

55th Annual Conference of the Political Studies Association

University of Leeds, 4-7 April 2005

GPSG Panel 2: The Evolution of the Greek State

Paper:

“Greece’s stance in the Convention negotiations for the ESDP”

Marina Petrelli

PhD candidate

University of Athens, Greece

Department of Political Science & Public Administration

Email: mpetrelli@pspa.uoa.gr

“Greece’s stance in the Convention negotiations for the ESDP”

Abstract:

The need for reforms in the European Security Defence Policy (ESDP) domain was spelt out clearly in the ‘Laeken Declaration’ of December 2001 which led to the Convention on the Future of Europe. The European Convention, convened in late February 2002, finalised its works in mid-July 2003. The Working Group VIII, chaired by Michel Barnier, was devoted to ‘Defence’. Most of the recommendations contained in the Final Report were included into the final draft of the Constitutional Treaty. The Convention agreed proposals and provisions (the Defence Agency, the ‘battle groups’ concept, the solidarity clause against terrorism, etc) which are bound to change the institutional context within which ESDP operates.

Greece attaches paramount importance to its participation in an EU with strong, political institutions and a common foreign and defence policy. This constitutes the core parameter which determines the choices and the scope of Greece’s foreign policy. Greece supports the deeper logic of European integration and the basic assumption and values on which the common European defence should be built as well as the institutional and political autonomy of the Union in the decision making process. Greece’s stance, presented in the European Convention, is deeply in favour of the development of the European defence in the context of the European Union (EU). Greece believes that without military capabilities and means, the common defence policy of the Union is condemned to ineffectiveness and credibility gaps, in particular regarding the prevention, management and conflict resolution. With regard to the institutional framework and the elaboration of the common European defence, Greece considers that it should be shaped within the institutions of the European Union with the wider possible participation of the European Commission (EC).

Introduction

The Draft European Constitution was the product of a revolutionary procedure in the European Union, the European Convention. To be more precise, the European Council of Laeken (December 2001) decided, in response to a relevant demand of the European Parliament that the debate over “the Future of Europe” would have a “structured character” through a democratic institutional frame.¹ The need for reforms in the ESDP domain was clearly defined in the ‘Laeken Declaration’ of December 2001 which led to the Convention on the Future of Europe. The European Convention, convened in late February 2002, finalised its works in mid-July 2003. The Convention consisted of EU member state governmental representatives as well as representatives from national parliaments and the European Parliament (on the whole 105 people including the alternates), worked in sessions and “working groups”² for approximately sixteen months³.

The attainment of ESDP was not a choice for EU member states but a need that could no longer be postponed, for it would prevent the marginalisation of European countries and would provide the EU with a global influence in decision-making. This was important because the European citizens demanded it; it was necessary for European integration and the generated EU expectations as a global player between third party countries. The fact that the EU had failed in the Iraq test, cast a deep shadow over the Convention. It was a common view that it would take decades, at best, to shape a credible EU defence policy, and that EU credibility in general had been badly damaged⁴.

However the Convention signified the negotiation of the defence capital and that is the reason why it formed a working group for defence.⁵ The Working Group VIII, chaired by Michel Barnier⁶, was the one devoted to ‘Defence’. Most of the recommendations⁷ contained in the Final Report were included in the final draft of the

¹ J. Shaw, P. Magnette, L. Hauffmann and A. Verges Bausili, *Convention of the Future of Europe*, London, Federal Trust, 2003.

² The Convention consisted of eleven working groups for a) subsidiarity, b) the Charter for Fundamental Rights, c) the legal personality, d) the national parliaments, e) complimentary competences, f) economic governance, g) external action, h) defence, i) simplification, j) freedom, security and justice and k) social Europe.

³ Greece’s members in the Convention representing the Hellenic government were G. Katiforis (Member) and Prof. P.C. Ioakimidis (Alt. Member). P. Avgerinos and M. Giannakou (Members), E. Stylianidis and N. Constantopoulos (Alt. Member) represented the Hellenic Parliament. On February 2003, G. Papandreou, at that time Minister for Foreign Affairs, was appointed representative of the Hellenic government and Mr. Katiforis in his turn replaced Prof. Ioakimidis.

