

THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AS A SOLUTION FOR THE CRISIS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Rafał Świtała, PhD.

rafal.switala@ue.katowice.pl

University of Economics in Katowice

Magdalena Syrkiewicz-Świtała, PhD.

switala@tlen.pl

Medical University of Silesia

Abstract

The European Union, due to the intensive impact of globalization and the achieved level of socio-economic development, is an important element of the global economy. The economic and financial crisis that started in 2008, affects the situation of the economies around the world. Despite the similarities of the crisis, different countries in various regions of the world should make individual analyses of the weaknesses of their economies and social models. The weakness of the European Union, as a group which comprises 28 countries with diverse potential, includes the difficulty in formulating and expressing its unified standpoint in the international forum. The growing importance of the relationship between the international parties contributes to the fact that the role of clear communication with the environment is steadily increasing. The intensive development of the Common Foreign and Security Policy is a chance of the European Union. This should be done both through institutional changes and increased awareness of the society and the political class in different countries on the need for closer cooperation in the field of foreign policy groups. The danger of this process is the existence of differences in national interests and poor skills in a constructive international dialogue between EU Member States. The Foreign and Security Policy of the EU enables to speak – and act – as one in world affairs.

Key words: foreign policy, the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy.

Introduction

The European Union is on a peculiar stage of development. On the one hand, it represents the most advanced international integration model in the world. Geographically, it covers most of the European continent territory, and its constituent countries are among the most advanced in terms of economic and social development. On the other hand, despite these successes and strengths, the further dynamic development of the group encounters a strong barrier. Further avoidance of effective structural reforms in the EU will lead to the gradual marginalization of this part of the world, as the values represented by the Community, will be in a deep defensive, mainly due to the weakening of the competitive position in relation to other countries such as China or Brazil. The weakening position of the EU in the world is caused by the occurrence of the adverse economic effects. The difficulty in ensuring the unity of the political group in the international arena is equally significant. This paper is devoted to the analysis of the functioning of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). The analysis of the activity of the EU is to identify the tasks and the mechanisms in the CFSP. It is also useful to identify the shortcomings and deficiencies of the solutions adopted in the framework of this particular policy. On this basis, it will be possible to identify the desired direction in which the CFSP should be developed so that it can be helpful for the maintaining and even strengthening the EU's position in the modern world.

1. Foreign policy of the European Union and its determinants

The basic policies of the European Union include foreign policy, its full name is: Common Foreign and Security Policy. The Common Foreign and Security Policy is one of the most comprehensive policies pursued by the European Union.

The European Union is a complex integration grouping with institutional structures and rich acquis. The law created by the Community in the field of international affairs affects all Member States and their assumptions will lead to far-reaching unification of the European continent in many dimensions, including economic, political, and social life. The European Union in its actions, before the Lisbon Treaty came into force, was based on three pillars¹.

The first pillar was an economic one, based on the European Communities, the European Coal and Steel Community and the Euratom. It included the Economic and Monetary Union, the Customs Union, the Internal

¹ <http://www.kielce.uw.gov.pl/ue/filary.htm>, (accessed on 12.06.2011).

Market, the Common Agricultural Policy and structural policies. The main objective of the first pillar was to allow the harmonious economic development, which was achieved by ensuring a single market, effective structural policies, social and monetary cooperation.

The European Union, over time, has developed the common foreign and security policy, which falls within the scope of the second pillar. The second pillar of the EU was to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests and independence of the Union. Under this pillar, the European Council and the Council of the European Union took care of raising the security of the Union and its members, as well as maintaining peace in the region and in the whole world.

Due to the fact that the European Union, as a subject of international relations, is not a country, one cannot make a simple comparison of an EU foreign policy with a typical activity that a sovereign state performs in the international arena. However, the foreign policy of a sovereign state and the integration group has a set of similar characteristics and properties.

