

# 1. SECURITY AND GEOPOLITICS

## EUROPEANISATION OF LATVIAN DEFENCE POLICY

VALERIJS BODNIEKS

### ABSTRACT

DOI: 10.26410/SF\_1/18/1

In later years after annexation of Crimea, ongoing conflict in Ukraine and Brexit defence is the most discussed issue among politicians and on mass media, because the main question is how to secure European Union (EU) from potential external aggression of Russia? Concerning defence of Europe, we need to take in to the consideration not only North Atlantic Treaty organization (NATO), but also EU Common Security and Defence policy (CSDP). NATO has a major impact on its member states – mostly European countries, but at same time a significant role in European security and defence should be given to CSDP.

In Latvia's case defence policy is based on NATO and most of the case studies about Latvian defence are related to NATO role, but at same time, because of changing threats for EU, it is necessary to pay more attention to CSDP role and impact on Latvia's defence. Therefore, this paper will describe Europeanisation from theoretical perspective by focusing on top-down Europeanisation, it will provide a historical background of EU CSDP and analysis top-down Europeanisation impact on the Latvian defence policy. This paper is based on Europeanisation theoretical framework, analysis of Latvian national security and defence strategic documents, Latvian legal acts concerning defence, data about Latvian participation in EU missions and Battle groups etc.

### KEY WORDS

Europeanisation, EU Common Security and Defence Policy, Latvian Defence Policy, NATO.

**VALERIJS BODNIEKS,**  
National Defence Academy of Latvia

## Theoretical aspects of Europeanisation

Initially, it would be logical to define what Europeanisation is, but it is difficult and almost impossible to define it. According to T. Florckhart's the Europeanisation field is rich on definitions of Europeanisation, and

a single and precise meaning of the term remains elusive, definitions are specific to individual peace of work with no clear overall agreement in which direction the Europeanisation concept should be taken,

nor on how far back the concept should reach<sup>1</sup>.

Acknowledgement for T. Florkhartsummarises conclusions and views about Europeanisation of N.T.T. Hang, J.P. Olsen, B. Coppieters, K. Wach, S. Bulmer and other researchers. B. Coppieters et al. define Europeanisation as an analytical concept which is used to examine the changes in domestic structures and policies that occur in response to policies and practices institutionalized at European level<sup>2</sup>. Additionally, B. Coppieters et. all. in the research about Europeanisation concludes that one of the best known and recognized definitions of Europeanisation is given by R. Ladrech, who understands Europeanisation as an incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making<sup>3</sup>. K. Wach focuses on E. Gellner and A.D. Smith's vision that the concept of Europeanisation in literature of the subject is defined as a phenomenon without origins,<sup>4</sup> but S. Bulmer emphasizes from the perspective of K. Fezerstein and K.M. Radaelli, that Europeanisation is not a theory, but rather a phenomenon which explains a wide range of theoretical approaches<sup>5</sup>. J.P. Olsendistinguish between five possi-

ble uses of Europeanisation: changes in external boundaries, developing institutions at the European level, central penetration of national systems of governance, exporting forms of political organization, a political unification project<sup>6</sup>. N.T.T. Hang concludes that some consider Europeanisation as a *top-down* process in which attention is paid to the impact of EU on the political institutions, policies and political forces of the member states, but others argue that it is necessary to view it from *bottom-up* and *horizontal* approaches<sup>7</sup>. At the same time N.T.T. Hang explains that the term Europeanisation in its broadest meaning can be understood as becoming more European like<sup>8</sup>.

It is more or less clear why it is difficult to give a precise definition to Europeanisation, but challenge is not related only to how to define the term Europeanisation, but there are at least three approaches of Europeanisation: *bottom-up*, *top-down*, *horizontal*. If we combine first two of mentioned approaches, it can be concluded that there is one more *circular* (a two way) approach. In this paper focus is on Latvian defence policy *top-down* Europeanisations, but in same time, to give a wider view of Europeanisation.

Researcher K. Wach, based on K.E. Howell analyses, describes that *bottom-up* Europeanisation can be explained as follows: "Groups of interests and networks of connections which are instruments by means of which preferences of individuals bottom-up groups are considered on the level of the EU, influencing the development of its political structures"<sup>9</sup>, but T.A. Börzel and

<sup>1</sup> Florkhart, T. 2010. Europeanization or EU-ization? The Transfer of European Norms across Time and Space. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 48(4), 789. [https://www.academia.edu/2018449/Europeanization\\_or\\_EU\\_ization\\_The\\_Transfer\\_of\\_European\\_Norms\\_across\\_Time\\_and\\_Space?auto=download](https://www.academia.edu/2018449/Europeanization_or_EU_ization_The_Transfer_of_European_Norms_across_Time_and_Space?auto=download)

<sup>2</sup> Coppieters, B. et al. 2004. *Europeanization and Conflict Resolution: Case Studies from the European Periphery*. Gent: Academia Press, 21.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>4</sup> Wach, K. 2015. Conceptualizing Europeanization: Theoretical Approaches and Research Designs. In: *Europeanization Processes from the Mesoeconomic Perspective: Industries and Policies*. P. Stanek and K. Wach, eds. Cracow: Cracow University of Economics, 13.

<sup>5</sup> Bulmer, S. 2007. Theorizing Europeanization. In: *Europeanization: New Research Agenda*. P. Graziano and M.P. Vink, eds. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 47.

