

CFSP WATCH 2003

National Report, Hungary

*by Zoltán Gálik, Teleki László Institute, Centre for Foreign Policy Studies,
Budapest, Hungary*

1. BASIC VIEWS OF CFSP/ESDP IN HUNGARY, PRIORITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT IN CFSP, KEY ISSUES FOR HUNGARY.

During the last decade Hungary has participated in the implementation of the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy as an associated country¹. The possibility given to align with the Union's CFSP common positions and declarations was important component in Hungary's co-operation with the European Union. It helped Hungary to align its positions with EU policies and decisions, and contributed to the process of getting acquainted with CFSP acquis.

In certain cases, Hungary and other associated countries are invited to make their comments on draft political declarations or statements to be issued by the EU, thus being offered the possibility to influence the final position of the Union. Since 1995, the EU invited associated states to align themselves with more than 300 common positions, declarations and *démarches*.

- It became obvious during the acquis screening and the negotiations that Hungary's foreign policy is largely harmonised and already in line with the Union's CFSP. Immediate and full-fledged participation in CFSP upon accession will thus not present any problem.
- During the accession talks external relations and CFSP chapters were swiftly closed since they did not present any major problem. Hungary did not request any derogation or transitional period.
- Hungary accepts a broader co-operation in the sphere of defence within the EU, which puts the Union in a position to play its full role on the international stage.
- Upon accession, Hungary wishes to fully participate in the CSDP (Common Security and Defence Policy).
- Hungary is situated near a permanent crisis spot and therefore has a particular interest in the development of an efficient European defence policy. Its geographical location is one of the reasons Hungary attributes great importance to playing a role in CSDP's decision shaping, to see its opinion being taken into account, while respecting the EU's decision-making autonomy. An inclusive approach and an appropriate place for non-EU member European allies will also reinforce the Common Security and Defence Policy itself.

2. NATIONAL PERCEPTIONS, POSITIONS TO CFSP/ESDP ISSUES.

As an effect of its geographical location, its future membership in the EU, its membership in NATO, as well as its associated membership in WEU, Hungary is directly interested in the creation of necessary structures and capabilities that make effective and swift European (military and non-military) crisis management, conflict prevention and peace-building activities (Petersberg tasks) possible.

- Hungary has participated in a number of peacekeeping and peace support operations in NATO-led IFOR, SFOR in Bosnia-Herzegovina, KFOR in Kosovo, and Operation Essential Harvest in Macedonia, manifesting its interest and capacity to contribute to these and similar EU actions².
- Hungarian forces participated and are still participating in peacekeeping and peace-enforcement missions across the world. Hungarians have served in a number of UN missions (UNIKOM – Iraq-Kuwait, UNIFICYP – Cyprus, UNOMIG – Georgia, MINURSO – Western Sahara, UNMIK – Kosovo) and OSCE missions (Georgia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, on the Georgian-Chechen border, Nagorno-Karabakh, Sinai Peninsula).
- Ever since the launching of the ESDP in 1999, it has been a firm belief among Hungarian politicians that, firstly there is and should be no contradiction between NATO obligations and support for the development of a European defence capability. NATO and the US presence in Europe are preconditions for Hungary's security. Hungary welcomes the progress achieved in the elaboration of CSDP since the Helsinki European Council and the decisions made in Nice in regard to the principles and modalities for developing the EU-NATO relations, as well as modalities of consultation with third states.
- As for the force structure the development-related goals of EU and NATO would be better to coincide and occasionally supplement each other. The European adaptation of NATO's planning system would effectively assist the development of the European crisis management capabilities
- Hungary welcomes the EU's efforts to conduct dialogue, consultation and co-operation with third states on issues related to security, defence policy and crisis management within a single inclusive structure. It particularly welcomes that non-EU European NATO members are enabled to conduct special consultations with the EU. Hungary welcomed the decision made at the Laeken European Council to make the CSDP operational.
- In the recent establishment of the European Rapid Reaction Force Hungary has expressed its firm support, but also stressed the necessity not to undermine NATO. In this respect, there has been no difference between official and unofficial attitudes. The public has not been interested in this issue at all.
- At the 21 November 2000 Capabilities Conference Hungary offered a 350 strong force, including an air defence unit equipped with Mistral missiles and

a mechanised infantry battalion. These units will be offered to both NATO and the EU.