⁴ See: A. Menon, “From crisis to catharsis: ESDP after Iraq”, *International Affairs*, July 2004, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 631-648; D. Allnoch, “Has the European Convention United Europe in Security and Defence Policy Issues?”, *CEuS Working Paper 2003/1*, Jean Monnet Centre for European Studies (CEuS), <http://www.monnet-centre.uni-bremen.de/pdf/wp/2003-1-Allnoch.pdf>

⁵ The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 13 June 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 14 June 2002, pg. 2; The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 25 June 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 26 June 2002, pg. 2; The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 10 July 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 12 July 2002, pg. 1.

⁶ The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 18 July 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 13 September 2002, pg. 1.

⁷ The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 11 September 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 14 June 2002, pg. 2.

Constitutional Treaty. The Draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe⁸, which was formally presented by Convention President Valerie Giscard d'Estaing at the Thessaloniki Council in summer 2003, proposed significant reform measures for ESDP. The Convention agreed proposals and provisions (the Defence Agency, the 'battle groups' concept, the solidarity clause against terrorism, etc) which are bound to change the institutional context within which ESDP operates. The main aim was the reinforcement of the coherence, the efficiency and the action of the Union.

This paper assesses whether and to which extent Greece as an EU member state was an "active" participant in the Convention work by examining contributions, interventions and amendment proposals submitted by the Greek representatives. The author will focus neither on the coalitions and alliances defined in the context of the European Convention nor on common positions drafted between Greece and other member states and the initiatives taken during the Greek Presidency. All the conclusions will be drawn by studying the official Greek contributions in the European Convention.

Contributions presented by the Greek Members

George Katiforis⁹, representative of the Greek government in the Convention, submitted two documents; the one concerning EU armaments strategy¹⁰ the political control and the second on strategic direction on EU crisis management operations¹¹. Mr. Katiforis underlined the need for the "strengthening of a globally competitive and dynamic European Defence Technological and Industrial Base (DTIB), and European Defence Equipment Market (EDEM), the promotion and enhancement of European armaments co-operation taking into account the diverse capabilities of the EU Member States, the improvement of co-operation in defence research and development, the opening of national defence markets and the promotion of European military capabilities"¹².

In the latter document, he supported that both political control and strategic direction should be exercised by the Political and Security Committee (PSC)¹³ on behalf of the Council. Hence, the PSC would be in charge of the EU-led operations i.e. selection of the headquarters, appointment of the Operations Commander, approval of the operation plan and the rules of engagement, exchange of views with the interfered international organisations.

⁸ The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe", *CONV 850/03*, Brussels, 18 July 2003.

⁹ George Katiforis participated also in the Praesidium as Greece was one of the three countries that would chair the Presidency during the work of the European Convention.

¹⁰ G. Katiforis, "Towards an EU Armaments Strategy", *WG VII, WD 4*, Brussels, 2 October 2002.

¹¹ G. Katiforis, "Political Control and Strategic Direction on EU Crisis Management Operations", *WG VII, WD 7*, Brussels, 11 October 2002.

¹² G. Katiforis, "Towards an EU Armaments Strategy", *WG VII, WD 4*, Brussels, 2 October 2002. pg. 2.

¹³ The Political and Security Committee (PSC, or COPS as it is known by its French acronym) has a central role to play in the definition of and follow-up to the EU's response to a crisis. It is composed of national representatives at senior/ambassador level, placed within the framework of Member States' Permanent Representations.

In his very first contribution, Prof. P.C. Ioakimidis, alternate member positioned by the Greek government, answering the questions of the “Laeken Declaration”¹⁴ for the Future of Europe considered that the common defence system should be developed from a crisis management mechanism to a collective security system. It would be based on the provision of “mutual assistance” and that the task of crisis management must be institutionalised so much in the military domain (Direct Intervention Force) as in the political sphere (civil protection and managing crisis).¹⁵ He underlined the importance of a gradual development of the common defence to a collective security system based on the principles of solidarity and mutual assistance and respect to NATO’s complementarity¹⁶. He supported the abolition of the Union’s three pillars structure and the gradual merge of the second pillar in the first one¹⁷.

