

VOTE ANALYSIS

The Giannakou report on EU's military structures: state of play and future prospects

September 2013



This report (A7-0205/2013) was debated in the European Parliament in Strasbourg Wednesday the 11th of September 2013 and voted on the day after in plenary. The report is far reaching in its ambition to develop a further militarization of the EU. Without a doubt this is a controversial issue in the non-aligned EU Member states. All points mentioned below form the report, as all other points proposed, were approved by the parliament as a whole even if there were a number of separate votes.

JAN Å JOHANSSON
RESEARCHER

 ORGANIZATION FOR EUROPEAN
INTERSTATE COOPERATION

www.oiceurope.com

Overview – How national delegations of MEP's voted

IRISH MEPS

	§ 5	§ 23/1	§ 23/2	§ 25	§ 34	§ 35	§ 40	§ 45/1	§ 45/2	§ 56/1	§ 56/2	§ 57/1	§ 57/2	Resolution
Aylward	A	YES	NO	YES	A	YES	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	A	A
Childers	A	YES	YES	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	NO	NO	A
Costello	A	A	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Crowley	A	YES	NO	YES	A	YES	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	A	A
Gallagher	A	YES	NO	YES	A	YES	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	-	YES
Harkin	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	A	YES
Kelly	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
McGuinness	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	A	YES
Mitchell	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	A	YES
Murphy	-	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Prendergast	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Jim Higgins signed in to EP the day of the vote but did not vote

A=Abstain

DANISH MEPS

	§ 5	§ 23/1	§ 23/2	§ 25	§ 34	§ 35	§ 40	§ 45/1	§ 45/2	§ 56/1	§ 56/2	§ 57/1	§ 57/2	Resolution
Auken - Socialistisk Folkeparti	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Christensen - Socialdemokratiet	NO	YES	A	A	YES	YES	NO	YES	A	A	A	YES	NO	A
Jensen - Venstre	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Jørgensen - Socialdemokratiet	NO	YES	A	A	YES	YES	NO	YES	A	A	A	YES	NO	A
Løkkegaard - Venstre	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Messerschmidt - Dansk Folkeparti	A	YES	NO	NO	NO	A	YES	YES	A	YES	NO	NO	A	NO
Rohde - Venstre	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	-	YES	YES	YES
Rosbach	NO	-	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Schallemose - Socialdemokratiet	NO	YES	A	A	YES	YES	NO	YES	A	A	A	YES	NO	A
Søndergaard - Folkebevægelsen mod EU	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Thomsen - Socialdemokratiet	NO	YES	A	A	YES	YES	NO	YES	A	A	A	YES	NO	A
Turunen - Socialdemokratiet	NO	YES	A	A	YES	YES	NO	YES	A	A	A	YES	NO	A

Bendtsen (Det Konservative Folkeparti) did not sign in to the European Parliament on this day

FINNISH MEPS

	§ 5	§ 23/1	§ 23/2	§ 25	§ 34	§ 35	§ 40	§ 45/1	§ 45/2	§ 56/1	§ 56/2	§ 57/1	§ 57/2	Resolution
Cronberg - Greens	NO	YES	NO	NO	-	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Essayah - Christ. Dem./KD	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Hassi - Greens	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Jaakonsaari - SDP	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Jääteentmäki - Centre	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	-	YES	YES	YES
Repo - SDP	YES	YES	-	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Sarvamaa - NCP/Kokoomuus	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Takkula - Centre	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Terho - The Finns/PS	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES

Pakarinen (Centre) and Pietikäinen (NCP/Kokoomuus) did not sign in to the European Parliament on this day

