

RESEARCH REPORTS 18

**The ‘Europeanisation’ of National Foreign,
Security and Defence Policy**

Plamen Pantev

**Institute for Security and International Studies
(ISIS)**

Sofia, November 2005

RESEARCH REPORTS 18

Institute for Security and International Studies

(ISIS)

Sofia

THIS RESEARCH REPORT BUILDS ON THE AUTHOR'S PRESENTATION ON A SIMILAR SUBJECT AT THE INTERNATIONAL AUTUMN SEMINAR, ORGANISED BY THE INSTITUTE FOR EUROPEAN POLICY, BERLIN ON 27 SEPTEMBER – 2 OCTOBER 2005 AT THE ANDRASSY UNIVERSITY, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY, ON THE TOPIC: "EUROPEAN FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AFTER ENLARGEMENT". THE RESEARCH REPORT DRAWS FROM HIS PREPARED TEXT AND FROM THE RESULTS OF ONGOING STUDIES BY ISIS ON CFSP AND ESDP OF THE EU, OF THE UNION'S TRANS-ATLANTIC SECURITY AND DEFENCE RELATIONS.

The author

© Institute for Security and International Studies (ISIS), 2005

ISBN 954 – 9533 – 22 – 0

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 miss-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. Kovziridze, 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.

Endnotes

¹ Robert Ladrech, Europeanization of Democratic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 1, 1994, p. 70.

² M. E. Smith, *The Europeanization of European Political Cooperation*, Berkley, CA, 1996.

³ Thomas Risse, Maria Green Cowles and James Caporaso (eds.), *Europeanization of Domestic Change*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 2001, p. 1.

⁴ Johan P. Olsen, *The Many Faces of Europeanization*, ARENA Working Papers, 2002, WP ½, at: http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp02_2.htm

⁵ Claudio M. Radaelli, *The Europeanisation of Public Policy*, in: K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli (eds.), *The Politics of Europeanisation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003, p. 30.

⁶ Gergana Noutcheva, Nathalie Tocci, Bruno Coppieters, Tamara Kovziridze, Michael Emerson and Michel Huysseune, *Europeanization and Secessionist Conflicts: Concepts and Theories*, in: Gergana Noutcheva, Nathalie Tocci, Bruno Coppieters, Tamara Kovziridze, Michael Emerson, Michel Huysseune and Marius

Vahl, *Europeanization and Conflict Resolution: Cases from the European Periphery*, Academia Press, Gent, 2004, p. 20-25.

⁷ Plamen Pantev, *ESDP: A Factor of Strengthening Trans-Atlantic Relations?*, in: Janusz Bugajski and Blagovest Tashev (eds.), *Early Warning and Policy Perspectives in the Trans-Atlantic Security Agenda: Central and East European Point of View*, Ni Plus Publishing House, Sofia, 2005, p. 79-86.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Plamen Ilarionov Pantev – (b. 1952), Senior Research Fellow; Ph. D. and Associate Professor in International Relations and International Law at Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridsky”. He is expert in security studies, civil-military relations, foreign policy forecasting, international law and international negotiations. He is also founder and Director of the Institute for Security and International Studies (ISIS).

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE FOR SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (ISIS)

The Institute for Security and International Studies (ISIS) is a non-governmental non-profit organisation, established legally in November 1994. It organises and supports research in the field of security and international relations. Fields of research interest are: national security and foreign policy of Bulgaria; civil-military relations, democratic control of the armed forces and security sector reform; European Integration, Euro-Atlantic security and institutions; Balkan and Black Sea regional security; global and regional studies; policy of the USA, Russia and the CIS; information aspects of security and information warfare; quantitative methods and computer simulation of security studies; international legal studies; theory and practice of international negotiations. ISIS organises individual and team studies; publishes research studies and research reports; organises conferences, seminars, lectures and courses; develops an information bank and virtual library through the Internet; supports younger researchers of security; and develops independent expertise in security and international relations for Bulgarian civil society. The institute networks internationally and establishes links with academic organisations and official institutions in the country and abroad on a contract basis. ISIS is not linked to any political party, movement or organisation, religious or ideological denomination. The institute has a flexible group of voluntary associates – 5 senior researchers, 8 PhD holders and 5 MAs – varying annually between 8 and 13 in all.

PUBLICATIONS OF ISIS

Research Studies:

"Bulgaria and the Balkans in the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union" (Plamen Pantev, Valeri Rachev, Venelin Tsachevsky), 44 pp., July, 1995. Research Study 1. In Bulgarian and English.

"Problems of Civil-Military Relations in Bulgaria: Approaches to Improving the Civilian Monitoring of the Armed Forces" (Plamen Pantev, Valeri Rachev, Todor Tagarev), 96 pp., April, 1996. Research Studies – 2. In Bulgarian.

"Bulgaria and the European Union in the Process of Building a Common European Defence" (Plamen Pantev, Valeri Rachev, Tilcho Ivanov), 51 pp., September 1996. Research Studies – 3. In Bulgarian and English.

"Strengthening of the Balkan Civil Society: the Role of the NGOs in International Negotiations" (Plamen Pantev), 24 pp., March 1997. Research Studies – 4. In Bulgarian and English.

"The New National Security Environment and Its Impact on the Civil-Military Relations in Bulgaria" (Plamen Pantev), 50 pp., May 1997. Research Studies – 5. In English.