<sup>6</sup> Olsen, J.P. 2002. The Many Faces of Europeanization. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 40(5), 923-924. <http://eu-wb.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/olsen-2002.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Hang, N.T.T. 2011. Europeanization: Simply a Top-down Process? *Marmara journal of european studies*. 19(1), 136. <http://dosya.marmara.edu.tr/avrupa/mjes%20arsiv/vol%2019%201%201%206-hang.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 137.

<sup>9</sup> Wach, K. 2015. Conceptualizing Europeanization: Theoretical Approaches and Research Designs. In:

D. Panke bottom-up Europeanisation explains as analyses in the frame of how states upload their domestic preferences to the EU level<sup>10</sup>. According to K. Crepaz, it maybe concluded that bottom-up Europeanisation according to D. Mc Cauley identifies in three variants: proactive, rejection/promotion and usage<sup>11</sup>. T.A. Börzel and D. Panke explain that in the top-down Europeanisation focus is on how the EU shapes institutions, processes, and politics outcomes in both member states and third countries, top-down approach searches for causes at the EU level that explain domestic changes<sup>12</sup>. Top-down Europeanisation manifests itself in the changes of the national policies of the country, influencing the internal structure of the EU's policies (for example: political, economic, social and institutional aspects).

From theoretical perspective important it is important that, according to T. Risse and T.A. Börzel, Europeanisation can cause three different degrees of domestic change: *Firstly*, Absorption: member states are able to incorporate European policies or ideas and readjust their institutions, respectively, without substantially modifying existing processes, policies, and institutions. The degree of domestic change is low; *Secondly*, Accommodation: member states accommodate Europeanisation pressure by adapting existing processes, policies and institutions without changing their essential features and the underlying collec-

tive understandings attached to them. One way of doing this is by "patching up" new policies and institutions onto existing ones without changing the latter. The degree of domestic change is modest.; *Thirdly*, Transformation: member states replace existing policies, processes, and institutions by new, substantially different ones, or alter existing ones to the extent that their essential features and/or the underlying collective understandings are fundamentally changes. The degree of domestic change is high<sup>13</sup>.

Combination of *bottom-up* and *top-down* Europeanisation approach is circular (a two way) approach. R.J. Vale, by referring to L. Quaglia et. all. analysis, explains that circular Europeanisation explains Europeanisation as the result of a bidirectional process where member states shape EU policies and institutions by uploading their own policies and institutions to the European level and then adapt to outcomes made at the EU level by 'downloading' EU policies and institutions into the domestic arena<sup>14</sup>.

C. Major and K. Pomorska horizontal Europeanisation define as the exchange of ideas, norms and ways of doing things between countries or other entities for which the EU sets the scene, thus change is not only due to but takes place within Europe<sup>15</sup>.

There are four approaches to Europeanisation, and *top-down* is applied to the analyses of Latvian defence policy. Prior to analyzing Europeanisation impact on Latvian defence policy, it is necessary to

Europeanization Processes from the Meso-economic Perspective: Industries and Policies. P. Stanek and K. Wach, eds. Cracow: Cracow University of Economics, 14.

<sup>10</sup> Börzel, T.A. and Panke, D. 2013. Europeanization. In: European Union Politics. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. M. Cini and N.P.S. Borrigan, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 120.

<sup>11</sup> Crepaz, K. 2016. The Impact of Europeanization on Minority Communities. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, 26.

<sup>12</sup> Börzel, T.A. and Panke, D. 2016. Europeanization. In: European Union Politics. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. M. Cini and N.P.S. Borrigan, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 111.

<sup>13</sup> Börzel, T.A. and Risse, T. 2000. When Europe Hits Home: Europeanization and Domestic Change. European Integration online Papers (EIoP). 4(15), 10. <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/pdf/2000-015.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> Vale, R.J. 17.01.2011. Is 'Europeanization' a Useful Concept? In: E-International Relations Students. <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/01/17/is-%E2%80%98europeanization%E2%80%99-a-useful-concept/>

<sup>15</sup> Major, C. and Pomorska, K., 2005. Theorising the Effects of the CFSP on National Foreign Policy and the Concept of Europeanisation. A network of research and teaching on European Foreign Policy: CFSP Forum. 3(5), 13. [https://www.academia.edu/191266/Europeanisation\\_framework\\_or\\_fashion](https://www.academia.edu/191266/Europeanisation_framework_or_fashion)

examine EU CSDP by focusing on most important decision and documents.

## Historical aspects and development of CSDP

CSDP history is complicated and its roots can be found in the history of Europe. Lots of documents from EU level are related to CSDP, but not all of them are similarly important, therefore it is necessary to focus only on the most important from the end of the II World War and first days of Western European Union (WEU) till nowadays.