The foreign policy is the activity of the specialized bodies directed to the international environment. It is not only the submission of internal policies, because (Przybylski 1996: 342-343):

- it is an external activity, e.g. of a state in the poliarchic, decentralized environment, where there is no central authority, but a large number of entities with formally equivalent validity,
- the goals, methods and programs of outside activities must deal with a particular stage in the development of international relations, the international situation, the activities, objectives and programs of other sovereign entities, as well as the current state of their abilities,
- it reflects the fundamental interests, which are known as the “reason of state”,
- the formulation, adoption and implementation of these basic interests require specialized methods and approaches, which imposes the need to safeguard the institution (including specialized bodies, staff, foreign service),
- its mechanism can be divided into two parts: performing strategic tasks and performing tactical tasks (e.g. diplomacy is considered to be a tactical one).

The conduct of foreign policy is dependent on the adoption of an appropriate set of policy objectives. They can be used as unchanging signposts directing current actions. The choice of the objectives determines the interaction with other international actors. Foreign policies are always inspired by the internal situation in which they exist. In other words, international relations are the direct derivative of the internal state of social relations. In

addition, it is assumed that communities seek fulfilment of their needs in the international space, because they perceive it in a better position to meet their particular interests and needs, than would be possible only in the stacking of social relations only within their own country (group of countries).

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, there has been the dynamic process of increasing the role of foreign policy. The reason underlying it is that more and more advanced technology and the fast flow of information is at the society's disposal and it gives a real chance to benefit from the international cooperation in all areas of life. The organized effort of the state is aimed at the implementation of relevant interests. This is done through peaceful cooperation with other countries or, in exceptional cases, the need for confrontation. Running external actions is not possible without competent human resources that make up the diplomatic service. The foreign policy of the state is mostly carried out by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or by the executive branch of a sovereign state. The external actions that the state may undertake often have the form of multilateral or bilateral cooperation (if they are directed to a single entity). In this case, it requires the involvement of a larger number of international actors. The objectives of the foreign policy include: existential, functional and co-existential. To achieve the objectives of the foreign policy decision-making centre is able to use a wide range of measures. The measures have taken their own characteristics of usability. Among them, there are those that have their own choices and can be applied interchangeably (some of them are even unique). These include, for example, a measure of the declaration of war. However, on the other hand, the vast majority of foreign policy measures have much more conventional specificity. In addition to the vast majority of them, they are peaceful in nature and are based on diplomatic activities. The measures used in foreign policy can be divided into groups: economic, cultural, military, regulatory and propaganda ones. The foreign policy can take the character of passive or active one. The passive foreign policy is carried out when the entity responsible for it sees the external international environment as a set of factors that are independent of the form of this policy. The active foreign policy implies acceptance of the assumptions on which there is a real chance to influence the external environment and shaping it according to its own hierarchy of values. If the purpose of a foreign policy is to preserve the status quo ambient, then this policy is called the defensive one. The offensive foreign policy is pursued through active involvement, with the intent to implement its own vision of international relations (Przybylski 1996: 344-345).

In the case of a group of countries, grouped together on a voluntary basis, with a lot of common interests, as it is in the case in the European Union, there is both a need and an opportunity to influence the common external environment and the state of international relations or foreign policy. The

main complicating factor is that the entity, including an entity group, having ambitions contribute to shape the external environment, must have legal personality. The Lisbon Treaty gives the EU a legal personality. Thanks to it, most of the pre-existing problems disappear. For example, it is easier to join the international organizations or to acquire rights and incur liabilities in the international sphere². The Treaty of Lisbon (its full name is: The Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community) was officially signed on 13 December 2007, and the ratification process unfolded in the years 2008 and 2009. The Treaty entered into force on the 1 December 2009 as one of the last treaties ratified by Germany, Ireland (where, on October 23, 2009, the referendum was held) and the Czech Republic³.

The Lisbon Treaty, according to its proponents, solves lots of the issues relating to the following areas⁴:

- it raises the level of democratization and provides greater transparency of the activities of the European Union,
- it increases the operational efficiency of the EU institutions through a clear division of responsibility of each of them,
- it incorporates the Charter of Fundamental Rights into a set of primary laws, it introduces new solidarity mechanisms,
- it raises the importance of the European Union on the international stage.

After the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty the implementation of the European Union Common Foreign and Security⁵ improved because, from this moment onwards, it became practically possible to act unanimously and adopt unified standpoints. This idea is effective by creating the office of High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. Holding this position is done through election and lasts five years.