SWEDISH MEPS

	§ 5	§ 23/1	§ 23/2	§ 25	§ 34	§ 35	§ 40	§ 45/1	§ 45/2	§ 56/1	§ 56/2	§ 57/1	§ 57/2	Resolution
Andersdotter - Piratpartiet	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	A	NO	A	NO	YES	NO	NO
Corazza Bildt - Moderaterna	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Engström - Piratpartiet	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Färm - Socialdemokraterna	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Gustafsson - Vänsterpartiet	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Hedh - Socialdemokraterna	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Ibrisagic - Socialdemokraterna	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	-	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Johansson - Centerpartiet	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Lövin - Miljöpartiet/Greens	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	A	NO	A	NO	YES	NO	NO
Ludvigsson - Socialdemokraterna	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	A	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Nilsson - Socialdemokraterna	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Paulsen - Folkpartiet	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Schmidt - Folkpartiet	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Svensson - Kristdemokraterna	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	-	YES
Ulvskog - Socialdemokraterna	A	A	YES	A	YES	A*	NO	-	YES**	NO	NO	NO	NO	A
Wikström - Folkpartiet	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

* announced afterwards that she had intended to vote no

** announced afterwards that she had intended to vote no

- = present but did not vote

Fjellner & Hökmark (Moderaterna-EPP), Schlyter (Miljöpartiet-Greens/EFA) and Westlund (Socialdemokraterna-S&D) did not sign in to the European Parliament on this day

From the report:

Point 4:

Recalls that the EU is called upon in the Treaty to work on the progressive framing of a common Union defence policy, which could lead to a common defence; further recalls the Member States' obligations under the mutual defence clause;

Approved. No Roll call vote (RCV).

Point 5:

Reiterates its grave concern at the continuing and uncoordinated cuts in national defence budgets, hampering efforts to close capability gaps and undermining the credibility of the CSDP; urges the Member States to stop and reverse this irresponsible trend, as well as to step up efforts at national and EU levels to limit its consequences through increased cooperation and pooling and sharing;

Approved. 431 yes, 170 no, 26 abstained.

Point 15:

Calls again for the creation of a fully-fledged EU Operational Headquarters within the European External Action Service (EEAS), if necessary through permanent structured cooperation; stresses that it should be a civilian-military structure, responsible for the planning and conduct of both EU civilian missions and military operations, with separate civilian and military chains of command;

Approved. No Roll call vote (RCV).

Point 23:

Invites the European Council to explore ways of streamlining the political decision-making process at EU and national level to make rapid reaction a reality; insists that the necessary political will be shown to address the challenges; encourages reflection on possible simplified procedures regarding deployments of battlegroups for limited periods of time, provided that certain, clearly defined and agreed pre-conditions are met, such as a specific request from the United Nations;

Point 23 –first part:

First part of the vote at point 23: Text as a whole excluding the words 'and national'.

Approved. 510 yes, 89 no, 29 abstained.

Point 23 –second part:

First part of the vote at point 23: Text as a whole excluding the words ‘and national’. In the second part it was voted about including those words

Approved. 427 yes, 154 no, 33 abstained.

Point 25:

Points out that any costs that are not linked to military operations, such as preparation and stand-by costs of battlegroups, could be charged to the EU budget;

Approved. 437 yes, 160 no, 24 abstained.

Point 27:

Recalls the mission and tasks of the EDA as provided for in Articles 42(3) and 45 TEU, in particular its essential role in developing and implementing an EU capabilities and armaments policy, harmonising operational needs, proposing multilateral projects, coordinating Member States’ programmes, strengthening the European Defence Technological and Industrial Base and improving the effectiveness of military expenditure; urges the Member States, given the EDA’s strong cost-effectiveness focus, to provide it with adequate funding in order to exploit its full potential, and repeats its call on the VP/HR to present proposals to finance the Agency’s staffing and running costs from the Union budget;

Approved. No Roll call vote (RCV).

Point 34:

Reiterates its call on the Member States to consider joint ownership of certain expensive capabilities, notably space capabilities, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or strategic lift assets; welcomes the work of the Commission exploring the options for developing EU-owned capabilities, exploiting the potential of synergies between defence and civilian security needs, such as in the areas of civil protection or border surveillance;

Approved. 432 yes, 164 no, 27 abstained.