Of course, EU is an economic power and European integration is based on economic issues, base for it was 1951 Treaty of Paris, when The European Coal and Steel Community was set up, but not less important was 1948 Treaty of Brussels and its amendment in 1954. With Brussels Treaty countries agreed on cooperation on economic, social, cultural and collective defence issues,<sup>16</sup> but with Modified Brussels Treaty was created Western European Union (WEU) and Germany, Italy joined this organization<sup>17</sup>. Up to WEU dissolution and incorporation in structure of EU as complete members in WEU were Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, as an associate members worked Czech Republic, Hungary, Island, Norway, Poland, Turkey, as observers were Austria, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, as an associate partners Bulgaria, Rumania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> 17.03.1948. Brussels Treaty. Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence. Entered into force on 25.08.1948. [http://www.nato.int/ebookshop/video/declassified/doc\\_files/Brussels%20Treaty.pdf](http://www.nato.int/ebookshop/video/declassified/doc_files/Brussels%20Treaty.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> 23.10.1954. Brussels Treaty. As amended by the Protocol modifying and completing the Brussels Treaty. Entered into force on 06.05.1995. [http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2003/11/26/7d182408-0ff6-432e-b793-0d1065ebe695/publishable\\_en.pdf](http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2003/11/26/7d182408-0ff6-432e-b793-0d1065ebe695/publishable_en.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> Bailes, A.J.K. and Messervy-Whiting, G. 2011. Death of an Institution: The End of Western European Union, a Future for European Defence? Brussels: Royal Institute for International Relations, 23.

According to F. Terpan, European defence Europeanisation started with the creation of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)<sup>19</sup>. CFSP was set up by 1992 Maastricht Treaty, but the idea of Europe common cooperation in policy comes from late 60<sup>th</sup>. At the 1969 Hague Summit European leaders agreed on necessity to unite on cooperation in political issues, therefore foreign ministers were responsible for research of mentioned issue<sup>20</sup>. Idea about European political cooperation was included in E. Davignon 1970 report by focusing not only on political cooperation, but also on harmonization of common external policy outside the European Community borders<sup>21</sup>. By 1992 Maastricht Treaty was founded EU as a successor of the European Community and created CFSP, according to A. Kaczorowska-Irelans, the E. Davignon report was precondition for formalized European cooperation within the framework of CFSP<sup>22</sup>. Content of the Maastricht Treaty set that the WEU is an integral part of the EU and is responsible for EU defence issues, working closely and respecting the interests of EU Member States in NATO<sup>23</sup>. Same ideas about responsibility of WEU is incorporated in 1992 Maastricht Declaration, which was adopted at the same time as the Maastricht Treaty<sup>24</sup>. The Secretary-General of the WEU in 2000 reported that Maastricht

<sup>19</sup> Terpan, F. 2008. The Europeanization of the French Defence Policy. In: Fourth Pan-European Conference on EU Politics. Riga, University of Latvia, 3. <http://www.jhucb.it/ecpr-riga/virtualpaper-room/113.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> 02.12.1969. Final communique of the Hague Summit. [http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1997/10/13/33078789-8030-49c8-b4e0-15d053834507/publishable\\_en.pdf](http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1997/10/13/33078789-8030-49c8-b4e0-15d053834507/publishable_en.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> 27.10.1970. Report by the Foreign Ministers of the Member States on the problems of political unification. [http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/4/22/4176efc3-c734-41e5-bb90-d34c4d17bbb5/publishable\\_en.pdf](http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/4/22/4176efc3-c734-41e5-bb90-d34c4d17bbb5/publishable_en.pdf)

<sup>22</sup> Kaczorowska-Ireland, A. 2016. European Union Law. 4rd ed. Abingdon: Routledge, 13.

<sup>23</sup> 07.02.1992. Treaty on European Union. Entered into force on 01.11.1993. [https://europa.eu/european-union/sites/europa.eu/files/docs/body/treaty\\_on\\_european\\_union\\_en.pdf](https://europa.eu/european-union/sites/europa.eu/files/docs/body/treaty_on_european_union_en.pdf)

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

Declaration and Maastricht Treaty is the basis for cooperation between EU and WEU<sup>25</sup>. The 1992 is significant not only because of Maastricht Treaty and Maastricht Declaration, but also with WEU Petersberg Declaration, by this document countries agreed on Petersberg tasks, which meant that WEU can involve in solving humanitarian crisis and take part in peacekeeping operations across EU borders<sup>26</sup>. With the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty was created a post of High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy<sup>27</sup>.

Till 1998 EU defence policy developed slowly and gradually, but after 1998 the process became much faster. EU as a defence and security actor. A. Kottey from I. Manner concludes that EU is different, specific and unique, because it is not like traditional international organization with centralized member states power, but its power manifests in EU norms, cooperation, and soft power in international relations.<sup>28</sup> Additionally we need to take in to account that EU is an economic power, not a military power. Mentioned is reflected in EU defence development starting from 1998 till nowadays. The 1998 Saint-Malo Declaration was a fundamental document for the future development of the EU as a security and defence actor. With this document European powers, the United Kingdom and France reached an agreement that the EU should become an independent decision-maker based on a military force to deal with international crises where

NATO is not involved<sup>29</sup>. J. Howorth analyzing European defence and the Saint-Malo Declaration, draws attention to that its essence is expressed in the fact that the EU need to be able to be a full power player in the international arena, the EU need some sort of capacity for autonomous action – military forces that could be used, if necessary, and can be involved to respond to international crises<sup>30</sup>. Next step toward more powerful EU was decisions adopted by the Cologne European Council in 1999. In the Cologne European Council Declaration it is stated that the EU international role should be increased based on the Maastricht Treaty and the Petersberg tasks, supported Saint-Malo declaration, and highlighted the need to strengthen the technology and industrial defence bases, incorporation of the WEU into the EU structure<sup>31</sup>. An important step toward the development of the European security and defence policy was the “Berlin Plus” agreement between EU and NATO. Based on “Berlin Plus” agreement, the first EU mission *EUFOR Concordia* in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was launched. For instance, agreement included mutual exchange of classified information between NATO and EU, access for EU to NATO planning capabilities in EU-led operations, access to NATO assets for EU operations, access for EU to NATO’s European command etc.<sup>32</sup> Gradually EU formed more powerful