Despite the fact that the Common Foreign and Security Policy has been officially operating since the early 1990s, because it was launched with the adoption of the Maastricht Treaty, the need to give a united Europe unified voice was already expressed in the first years of the integration. The

² Article 10b of the Treaty defines “Decisions of the European Council on the strategic interests and objectives of the Union common foreign and security policy and to other areas of the external action of the Union. Such decisions may concern the relations of the Union with a specific country or region or a specific topic. They define their duration, and the means to be made available by the Union and the Member States”.

³ http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/countries/index_pl.htm#, (accessed on 11 February 2012).

⁴ http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/glance/index_pl.htm, (accessed on 1 July 2012).

⁵ WPZiB (Eng. Common Foreign and Security Policy) has been founded on the basis of the Maastricht Treaty.

founding members of the European Coal and Steel Community, the first positive experience encouraged the integration process, they mentioned in the common external action possible additional benefits for themselves. The position that Europe occupied internationally after the Second World War, visibly weakened, and the leaders of the major Western European countries realized that by not acting alone it would restore the importance of the Old Continent (Zięba 2007: 16). The area that would stand up to the fore in terms of needs was to provide external security. During this period, security was handled in three ways. It was essential to prepare for the possibility of an armed strike by the Soviet Union, which would require coordination between various defence systems and the development of military plans. The second aspect of the need for cooperation on the European continent was dictated by the desire to reduce dependence on the U.S. military matters. The NATO's Pact politically and militarily operated since 1949, and one of the reasons for its establishment was the need to link policy pursued by the U.S. military to the defence of Western Europe (Łastawski 2004: 128).

Europe, however, wanted to create an own, parallel defence system. The desire to prevent the revival of German militarism and to find a formula that would guarantee a form of control over the forces of the Federal Republic of Germany was considerably important. The first major initiative which involved this cooperation area, was the concept of the creation of the EDC (European Defence Community) in 1952. Member countries of the European Coal and Steel conducted the debate on the creation of an European army, which would be put under the command of one European minister. The project was not implemented because the French National Assembly did not ratify it⁶. In parallel to the establishment of the EDC close cooperation with the European Political Community (EPC) was planned to be initiated, which was to focus on cooperation of high level diplomatic services of western European countries. As the French blocked the establishment of the EDC, the project to create the EPC was abandoned as well. It can be assumed that these two concepts (EDC and EPC) were too revolutionary for their times and therefore they were never in the implementation phase. The idea of integrating in the political dimension was abandoned for some time. Western Europe increasingly focused on economic issues, which led to the creation of the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic En-

⁶ France saw the EDC as danger to it as it somehow limited their sovereignty in foreign policy. At that time, the international situation in the world was tense in the world because of the war in Korea. In mid-1954, after losing the battle, France lost control in Indochina. One of the main reasons why France did not ratify the establishment of the European Defence Community was the refusal of the UK to participate in this project. The UK's participation was to neutralize and weaken the position of the Federal Republic of Germany.

ergy Community (Euratom)⁷ in 1958. Revival of the idea of cooperation in the field of foreign policy could be observed in the late 1960s. The decisive moment was the change in the position of President of France. Charles de Gaulle's successor, Georges Pompidou (during his rule Great Britain joined the EEC⁸) was more willing to coordinate foreign policy of EEC countries at ministerial level. At the conference in The Hague in December 1969, during the EEC summit, the so-called Davignon report was presented, and a Belgian diplomat, Viscount Davignon, became a head of the committee whose task was to deepen integration of the political sphere. The Davignon's report was finally adopted in October 1970, during the summit in Luxembourg⁹. As a result, the European Political Cooperation was of an intergovernmental nature because no permission was granted to institutionalize it. Twice a year, meetings of the foreign ministers were held. The meetings were chaired by the Foreign Minister of the country, which held presidency. EPC in the approved form did not provide a consensus between EEC countries, but its major achievement was the collaboration achieved through consultations, exchange of information and observations, which led to the unification of positions.