Prof. P.C. Ioakimidis submitted a second paper which focused solely on the development of the EU’s common foreign, security and defence policy¹⁸. The need for strengthening the European Security and Defence Policy was clearly expressed in this contribution as well as a number of reforms considered absolutely necessary in order to ameliorate EU’s security and defence governance. Some of the proposals expressed in the second contribution were common with the first one (abolition of the pillar structure, NATO’s complementarity). He proposed the establishment of a Council of Defence Ministers as a follow up of the progress achieved in developing the Union’s Security and Defence Policy. He was not for a wider use of qualified majority in the ESDP but he was a staunch supporter of a mutual assistance clause in the Constitutional Treaty as an enhancing factor of the credibility in ESDP as long as the possibility of “opting in” at a later stage was supported. He considered also that it was necessary to expand the Petersberg tasks to new areas (i.e. terrorism) and imperative to extend the provisions of enhanced cooperation of the Treaty to the area of defence. The creation of a voluntary humanitarian force was of great interest and innovative but unfortunately it was not supported by other members.

Finally, Prof. P.C. Ioakimidis submitted along with Paraskevas Avgerinos, representative of the Hellenic Parliament in the Convention, a paper concerning some observations¹⁹ on the Preliminary Draft Constitutional Treaty presented by Valéry Giscard d’Estaing on 28 October 2002²⁰. In this contribution, the two members

¹⁴ “Laeken Declaration on the Future of the European Union”, in Presidency Conclusion – European Council Meeting in Laeken, *SN 300/1/01 REV 1*, 14-15 December 2001, pp. 19 – 26.

¹⁵ The European Convention (The Secretariat), “Contribution from Prof. P.C. Ioakimidis, alternate member of the Convention: “Answers to the questions of the Laeken Declaration””, *CONV 113/02, CONTRIB. 48*, Brussels, 18 June 2002, question 13, pg. 13.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, question 49, pg. 40.

¹⁷ The Treaty of Maastricht which established the European Union, divided EU policies into three main areas, called pillars. The first or “Community” pillar concerns economic, social and environmental policies. The second or “Common Foreign and Security Policy” pillar concerns foreign policy and military matters. The third or “Police and Judicial Co-operation in Criminal Matters” pillar concerns cooperation in the fight against crime. This pillar was originally named “Justice and Home Affairs”.

¹⁸ The European Convention (The Secretariat), “Contribution by Mr. Panayotis Ioakimidis, alternate member of the Convention: “The development of the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy and Defence Policy (CFSP/ESDP)””, *CONV 389/02, CONTRIB. 134*, Brussels, 7 November 2002.

¹⁹ The European Convention (The Secretariat), “Contribution by Mr. Paraskevas Avgerinos, member, and Mr Panayotis Ioakimidis, alternate member: “The Draft Constitutional Treaty: Preliminary Observations””, *CONV 443/02, CONTRIB 162*, Brussels, 2 December 2002.

²⁰ The European Convention (The Secretariat), “Preliminary draft Constitutional Treaty”, *CONV 369/02*, Brussels, 28 October 2002.

highlighted the importance of maintaining the balance between supranational and intergovernmental institutions which was not “respected” until then. They underlined that the relative articles for common defence policy (Art. 30) should be carefully drafted so as to avoid confusion and inconsistencies.

Marietta Giannakou, representative of the Hellenic Parliament in the Convention, on 21 November and 16 December 2002 submitted two contributions on defence²¹. The papers presented in the Defence working group consisted a summing up of all the questions posed during the meetings of the aforementioned working group. Regarding the military capabilities she supported that the only way for a member state to meet its commitments would be to include a relevant provision in the EU Treaty. Such a provision would stipulate that if a Member State decided to participate in the military aspects of the ESDP, it would be obliged to make the corresponding contributions. She underlined that the expenditure of the member states regarding military equipment could not be evaluated by using a convergence procedure similar to the one of the Monetary Union. The adaptation of the military means to the missions as well as the corresponding interoperability of equipment would require a clarified scheme of operations, which should have an obligatory character. If the member states participated in the military aspects of the ESDP, then they would be obliged to participate in the ESDP operations.