<sup>25</sup> Solana, J. 2000. Western European Union: WEU Today. Belgium: WEU Secretariat-General, 20. [http://www.weu.int/WEU\\_Today2.pdf](http://www.weu.int/WEU_Today2.pdf)

<sup>26</sup> 19.06.1992. Western European Union Council of ministers. Petersberg Declaration. <http://www.weu.int/documents/920619peten.pdf>

<sup>27</sup> 02.10.1997. Treaty of Amsterdam amending the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties establishing the European Communities and certain related acts. Entered into force on 01.05.1999. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/treaty/pdf/amst-en.pdf>

<sup>28</sup> Cottey, A. 2007. Security in the New Europe. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 80.

<sup>29</sup> 04.12.1998. Declaration Issued at the British-French Summit, Saint Malo, France. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/French-British%20Summit%20Declaration,%20Saint-Malo,%201998%20-%20EN.pdf>

<sup>30</sup> Howorth, J. 2007. Security and Defence Policy in the European Union. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 33.

<sup>31</sup> 04.06.1999. Cologne European Council President Report on Strengthening of the common European policy on security and defence. <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/Cologne%20European%20Council%20-%20Annex%20III%20of%20the%20Presidency%20conclusions.pdf>

<sup>32</sup> European Union External Action Service. 08.07.2016. Shaping of a Common Security and Defence Policy. <https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security->

and in 2003 EU Council adopted European Security Strategy – A Secure Europe in a Better World with accent that EU should be global player and responsible for peace and security in world<sup>33</sup>. EU responsibility to make world more secure can be seen in EU led military operations, because according to J.C. Juncker report “State of Union 2016” till the end of 2016 EU involve at 30 civilian and military missions from Africa till Afghanistan<sup>34</sup>. J.C. Piris in his research about European security points out that security and defence policy include not only military power, but also other actors and they cooperation (layers, diplomats, police officers etc.), because terrorism, crisis situations cannot be solved only by military power, and EU have all necessary assets, therefore the main aim for EU is crisis and after crisis management in third countries<sup>35</sup>. Important military tool for EU are EU Battle groups – highlevel military units of 1,500 military personnel, they must be persistent and capable of carrying out tasks without additional supplies for 30 days<sup>36</sup>. The concept of EU Battle groups was approved by the EU Military Committee in April 2004 and the main Battle group requirements are included in European Council Headline Goal 2010<sup>37</sup>.

Wide changes with base for EU future cooperation on defence were included in

and-defence-policy-csdp/5388/shaping-of-a-common-security-and-defence-policy-\_en

<sup>33</sup> 12.12.2003. Eiropas Drošības stratēģija: Droša Eiropa labākā pasaulē. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/031208ESSIILV.pdf>

<sup>34</sup> Junker, J.C. 2016. State of The Union 2016. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 19. <http://europa.eu/rapid/attachment/SPEECH-16-3043/en/SOTEU%20brochure%20EN.pdf>

<sup>35</sup> Piris, J.C. 2010. The Lisbon Treaty: A Legal and Political Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 268.

<sup>36</sup> European Union External Action Service. 08.07.2016. Shaping of a Common Security and Defence Policy. [https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp/5388/shaping-of-a-common-security-and-defence-policy-\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp/5388/shaping-of-a-common-security-and-defence-policy-_en)

<sup>37</sup> 18.06.2004. European Council Headline Goal 2010. <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsupload/2010%20headline%20goal.pdf>

2007 Lisbon Treaty (entered into force in 2009). With the Lisbon Treaty was included a new regulation in Maastricht Treaty about security and defence policy in EU and amended Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Basically European security and defence policy was replaced with CSDP as an integral part of CFSP. The importance of the Lisbon Treaty lies in the fact that norms about defence clause, solidarity clause, Petersberg tasks and Permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) are included in the Treaty.

The EU mutual defence clause is included in treaties Article 42.7 and it derives from the Article 5 of the Brussels Treaty that created the WEU, which was incorporated in the EU in 2011, but solidarity clause is included in treaties Article 222. Article 42.7 states that: “If a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all the means in their power, in accordance with article 51 of the United Nations charter”, but Article 222 states that: “EU and its member states shall act jointly in a spirit of solidarity if a member state is the object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster. The Union shall mobilise all the instruments at its disposal, including the military resources made available by the Member States, to prevent the terrorist threat in the territory of the member states, 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”<sup>38</sup>. With Lisbon Treaty the Petersberg tasks were changed and according to treaties Article 28 B tasks

<sup>38</sup> 13.12.2007. The Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty Establishing the European Community. Entered into force on 01.12.2009. [http://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/688a7a98-3110-4ffe-a6b3-8972d8445325.0007.01/DOC\\_19](http://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/688a7a98-3110-4ffe-a6b3-8972d8445325.0007.01/DOC_19)

include: "...joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilization. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including support to third countries in combating terrorism in their territories"<sup>39</sup>. Without above mentioned, Lisbon Treaty determines established rule and practice of unanimity principle which states that "Decisions relating to the common security and defence policy, including those initiating a mission as referred to in this Article, shall be adopted by the Council acting unanimously... such a unanimous decision will be taken "on a proposal from the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy or an initiative from a Member State"<sup>40</sup>. Additionally, in Lisbon Treaty, articles 42.6 and 46 as well as Protocol 10 outlined PESCO, that means that "Those Member States whose military capabilities fulfil higher criteria and which have made more binding commitments to one another in this area with a view to the most demanding missions shall establish PESCO within the Union framework"<sup>41</sup>. It is interesting that according to J.C. Piris PESCO implies "Schengen defence" or "defence of euro zone", because countries with higher military capabilities and willingness to cooperate with other countries can form a permanent co-operation framework within the EU<sup>42</sup>. All above mentioned shows that CSDP developed with significant speed, of course the best realization in practice took place in EU missions, but after 2014 Russia invasion in Crimea EU restarted CSDP with other speed and aim.

