



BUAB

Avrupa Birliđi Uygulama ve
Arařtırma Merkezi

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF EU SECURITY PRIOR TO LISBON
TREATY: CLASSIFICATION OF THREATS**

Dr. Aykut KARAKUŐ

Monthly Report | Issue: 6

December, 2024

<https://buab.beykent.edu.tr>

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF EU SECURITY PRIOR TO LISBON TREATY: CLASSIFICATION OF THREATS

Aykut KARAKUŞ*

Introduction

The dynamics of the bipolar international system that emerged following the end of World War II triggered the emergence of discussions on collective European security. In this context, the Brussels Treaty of 1948, which constituted a cornerstone in the evolution of European security concepts, led to the establishment of the Western European Union (WEU). However, the formation of NATO on April 4, 1949, relegated the WEU to a secondary role. Throughout the Cold War, European security was predominantly maintained under the NATO framework.

With the Maastricht Treaty, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) was established as one of the three foundational pillars of the European Union. To enhance the functionality of the WEU, the Petersberg Tasks were adopted in Bonn on June 9, 1992. These tasks were categorized into three main areas: peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and peacemaking. However, the emergence of new dynamics in the post-Cold War era -including globalization, the rise of asymmetric power structures, terrorism, and the expanding scope of security- necessitated a reclassification of threats. Accordingly, following the September 11 attacks, the EU sought to redefine and reclassify threats in its December 2003 Security Strategy Document. Ultimately, the EU categorized these threats into two main types: global and critical.

THE CONCEPT AND EVOLUTION OF EUROPEAN SECURITY PRIOR TO MAASTRICHT

The collective conceptualization of security in Europe remained underdeveloped during the 1950s and 1960s, primarily due to divergent perspectives held by France and the United Kingdom regarding the rearmament of Germany. This lack of a unified political and security framework among the members of the European Economic

* Researcher, Dr., Istanbul Beykent University European Union Application and Research Center (BÜAB), aykutkarakus@beykent.edu.tr

Community (EEC) did not, however, impede significant progress in economic integration. Following the Schuman Plan of 1950, the Treaty of Paris, which formally established the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), was signed on June 18, 1951 (Hesapçioğlu, 2007: 74). Subsequently, “*the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) were instituted through the Treaty of Rome in 1957, and these entities were unified under the European Communities (EC) via the Merger Treaty of 1967*” (Karakuş and Ekinçi, 2021, 559). A critical development occurred during the Luxembourg Summit of 1970, which witnessed the adoption of the Davignon Report and the establishment of the European Political Cooperation (EPC). For the first time, member states collectively articulated a commitment to fostering a common European identity within the political sphere.

The détente phase within the bipolar international system facilitated further advancements, most notably the signing of the Helsinki Final Act on August 1, 1975. This accord led to the creation of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) (Karabulut, 2011: 72). Nonetheless, the CSCE was designed primarily as a forum for dialogue on political, economic, military, and socio-cultural issues between the Western and Eastern Blocs, rather than as a mechanism tailored to address the specific security needs of the European Communities. Throughout the Cold War, EC member states perceived the United States as a critical balancing power vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, with their security requirements largely fulfilled within the NATO framework. The fragmentation of the Eastern Bloc (manifested through developments such as the Yugoslav civil war and the initial liberalization processes in Romania and Bulgaria) underscored the necessity of advancing institutional and legal frameworks to address emerging challenges. This period of transformation laid the groundwork for the Treaty of Maastricht, which would serve as a cornerstone for the institutional evolution of the present-day European Union (Goldstein, 1992: 120-121).

THE EVOLUTION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION'S SECURITY CONCEPT POST-MAASTRICHT

The end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the bipolar international system marked a turning point in academic discourse, challenging the dominance of realist

perspectives on security. While realist theorists traditionally categorized military and security issues as high politics, liberal theorists argued that individual security should take precedence over state security. Within this framework, dimensions such as economic security, food security, environmental security, freedom from violence, and political security were reconceptualized as fundamental components of individual security (Dedeoğlu, 2014: 37).