As for the establishment of a European Armaments Policy, it would be necessary to establish a Common European Armaments Policy, based on research and technology. She referred also to the factors that affect the development and the function of a European defence industry: the new threats (international terrorism, organised crime, etc.), the new operational needs based on the nature of humanitarian and peacekeeping operations (Petersberg tasks), the decrease of military expenditure, the realisation of the Headline Goal. As for the question of whether there should be an armaments organisation, the representative of the Greek parliament in the Convention believed that the existing framework of voluntary cooperation on issues of armaments forged the establishment of an institutional framework, within which member states would examine issues, such as the movement of military material in the EU or the exchange of technological information. Marietta Giannakou emphasised also that, given the fact that the Political and Security Committee has full responsibility for the conduction of crisis management operations, it would be necessary to establish a mechanism within which this Committee would be accountable not only to the Council, but also to the Parliament which would be chaired by the High Representative. As for the scope of ESDP, Mrs. Giannakou maintained that the Petersberg tasks did not need to be reviewed and that the Treaty should include additional provisions concerning further ESDP missions. Finally, Mrs. Giannakou suggested that the concept of security within the Union should be based on territorial defence against the new asymmetrical threats.

Interventions during the Plenary Sessions

²¹ The European Convention (The Secretariat), “Paper by Mrs. Marietta Giannakou”, *WG VIII, WD 24*, Brussels, 21 November 2002 and The European Convention (The Secretariat), “Contribution by Mrs. Marietta Giannakou, member of the Convention: - “European Security and Defence Policy”, *CONV 463/02, CONTRIB. 173*, Brussels, 16 December 2002.

The representatives of Greece participated actively in the plenary sessions in every scope of the agenda. But views on European security defence policy were traced only in the interventions of George Katiforis, Paraskevas Avgerinos and Marietta Giannakou.

Mr. Katiforis emphasised the need for more Europe with a stronger presence as a stability factor in the international stage, which would provide the continent with greater security in its external borders.²²

Mr. Paraskevas Avgerinos underlined the feeling citizens share on the absence of the EU in the international arena as well as the need for “more Europe”. This demand should lead to the expansion of the EU competences to the foreign and defence policy among other policies mentioned in his intervention based on the notion that supranational action will be more effective than national action. Hence, a collective system of security and solidarity should be created in the context of the European policy of security and defence.²³

Mrs. Giannakou, in her intervention in the second plenary session (21-22 March 2002) argued that the European Union should have one voice towards third parties and this could be assisted only by a common foreign, security and defence policy.²⁴ The representative of the Hellenic Parliament noted that the EU should undertake policy-making in areas where a common policy and a common action abroad would be required as in the case of security and defence policy, as well as in the protection of the European borders equipped with a proper defence mechanism integrated in the community system.²⁵ In the fourth plenary session of the Convention the main subject of discussion was the delimitation of competences. Mrs. Giannakou expressed the Union should have full competences in defence and security policy.²⁶ In her intervention concerning some observations in Part I, Titles I-III and V-IX²⁷, she underlined the possibility of decision making on defence issues by qualified majority on the basis of a solidarity clause which would not only assist member states with terrorist attack within the Union’s territory but also in a case of attack by another state. She broadly supported the establishment of a European Armaments and Strategic Research Agency.

Proposal amendments

The Members of the Convention presented 329 amendments to Chapter 1 on the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), of which 118 relate specifically to the

²² Intervention by Mr George Katiforis, representative of the Hellenic government and member of the Praesidium, at the second plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 21-22 March 2002.

²³ Intervention by Mr Paraskevas Avgerinos, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the third plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 15-16 April 2002.