After 2014 aggression in Ukraine and Brexit, the discussion was related to questions about European army, EU military headquarters, European Defence Fund, EU Global strategy and PESCO. All ideas caused debates and discussions, but on document level European Defence Action plan, European Parliament resolution on European defence union and European global strategy should be highlighted. EU is the world second largest military spender behind the United States and its most important challenge according to European Defence Action plan in defence is inefficiency in spending due to duplication, lack of interoperability and technological gap as well as shrinking defence budget in recent years<sup>43</sup>. European Defence Action plan focuses on capability needs and supports the European defence industry and it has three main pillars: launching a European Defence Fund, Fostering investments in defence supply chains, reinforcing the single market for defence<sup>44</sup>. Moreover, in European Defence Action plan broadly explained each of pillar, but the main idea is that after Russia's aggression in Ukraine and Brexit EU restarted defence issues and CSDP as well as among politicians begin to reborn ideas of European defence union (for example: Germany called for a European Security and Defence Union in White Paper of 2016 on 'German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr'). In the European Parliament resolution on European defence union European Parliament not only supports creation of European Security and Defence Union, but also encourages Member States to cooperate

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> 30.11.2016. The European Commission proposes a European Defence Fund and other actions to support Member States' more efficient spending in joint defence capabilities, strengthen European citizens' security and foster a competitive and innovative industrial base. European Defence Action Plan. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM:2016:950:FIN>

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

together toward European Security and Defence Union, as well as launched initiative to reform the EU battlegroups concept to establish permanent units which would be independent of any lead nation and subject to systematic joint training, and to establish a permanent headquarters for command and control for CSDP military operations<sup>45</sup>. After 2003 European Security Strategy – A Secure Europe in a Better World in 2016 a new strategy was adopted: Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe a Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy. Regarding security and defence the main idea in strategy is pre-condition that Europeans should take greater responsibility for security, EU should be better equipped, it must be ready to deter, respond to, and protect against external threats<sup>46</sup>. Additionally, regarding PESCO, it is necessary to point, that in November 2017 EU 23 Member States signed a joint notification and handed it over to EU High Representative Federica Mogherini<sup>47</sup>.

The content of all mentioned above documents includes specific information and everyone from them can be analyzed separately, but main idea lies in the fact that in recent years EU restarted CSDP in tremendous speed. Moreover, in last years it can be seen that significant changes happen in politician minds of EU leading nations, furthermore it is obvious that now CSDP is not only on paper and realizes in EU missions, but it starts working in co-

operation with NATO more widely. Finally, concerning CSDP historical development we need to take in to account the researcher C. Archer who mentioned that EU is not a traditional military union like NATO, but in its essence are included elements from G. Snyder definition on alliances as an formal union to us military power in specific conditions against countries outside alliance<sup>48</sup>. Everything above mentioned raises a question about Europeanisation impact on Latvian defence policy.

## Europeanisation impact on Latvian defence policy

Latvian defence policy is based on participation in NATO, but at the same time a complementary role is given to CSDP. From historical aspect Latvia started its way toward westernization after regaining independence. Latvian position on European security and defence policy before Latvia joined EU is included in 2000 Latvia's Integration strategy in EU. From the document it can be concluded that Latvia and EU have common interests on CFSP and for Latvia participation in EU defence policy will increase defence capability<sup>49</sup>. From Sweden Defence ministry report about the Baltic States follows that in 2004 none of the Baltic States have objections to join EU defence policy, because it coincides with the aim to participate in EU<sup>50</sup>. Additionally, the impact of EU defence policy and its importance for Latvia is in-

<sup>45</sup> 22.11.2016. European Parliament Resolution of 22 November 2016 on the European Defence Union (2016/2052(IN)). <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+TA+P8-TA-2016-0435+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN>

<sup>46</sup> 28.06.2016. Kopīgs redzējums, kopīga rīcība: stiprāka Eiropa. Globāla Eiropas Savienības ārpolitikas un drošības politikas stratēģija. [http://www.eeas.europa.eu/top\\_stories/pdf/eugs\\_lv\\_.pdf](http://www.eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/pdf/eugs_lv_.pdf)

<sup>47</sup> 22.11.2017. European Commission – Statement Defence: European Commission welcomes steps towards Permanent Structured Cooperation [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_STATEMENT-17-4608\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-17-4608_en.htm)

<sup>48</sup> Archer, C. 2010. Small States and the European Security and defence Policy. In: Small States in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities. R. Steinmetz and A. Wivel, eds. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 53.

