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This Research Report focuses on the issue of the interpretation of the meaning of the term ‘Europeanisation’. It is followed by a discussion of two constraining factors of Europeanising the foreign, security and defence policy. Lastly, it deals with the interrelationship of ‘security’ and ‘regional integration’ – an issue that is generally disregarded by analysts and politicians, but that can lead to a methodological mis-match, creating obstacles to the course of a less contradictory Europeanisation of the foreign, security and defence policy of the EU.

1. The Term ‘Europeanisation’

‘Europeanisation’ is a term with various interpretations, given by many authors – R. Ladrech1, M. Smith2, T. Risse, M. G. Cowles and J. Caporaso3, J. Olsen4, C. Radaelli5, G. Noutcheva, N. Tocci, B. Coppieters, T. Kozziridze, M. Emerson and M. Huysseune6, etc.

In my understanding the term ‘Europeanisation’ reflects two interrelated meanings – first, a political concept, and, second – a theoretic instrument.

As a political concept ‘Europeanisation’ is a reflection of the interdependence between national political attitudes and institutional structures, and those of the European Union.

As a theoretic tool ‘Europeanisation’ is used to analyse the evolution of the national and the Union policies and institutions, their interaction and mutual influence they exercise on each other.

There are two dimensions of the term, concerning its “national” component: First, when the nations are EU members (or acceding to the Union countries). Second – when the nations are non-members from problematic regions of Europe (as the Western Balkans), or from the immediate neighbourhood of the EU. In both the Western Balkan case and the neighbourhood the Union applies special strategic instruments to deal with fundamental issues of conflicts, stabilisation, encouraging and supporting steps towards the modernisation of these areas.
We shall apply the term in connection with the first dimension – the relationship of the individual countries – members and acceding to membership in the EU, on one side, and the Union, on the other.

2. Constraining Factors of the ‘Europeanisation’ of the Foreign, Security and Defence Policy of the EU States

a. The National State/Sovereignty and Balance of Power Paradigms

It can hardly be denied that the ideas and plans of ‘European’ armed forces, ‘European’ foreign-policy decision-making process, and ‘European’ military and diplomatic services and the respective institutions are effectively over-burdened by the notion of the ‘nation-state’ and of national sovereignty.

The very readiness of sacrificing one’s life when serving in defence and security institutions is motivated by the lofty ideal of the survival and prosperity of the homeland. The purposeful education of European solidarity – both at the institutional and the individual levels, is not yet strong enough to replace the motivation, stemming from the ideals of the national state and sovereignty.

Furthermore, Union interests cannot still replace national interests and the national foreign policy decision-making process powerfully dominates over the EU one.

The notion of a democratic and legitimate treating of the foreign-political, security and defence issues is still linked to a ‘national’ social and political framework.

Coping with the frustrating tension between the nation-state and the supra-nationality on foreign-political, security and defence issues needs the conscientious step from national, and often – from egoistic national considerations to European solidarity: the readiness to sacrifice the life and to pay to others because they are Europeans.

We should not blind ourselves to the fact that such a state of affairs on foreign-political, security and defence issues would be possible when the level of satisfaction by the
individual European citizen from the progress of integration would lead her/him to such a motivation. While incremental European integration makes its way, intergovernmental cooperation on the same issues should be intensified and qualitatively improved.

Furthermore, a working level of pan-European solidarity would be reached only if the economically less developed for now East, Central and South East Europeans are taken as equals in an enlarged EU. The areas of foreign policy, security and defence call for integrity, fairness and comradeship that cannot tolerate compromises with principles. Until the situation is ripe enough and this moment comes – a well-conceived education of pan-European solidarity should develop in parallel with the respective sector functional integration of the EU. The incentive of fighting the terrorist threat is powerful and makes this task doable. For example, the most sacred zone of national sovereignty – intelligence information, needs to be exchanged with others to pay back the costs for its production and to reach the required level of counter-terrorism effectiveness.

A most dangerous aspect of an open or a hidden manifestation of the national sovereignty thinking in the area of foreign policy, security and defence of the EU, especially after the difficulties with the constitutional framing of the integration process, would be the re-appearance of balance-of-power attitudes among the leading countries of the Union. This would have devastating effects on the other states, on the world and on the future of the Union. While this is a hypothetical consideration, its danger is potentially real while operating within the nation-state and national sovereignty paradigms. And if we do not develop further European integration there is always the risk of reversing the process. This is 100 per cent true for the fields of foreign policy, security and defence too.

b. Inadequate ‘Euro-Atlantic’ Component

Very inappropriately in a period of a dire need of pushing ahead the project of Europeanising the foreign policy, security and defence of the EU, misunderstandings about the meaning and the details of this project with the Americans and NATO definitely created problems for all involved. Furthermore, this was taking place while a new security agenda and threats were appearing and acting on the international arena⁷.
Which were the positions, taken by the two sides of the Atlantic that reflected negatively on the process of shaping the European political, security and defence identity:

First, by the USA: ‘It would be fine for Europe to create efficient and practically applicable armed forces – a development that would narrow the gap in the level of military forces with us, but as this would probably lead to an autonomous strategic Europe, which is separate from NATO and the US, this could be dangerous for the security of both sides of the Atlantic’.

This vision ignores the fact the sole power centre that the United States has constituted in the years after the end of the Cold War has gained much of this strength thanks to the trans-Atlantic cooperation and solidarity, to the contribution of the EU to the objectives and ideals that the Americans cherish too.

Second, by the EU: ESDP is a needed ‘European counter-balance’ to America in a multi-polar international relations structure. French, Russian and Chinese sources have been most often exhibiting this vision as the ‘balance of power’ global thinking was dominating their conceptual approaches to the field.

However, for some fifteen years already the world has been living in a world that calls for a ‘balance-of-threat’ attitude. The ‘balance of power’ conceptual fundament of the growing CFSP and ESDP would diminish the power potential of both the EU and the USA. The very idea and policy of ‘multi-polarity’ in a world, which is not multi-polar at all leads to competition and frictions among the contending power centres and the USA – ‘the centre’ of global power. The effect on the individual EU member-states by now has been contradictions and disunity at critical moments.

3. The Theoretic Issue of How Security Relates to Security Sector Integration

The issue may seem trivial, but part of the methodological miss-match that has been created in the last years in the EU and between the EU and the USA is the inadequate conceiving of the relation between security and integration. While security is a global
sub-system of the international relations system, security and defence sector integration in the EU is a subsystem of a regional integration system. In other words, they relate to each other as ‘whole’ to its ‘part’. The more general issues always have precedence to the particularities. Hence, the sector integration in the EU must be aware of the global security developments, in which the EU-US partnership and cooperation is indispensable for mere survival and safety reasons – an issue of common interest.

4. Conclusions

For Europeanising the national foreign, security and defence policy the EU has to improve its internal evolution from national sovereignty to higher European solidarity. Furthermore, in its relations with the USA both actors have a job to do: the Europeans need to build a more capable CFSP and autonomous security and military force; at a later stage EU would need an adequate power posture that would back up its role as a global actor in cooperation with the Americans. The USA, on its side, should take a definite position as to how Europe is weighed in the American foreign policy in comparison to other international engagements of Washington. The problem for the USA in finding the right measure would be how to balance its power with a delicate enough approach to the Union, of accepting the form, contents and direction of CFSP and ESDP and prevent tensions. This would definitely contribute to a more coherent and effective foreign, security and defence policy of the EU.
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