²⁴ Intervention by Ms Marietta Giannakou, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the second plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 21-22 March 2002.

²⁵ Intervention by Ms Marietta Giannakou, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the third plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 15-16 April 2002.

²⁶ Intervention by Ms Marietta Giannakou, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the fourth plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 23-24 May 2002.

²⁷ Intervention by Ms Marietta Giannakou, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the fifth plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 06-07 June 2002.

ESDP. The articles in Part One (Articles 29, 30 and the solidarity clause) were the subject of 110 amendments.²⁸

In Article 30 of **Part I, Title V**, paragraph 3²⁹ Mrs. Giannakou suggested to move the last subparagraph concerning multinational forces, to follow the first sentence in the second subparagraph and concerning the Agency's tasks add a final subparagraph, which would read, "In the framework of financial means attributed to the agency, it may support arms procurement processes". In paragraph 5³⁰, Mrs. Giannakou requested the insertion of the expression "*for preserving the values of the Union and serving its interest*" at the end of the first sentence of the paragraph. In paragraph 8³¹ the insertion that the European Parliament is to be "*regularly*" informed, and explicitly be stated that it is for "*the Council or the Minister for Foreign Affairs*" to do so.

Concerning Article X on "solidarity clause"³², Marietta Giannakou, Paraskevas Avgerinos and Evripidis Stylianidis suggested the insertion of a paragraph on mutual defence. They also wished for the rewording of an article specifying the means the Union would mobilise.

In **Part II, Title B** (The Union's External Action), chapter 1B (The Common Security and Defence Policy), article 17§2³³, Marietta Giannakou and Evripidis Stylianidis requested the insertion of the consultation of the European Parliament. In

²⁸ The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Summary sheet of proposals for amendments concerning external action, including defence policy: Draft Articles for Part One, Title V (Articles 29, 30 and X), Part Two, Title B (Articles 1 to 36) and Chapter X (Article X) of the Constitution", CONV 707/03, Brussels, 9 May 2003.

²⁹ "Member States shall make military and civilian capabilities available to the common security and defence policy, to contribute to the objectives defined by the Council.

Member States shall undertake progressively to improve their military capabilities. A European Armaments and Strategic Research Agency shall be established to identify operational requirements, to put forward measures to satisfy those requirements, to contribute to identifying and, where appropriate, implementing any measure needed to strengthen the industrial and technological base of the defence sector, and to assist the Council in evaluating the improvement of its military capabilities.

Those Member States which establish multinational forces together may also make those forces available to the common security and defence policy."

³⁰ "The Council may entrust the execution of a task, within the Union framework, to a group of Member States. The execution of such a task shall be governed by Article 18 in Part Two, Title B, of the Constitution"

³¹ "The European Parliament shall be consulted on the main aspects and basic choices of the common security and defence policy, and shall be kept informed of how it develops."

³² "In application of the principle of solidarity, the Union shall mobilise all the instruments at its disposal, including military resources, to:

- prevent the terrorist threat;
- protect democratic institutions and the civilian population from any terrorist attack;
- assist a Member State in its territory at the request of its political authorities in the event of a terrorist attack.

The detailed rules for implementing this provision appear in Article X of Part Two, Title B, of the Constitution."

³³ "The Council, acting unanimously, shall adopt decisions relating to the tasks referred to in this Article, defining their objectives and scope and the general conditions for their implementation. The Minister for Foreign Affairs, acting under the authority of the Council and in close and constant contact with the Political and Security Committee, shall ensure coordination of the civilian and military aspects of such tasks."

