issued a new National Defence Directive, which stressed that Spanish national security is indissolubly linked to the security of the European continent. Although the Zapatero government emphasised after the publication of this directive that it wished to continue to cooperate closely with NATO, nonetheless the directive itself clearly reflected Spain's increasingly European-oriented foreign and security policy. Ever since the Convention, the Spanish government has

consistently supported the post of a European President. Indeed, it was Spanish Prime Minister José María Aznar who, together with British Prime Minister Tony Blair and French President Jacques Chirac, first proposed the creation of the role. Spain is also in favour of establishing a High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, hoping that Javier Solana will be appointed to this post.

Portugal is supportive of the ESDP provisions in the Lisbon Treaty. The Portuguese government favours particularly the extension of the Petersberg tasks to include disarmament operations and post-conflict stabilisation, since it hopes that the new tasks will lead to the greater involvement of the EU in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Southern Mediterranean - two areas with which Portugal has close links.

Although Italy is the fourth biggest EU state in terms of military capabilities, compared to the UK, France and Germany it has not been able to exercise much influence in ESDP. A number of factors combine to explain Italy's under-representation in this respect. Italy has for example suffered from a succession of unstable governments, while also remaining more peripheral to EU decision-making than France and Germany and lacking the intimate ties with the US that Britain enjoys. Nonetheless, Italy has traditionally been a strong supporter of further developments in ESDP, with the exception of the government of Silvio Berlusconi. When Berlusconi came into office in 2001, he sought to align Italy more closely to the US. As a consequence, during the Convention and the subsequent IGC Italy reacted cautiously to the ESDP proposals, and to permanent structured cooperation and the mutual assistance clause in particular. The Berlusconi government did not want to irritate the US by supporting innovations which could be seen as prejudice to existing NATO commitments. After Romano Prodi, former President of the European Commission, succeeded Mr Berlusconi in 2006, the Italian government reverted to a more favourable stance towards ESDP and supported the inclusion of all ESDP provisions of the Constitutional Treaty, including permanent

structured cooperation and the mutual assistance clause, in the Lisbon Treaty.

Greece, another Mediterranean country, continues to have a difficult relationship with Turkey. The tension between the two states has often hindered closer cooperation within NATO and between the EU and NATO. For example, for almost two years the dispute between Greece and Turkey had prevented an agreement on "Berlin Plus" (an arrangement permitting the EU access to NATO operational planning capabilities and NATO common assets) before in December 2002 the EU and NATO were able to find a compromise. Given this constant tension and the fact that Turkey is a close ally of the US, Greece has a strained relationship with NATO as a whole. And it is therefore more concerned with the EU's military potential than with the strengthening of NATO and transatlantic relations. Greece supports the ESDP provisions in the Lisbon Treaty as an important step towards making ESDP more coherent and efficient. It is unenthusiastic about the final wording of the solidarity clause and mutual assistance clause in the Lisbon Treaty on the grounds that they lag behind similar NATO arrangements.

Benelux States

Belgium and Luxembourg have traditionally strong links with France and Germany, not only because they are neighbouring countries but also because they share a similar vision for the EU, including greater integration in EU defence. At the height of the Iraq war, France, Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg held a summit in Tervuren/Belgium where they agreed on ambitious ESDP proposals. The meeting provoked resistance or even amusement among other EU member states (as Denis MacShane, Britain's minister for Europe said: 'The idea of a European defence based on Belgium and without the United Kingdom— I wonder if that's particularly serious'¹) Some of the proposals made at the summit, such as the creation of a European armaments agency and a commitment for mutual defence, were later in-

troduced to the Convention and after long discussions and a number of changes incorporated into the Constitutional Treaty as parts of the European Defence Agency and mutual assistance clause. For Belgium and Luxembourg, division over the Iraq conflict highlighted the need for the EU to further develop ESDP. In the Convention and the 2003/2004 IGC, both countries were therefore supportive of the ESDP provisions, with the exception of the creation of a European president, something that in their view would undermine the principle of the equal treatment of all member states.