Point 35:

Underlines the need to create a common approach in Europe towards developing a medium-altitude long-endurance remotely piloted air system (MALE RPAS) and encourages the Commission and the Member States to develop an innovative approach for achieving this ambition;

Approved. 441 yes, 160 no, 24 abstained.

Point 40:

Deplores the declining national budgets for defence research and the fact that it is mostly fragmented along national lines; points out the potential of the EU to bring substantial added value through the European Framework Cooperation and greater synergies between defence and civilian security research; highlights in particular the need to focus on investments in key enabling technologies such as robotics, nano- and microelectronics, and to make sure that EU funds spent in these areas benefit also the needs of defence;

Approved. 417 yes, 169 no, 31 abstained.

Point 45:

Reiterates its full support for European structures and projects in the area of education and training and stresses, in particular, the contribution of the European Security and Defence College (ESDC) to the promotion of a common security culture, as well as its potential in identifying and developing cost-saving collaborative projects between national institutions; welcomes the decision of the Council of 22 April 2013 to strengthen the College by providing it with legal capacity and with funding from the Union budget; considers that this could constitute a model for EU budget support to other CSDP structures such as the EDA and the EU Satellite Centre; encourages further development of the European initiative for the exchange of young officers, inspired by Erasmus, as well as the participation of European military officers' education and training institutes in the Erasmus programme;

Point 45 – first part:

First part of the vote at point 45: Text as a whole excluding the words 'and with funding ... EU Satellite Centre'

Approved. 494 yes, 91 no, 35 abstained.

Point 45 – second part:

First part of the vote at point 45: Text as a whole excluding the words 'and with funding ... EU Satellite Centre'. In the second part it was voted about including those words.

Approved. 419 yes, 162 no, 27 abstained.

Point 54:

Invites the Member States to take a qualitative step forward in European defence by strengthening the EU's military structures in line with this resolution; encourages the Member States willing to do so to proceed, if necessary, in accordance with Articles 42(6) and 46 TEU on permanent structured cooperation as well as Article 44 TEU; takes the view that should such forms of cooperation be launched, it should, above all, be based on the participating Member States' willingness to assume their responsibilities within the international community and to make the Union better equipped for crisis management operations;

Approved. No Roll call vote (RCV).

Point 55:

Considers, therefore, that permanent structured cooperation should include, in particular, the following elements aimed at enhanced operational effectiveness:

- the establishment of a permanent EU Operational Headquarters,
- common funding of rapid reaction operations using EU battlegroups,
- a commitment to contribute to the battlegroup roster, with aligned rules of engagement and streamlined decision-making procedures;

Approved. No Roll call vote (RCV).

Point 56:

Points out that the Member States also need to strengthen their commitments with regard to capability building, notably through pooling and sharing, but that maximum flexibility and inclusiveness needs to be maintained in order to make the most of various bilateral, regional or multilateral synergies; considers, nevertheless, that an agreement on permanent structured cooperation should at least include commitments to:

- structured coordination of defence planning
- common evaluation and review of capability building
- increased funding for the (European Defence Agency) EDA;

Point 56 – first part:

First part of the vote at point 56: Text as a whole excluding the words ‘increased funding for the EDA’.

Approved. 471 yes, 109 no, 44 abstained.

Point 56 – second part:

First part of the vote at point 56: Text as a whole excluding the words ‘increased funding for the EDA’. In the second part it was voted about including those words.

Approved. 405 yes, 185 no, 30 abstained.

Point 57:

Notes that the Treaty clearly states that permanent structured cooperation is to be established within the Union framework, observing that the vast majority of activities developed under it could therefore benefit from access to the EU budget under the same conditions as other EU activities, in line with Article 41 TEU;

Point 57 – first part:

First part: ‘Notes that the ... the Union framework’.