In 1985 the content of the Single European Act (SEA) was accepted, which introduced the actual reform of the existing European cooperation. This act confirmed the will to create the European Union, and that it must base on the European Communities and the developed EPC. In the treaty the instrument of EPC included the joint actions and the common positions. The document also specified that the external policy of the European Community would be in accordance with the arrangements under the EPC. In addition, the SEA established a permanent secretariat of EPC, which was located in Brussels. The competence of the Secretariat mainly concerned administrative matters. The Single European Act was a significant breakthrough in the policy of the Communities (Łastawski 2004: 245). The solutions used in the EPC proposals were a combination of the UK's proposal, which preferred the idea of intergovernmental cooperation, and of French and German projects of granting primacy to Heads of State and Government, as well as of other government initiatives, strengthening the integration within the Communities (Zięba 2007: 40-41).

The Treaty on European Union (entered into force on 1. November 1993), signed in 1992 was a milestone in the cooperation between the Member States in the area of common foreign policy. The Treaty set out the

⁷ *European Atomic Energy Community – (EAEC).*

⁸ On the 1st January 1973, after the referendum, the United Kingdom, along with Denmark and Ireland joined the European Economic Community.

⁹ http://eup.wse.krakow.pl/?page_id=101, (accessed on 04 March 2011).

objectives of this policy, for which institutional framework and legal instruments were created. According to the Maastricht Treaty, Common Foreign and Security Policy was to be pursued by means of intergovernmental decisions, which means that a different approach than the one regulating the first pillar of the European Union was adopted. The Treaty of Lisbon improved the functioning of the common foreign policy by appointing the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security.

2. The purpose and instruments of the Common Foreign and Security Policy

The objectives of the Maastricht Treaty, which relate to the Common Foreign and Security Policy were already mentioned generally in Article B (Title I). The Union's objectives include: "assert its identity on the international scene, in particular through the implementation of a common foreign and security policy, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy, which might lead to a common defence¹⁰". Title V of the Treaty was devoted to Common Foreign and Security Policy¹¹. When defining the objectives of CFSP, the general wording was used and the area of its application was not narrowed only to the European territory. The following objectives of the common foreign and security policy were identified¹²:

- "to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests and independence of the Union,
- to strengthen security of the Union and its Member States in all its forms,
- to preserve peace and strengthen international security, in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act and objectives of the Paris Charter,
- to promote international cooperation,
- to develop and strengthen democracy and the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms".

Additional issues related to safety and the defence policy were identified in the Treaty as an integral part of the Common Foreign and Security Policy¹³. The common foreign and security policy comprises all issues related to the Union's security, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy, which might lead to a common defence.

¹⁰ The Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty).

¹¹ The provisions on the Common Foreign and Security Policy.

¹² The Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty), Article J.1 section 2.

¹³ Ibidem, Article J 4.

The European Union seeks to achieve the objectives¹⁴:

- “by establishing regular cooperation between Member States in pursuing the policy, in accordance with Article J.2,
- through progressive implementation, in accordance with Article J.3, of joint action in areas where the Member States have important interests in common”.

The instruments of the Common Foreign and Security Policy before the Lisbon Treaty was enforced included:

- principles of and general guidelines of the common foreign and security policy,
- common strategies,
- joint actions,
- common positions.

The Lisbon Treaty made changes in CFSP instruments. Currently, the European Council and the Council of the EU take decisions solely in relation to¹⁵:

- “interests and strategic objectives of the Union,
- measures that the Union should take,
- stances that EU should take,
- conditions of implementing the actions and stances of the Union”.

The Common Foreign and Security Policy envisages the development and the use of rules and guidelines. It is included in the prerogatives of the European Council. The European Council, which consists of the heads of states, has broad powers to develop relations in the international sphere, hence its preparation to determine priorities of the foreign policy. The regular meetings of the European Council even force its participants to conduct ongoing dialogue and consultation. Therefore, it should not be difficult not to infringe the provision of Article J.2. The full text reads¹⁶:

- “*Member States shall inform and consult one another within the Council on any matter of foreign and security policy of general interest in order to ensure that the Union’s influence is exerted as effectively as possible by means of concerted and convergent action,*
- The Council shall determine a common position, if it considers this necessary. Member States shall ensure that their national policies conform to the common positions;
- Member States shall coordinate their action in international organizations and at international conferences. Then the common

¹⁴ Ibidem, Article J.1 section 3.

¹⁵ http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/lisbon_treaty/ai0025_pl.htm [received: 01.08.2012].

¹⁶ The Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty)..., Article J.2 point 1-3.

positions will be upheld. If in international organizations and at international conferences not all the Member States are represented, the participating Member States shall defend the common positions”.