The third Benelux state, the Netherlands, emphasised the need to realise a new treaty after its people had rejected the Constitutional Treaty. The Dutch government insisted that the Lisbon Treaty would have to differ from the Constitutional Treaty in terms of substance, scope and title. However, since very few Dutch voters seem to have rejected the Constitution because of its ESDP provisions, the Dutch government supported the retention of these provisions in the Lisbon Treaty.

Neutral / Non-aligned Countries

The developments among the six neutral / non-aligned EU states – Austria, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Malta and Cyprus - since they joined the EU, have, with regard to ESDP, been remarkable. These countries have shown that military non-alignment is not a hindrance to a full role within ESDP. A good example of their exercising a full role in ESDP is the commitment made by Austria, Sweden, Finland, Ireland and Cyprus to the EU battlegroups (although the initiative remains a sensitive issue in particular in Ireland, not least because of the use of the term 'battlegroup'). Nevertheless, Cyprus, Greece, Romania and Bulgaria participate in the Balkan battlegroup, and as of 1 January 2008, Sweden, together with Finland, Norway, Estonia and Ireland, are on standby in the Nordic battlegroup. Due to the small size of its armed forces, Malta has not yet committed forces to battlegroups.

In the 1990s, Austria, Sweden and Finland reviewed their position on neutrality. Before Austria joined the EU in 1995, the Austrian parliament added a special provision to its constitution stipulating that the Neutrality Act of 1955 would not obstruct Austria's participation in the CFSP. After the ratification of the Amsterdam Treaty, the Austrian parliament in 1998 adopted another constitutional amendment, under which Austria could take part in the whole spectrum of the Petersberg Tasks, including combat missions in the context of crisis management and peace-making measures. This development demonstrates that Austria has changed its status on permanent neutrality to that of a non-allied state.

The absence of the concept of neutrality in the 2004 report of Finnish security and defence policy shows that, for Finland too, the concept is no longer regarded as a useful tool in policy-making. What is however left of Finnish neutrality is military non-alignment. The Swedish government meanwhile has a policy of non-participation in military alliances, nowadays formally excluding only binding agreements on mutual security guarantees.

The peculiarity of Ireland's military neutrality sets it apart from the likes of Austria, Finland or Sweden. Ireland has kept a part of its "true" neutrality. Irish legislation requires that any decision to send troops overseas on a military mission requires the authority of the government, an explicit parliamentary decision and formal authorisation from the UN (so-called triple lock). Furthermore, when the Irish people gave their approval for the Nice Treaty, they also backed a government proposal to amend the constitution to the effect that Ireland could only take part in an EU common defence initiative with the specific approval of the people as expressed in a referendum.

For Austria, Finland, Ireland and Sweden, the most contentious issue in the Lisbon Treaty is the mutual assistance clause. When this clause was first presented in the Convention the governments of the four countries vehemently opposed its inclusion in the Constitutional Treaty.

Binding security guarantees between the member states of the Union was the line these states were not willing to cross. To resolve this impasse, the member states agreed at the 2003/2004 IGC to insert a passage from the Maastricht Treaty: 'This shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain member states'. All four states are, meanwhile, in favour of the mutual solidarity clause, since the clause asks for assistance against non-state terrorist networks or in the event of a natural or man-made disaster and hence does not apply to an attack by another state as the mutual assistance clause does. Furthermore, as mentioned in a separate Declaration attached to the Lisbon Treaty: '[...], none of the provisions of [the solidarity clause] is intended to affect the right of another Member State to choose the most appropriate means to comply with its own solidarity obligation towards that Member State.' Nonetheless, one could well argue that the solidarity clause is a new step for the neutral/non-aligned countries. One day, the EU might have to use military components to fight terrorism and if the terrorist attack were sponsored by a state, then the solidarity clause would become akin to a mutual defence clause. Permanent structured cooperation as well is seen as problematic by Austria, Finland, Ireland and Sweden. Ireland in particular only accepted structured cooperation as part of an overall package and after following the insertion of limiting clauses. Finland's Foreign Minister Tuomioja stated in an interview in June 2005 that he would not regret the failure of the Constitutional Treaty if it resulted in the abandonment of the permanent structured cooperation concept.