"Prenegotiations: the Theory and How to Apply it to Balkan Issues" (Plamen Pantev), 24 pp., October 1998. Research Studies – 6. In English.

"Balkan Regional Profile: The Security Situation and the Region-Building Evolution of South-Eastern Europe" (Plamen Pantev, Valeri Rachev, Tatiana Houbenova-Delisivkova), 17 pp., April 1999. Research Studies – 7. In English (only an electronic version).

"Black Sea Basin Regional Profile: The Security Situation and the Region-Building Opportunities" (Plamen Pantev, Valeri Rachev, Tatiana Houbenova-Delisivkova), 17 pp., April 1999. Research Studies – 8. In English (only an electronic version).

"Security Risks and Instabilities in Southeastern Europe: Recommended Strategies to the EU in the Process of Differentiated Integration of the Region by the Union" (Plamen Pantev), 36 pp., November 2000. Research Studies – 9. In English (only an electronic version).

"Civil-Military Relations in South-East Europe: A Survey of the National Perspectives and of the Adaptation Process to the Partnership for Peace Standards", in cooperation with IIF, Vienna and the PfP Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes, (Plamen Pantev, ed.), 218 pp., April 2001, Research Studies – 10. In English.

"The Evolution of Civil-Military Relations in South East Europe: Continuing Democratic Reform and Adapting to the Needs of Fighting Terrorism", ISIS, Sofia/NDA, Vienna/DCAF, Geneva, Plamen Pantev, etc. (eds.), 276 pp. (Hardcover), July 2005, Springer Ferlag, Heidelberg, Research Studies – 11. In English.

“Bulgaria in NATO and the EU: Implications for the Regional Foreign and Security Policy of the Country” (Plamen Pantev), 28 pp., September 2005. Research Studies – 12. In English.

Research Reports:

“The Balkans in the Cooling Relations Between Russia and Western Europe” (Dinko Dinkov), 29 pp., November 1995. Research Reports-1. In Bulgarian.

“The Political Dialogue Between the European Union and the Central and Eastern European Countries” (Vladimir Nachev), 15 pp., November 1995. Research Reports- 2. In Bulgarian.

“The Bulgarian Foreign Policy in the Post-Conflict Period: Tendencies, Roles, Recommendations” (Plamen Pantev, Valeri Rachev, Venelin Tsachevsky, Tatiana Houbenova-Delisivkova, Dinko Dinkov), 35 pp., November 1995. Research Reports-3. In Bulgarian.

“The Bulgarian Military Education at a Crossroads” (Todor Tagarev), 29 pp., September 1996, Research Reports-4. In English.

“An International Methodology for Evaluation of Combat Capabilities of Military Systems: the Bulgarian Perspective of Greater Transparency and Confidence” (Volodya Kotsev), 13 pp., October 1996, Research Reports-5. In English.

“Confidence and Security in the Balkans: the Role of Transparency in Defence Budgeting” (Tilcho Kolev), 22 pp., November 1996, Research Reports-6. In English.

“NATO Enlargement: Two Looks from Outside” (Laszlo Nagy, Valeri Ratchev), 82 pp., February 1997, Research Reports-7. In English.

“Bulgaria and NATO: 7 Lost Years” (Jeffrey Simon), Translation from English into Bulgarian from “Strategic Forum” 142, May 1998, 15 pp., November 1998, Research Reports – 8. In Bulgarian.

“Reengineering Defense Planning in Bulgaria” (Velizar Shalamanov, Todor Tagarev), 28 pp., December 1998, Research Reports – 9. In English.

“Peacekeeping and Intervention in the Former Yugoslavia: Broader Implications of the Regional Case” (Plamen Pantev), 17 pp., November 1999, Research Reports – 10. In English.

“The Emergence of a New Geopolitical Region in Eurasia: The Volga-Urals Region and its Implications for Bulgarian Foreign and Security Policy” (Nikolay Pavlov), 23 pp., December 2000, Research Reports - 11. In English.

„Regional Identity in the Post-Cold War Balkans“ (Dimitar Bechev), 22 pp., August 2001, Research Reports – 12. In English.

„The Balkans and the Caucasus: Conceptual Stepping Stones of the Formation of a New Single Geo-economic, Geopolitical and Geo-strategic Region” (Plamen Pantev), 8 pp., November 2002, Research Reports – 13. In English.

“Control, Cooperation, Expertise: Civilians and the Military in Bulgarian Defence Planning Experience” (Todor Tagarev), 19 pp., April 2003, Research Reports – 14. In English.

“Bulgaria’s Role and Prospects in the Black Sea Region: Implications of NATO and EU Enlargement” (Plamen Pantev), 12 pp., August 2004, Research Reports – 15.. In English.

“Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Asiatic Concerns of an Enlarged Europe – a Bulgarian View” (Plamen Pantev), 7 pp., August 2004, Research Reports – 16. In English.

“Security Threats and Risks in South Caucasus: Perceptions From the Western Black Sea” (Plamen Pantev), 12 pp., June 2005, Research Reports – 17. In English

Note: All publications in English have electronic versions at the Institute’s website hosted by the International Security Network (ISN), Switzerland: <http://www.isn.ch/isis>

ISIS Address

1618 Sofia, lc “Krasno selo”, bl. 194 , ent. B, ap. 36

P. O. Box 231, Bulgaria

Phone/Fax: ++(359 - 2-) 8551 828

E-Mail Address: isis@mgu.bg

Website: <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isis>