Approved. 475 yes, 111 no, 37 abstained.

Point 57 – second part:

Second part: ‘observing that the ... Article 41 TEU’.

Approved. 386 yes, 190 no, 34 abstained.

Approval of the resolution as a whole

The resolution as a whole was approved with 403 yes votes against 178 no votes and 33 abstentions.

Yes votes came from the Group of Christian Democrats (EPP), a large majority of the Liberal ALDE group, and a large majority of the Socialist S&D group.

No votes came from a large majority of the Conservative ECR group, the Green/EFA (regionalist) group, the Leftist GUE/NGL, most of the EU critical EFD group, and most of the non-attached (NI) members.

The Irish members voted as follows:

Yes: Gallagher (FF), Harkin (Ind), Kelly (FG), McGuinness (FG), Mitchell (FG), Prendergast (Lab).

No: Murphy (SP).

Abstained: Aylward (FF), Crowley (FF), Childers (Lab), Costello (Lab).

Absent – already left the vote: Higgins (FG).

No Irish member spoke in the debate Wednesday the 11th of September. But two explanations of vote were given by one member from the North and by one member from the South.

The Danish members voted as follows:

Yes: Jensen (Venstre), Løkkegaard (Venstre), Rohde (Venstre).

No: Rosbach (Løsgænger), Messerschmidt (DF), Søndergaard (Folkebevægelsen mod EU), Auken (SF).

Abstained: Christensen (S), Jørgensen (S), Schaldemose (S), Thomsen (S), Turunen (S).

Absent: Bendtsen (Konservative).

The Finnish members voted as follows:

Yes: Jäätteenmäki (Centre/ALDE), Takkula (Centre/ALDE), Torvalds (SFP/ALDE), Terho (Finns/EFD), Sarvamaa (NCP/EPP), Yesakonsari (SDP/S&D), Repo (Ind./S&D).

No: Essayah (Christ.Dem./EPP), Cronberg (Greens), Hassi (Greens).

Absent: Pakarinen (Centre/ALDE), Pietikäinen (NCP/EPP).

The Swedish members voted as follows:

Yes: Wikström (FP), Corazza Bildt (M), Ibrisagic (M), Svensson (KD), Färm (S), Ludvigsson (S), Nilsson (S).

No: Johansson (C), Paulsen (FP), Schmidt (FP), Hedh (S), Andersdotter (PP), Engström (PP), Lövin (MP), Gustafsson (V).

Abstained: Ulvskog (S).

Absent: Fjellner (M), Hökmark (M), Westlund (S), Schlyter (MP).

Oral explanations of vote

Martina Anderson (Sinn Fein, GUE/NGL, Northern Ireland).

Mr President, one of the reasons that the people of Ireland were so opposed to the Lisbon Treaty was the fear of its impact on Irish neutrality and the further drive towards the militarisation of the European Union. Even then, we did not think that a report like this would be adopted in the European Parliament.

Sabre-rattling, war-mongering and jingoism like this are destined to make people across the European Union even more critical of the EU and to see it as an increasingly militarized and aggressive body. I believe if people are given a vote there will be huge resistance to the sort of changes to the Treaty proposed and outlined in this report.

Paul Murphy (Socialist Party, GUE/NGL, Republic of Ireland).

Mr President, two weeks ago the British Government suffered a humiliating defeat when MPs felt the pressure of the mass of the population against going to war once more. Across the world, people remember the lies they were told about Iraq, about Afghanistan, and they have no trust in the political establishment. They also oppose billions of euros being handed over to the armaments industry.