Another tool of the Common Foreign and Security Policy are so-called common strategies. Their history goes back to the Amsterdam Treaty¹⁷, which entered into force on 1 May 1999. The body making decisions about adopting common strategies is the European Council. Strategies define the objectives that the European Union wants to achieve. On the basis of developed strategies, common positions and common tasks are adopted. Common strategies are characterized by a higher level of specificity, compared to the principles and general guidelines of the CFSP. So far three, strategies have been developed. They relate to Russia, Ukraine¹⁸ and the Mediterranean region.

An important novelty, which the Treaty of Amsterdam sanctioned, was the possibility of performing so-called Petersburg tasks or missions¹⁹. These missions are normalized in Article J.7 in sections 2 and 3²⁰. The CFSP also includes the Common Security and Defence Policy that provides the possibility of taking action using both civilian and military forces. The CFSP, which is a kind of successor to the WEU project²¹, envisages the perfor-

¹⁷ The Treaty of Amsterdam was concluded after the European Union’s diplomatic failures during the conflict in the Balkans in the 1990s and was intended, in its part relating to the Common Foreign and Security Policy, to improve the efficiency of international activities of the Community, for example, in the event of any future conflict.

¹⁸ In the Common Strategy of the European Council of 11 December 1999 on Ukraine (1999/877/CFSP) in Part I, Section 5 strategic objectives of the European Union with regard to Ukraine were precisely defined: “to contribute to the emergence of a stable, open and pluralistic democracy in Ukraine, governed by the rule of law and underpinning a stable functioning market economy, which will benefit all the people of Ukraine, cooperation with Ukraine in the maintenance of stability and security in Europe and in the world, and in finding effective responses to common challenges facing the continent; increasing economic, political and cultural with Ukraine, as well as cooperation in the field of justice and home affairs”.

¹⁹ Petersburg tasks are a result of the work of the WEU in 1992. The Western European Union was finally dissolved and its tangible assets and competence were contributed to the European Union in the area of the Common Security Defence Policy (CSDP).

²⁰ The Treaty of Amsterdam, Article J.7 paragraph 2 reads: “Questions referred to in this Article shall include humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making.

²¹ The Western European Union was dissolved on 31 March 2010 as the Treaty of Lisbon entered into force. In fact, the organization ceased operations on 30 June 2011 Statement of the Presidency of the Permanent Council of the WEU on behalf of the High Contracting Parties to the Modified Brussels Treaty – Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom, http://www.weu.int/Declaration_E.pdf (received: 11.06.2012).

mance of the Petersburg tasks. The concept of the missions refers to the possibility of initiating humanitarian, rescue, and peacekeeping tasks and to deal with the crisis, or even to restore peace (Ruszkowski 2003: 413).

The joint activities are part of the instruments that the Council of the European Union apply in situations when operational actions are taken. The instrument that is called: the unified standpoint can be used in the case of problems of objective or geographical nature. Political declarations and statements, although they do not have the treaty settlements, are included in CFSP instruments. The Common Foreign and Security Policy is pursued by concluding and implementing international agreements²².

It should be noted that the Treaty of Nice decided on setting up the Political and Security Committee. In addition, the treaty has enlarged the possibility of taking decisions by qualified voting majority. The issues of appointing special representatives and entering into international agreements in the framework of the CFSP (Pietraś 2006: 72-73; Mościcka 2005: 455-456) are the main fields of applying this procedure.

Special Representatives (EUSR), in accordance with the Article 33 of the Treaty on European Union can be appointed by the Council²³ at the request of the Top Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. A special representative is entrusted with a mandate in connection with particular political issues. The representatives, who have been entrusted a mandate, report to the Top Representative. The main task of special representatives, who are sent to the troubled regions of the world, is looking for methods of solving current political problems. During the missions, the officers represent interests of the Community, try to promote European Union countries values effectively. The representatives' importance is marked with their presence there and they also create the European Union's image on the international arena²⁴. The representatives are involved in strengthening the relations between the European Union and the selected regions of the world. In special representatives' actions, the particularly underlined aspects are: respecting human rights, democracy and stability in the region.