article 18§1³⁴, Mrs. Giannakou and Mr. Stylianidis requested to be added: (i) a reference to the enhanced cooperation provisions and (ii) that the Minister for Foreign Affairs will participate in the meetings of the participating Member States and will have a role in informing the European Parliament. In article 19§2³⁵, M. Giannakou and E. Stylianidis requested an amendment to the procedure i.e. to add the European Parliament's consent. In article 20§1³⁶, Mrs. Giannakou and Mr. Stylianidis requested its rewording so that Member States "*may, after a proposal from one of them and after informing the EP and a decision of the Council by a qualified majority*", establish structured cooperation. They also requested the replacement in paragraph 2³⁷ of the European Council by the Council. In article 21§1³⁸, M. Giannakou requested the replacement of the European Council by the Council as in art. 20§2 while in paragraph 2 the insertion of a reference to Article 30(7), Part One of the Constitution. Finally, in article 22§3³⁹, M. Giannakou and E. Stylianidis requested to be added (i) "without prejudice to the role of the European Parliament in budgetary affairs" and (ii) to the end of the article that after five years the start-up fund will become an integral part of the Union's budget.

³⁴ "Within the framework of the decisions adopted in accordance with Article 17 of this Title, the Council may entrust the implementation of a task to a group of Member States having the necessary capability and the desire to undertake the task. Those Member States shall agree between themselves on the management of the task."

³⁵ "The Agency shall be open to all Member States wishing to be part of it. The Council, acting by qualified majority, shall adopt a decision defining the Agency's statute, seat and operational rules. Such rules should take account of the level of effective participation in the Agency's activities. Specific groups shall be set up within the Agency bringing together Member States engaged in joint projects."

³⁶ "The Member States listed in Declaration X annexed to the Constitution, which fulfil high military capability criteria and wish to enter into more binding commitments in this matter with a view to more demanding tasks, hereby establish structured cooperation between themselves within the meaning of Article 30(6) of Part One of the Constitution. The military capability criteria and commitments which those Member States have defined are set out in that Declaration."

³⁷ "If a Member State wishes to participate in such cooperation at a later stage, and thus subscribe to the obligations it imposes, it shall inform the European Council of its intention. The restricted Council on structured cooperation shall decide on the Member State's request."

³⁸ "The closer cooperation on mutual defence provided for in Article 30(7) of Part One shall be open to all Member States of the Union. A list of participating Member States shall be set out in a Declaration annexed to this Constitution. If a Member State wishes to take part in such cooperation at a later stage, and thus subscribe to the obligations it imposes, it shall inform the European Council of its intention and subscribe to the Declaration annexed to the Constitution."

³⁹ "A Union budgetary heading shall be created for urgent financing of initiatives in the framework of the common foreign and security policy, in particular preparatory activities for tasks as referred to in by Article 30(1) of Part One of the Constitution. Specific procedures shall be put in place to guarantee rapid access to appropriations entered under this heading and their effective use within the deadlines imposed by the situations concerned.

Preparatory activities for tasks as referred to in Article 30(1) of Part One of the Constitution which are not charged to the Union budget shall be financed by a start-up fund made up of Member States' contributions.

The Council shall adopt by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Minister for Foreign Affairs:

- the procedures for setting up and financing the fund, in particular the amounts allocated to the fund and the procedures for reimbursement;
- the procedures for administering the fund;
- the financial control procedures.

When it is planning a task as referred to in Article 30(1) of Part One of the Constitution which cannot be charged to the Union's budget, the Council shall authorise the Minister for Foreign Affairs to use the fund. The Minister for Foreign Affairs shall report to the Council on the implementation of the remit."

In **Part II, Chapter X** (Solidarity), Article X§1⁴⁰ was drafted, by M. Giannakou, P. Avgerinos and E. Stylianidis, as follows: “Based on a common proposal by the Union’s Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Commission, the Council of Ministers will enact provisions setting a framework for the implementation of the solidarity clause described in Article X, Part I of the Constitution. These provisions will be enacted according to the relevant provisions of the Constitution.” Paragraph 2⁴¹ was drafted also and added by “any armed attack”: “If any Member State should be the object of a terrorist attack or any other armed attack, the other Member States will afford the Member State so attacked, at the request of its civilian authorities, all military and other aid and assistance within their power. To this end, the Member States will co-ordinate their action through the Council of Ministers.” In paragraph 3, they replaced the reference to “joint opinions” with *relevant opinions* and reworded as follows: “For the implementation of this provision, the Council of Ministers shall be assisted by the Political and Security Committee and the Permanent Committee of Internal Security, which may issue relevant opinions to the Council of Ministers.” Finally paragraph 4⁴² was rephrased as well: “In order to increase the effectiveness of the Union’s action in this field, the European Council, based on a report by the Council of Ministers, will evaluate, on a regular basis, the threats facing the Union.”