The Treaty of Maastricht, signed on February 7, 1992, signified a watershed moment in the European Community's (EC) transition from a civilian power to a security actor. Built upon three foundational pillars -Economic and Monetary Union, Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and Justice and Home Affairs- the treaty provided the institutional framework for this transformation. Article 1/2 of Section 5 in the Maastricht Treaty explicitly defines the objectives of the CFSP as follows:

“The Union and its Member States shall define and implement a common foreign and security policy, governed by the provisions of this Title and covering all areas of foreign and security policy. The objectives of the common foreign and security policy shall be: to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests and independence of the Union; to strengthen the security of the Union and its Member States in all ways; to preserve peace and strengthen international security, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter as well as the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the objectives of the Paris Charter; to promote international cooperation; to develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms” (Maastricht, 5/J.1).

Paragraph J4/2 of the CFSP outlines that, until the European Union establishes its own defense union, the Western European Union (WEU) would address defense needs. Accordingly, EUROCORPS was activated following the Pegasus-95 military exercise, and EUROPOL was subsequently established. The adoption of the Petersberg Tasks in Germany on June 19, 1992, delineated a range of operational responsibilities, including humanitarian assistance, evacuation and rescue operations, peacekeeping, crisis management, and peace-building missions involving combat forces (Efe, 2007: 132). Furthermore, at Germany's initiative, peace-making, a method of peace enforcement, was incorporated into these tasks (Ortega, 2001: 106). These initiatives

laid the groundwork for the EU's foreign policy and security operations within the CFSP framework.

At the 1994 NATO Summit, pivotal decisions were made to enable the WEU to utilize NATO's assets and capabilities, particularly for the implementation of the Petersberg Tasks. By June 1996, the WEU was formally recognized as NATO's European pillar, resulting in the establishment of the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) (Açıkmeşe and Dizdaroğlu, 2014: 142). This structure subsequently became known as the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI). The Amsterdam Treaty initiated the integration of the WEU into the European Union, transferring responsibility for the Petersberg Tasks to the EU's jurisdiction.

The institutionalization and operationalization of the CFSP were further advanced through the Cologne and Helsinki Summits, where the establishment of the High Representative for CFSP and the Rapid Reaction Force (RRF) was formalized. These developments underscored the European Union's commitment to evolving into an autonomous and credible security actor on the global stage.

EU SECURITY AND THREAT CLASSIFICATION

The European Union member states, foreseeing that they would not be able to succeed in fighting emerging threats alone in the new century, and driven by the decision of “a secure Europe in a better world,” adopted the European Security Strategy document in December 2003. The formulation of this document was notably influenced by the asymmetric warfare threats frequently raised by actors following the September 11, 2001 attacks (e.g., the U.S. interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq), the internal conflict between Albanians and Macedonians in 2001, and the conflict between the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) and Serbs in Kosovo. The primary objectives outlined in this document are combating threats to ensure the security of the EU, securing border stability in neighboring regions, contributing to the establishment of a multilateral international order, and enhancing civilian capabilities.

Through the European Security Strategy document, the EU recognized security as the first condition for development and proceeded to classify threats to EU security. This document includes a classification of *global* and *critical* threats. In this context, global issues such as water wars, the EU's dependency on Russia for energy, and the necessity

of intervening in potential crises in the Gulf and North Africa to ensure energy security are highlighted.

When examining the annual reports on the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), it is observed that civilian operations are preferred over military operations. However, after 2009, the EU has made successful steps towards conducting operations independent of NATO. While this progress cannot be compared to NATO's, it can still be considered successful in terms of the development of the EU Common Security and Defence Policy. However, it would be more accurate to describe these operations as complementary to UN and NATO operations.