<sup>49</sup> 09.02.2000. Latvijas stratēģija integrācijai Eiropas Savienībā: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 40/41 (1951/1952). <https://www.vestnesis.lv/ta/id/917>

<sup>50</sup> Swedish Ministry of Defence. 2012. The Security and Defensibility of the Baltic States: A Comprehensive Analysis of a Security Complex in the Making. B. Ljung, T. Malmlöf and K. Nerethieks, eds. Kista: Swedish Defence Research Agency, 40. <http://www.afs.a.se/balticum.pdf>



cluded in the report on 2000 Strategy for Latvia's Integration into the EU realization. The report states that Latvia supports the Cologne European Council decisions and the EU involvement in crisis management outside EU borders, additionally according to the report for Latvia participation in the EU defence policy is additional process for integration in NATO<sup>51</sup>. After joining NATO and EU, main aspects of CSDP are included in Latvian defence policy strategic documents (National Security Concept, The State defence Concept), therefore it is necessary to highlight from documents the most important aspects about Latvian position and involvement in CSDP.

According to National Security Concept 2002, Latvia has taken responsibility not only for EU security issues, but also for the development of the EU defence policy and its involvement in international crisis management, furthermore for Latvia is important to be involved in EU missions<sup>52</sup>. Latvian National Security Concept 2002 was adopted before Latvia joined EU and NATO, therefore the main idea of this document is concentrated in the concept that Latvia's major strategic aim is to join both organizations. In 2005 the first National Security Concept since Latvia joined NATO and EU was approved. Regarding the EU defence policy the document states that Latvia supports not only EU formation as a military actor, but also supports EU participation in missions<sup>53</sup>. In National Security Concept 2008 indicated that Latvia partici-

pates in EU missions and supports EU defence policy to develop common strength and ability, to conduct international threats and crisis<sup>54</sup>. The National Security Concept 2011 focuses on the role of NATO and EU in minimizing the risk of external threats for Latvia and supports the complementary principle of both organizations to the resolution of conflicts, threats and crises in the international environment, as well as it expresses the need to increase the EU military capabilities to influence the EU role in security and defence<sup>55</sup>. The National Security Concept 2015 focuses on the EU complementary role to strengthen NATO collective defense in field of the border security, energy security and information space and cyber security, as well as an important role is given to EU fast reaction forces and participation in missions<sup>56</sup>.

The State defence Concept 2003 was adopted before Latvia joined NATO and EU. From concept can be concluded that EU has a complementary role as a NATO strategic partner with need to avoid duplication of functions between two organizations<sup>57</sup>. According to The State defence Concept 2008 in order to maintain Latvian independence it is important to participate in NATO and EU, moreover the document points out that Latvian National Armed Forces (NAF) need to move towards the compatibility with both NATO military units and the EU Battle Groups<sup>58</sup>. The National Defense

<sup>51</sup> 09.05.2001. 2. Ziņojums par Latvijas Republikas stratēģijas integrācijai Eiropas Savienībā izpildi: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 76(2463). <https://www.vestnesis.lv/ta/id/20494>

<sup>52</sup> 24.01.2002. Nacionālās drošības koncepcija: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 17 (2592). <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/227208-par-nacionalas-drosibas-koncepciju>

<sup>53</sup> 02.02.2005. Nacionālās drošības koncepcija: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 23(3181). <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=21772>

<sup>54</sup> 02.10.2008. Nacionālās drošības koncepcija: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 165 (3949). [http://www.mod.gov.lv/~media/AM/Par\\_aizsardzibas\\_nozari/Plani,%20koncepcijas/Nac\\_dros\\_2008.ashx](http://www.mod.gov.lv/~media/AM/Par_aizsardzibas_nozari/Plani,%20koncepcijas/Nac_dros_2008.ashx)

<sup>55</sup> 10.03.2011. Nacionālās drošības koncepcija: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 45 (4443). <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=227460>

<sup>56</sup> 26.11.2015. Nacionālās Drošības Koncepcija: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 233 (5551). <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/278107-par-nacionalas-drosibas-koncepcijas-apstiprinasanu>

<sup>57</sup> 13.11.2003. Valsts aizsardzības koncepcija: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 167 (2932). <http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=228302>

<sup>58</sup> 19.06.2008. Valsts aizsardzības koncepcija: Latvi-

Concept 2012 includes the most comprehensive regulation regarding CSDP, which has been incorporated in Latvian security and defense policy planning documents. The document states that for Latvia's defence EU is an additional instrument and EU promotes and ensures cooperation between European countries in the field of development of military capability, effective engagement in global crisis management, as well as reduction the military capability-gap with NATO<sup>59</sup>. Moreover, it is important, that the concept includes EU mutual defence clause (Lisbon Treaty article 42.7) with indication that clause means political solidarity, but it is without mechanisms of implementation<sup>60</sup>. Wider focus on CSDP in National Defence Conception 2012 can be described as a result of discussions on Lisbon Treaty and defence issues included in Treaty. Additionally, in National Defence Concept 2016, which is approved after Russian aggression in Ukraine, accent is on the EU Battle groups and fact that EU power lies in its nonmilitary instruments.<sup>61</sup> In compliance with the National Security Concept and National Defence Concept for Latvia's involvement in CSDP can be seen in EU Battle groups and EU military missions.

