

CFSP WATCH 2003

NATIONAL REPORT ESTONIA

by Andres Kasekamp, The Estonian Foreign Policy Institute

1. Basic Views of CFSP/ESDP in your country. National Perceptions and Positions with regard to CFSP/ESDP Issues

“We support the continuation of the intergovernmental method of decision-making in the area of common foreign and security policy. We feel that the different foreign policy interests of Member States do not allow us to take immediate and radical steps towards the communitarisation of the CFSP.

Given the lack of sufficient capabilities and political will, the emerging European security and defence policy should be regarded in the framework of broader trans-Atlantic relations. EU actions in the field of defence should focus on complementing the activities of NATO, especially on fulfilling the Petersberg tasks, where the Union would certainly be able to add value.

We believe that the different aspects of EU external actions should be more coherent, in order to ensure efficient use of existing resources. This means that the instruments of the common foreign security policy, common trade policy and development cooperation policy should be used to achieve the same goals.”

(Positions of the Estonian Government on the Future of Europe. Approved by the Government on 19 November 2002 and on 14 January 2003)

- **The perceived success and/or failure of CFSP/ESDP**

So far, it is generally perceived as a failure by the political establishment and the public at large.

- **The position of your country towards NATO (in relationship with the ESDP)**

Estonia will join NATO in May 2004. NATO provides for collective defence. ESDP doesn't. Therefore NATO's Article 5 is viewed as the vital guarantor of Estonian security. ESDP should not unnecessarily duplicate NATO.

- **The role of the EU in crisis management e.g. Kosovo, the Middle East**

Positive.

- **The perceived impact of EU enlargement on CFSP/ESDP (old versus new Europe?)**

Enlargement should make the CFSP/ESDP debate more balanced and realistic, i.e., it will promote a healthier Transatlantic relationship by restraining those who wish to develop the ESDP into an alternative to NATO and close partnership with the US.

3. European Convention: Reform of EU External relations, CFSP/ESDP

Have there been any official contributions or proposals brought to the Convention by your country's representatives with regard to External relations, CFSP and ESDP?

No. Only Statement by Mr Henrik Hololei on 20 December.

Describe (briefly) the position of your country in the following key issues:

- **External Representation: What is the position of your country on the appointment of a European foreign minister and a President of the European Council? Is your country in favour of double hatting?**

Estonia is officially against the appointment of a President of the European Council.

“Estonia would like to see the role of the High Representative strengthened in order to further increase the efficiency and visibility of the Union on the international arena. His role as the representative of the Union could also include chairing the political dialogue meetings from the EU side. However, we do not approve the merging of the posts of CFSP High Representative and External Relations Commissioner. It is more likely that under the present system the Member States have more influence over their representative, which we believe, should continue as the cooperation in the field of foreign policy should remain in essence intergovernmental.”

(Positions of the Estonian Government on the Future of Europe. Approved by the Government on 19 November 2002 and on 14 January 2003)

Estonia also not exclude a possibility for ‘double hatting’ (Statement by H. Hololei, 20 December)

- **Decision-making: Does your country opt for an extension of qualified majority voting in the field of CFSP?**

“On the one hand it is the opinion of my Government that decisions in the principal questions of foreign policy will have to be made on the basis of unanimity also in the future (and certainly in the matters related to defence). At the same time sufficient flexibility should be guaranteed and implementing decisions within the unanimously agreed framework may be adopted by qualified majority voting.” (Statement by H. Hololei, 20 December)

- **What is the position on forms of flexibility such as enhanced cooperation or constructive abstention?**

Should allow for more use of both enhanced cooperation or constructive abstention.
(Statement by H. Hololei, 20 December)

- **Crisis management: What is the official position on updating the Petersberg tasks and making reference to tasks that involve military resources?**

Official position on updating the Petersberg tasks is favourable. Especially enthusiastic about soft security areas (conflict prevention, disarmament, military assistance, post-conflict stabilization, combatting terrorism).

- **Defence: Which of the proposals raised by the European Convention is most strongly endorsed by your country e.g. armament's issues, solidarity clause, flexibility?**

None of these examples are strongly endorsed by Estonia. Flexibility and creation of an Armaments Agency are however viewed positively.

What is the official position of your country on the proposal of four (Belgium, Germany, France and Luxemburg) on European defence policy?

Negative.

4. Mapping of Activities in CFSP-related Research

Please indicate major experts, universities and research institutions working in the CFSP field in your country.

The Estonian Foreign Policy Institute (Andres Kasekamp)
University of Tartu (Viljar Veebel)
Finnish Institute of International Affairs (Kristi Raik)