Greece regarded the draft Constitution drawn up by the Convention as an especially good and balanced text which deserved therefore to be adopted by the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) without major changes likely to damage its overall architecture and institutional structure. Greece would have wished a European Constitution at a higher political level of ambition in terms of promoting the democratic character of the Union and deepening policy integration. It realizes however that the present political equilibrium in Europe did not allow any further progress to be made.

Defence is an extremely important issue for every member state of the European Union in the light of the manifold threats, risks and challenges that confront them today. What the draft Constitution set out on defence appeared to Greece to be a sensible compromise. It allowed progress to be made with all member states on board and, at the same time, it provided the necessary flexibility for those countries, which were able and willing, to forge ahead.

Greece attaches particular significance to “structured” and “closer cooperation” set out in the Constitution. Both are necessary instruments for advancing defence integration without creating problems to anyone who does not wish to join the others. The establishment of the European Armaments, Research and Military Capabilities Agency is also an important step forward to the establishment of a common defence market. For Greece, it was absolutely essential that whatever was decided should not

⁴⁰ “On the basis of a joint proposal by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Commission, the Council shall adopt acts defining a framework for the implementation of the solidarity clause referred to in Article X of Part One. These acts shall be adopted in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Constitution.”

⁴¹ “Should a Member State fall victim to a terrorist attack, the other Member States shall assist it at the request of its political authorities. To that end, the Member States shall coordinate between themselves in the Council.”

⁴² “The European Council shall regularly assess the threats facing the Union, on the basis of a report from the Commission, in order to enable the Union to take effective action.”

undermine the Atlantic Alliance or create new tensions with our transatlantic partners. But, on the other hand, the Union should acquire the necessary autonomy to act.

Conclusions

Greece attaches paramount importance to its participation in a EU with strong, political institutions and a common foreign and defence policy. This constitutes the core parameter, which determines the choices and the scope of Greece's foreign policy. Greece supports the deeper logic of European integration and the basic assumption and values on which the common European defence should be built on as well as the institutional and political autonomy of the Union in the decision making process. Only the success of ESDP allows the EU to increase its international influence at the level of its economic significance, to satisfy the citizens' expectations and to rebalance, as a whole, the present scenario in international relations.

Additionally, Greece during its Presidency of the Council⁴³, attached particular importance to the work of the Convention on the Future of Europe⁴⁴. One of the five major priorities was to have the Draft Constitutional Treaty on the Future of Europe presented at the European Council in Thessaloniki, based on the proposals of the Convention. In particular one of the Greek presidency's three aims was that the "Union would be a strong player in the wider regional and international system, as a factor for peace, stability and cooperation, an active contributor to the process of building a better world, based on international law and institutions, and a promoter of good governance, [...] and the eradication of conflicts, organized crime and terrorism."⁴⁵

Greece worked to make defence policy an issue of the Union. In this way, there would be coherence between the policies of internal security and external action. The common defence should gradually obtain a character of an integrated system of security in accordance with the principles of solidarity and mutual assistance. The development of the European defence towards this direction would function complementary towards the Atlantic Alliance as well. Greece also proposed the creation of a voluntary humanitarian force consisting of young volunteers from all EU member states in the context of the civilian crisis management mechanism. Apart from the evident consequences this could give the opportunity to young Europeans to identify themselves with the European project.

Concluding, Greece actively participated in the proceedings of the Convention. Greece considered necessary to make ESDP an issue of the Union, especially after the terrorist attacks of September 11 and the changes that took place in the international system. Greece's stance, presented in the European Convention, was deeply in favour of the development of the European defence in the context of the European Union. Greece believed that without military capabilities and means, the common defence policy of the Union is condemned to ineffectiveness and credibility gaps, in particular regarding the prevention, management and conflict resolution. With regard to the institutional framework and the elaboration of the common European defence, Greece

⁴³ Greece took over the Council Presidency on 1 January 2003, almost a year after the establishment of the Convention on the Future of Europe.

