

CFSP WATCH 2005 – Estonia – by Andres Kasekamp

1. **What are the priorities for your government in CFSP in 2005? What are the key issues for your country in 2005 (especially with regard to the negative referenda on the Constitutional Treaty in France and the Netherlands; after the recent EU enlargement and on behalf of the perspective of the upcoming accession round(s))?**

- The Estonian government felt somewhat relieved after the negative referenda results of the Constitutional Treaty in France and the Netherlands, as both public opinion and political elite were not enthusiastic about the Constitutional Treaty.
- NATO is seen as a priority and CFSP as a co-product of integration process, which can be developed as secondary goal.
- Currently, the Estonian government is passively participating in CFSP activities, in order to be “a good member state” and to be able to use CFSP possibilities if a beneficial situation appears. Dynamics, however, are towards bigger support of CFSP development.
- When debating the Constitutional Treaty, the CFSP played only minor role. Most of the public is unaware of changes concerning CFSP/ESDP.
- In last six months, CFSP has been debated **a lot in a negative incompetent way** in Estonian media, as it is seen responsible for not meeting Baltic interests in Russian-EU political agreements on simplification of visa rules and in Russian-German gas pipeline project in Baltic Sea and the lack of strong support to push Russia to ratify the border treaty with Estonia.

2. **Does your country adopt a more pessimistic or optimistic stance regarding the ratification crisis of the Constitutional Treaty? How might the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty in France and the Netherlands influence the ratification debate in your country and also have an impact on the outcome of the referendum?**

- As the Constitutional Treaty ratification was seen as a potential problem, the negative referenda result in France and the Netherlands was at that moment seen as somewhat of a relief: debates on Constitutional Treaty ceased at the government and public levels.
- The current government has become more pro-integrationist and supports continuing of ratification process after slight changes in CT.
- Government has not introduced any clear official position, but generally they support new IGC on Constitutional Treaty.
- Public interest and support are both falling after France and the Netherlands rejection.
- It is not decided how will Estonia ratify the Treaty. It is quite clear, that there will be no referenda before the positive referenda in France and the Netherlands, but Parliamentary ratification is possible.

3. **National Perceptions and Positions with regard to CFSP/ESDP Issues in 2005**

Please describe key positions and perceptions in your country with regard to EU foreign policy, taking into account:

The perceived success and/or failure of CFSP/ESDP (e.g. taking into account current developments like the current ratification crisis of the Constitutional Treaty);

- EU has since Maastricht great external and security policy ambitions but numerous un-answered questions. CFSP success depends on its ability to create additional value

for majority of the member states. Estonia supports clarification of institutional logic and cooperation methods.

- Estonia is also ready to participate in the ESDP, but most of political elite finds it secondary after NATO.
- There is also some public opinion that CFSP is following mostly the interests of big member states. Therefore governments supports development of supranational components in CFSP/ESDP
- The main problem is that Estonia is asked to provide her highly limited resources for ESDP at a time when the Baltic countries are weak in military capability terms, compared to other member states, and already have obligations in NATO.

The perceived impact of EU enlargement on CFSP/ESDP;

- Enlargement has certainly influenced the development of CFSP/ESDP, as new countries are bringing different security priorities, needs and abilities with them. It also means that the common priorities, needs and abilities must be reformulated.
- Both political and academic groups agree that to survive and develop, CFSP needs reforms. Today's format does not meet the needs of the EU 25 and does not support a strong transatlantic alliance.
- Estonia as some other border countries would need additional components in CFSP/ESDP to see it as a practical security policy tool.

European Neighbourhood Policy and its implications;

- More attention in Estonia is paid to European Neighbourhood Policy, as it has a clear function, target area and Estonia has competence to participate, as we have been a quite valuable test area in developing ENP
- The academic position is that the EU cannot just stay aside in the management of regional conflicts and ENP is something what the EU could do really well, as it does not need consensus or military capability
- Both state and academic actors are participating optimistically in European Neighbourhood Policy activities.