Until 2009, the EU prioritized civilian-heavy operations. In this context, operations such as “*EUPM (EU Police Mission), EUFOR Althea, Concordia, Artemis-Congo, EUJUST Themís, ACEH Monitoring Mission (AMM - Indonesia), EUPOL-Kinshasa, EUBAM Ukraine, EUBAM Rafah, EUSEC-DR, EUJUST LEX, and Kosovo EULEX*” were particularly prominent.

CONCLUSION

The operations conducted by the EU under the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) framework are notably focused on civilian rather than military objectives. Furthermore, an analysis of the nature and scope of these operations prior to 2009 reveals that EU operations were primarily supportive of, or complementary to, the United Nations (UN) and NATO. Operations such as Concordia, EUFOR Althea, EUPM, EUJUST Themís, EUBAM Rafah, and Kosovo EULEX can be classified within this category. While this trend partially continued after 2009, the EU achieved greater success in executing more autonomous and independent operations. Notable examples of such operations, although civilian in scale, include EUBAM Libya, EUCAP Sahel-Niger, EUAM, EUTM Mali, EUMAM-RCA, NAVFOR-MED Operation Sophia, EUCAP Nestor, and EUAM Ukraine, which prioritize EU security and reflect a more autonomous approach.

The challenges faced by the EU in the context of its Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) include issues related to power and capacity, the United Kingdom's departure from the Union, existing differences in perspectives, and divergent national interests at the state level. These factors complicate the collective implementation of a

unified security and defense policy. Addressing these power and capacity gaps would provide the EU with a significant advantage and momentum in its quest to become a global security actor. In this regard, the expansion of the EU by prioritizing the military, political, and power elements of current candidate countries represents a rational strategy. The integration of candidate countries such as Türkiye, which are sufficiently capable in terms of power and capacity, would undoubtedly contribute to the EU's physical and military capabilities, thereby advancing the implementation of the CSDP. Moreover, the evolving structure of the international system, coupled with the diversification of communication channels, has amplified the influence of individuals in decision-making processes, necessitating that governments and nation-states consider the desires of individuals and society. In this context, given the EU's liberal and supranational structure, and the public support for the CFSP, it is reasonable to anticipate that future EU operations will increasingly be autonomous and comprehensive, driven by the pressures exerted by individuals and society.

REFERENCES

- Akgül A. S. & Dizdaroğlu, C. (2014). "NATO-AB İlişkilerinde İşbirliği ve Çatışma Dinamikleri", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 10(40), 131-164.
- Treaty on European Union (Maastricht, 7 February 1992), https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2002/4/9/2c2f2b85-14bb-4488-9ded-13f3cd04de05/publishable_en.pdf, (Erişim: 22.12.2024).
- Dedeoğlu, B. (2014). *Uluslararası Güvenlik ve Strateji*, 3. Baskı. İstanbul: Yenyüzyıl Yayınları.
- Efe, H. (2007). "AB'NİN Gelişen "Avrupa Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikası" ve Türkiye", *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(3), 127-145.
- Goldstein, W. (1992). "Europe After Maastricht", *Council on Foreign Relations*, 71(5), 117-132.
- Hesapçioğlu, M. & Topsakal, C. (2007). "Avrupa Birliği Sürecinde Eğitim ve Avrupa Vatandaşlığı", *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 26(26), 73-93.

Karabulut, B. (2011), “Helsinki’den Astana’ya Avrupa Güvenlik ve İşbirliđi Örgütü (AGİT): AGİT’in Geleceđi Üzerine Bir Deđerlendirme”, Gazi Akademik Bakıř, 4(8), 69-93.

Karakuř, A. & Ekinici, O. (2021). “OGSP’nin Geliřim Süreci: Bir Güvenlik Aktörü Olarak AB”, USBAD Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Akademi Dergisi, 3(5), 557-582.

Ortega M. (2001). “The European Union, the Petersberg Missions and Intervention”, European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS), 101-120.