⁴⁴ For several years now, successive Eurobarometer findings show that Greeks constantly support the development of the European security and defence policy by rates over 70%.

⁴⁵ The Priorities of the Greek Presidency 2003, pg. 9.

considered that it should be shaped within the institutions of the European Union with the wider possible participation of the European Commission.

References

Official EU Documentation

- G. Katiforis, "Towards an EU Armaments Strategy", *WG VII, WD 4*, Brussels, 2 October 2002.
- G. Katiforis, "Political Control and Strategic Direction on EU Crisis Management Operations", *WG VII, WD 7*, Brussels, 11 October 2002.
- "Laeken Declaration on the Future of the European Union", in Presidency Conclusion – European Council Meeting in Laeken, *SN 300/1/01 REV 1*, 14-15 December 2001, pp. 19 – 26.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 13 June 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 14 June 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 11 September 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 14 June 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Contribution from Prof. P.C. Ioakimidis, alternate member of the Convention: "Answers to the questions of the Laeken Declaration"", *CONV 113/02, CONTRIB. 48*, Brussels, 18 June 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 25 June 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 26 June 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 10 July 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 12 July 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), *Meeting of the Praesidium-Brussels, 18 July 2002: Summary of Conclusions*, Brussels, 13 September 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Preliminary draft Constitutional Treaty", *CONV 369/02*, Brussels, 28 October 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Contribution by Mr. Panayotis Ioakimidis, alternate member of the Convention: "The development of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy and Defence Policy (CFSP/ESDP)""", *CONV 389/02, CONTRIB. 134*, Brussels, 7 November 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Paper by Mrs. Marietta Giannakou", *WG VIII, WD 24*, Brussels, 21 November 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Contribution by Mr. Paraskevas Avgerinos, member, and Mr Panayotis Ioakimidis, alternate member: "The Draft Constitutional Treaty: Preliminary Observations"", *CONV 443/02, CONTRIB 162*, Brussels, 2 December 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Contribution by Mrs Marietta Giannakou, member of the Convention: - "European Security and Defence Policy", *CONV 463/02, CONTRIB. 173*, Brussels, 16 December 2002.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Summary sheet of proposals for amendments concerning external action, including defence policy: Draft Articles for Part One, Title V (Articles 29, 30 and X), Part Two, Title B (Articles 1 to 36) and Chapter X (Article X) of the Constitution", *CONV 707/03*, Brussels, 9 May 2003.
- The European Convention (The Secretariat), "Draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe", *CONV 850/03*, Brussels, 18 July 2003.

- The Priorities of the Greek Presidency 2003.

Interventions by Greek delegates

- Intervention by Ms Marietta Giannakou, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the second plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 21-22 March 2002.
- Intervention by Mr George Katiforis, representative of the Hellenic government and member of the Praesidium, at the second plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 21-22 March 2002.
- Intervention by Ms Marietta Giannakou, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the third plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 15-16 April 2002.
- Intervention by Mr Paraskevas Avgerinos, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the third plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 15-16 April 2002.
- Intervention by Ms Marietta Giannakou, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the fourth plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 23-24 May 2002.
- Intervention by Ms Marietta Giannakou, member of the Hellenic Parliament, at the fifth plenary session of the European Convention, held on the 06-07 June 2002.

Academic References

- D. Allnoch, "Has the European Convention United Europe in Security and Defence Policy Issues?", *CEuS Working Paper 2003/1*, Jean Monnet Centre for European Studies (CEuS), <http://www.monnet-centre.uni-bremen.de/pdf/wp/2003-1-Allnoch.pdf>.
- A. Menon, "From crisis to catharsis: ESDP after Iraq", *International Affairs*, July 2004, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 631-648.