And then we have this report – which flies in the face of all of the attitudes of the majority of people across Europe. It drives forward instead the efforts to militarise the European Union. It calls for the strengthening of EU battle groups in an attempt to move towards an EU army, for more money to be spent on armaments, and for a closer relationship with NATO, a military alliance with over 5 000 nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

The EU Council meeting in December will discuss further militarisation – further the agenda of the European merchants of death. The rebuilding of a strong, anti-war movement, armed with a political alternative to war ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Charles Tannock (Conservative Party, ECR, United Kingdom)

Mr President, acting in times of humanitarian and global crisis as a united EU while simultaneously respecting the sovereign rights of individual Member States is no easy task. By acting alongside NATO, the CSDP has proved to be broadly helpful, when it involves civilian missions, in meeting such a delicate balance and allowing the EU to play a successful role in, for example, Afghanistan and the Balkans. It would therefore be foolish to make any attempt to extend the scope of the CSDP which would see it duplicate the role of NATO. It is with this in mind that I find it necessary to vote against the recommendations of the report, particularly with regard to its proposal on establishing an EU military operational headquarters within the EEAS. Furthermore, the attack it made on individual Member States for cutting their military budgets at a time of austerity is totally unjustified. Any EU defence policy must be based on the principle of intergovernmental cooperation over the communautaire method which, sadly, this report has little respect for.

Explanations of vote in writing

Geoffrey Van Orden (Conservative Party, ECR, United Kingdom)

This report is an assessment of the EU's "military capabilities" in the context of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), with a series of recommendations about future developments. CSDP is a device to take forward political integration, disguised for the unwary as something, apparently useful and uncontentious. I submitted 18 amendments at Committee level, none of which were accepted. Rather than recognising that NATO remains

the primary military alliance, the report proposes a series of measures aimed at establishing new EU military structures. It advocates increased defence integration at an EU level to bolster the EU position as a global actor and "security provider" through increased common funding. The report specifically crosses an important British government red line concerning institutional duplication and growth - notably, the establishment of a permanent EU Operational Headquarters, which the report proposes should be set up "if necessary through permanent structured cooperation". It also wants to establish a permanent CSDP 'warehouse', duplicating the NATO Support Agency, to provide support & equipment for EU missions. In fact, everything military that it describes or proposes is already being done by NATO. The ECR Group therefore voted against this report.

Michał Tomasz Kamiński (Poland Comes First, ECR, Poland)

I voted in favor of this report. It provides a valuable assessment of the European Union's military capabilities in the context of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). The joint EU action through the CSDP has helped establish stability, in areas such as the Balkans, and the EU mission in Afghanistan is also playing a central role alongside NATO in increasing the capacity of the Afghan police force, in the international effort to counter piracy, and to protect the World Food Programme.

Emer Costello (Labour Party, S&D, Ireland)

I support Ireland's participation in the EU's Common Security and Defence policy in accordance with the EU treaties, including Article 42 (2) which provides that Union policy in this area shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States (i.e. Irish neutrality) and in accordance with Ireland's 'triple-lock' under which members of the Irish Defence Forces participate in international missions with upon approval by the Irish Government, approval by the Irish Parliament and under a UN mandate. I am committed to ensuring that the Irish Defence Forces are appropriately equipped and staffed to meet our obligations to UN and EU peace-keeping missions. I could not support this own-initiative report however as I believe some of its recommendations go beyond this framework.

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Initiative for Catalonia Greens, Greens/EFA, Catalonia, Spain)

Against. Some of the issues raised in the report are in line with our analysis and position on CSDP structures, capabilities and policies. But there are a number of very problematic proposals in this report such as using the EU budget for defence research, for the Defence Agency, the Satellite centre, the Defence College, CSDP operations, the Battle Groups and a variety of CSDP related issues. Other very problematic proposals are the development of a European drone program and the questioning of (national) parliamentary involvement regarding military interventions. The huge majority of our amendments have therefore not been adopted at committee level (S+D and ALDE with EPP on these issues). This is why we voted against the report.

The activities of the OEIC are financially supported by the European Parliament. The liability of any communication or publication by the OEIC, in any form and any medium rests with the OEIC. The European Parliament is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein. Report edited by Richard Byfält.

Cover photo: © European Union 2013