Finland opposes the post of a European Council President, whereas it supports the creation of a European Foreign Minister. In contrast, the Swedish government views positively the creation of European Council President partly because such a post would limit the power of the Commission and promote the intergovernmental elements of the EU. The Irish government is in favour of giving the High Representative for the CFSP more power. At the same time, it welcomes the abandon-

ment in the Lisbon Treaty of the title 'Union Minister for Foreign Affairs' contained in the European Constitutional Treaty, which it considered provocative.

The fact that Austria, Sweden, Finland and Ireland joined the NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP), a programme of practical bilateral cooperation between individual partner countries and NATO, sets them apart from the two other neutral/non-aligned states in the EU – Malta and Cyprus. The Copenhagen European Council decided that only those member states which are members of either NATO or PfP, are eligible for ESDP operations using NATO assets and information. Malta and Cyprus are therefore prevented from full ESDP participation. Nevertheless, Malta supports the ESDP provisions in the Lisbon Treaty without reservation, its national parliament unanimously ratifying the Lisbon Treaty on 29 January 2008. Cyprus also traditionally holds a positive view of ESDP. The Cypriot government hopes that it can play a more constructive role in the development of ESDP, taking into consideration the country's privileged geostrategic position in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The Three Largest Member States

1. Germany

When the Grand Coalition assumed power in Germany in 2005, a new style in German foreign policy-making could be identified. Whereas former Chancellor Schröder had been criticised for his personalised and assertive way of conducting foreign policy, current Chancellor Merkel has been hailed for her business-like and conciliatory approach. This new modest tone, along with careful consultations with other EU member states about their expectations and reservations concerning the future of the Constitutional Treaty allowed the German EU Presidency to pave the way for treaty reform at the European Council summit in June 2007. Before Germany took over the EU Presidency in January 2007, it was vehemently against dropping the Constitutional Treaty. While the German gov-

ernment changed its position at the beginning of its Presidency and signalled its willingness to revert to the traditional method of an amending treaty instead of a constitution, it was still able to ensure that most of the Constitutional Treaty's innovations, in particular the ESDP provisions, would be saved.

Together with France, Germany contributed several proposals for the ESDP domain to the Convention. Two of these proposals proved, at the Convention and at the 2003/2004 IGC to be highly controversial. The first proposal was for "closer cooperation on mutual defence". A member state participating in such cooperation, which is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, should inform the other participating member states of the situation and request assistance from them. The second proposal opened up the possibility for those member states which meet certain military capability criteria and which wish to enter into more binding commitments, to establish "structured cooperation". A breakthrough on these two initiatives was achieved in weeks leading up to the meeting of EU Foreign Ministers in Naples in November 2003, when Germany, France and the UK agreed on new draft proposals which were later approved by other member states and included in the Constitutional Treaty. In the first proposal, any reference to mutual defence disappeared. It was now called the 'mutual assistance' clause. Two assertions - that the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain member states would not be prejudiced, and that NATO would remain the foundation of collective defence for member states - were inserted. In addition, the requirement to give aid and assistance to a member state under attack was qualified with the wording that member states should have "an obligation of aid and assistance". Although the German government agreed on the new text, it considered the mutual assistance clause to have been unnecessarily weakened. The new formulation on structured cooperation (now named 'permanent structured cooperation') was on the other hand seen by Germany as a balanced compromise. Germany, France and the UK agreed that

permanent structured cooperation would come under the political responsibility of the Council and contain reference to the operational capacities of the participants.

Although the German government has always been strongly committed to the development of ESDP, it is still reluctant to use its military force and deploy troops abroad. Under the Schröder government, German security and defence policy underwent some far-reaching changes, such as the making legally possible the participation of German armed forces in out-of-areas missions. This however does not mean that Germany's willingness to deploy its troops has changed. If Germany contributes troops to ESDP, NATO or UN out-of-area missions, it does so only out of a sense of solidarity and the desire to accommodate the expectations of its international partners.