The role of the EU in crisis management e.g. in Congo, Georgia, Darfur;

- Estonia is ready to accept all the main crises management missions in case we can choose where to participate.
- EU crises management is supported in the case that there is role sharing and the member states can choose which area and with which methods they engage.
- We found our main interests areas in Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova

The view of the European Security Strategy (ESS) as an instrument for enhancing coherence in the EU's security policy; how does your country view the ESS and which issues are of particular importance?

- ESS is consolidating very specific interests of asymmetrically threatened countries; it addresses specific threats and completely leaves out others.
- When prioritizing among listed threats in ESS ethnic conflicts and regional instability is seen as most important. In questions of terrorism and international crime, Estonia is participating mostly in good will, without feeling directly threatened.

The creation of battle groups and their role for ESDP.

- Estonia is officially supporting the idea of Battle groups; however, NATO is still seen as the priority.
- Academic groups see the problem of Battle groups as well in overlapping functions with NATO and very limited use

4. The Constitutional Treaty and its future – National perceptions concerning a ‘plan B’?

Official positions on the Constitutional Treaty provisions on CFSP / ESDP and external relations?

Estonia, while supporting general development of integration during IGC, was generally cautious on CFSP/ESDP provisions.

Currently, both the Prime Minister’s Office and MFA are showing growing support and interest for the development of CFSP provisions. It is seen as a necessary part of CT.

Constitutional Treaty or some version of ‘Nice Treaty Plus’?

Describe (briefly) the position of your country on the following key issues and the possibility of their realisation without a Constitutional Treaty as a ‘plan B’, ‘C’ or ‘D’:

- **External Representation: What is the final position of your country on the European foreign minister and the President of the European Council? Will / should there be a post resembling that of the Foreign Minister based on the Nice Treaty (something like an enhanced High Representative)? How could this be realised?**

Estonia asked for the clarification of functions and role of European foreign minister. Estonia did not support the idea of the President of the European Council. Estonia is ready to accept those reforms as a part of a compromise.

The Nice Treaty format of High Representative is seen as too weak.

- **Basic structures of the European External Action Service have already been developed. Now that the Constitutional Treaty might not enter into force, is your government in favour of developing such a body in order to support the High Representative?**

The Government is ready to support European External Action Service to ensure strengthening of the post of High Representative

- **Decision-making: Does your country opt for an extension of qualified majority voting in the field of CFSP? Will the Nice provisions be sufficient for an efficient CFSP/ESDP decision-making within the enlarged EU?**

Estonia will support the idea of extension of qualified majority voting in the field of CFSP. Nice treaty is seen as inefficient for CFSP/ESDP decision-making within the enlarged EU

- **Crisis management: What is the official position on expanding the Petersberg tasks and making reference to tasks that involve military resources? Which regions does your country consider as particularly promising for EU crisis management?**

Estonia shares the opinion that the Petersberg task definition is too narrow and supports its development to meet practical situation and needs.

Estonia is mostly considering Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Belarus as key target areas for EU crises management.

- **Defence: What is your country's position towards the establishment of the civilian-military cell at the EUMS? Was your government in favour of creating a full-fledged operational EU headquarters?**

Estonia is not supporting the creation of new headquarters without creating additional mobile capability, and seeing clear need for them. The Government does not support duplication in crises management structures inside transatlantic organizations.

- **Is your country in favour of realising provisions such as the permanent structured cooperation even without the Constitutional Treaty? What measures would be preferred?**

Government sees CT as a necessary legitimatizing instrument for reform in the CFSP/ESDP field.

- **Would your country support the creation of core groups inside or outside the EU in CFSP/ESDP if the Constitutional Treaty finally failed?**

Estonia does not support the idea of multi-speed or core-Europe. The Government is ready to go to compromises to ensure continued integration.

5. Mapping of Activities in CFSP-related Research

- Please indicate major experts, universities and research institutions working in the CFSP field in your country.
 - Institutions:
 - Estonian Foreign Policy Institute
 - Department of Political Science, University of Tartu
 - Academic experts
 - Andres Kasekamp (University of Tartu and Estonian Foreign Policy Institute)
 - Viljar Veebel (University of Tartu and Estonian Foreign Policy Institute)
 - Eiki Berg (University of Tartu)