At the moment when the Lisbon Treaty, which introduced the External Action Service of the European Union – the supporting diplomatic body of the Top Representative – came into force, many doubts concerning the further functioning of Special Representatives have appeared.

The objections were caused by the fact that some of the permanent representatives were dismissed (e.g. on 11. August 2010 the EU Council decided

²² http://eup.wse.krakow.pl/?page_id='home, (accessed on 3 July 2011).

²³ <http://www.arslege.pl/traktat-o-unii-europejskiej/k78/>, (accessed on 6 September 2012).

²⁴ http://eup.wse.krakow.pl/?page_id=107 (received: 11.04.2011).

to abandon the positions of the EUSR for the South Caucasus, Moldova, Macedonia, and for the Middle East Peace Process by the end of February 2011). According to some analysts' opinions, it was a mistake which caused the lack of continuity of EU diplomatic missions in those regions where new structures (EEAS) had not begun to operate effectively yet (Liszczyk 2010). The conflict of objectives could have occurred because the reason for founding the European External Action Service was the necessity for obtaining better coherence of the European Union foreign policy. The policy was expected to eliminate the tension between the Community's external policy²⁵ and intergovernmental CFSP. The intention of the Service was to contribute to avoiding the duplication of administrative structures of the Council and the Commission. The aim was also to de-politicize the Commission delegations, to locate them in different parts of the world, so that they might serve as diplomatic representations in future (Osica, Trzaskowski 2009: 28). In the middle of 2012, the European Union had its Special Representative for the Central Asia²⁶.

CFSP financing can sometimes be very expensive. This is caused by the possibility of financing the participation of the armed forces, police, or technical experts in foreign missions. Such activities may be covered from the budget of the European Union, as well as from additional contributions made by the member states. The EU budget is not charged with the operation costs when the Council establishes, by means of a unanimous vote, different rules of financing particular activities in the framework of the CFSP activities (Dinan 2005: 595).

The achievements of the CFSP integration include: formation of the European Top Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy²⁷ whose responsibilities shall include²⁸:

²⁵ Through the Community's external policy, it should be taken into account the trade, developmental aid and relations with the countries applying for EU membership or those that are in EU neighbourhood.

²⁶ SPUE Patricia Flor replaced Pierre's Morrela, acc. New special representative of EU in Central Asia, (no author), www.kyrgyzstan.pl, (accessed on 01 August 2012).

²⁷ When selecting the newly created positions nomenclatures, the term "EU Foreign Minister" was not used, because this could be badly received by those who conducting foreign policy match with the prerogatives of the nation. It was tried not to make a mistake which was the establishment of a "foreign minister" in the rejected Constitutional Treaty in a referendum. Some member states treated it as a kind of an attack on their sovereignty. According to: http://eup.wse.krakow.pl/?page_id=104 (received: 03.07.2011); http://www.e-finanse.com/artykuly_eng/70.pdf, (accessed on 04 July 2011).

²⁸ The Top Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, European External Action Service, Ed. The General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, November 2009, Brussels 2009, (pdf version.), www.consilium.europa.eu, (accessed on 15 February 2012).

- pursuing the European Union Common Foreign and Security Policy,
- submitting own proposals for that policy preparation,
- pursuing foreign policy, in the framework of activities under the authority of the Council,
- watching the implementation of decisions taken,
- chairing the Foreign Affairs Council,
- co-chairing the Commission,
- watching the consistency of the Union's external actions,
- taking the responsibility for duties in the field of foreign relations,
- coordinating other aspects of the Union's external actions,
- representing the Union in matters relating to the Common Foreign and Security Policy,
- conducting the political dialogue with third parties on behalf of the European Union,
- expressing the Union's position in international organizations and at international conferences,
- conducting the European External Action Service and leading the Union delegations in third countries and in international organizations.

The novelty of solutions of the Lisbon Treaty is connected with authorising one person (the Top Representative of the Union for the Common Foreign and Security Policy) competences in the scope of the CFSP. The previous model authorised to two persons, and they are as follows²⁹:

- Top Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP),
- Commissioner for Foreign Affairs.

This solution reinforces the recognition of the Top Representative internationally, and it raises its importance.