2. France

In 1998, French President Jacques Chirac initiated with his British counterpart, Tony Blair, the St Malo agreement. Though both states held differing views on the underlying purpose of a European security and defence policy and how it should fit in with NATO, this nonetheless constituted a major step towards the development of a credible ESDP. Since then, the French government has sought to build up ESDP as a counterweight to NATO. The negotiations in the Convention and the subsequent IGC confirmed however that France needs the support of Britain in particular if it is to develop ESDP further. France and Britain are the main providers of troops and the largest producers and buyers of military hardware within the European Union. They are the only countries in the Union with genuinely global, strategic, expeditionary mindsets and the forces to back up their ambitions. Yet negotiations between the two states have seldom been easy. France, especially under President Chirac, tended to view the relationship between NATO and ESDP as a zero-sum game: what is good for one is bad for the other. This position changed significantly when Nicholas Sarkozy came into office in May 2007. Sarkozy signalled that he would like French officers fully to

rejoin NATO's military command structure. In the second half of 2008, France will take on the Presidency of the EU. One of the main tasks of the Presidency will be to focus on ESDP. France is eager to introduce ambitious ESDP proposals such as a permanent and substantial EU planning command and a new European security strategy. A revision of the French national defence and security policy is currently underway.

3. Britain

The creation of ESDP at the Franco-British St Malo meeting saw the effective end of the UK's 50-year commitment to avoid discussing the development of defence matters within the European framework. Although Britain for the first time accepted the legitimacy of an autonomous EU capacity at military level, it stressed that an emerging European security and defence policy must never be allowed to challenge the existing structures of NATO. After 9/11 and the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, British attention was diverted away from the development of ESDP. At the Convention's working group on defence, British representatives were at best indifferent and at worst hostile towards most of the ESDP proposals. (This was in contrast to British behaviour in the Convention's working group on external action, where British representatives actively contributed and fully supported the appointment of a European Council President and the merger of the two posts of High Representative for CFSP and External Affairs Commissioner.)

Britain's hostility was in particular aimed at the concept of permanent structured co-operation, since it feared that the US might see the initiative as an alternative to NATO. Britain was also concerned that under a regime of permanent structured cooperation a small-number of self-elected states could 'short-circuit' decision-making and as a consequence decisions on European military missions could be taken by a minority. British members of the Convention also argued against the inclusion of a mutual defence agreement in the Constitutional Treaty, as a duplication of NATO structure. Britain's position

on both permanent structured co-operation and a mutual defence agreement changed however, following the Franco-British-German trilateral talks in November 2003. At this meeting, the British government secured assurances, later approved by the 2003/2004 IGC and included in the Constitutional Treaty, that, in particular, a group participating in permanent structured cooperation could not launch a mission on behalf of the EU without the unanimous agreement of the Council. The mutual assistance clause was also re-drafted to satisfy all EU member states.

After the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty by France and the Netherlands, the British government were one of the first to declare the Constitutional Treaty dead. Later, during the so-called 'period of reflection', they argued for a simple amending treaty as opposed to the retention of the Constitutional Treaty desired by other member states. Although the ESDP provisions of the Constitutional Treaty were strongly influenced by British thinking, at the June 2007 European Council summit the then Prime Minister Blair demanded the reconsideration of these provisions to emphasize their intergovernmental nature. At the request of the British government, two minor changes to the ESDP provisions were therefore inserted in the Lisbon Treaty. The Union Minister for Foreign Affairs was renamed High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and a Declaration was attached to the Treaty to underline that the new ESDP provisions did not 'prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of the member states' or 'the primary responsibility of the Security Council and of its members for the maintenance of international peace and security'.