Before Latvia joined EU and NATO Latvia participated with 4 soldiers in EU military missions *EUFOR Concordia* in 2003, it was NATO mission *Allied Harmony* continuation<sup>62</sup>. After Latvia joined EU and NATO,

Latvia participated in the EU military missions *EUFOR Althea*, *EU NAVFOR Atalanta*, *EUTM Mali*, *EUFOR RCA*, *EU NAVFOR Med-Sophia*. Latvia's membership in the EU military mission *EUFOR Althea* in Bosnia and Hercegovina with 23 soldiers was from the end of 2004 till 2009<sup>63</sup>. In the EU military mission *EUFOR Althea* participated not only EU countries, but also Machedonia, Chile, Turkey with the main goal to support Bosnia and Hercegovina in military progress and education, as well as to stabilize situation, fight with terrorism, clear the territory from mines etc.<sup>64</sup>. Forces of *EU NAVFOR Atalanta* deter, prevent and repress acts of piracy and armed robbery of the Somali coast, as well as protects vessels of the World Food Programme delivering aid to displaced persons in Somalia<sup>65</sup>. Latvia participated in this EU military mission with 24 soldiers, they served in the operational headquarter in the United Kingdom and on the headquarters vessel near the coast of Somalia<sup>66</sup>. According to M.E. Smith *EU NAVFOR Atalanta* was first EU sea mission with aim to protect not only third parties' interests, but also EU interests<sup>67</sup>. The EU military mission *EUTAM Mali* is multinational military training mission, it is realized from 2013. In *EUTAM Mali* soldiers are not involved in combat operations. From Latvia in this mission have been 42 soldiers<sup>68</sup>. The EU mission in Central African Republic was initiated in 2014 and lasted six months with

jas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 103 (3887). <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/177839-par-valsts-aizsardzibas-koncepciju>

<sup>59</sup> 10.05.2012. Valsts Aizsardzības Konceptija: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 81 (4684). <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=248069>

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> 16.06.2016. Valsts aizsardzības koncepcija: Latvijas politikas plānošanas dokuments. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 117 (5689). <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/282964-par-valsts-aizsardzibas-koncepcijas-apstiprinasanu>

<sup>62</sup> Nacionālie Bruņotie spēki. 2016. Starptautiskajām Operācijām 20. Rīga: Latvijas Ģeotelpiskās informācijas aģentūras tipogrāfija „Latvijas karte”, 20.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid. 28.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid. 28.

<sup>65</sup> 26.11.2017. EU External Action Service. <http://eunavfor.eu/>

<sup>66</sup> Nacionālie Bruņotie spēki. 2016. Starptautiskajām Operācijām 20. Rīga: Latvijas Ģeotelpiskās informācijas aģentūras tipogrāfija „Latvijas karte”, 42.

<sup>67</sup> Smith, M.E. 2012. EU Grand Strategy and the Ethics of Military Force: The Case of EUNAVFOR-Atalanta. UACES 42nd Annual Conference Passau, 3-5 September 2012, 1. <http://uaces.org/documents/papers/1201/smithme2.pdf>.

<sup>68</sup> Nacionālie Bruņotie spēki. 2016. Starptautiskajām Operācijām 20. Rīga: Latvijas Ģeotelpiskās informācijas aģentūras tipogrāfija „Latvijas karte”, 46.

its main goal to reduce crisis, to provide security and humanitarian help for local people – in that mission Latvia was represented by 39 soldiers by guarding Bangui airport, patrols and transporting humanitarian cargo<sup>69</sup>. The EU military mission *EU NAVFOR Med Sophia* is going on from 2015 with the aim to combat illegal migration and smuggling, Latvia in this mission was represented in Headquarters (Rome) by 3 soldiers<sup>70</sup>. Additionally, changes in law on Latvian participation in EU and NATO missions were made before Latvia joined EU and NATO, therefore participation in EU missions for Latvia is self-evident, natural and without significant change in national defence policy<sup>71</sup>.

From one hand it can be concluded that in EU military missions Latvia participates with small amount of soldiers, but from the other hand we need to take into account that Latvia is a small country and participates in EU military missions with its possible capacity, moreover, according to the head of Latvian National Armed Forces Joint Headquarter department J-3/5/7 G. Kauliņš Latvia sends to international operations (including EU initiated) soldiers – experts, who give their experience to other soldiers during military trainings<sup>72</sup>. According to the Deputy of Latvian Parliament *K. Kreslīņš* opinion it is necessary to involve more indiscuses about involvement in international missions and EU Battle groups without duplication of NATO function, but limit for that lies in financial issues<sup>73</sup>. Till this

moment, EU Battle groups have not been examined in real operation, support for EU Battle group wider involvement is given by Latvian Parliament deputy L. Čigāne<sup>74</sup>. Wider EU Battle group involvement allows to identify issues and directions to work on, because now basically EU Battle groups are used for common training.

As mentioned above, Latvia in CSDP is involved not only in EU military missions, but also in EU Battle groups. Support from Latvia in EU Battle groups was given in November 2004, what happened shortly after approval of EU Battle group Concept<sup>75</sup>. Latvia more actively involved in EU Battle groups and in 2005 was signed the Letter of intent on cooperation in the field of EU Battle Groups with Germany, Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia,<sup>76</sup> but in 2006 mentioned countries signed a mutual cooperation memorandum about regulation in field of EU Battle groups (EU BG 2010)<sup>77</sup>. On the issue of EU Battle groups main changes in legal acts were made in 2008<sup>78</sup> and 2010<sup>79</sup> when norm were incorporated that Latvian

<sup>74</sup> Interview with Latvian Parliament deputy L. Čigāne 27.03.2017.