In conclusion, it can be said that the European Union has been observing the need for external activities for a long time. The barrier that hinders conducting effective and adequate to the present geopolitical situation activities in the scope of foreign policy on behalf of the European Union has been the weakness of international representation and the strength of a political mandate for initiatives undertaken. Still there is not single and strong voice of the European Union in the world. In addition, the EU's foreign partners have got used to the fact that Europe is not decisive and firm in taking its unified standpoint as big powers like Russia, the USA and China do. This

²⁹ http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/lisbon_treaty/ai0009_pl.htm, (accessed on 11 May 2012).

happens despite the fact that still the possessed economic potential of the European Union authorises it to take the world top position.

The confirmation of the fact that the European Union now sees itself as a player of global importance, is the change of names in the records of budget items that relate to the Common Foreign and Security Policy. At present, the notion: “a global partner” (Czubocha, Paszkowska) exists in the budget description. It should be expected that pursuing the CFSP in future will be connected with the significant increase in costs. The international activity on a large scale is inseparably connected with the need of making quick decisions, as well as earmarking substantial amounts to fulfil the declarations with intense political content. There should not be any problems with the last postulate because expenditures spent on effective CFSP can be treated as an investment and such a solution finds understanding among elites and member countries societies, but there will be a great problem in guaranteeing the fast decision making – it requires achieving internal unity inside the integration group.

3. Summary

The CFSP has developed its specific and characteristic institutions and broad legal instruments. However, together with its development, there are many controversies about its functioning. Most of them are connected with the fundamental question of real possibility of developing a common and unified standpoint by all European Union members, who often possess different particular aspirations. On the other hand, in the contemporary world, the discrepancies do not concern absolutely all matters and many times the desire to speak unanimously – “one voice” – is highly desirable. All of these are very pragmatic.

At the present stage of the development it is difficult to talk about the high efficiency of the applied solution of a common foreign policy. The changes that occur in the area of CFSP are evolutionary. This is because the European societies have time and opportunity to familiarize with new democratic mechanisms in this important area. The European Union is forced to negotiate successfully with strong political and economic partners. Taking actions, for example, in the scope of counteracting the global financial and economic crisis requires interactions, among others, with Members of the BRICS and the USA. The effective dialogue is possible only in a situation when the European Union members take a unified standpoint and it will not be possible without the continued improvement of mechanisms in the Common Foreign and Security Policy.

References

1. Przybylski H. (1996), *Politologia*, Wyd. Śląsk, Katowice.
2. Zięba R., (2007), *Wspólna Polityka Zagraniczna i Bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej*, Wyd. Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa.
3. Łastawski K. (2004), *Od idei do integracji europejskiej*, Wyd. Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej TWP, Warszawa.
4. Traktat o Unii Europejskiej (Traktat z Maastricht), Artykuł J.1 punkt 2.
5. Pietraś Z.J. (2006), *Prawo wspólnotowe i integracja europejska*, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin.
6. Mościcka H. (2005), II filar Unii Europejskiej – wybrane aspekty instytucjonalne, in: Wojtaszczyk K.A. (ed.), *System instytucjonalny Unii Europejskiej*, Wyd. ASPRA-JR, Warszawa.
7. Liszczyk D. (2010), Specjaliści przedstawiciele UE w nowej architekturze instytucjonalnej Wspólnej Polityki Zagranicznej i Bezpieczeństwa, *Biuletyn PISM*, 115 (723).
8. Osica O., Trzaskowski R. (2009), Europejska służba działań zewnętrznych, Implikacje dla instytucji i stosunków zewnętrznych Unii Europejskiej, *Przegląd Natoliński – Nowa Europa*, Numer specjalny 2(3).
9. Dinan D. (2005), *Ever closer Union. An introduction to European integration*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Colorado.
10. Czubocho K., Paszkowska M., *Finansowanie wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa*, E-finance, Finansowy Kwartalnik Internetowy, www.e-finance.com.
11. <http://www.kielce.uw.gov.pl/ue/filary.htm>.
12. http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/countries/index_pl.htm#.
13. http://eup.wse.krakow.pl/?page_id=101.
14. http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/lisbon_treaty/ai0025_pl.htm.
15. <http://www.arslege.pl/traktat-o-unii-europejskiej/k78/>.
16. http://eup.wse.krakow.pl/?page_id=107.
17. http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/lisbon_treaty/ai0009_pl.htm.