- Hungary puts the reinforcement of its national capabilities, required to carry out Petersberg-type missions in the context of the ongoing reform of the armed forces. The ratio of Hungarian defence expenditure to GDP is being increased annually by 0.1 per cent.
- Hungary was one of the countries in Europe that supported the U.S. policy on Iraq. Among current EU member states - Great Britain, Spain, Italy, Portugal and Denmark – and soon-to-be members Czech Republic and Poland, Hungary signed the letter supporting the U.S. position on Iraq. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld offered a now famous distinction between what he called Old Europe and New Europe. According to András Simonyi, Hungary's ambassador to the United States³ „I wouldn't say Old Europe/New Europe. We Hungarians want to make sure that everybody understands we are not about to choose between Europe and the United States, [...] we spell it out clearly: more Europe, not less America.”
- Hungary, other non-EU member allies, as well as EU member states share a single security environment and have common security interests⁴. In order to enable the EU to react effectively and, whenever possible, in a preventive manner to challenges originating from its periphery, it is advisable to establish wide-ranging co-operation with neighbouring states. The special understanding with these six countries is justified by the fact that those countries are members of the organisation that ensures the highest level of security guarantee for the entire region. Hungary agrees that the supervision of security and defence policies remains a competency of national parliaments.
- Hungary agrees with the concept of rationalising and harmonising European defence industries and of the improvement of efficient co-operation in this field. Increased harmonisation of defence industries would result in a number of advantages, *inter alia*, in a favourable impact on the development of a Common Security and Defence Policy. With its limited means and capabilities available, Hungary would like to be involved in certain forms of European defence industrial co-operation. This intention is being manifested by the Hungarian application for membership in the WEAG.

3. EUROPEAN CONVENTION

According to the contribution presented by Mr Péter Balázs, member of the Convention⁵ „any reform of the Council Presidency has to respect three basic principles:

- the equality of Member States
- improved efficiency and consistency
- the stability of the Council by providing strengthened continuity

A team presidency composed of four countries (“four wheels”) for a longer period of time than the current six months could provide both of the lacking elements.

- The maintenance of the rotation system ensures appropriately the equality of member states.
- Stability and continuity would be achieved by the extension of the presidency’s duration.
- Consistency and efficiency would be guaranteed by the “rolling system”, i.e. by two member states leaving and two other joining to the team at regular intervals.

The allocation of responsibilities (Council configurations) should be agreed within the team, based on the experiences and capacities of the members (country-profiled division of labour). The chairmanship of intermediary bodies (Coreper, etc.) and working groups should follow the nationality of the President of the relevant Council.

The duration of the Presidency would be one year. By applying the “rolling, four wheel drive system” at the end of each six month period two members (“the two front wheels”) would leave when two new countries join. Thereby each member state would have its turn of Presidency every six years. The one year length can also harmonise with the Commission’s annual working programme. This frequency is more favourable than the current model (7.5 years), notwithstanding the 12.5 years resulting from the automatic extension of this model to 25 members.

The extended duration will increase the visibility of the Council externally as well as for the home audience, while a careful division of labour of the “four wheel drive presidency” will increase its efficiency by alleviating the heavy burdens of a full scale presidency.

Key benefits of the proposed model above are:

- respect of all basic principles (equality, efficiency, stability)
- providing a healthy equilibrium of member states
- preserving the current institutional balance”

Other issues

- Hungary fully supports the establishment of a mutual defence clause to which willing member states can opt in under certain conditions and fully consistent with NATO commitments.
- Preservation of the Community method e.g. the institutional balance that currently exists and the co-decision procedures and qualified majority voting
- Hungary does not want the number of commissioners reduced as the present system is a strong selling point for the EU to the general public in the country⁶. However it should be noted that in the long run, Hungary would be willing to discuss this issue further.
- As for the the merger of the functions of the High Representative of the European Union for the CFSP and the Commissioner for External Relations into the post of EU’s Foreign Minister the Hungarian government supports the

idea of double-hatting but wary about its institutional articulation, i.e. whether by virtue of its place in the institutional structure, the Foreign Minister will have a communitarian bias or be dominated by the European Council.

- Hungary agrees with the concept of rationalising and harmonising European defence industries and of the improvement of efficient co-operation in this field.
- Hungary is eager to see human rights inserted into the Constitution, particularly in the area of minority rights.

4. MAPPING OF ACTIVITIES IN CFSP-RELATED RESEARCH

Teleki László Institute
Centre for Foreign Policy Studies
H-1125 Budapest, Szilágyi Erzsébet fasor 22/c.
<http://www.TelekiIntezet.hu>

Experts: European security issues: Ferenc Gazdag (f.gazdag@tla.hu), Zoltán Gálik (galik@diplomacy.hu), Erzsébet N. Rózsa (e.rozsa.mki@tla.hu)

Budapest University of Economic Sciences
Department of International Relations
H-1093 Budapest, Fővám tér 8.
<http://www.diplomacy.hu>

Strategic Defence Research Office, Hungarian Ministry of Defence
Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University
H-1101 Budapest, Hungária krt. 9-11
<http://www.zmne.hu>

REFERENCES

¹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Negotiation Position of the Government of the Republic of Hungary, <http://www.kum.hu>

² Erzsébet N. Rózsa [2002]: Hungary and CFSP In: Bigger EU, wider CFSP, stronger ESDP? Occasional Papers, European Union Institute for Security Studies

³ Interview with András Simonyi, The San Diego Union – Tribune June 29, 2003

⁴ Memorandum by Embassy of the Republic of Hungary – The UK Parliament, (<http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199900/cmselect/cmdfence/295/295we17.htm>)

⁵ January 2003, http://www.kum.hu/siwawa/file/Contribution_presented_by_Mr_Peter_Balazs.pdf

⁶ Károly Grúber [2003]: The Convention seen from a Future Member State: The case of Hungary. In: An Assessment of the European Convention, The Clingendael Institute, Hague, 5 June 2003