



STRENGTHENING AND DEMOCRATISING EUROPE'S DEFENSE POLICY

Global events once again confirm the need for a strong and cooperative security policy.

Unfortunately, soft, democratic policies have not worked, as a result of which we have in recent years seen armed aggressions, acts of terrorism, and the outbreak of full-scale war in Europe.

This once again underlines the need for a clear response and solidarity on the issue of collective security and peace, for strengthening the Eastern flank of NATO at this moment, and also starting developing a strong common European defense capacity.

For years the Baltic States and Poland have raised their concerns about a potential Russian invasion, which were mostly ignored and dismissed as paranoia. After the terroristic and fascist Russian regime, led by Vladimir Putin, annexed Crimea and the de facto occupation of the Donbas and Luhansk regions in 2014, the Baltic States and Poland increased their military spending to at least 2% of the GDP. This was not followed by the rest of the NATO member states. This left Baltic States and Poland feeling isolated and alone in managing their defense. Unfortunately NATO was the only viable defense mechanism available to these countries. We need to show true European solidarity and support Eastern European countries in their need for safety.

Moreover, FYEG understands Finland and Sweden's wishes to join NATO, as that will make the Baltic Sea region safer and condemn any obstruction and manipulation by others in realizing the right of these countries to join the alliance.

While Western countries continued flirting with Vladimir Putin just to continue importing Russian fossil fuels, those countries which had previously been exposed to the horrors of Russian imperialism, started preparing for the worst, while continuing to support Ukraine from Russia's war against them.

Moreover, Germany kept building the Nord Stream 2 fossil gas pipeline from Russia to Germany, while Ukraine, Poland, and the Baltic States were opposed to it due to increased Russian influence. The partial Russian occupation of Ukraine had almost completely disappeared from the public eye until Russia started yet another invasion in early 2022.

Furthermore, many member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and member states of the European Union (EU) continued to export their weapons to Russia after the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014. Germany and France exported weapons worth more than 270 million euros. France's exports to Russia even increased significantly in 2015, a year after Russia annexed the Crimea peninsula. Czechia,

Bulgaria, Italy, Slovakia, Finland, Spain, and Croatia also continued to export weapons, spare parts, and vehicles to the Russian military.

The Ukrainian resistance held up against the relentless terroristic onslaught of Russian occupiers. Despite Ukraine's heroic resistance, without the influx of new weaponry, Ukraine cannot hold. It is thus necessary that Ukraine will be supplied with weapons to continue its counter-offensives against the Russian war criminals.

The Baltic States and Poland have been the biggest supporters of Ukraine during this invasion. Estonia has provided Ukraine military support of about 0.8% of their GDP, Latvia 0.7%, Poland 0.2%, and Lithuania – 0.1%, while Germany has given only 0.01% of their GDP in military aid. These discrepancies in the support for Ukraine standing up against the Russian invasion are worrying and are an expression of lacking European solidarity.

In order to strengthen European solidarity and with the aim to build European defense capacities, in particular to protect Eastern European countries against aggressions of the Russian Federation, FYEG calls to urgently build a strong and resilient European Defense Mechanism. It would be articulated by strengthening the cooperation between military forces of European countries and by providing defense support to the countries exposed to the most immediate threats.

Given the atrocities committed by forces under NATO command in the past, the reliance on NATO of some European countries for their defense is not sustainable, yet we acknowledge the current dependence on NATO as a defense mechanism for the countries most threatened by Russian aggression.

FYEG therefore demands that the European defense mechanism is set up as quickly as possible as an alternative defense solution to the NATO. Whereas the EU could play an essential role, it is vital that this mechanism is not limited to EU member states, but is open to every European country except for the Russian Federation.

The lack of a collective regulatory mechanism has allowed individual NATO members to exploit the alliance for their own interests, which in turn has resulted in criminal actions in the Middle East and other counties. Now this has led to weak support for Ukraine, provoking a difficult political and security situation for countries in Eastern Europe, the Baltics, and the Nordic countries, which are close to Ukraine and the Russian Federation.

We acknowledge there is a need in NATO for fair regulatory mechanisms that prevents the USA or any other single country from taking one-sided decisions as well as ensuring democratic ways of resolving internal problems and conflicts. At the same time we demand the creation of a strong institution in the future European defense mechanism that focuses exclusively on conflict prevention and resolution as well as ensuring peace and global security.

We believe that a strong structure and regulatory mechanisms will also enable us to control the level of militarization of countries and avoid subsequent wars and armed conflicts. One of the core values of the Greens is non-violence, so we believe that with the great threat of aggression from a Russian (or any other) imperialist government, we must first defend peace in all countries.



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.