<sup>75</sup> Latvijas Nacionālie bruņotie spēki. Eiropas Savienības Kaujas Grupa (EUBG). [http://www.mil.lv/Operacijas/Daliba\\_NATO\\_un\\_ES\\_spekos/Daliba\\_ES\\_spekos/Eiropas\\_Savienibas\\_kaujas\\_grupa\\_EUBG.aspx](http://www.mil.lv/Operacijas/Daliba_NATO_un_ES_spekos/Daliba_ES_spekos/Eiropas_Savienibas_kaujas_grupa_EUBG.aspx)

<sup>76</sup> Aizsardzības ministrija. ES militāro spēju attīstība. [http://www.mod.gov.lv/Eiropas\\_Savieniba/EirSav\\_militaro\\_speju\\_attistiba.aspx](http://www.mod.gov.lv/Eiropas_Savieniba/EirSav_militaro_speju_attistiba.aspx)

<sup>77</sup> 06.11.2006. Par Vācijas Federatīvās Republikas Federālās Aizsardzības ministrijas, Latvijas Republikas Aizsardzības ministrijas, Lietuvas Republikas Nacionālās Aizsardzības ministrijas, Polijas Republikas Nacionālās Aizsardzības ministra un Slovākijas Republikas Aizsardzības ministrijas saprašanās memorandu par pamata noteikumiem Eiropas Savienības kaujas grupai (EU BG 2010); Ministru kabineta noteikumi Nr. 919. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 181 (3549). <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=147669>

<sup>78</sup> 18.12.2008. Grozījumi likumā „Latvijas Nacionālo bruņoto spēku piedalīšanās starptautiskajās operācijās”. Latvijas likums. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 2 (3988). <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/186076-grozijumi-likuma-latvijas-nacionalo-brunoto-speku-piedalisanas-starptautiskajas-operacijas->

<sup>79</sup> 11.03.2010. Grozījumi Nacionālo Bruņoto spēku likumā: Latvijas likums. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 51/52 (4243/4244). <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/207391-grozijumi-nacionalo-brunoto-speku-likuma>

<sup>69</sup> Ibid, 54.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid, 62.

<sup>71</sup> 31.01.2002. Grozījumi likumā „Latvijas Nacionālo bruņoto spēku piedalīšanās starptautiskajās operācijās”. Latvijas likums. Latvijas Vēstnesis. 22 (2597). <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/58593-grozijumi-likuma-latvijas-nacionalo-brunoto-speku-piedalisanas-starptautiskajas-operacijas->

<sup>72</sup> Interview with Latvian National Armed forces headquarter J-3/5/7 department head G. Kauliņš 20.03.2017.

<sup>73</sup> Interview with Latvian Parliament deputy K. Kreslīņš 03.03.2017.

NAF should participate in fast reaction forces according to EU documents and prepare units to participate in EU Battle groups. In general, from 2010 till 2016 Latvia was involved in 4 EU Battle groups with 428 soldiers and National Guard: *EUBG 2010/1* (leading nation Poland), *EUBG 2013/2* (leading nation United Kingdom), *EUBG 2015* (leading nation Sweden), *EUBG 2016* (leading nation United Kingdom)<sup>80</sup>.

Additionally, it is important to mention that Latvia participate in EU Defence agency, but still actual direction is PESCO. In Latvian defence policy strategic documents PESCO is not mentioned, but in same time Latvia is one of those countries which supports PESCO and with other countries in 2017 signed joint notification on PESCO. Of course, there are lots of questions related to PESCO future, but still for Latvia the main and strategic involvement in CSDP is participation in EU military missions and EU Battle groups. PESCO in future would not become just formal cooperation only in documents, but will become the third strategic direction for Latvia, and this direction will include regional Baltic states cooperation on defence issues. For example, strategic directions for Latvia could be regional cooperation on education, military medicine and military industry.

## Conclusion

In the field of Latvian defence, europeanisation has a weak influence, and it has caused a low level of changes in Latvia's defence policy. Latvia's defence policy has a good compatibility with CSDP without major changes and it is automatically included in Latvian defence policy. Europeanisation weak influence in EU defence field should be related to the fact, that EU is established

rule and practice of unanimity principle. The impact of europeanisation has occurred in the following elements: participation in European Defence agency, EU military missions, engagement in EU Battlegroups, changes in defence policy planning documents and regulations.

Involvement in CSDP for Latvia means: the possibility to express solidarity, to strengthen collective cooperation and to assume responsibility for partnership countries, obtain personnel experience in EU missions and EU Battlegroups, gain financial benefits, and also support for involvement in PESCO to strengthen Latvian national capabilities. Latvia is not involved in CSDP because of lack of personnel, lack of financial resources. Latvian defence policy relies on NATO, allocating a complementary role to the EU CSDP. Latvia has interest in greater involvement in CSDP, and this involvement occurs within the bounds of possibility.

<sup>80</sup> Latvijas Nacionālie bruņotie spēki. Eiropas Savienības Kaujas Grupa (EUBG). [http://www.mil.lv/Operacijas/Daliba\\_NATO\\_un\\_ES\\_spekos/Daliba\\_ES\\_spekos/Eiropas\\_Savienibas\\_kaujas\\_grupa\\_EUBG.aspx](http://www.mil.lv/Operacijas/Daliba_NATO_un_ES_spekos/Daliba_ES_spekos/Eiropas_Savienibas_kaujas_grupa_EUBG.aspx)