Considering the German, French and British views on the ESDP provisions, it becomes apparent that each of the three states has very different geopolitical instincts: the British are strongly Atlanticist, the French stress the need for Europe to be able to act autonomously, while the Germans are reluctant to deploy troops overseas or to use force. Because these

three countries are the most militarily powerful of the Union, and because they represent different political camps within the EU on the question of ESDP, any agreement attained between them usually has a good chance of being endorsed by all other member states.

Conclusion

Having established the positions of the member states on the five most important CFSP/ESDP provisions in the Lisbon Treaty, it is now possible to attempt to identify whether any broad patterns of approach are discernible (see table overleaf).

On the basis of the chart below, EU member states can be divided into three general groups: a pro-ESDP group, an ambiguous ESDP group, and a group with a rather negative attitude towards ESDP innovations. The founding member states (except the Netherlands), the Mediterranean states and the two newest member states – Bulgaria and Romania – belong to the pro-ESDP group. The ambiguous group comprises four neutral/non-aligned countries (Austria, Finland, Cyprus and Malta), two Central and Eastern European countries (Slovenia and Hungary) and the Netherlands, while the negative ESDP group opposing most of the ESDP provisions in the Lisbon Treaty include the remaining Central and Eastern European states (Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland), the neutral countries (Sweden and Ireland) and the UK. The composition of the groups is generally unsurprising. The five founding member states and the Mediterranean countries tend to favour European integration in almost every domain. The Finnish and Austrian position on ESDP issues is conditioned by their policy of non-alignment. For this reason the two normally pro-integrationist countries belong to the ambiguous group. The same is true for Malta and Cyprus. The more positive view of ESDP taken by Slovenia and Hungary compared to that of the Polish and the Baltic states stems, amongst other reasons, from the fact that Slovenia and Hungary border the troubled Balkan re-

gion. The Baltic states, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic on the other hand consider NATO as essential for ensuring security in their region especially in the light of a resurgent Russia. These states also maintain a close relationship with the US. They are therefore against any innovation which in their view could threaten the primacy of NATO. In this respect, the British position resembles the Central and Eastern European one. The British view of ESDP is, however, by no means an entirely sceptical one. Every important ESDP innovation, including the creation of ESDP itself, has either been initiated by Britain together with France and Germany or at least after some debate and redrafting supported by Britain. Without the UK, EU defence would not have progressed so far. The French-German alliance would not have been enough to forge an effective ESDP. By influencing the development of ESDP Britain on the other hand ensures that ESDP continues to proceed under the umbrella of NATO.

| | High Representative | Council President | Perm. structured cooperation | Mutual assistance clause | Solidarity Clause |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Est. | +/- | - | +/- | - | + |
| Lit. | +/- | - | +/- | - | + |
| Lat. ... | +/- | - | +/- | - | + |
| Pol. | - | + | - | - | +/- |
| Czch. | - | + | - | - | +/- |
| Sl'vak. ... | - | + | - | - | +/- |
| Hun. | + | +/- | +/- | +/- | + |
| Sl'ven. | +/- | +/- | + | +/- | + |
| Rom. ... | + | +/- | + | + | + |
| Bulg. | + | +/- | + | + | + |
| Spain | + | + | + | +/- | + |
| Port. ... | + | + | + | +/- | + |
| Italy | + | + | +/- | +/- | + |
| Gre. | + | + | + | + | + |
| Belg. ... | + | - | + | + | + |
| Lux. | + | - | + | + | + |
| Ned. | + | +/- | +/- | +/- | + |
| Aus. ... | + | +/- | +/- | - | + |
| Fin. | + | +/- | - | - | + |
| Swe. | - | + | - | - | + |
| Ire. ... | +/- | +/- | - | - | + |
| Malta | + | +/- | + | - | + |
| Cyp. | + | +/- | + | - | + |
| Ger. ... | + | +/- | + | + | + |
| Fr. | + | + | + | + | + |
| UK | +/- | + | - | - | +/- |

Notes

¹ Doyle, Leonard (2003), 'French call for military cooperation divides EU', *The Independent*, April 28th.