

Journal of European Integration

ISSN: 0703-6337 (Print) 1477-2280 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/geui20

Towards European Security Integration: Boundaries of European Security and Defence Policy

Ramazan Erdağ

To cite this article: Ramazan Erdağ (2016) Towards European Security Integration: Boundaries of European Security and Defence Policy, Journal of European Integration, 38:2, 211-217, DOI: 10.1080/07036337.2015.1115240

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2015.1115240

Published online: 14 Dec 2015.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 50

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=geui20

Download by: [Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi] **Date:** 27 January 2016, At: 04:17

JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION , 2016
VOL. 38, NO. 2, 211–217
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2015.1115240

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

REVIEW ARTICLE

Towards European Security Integration: Boundaries of European Security and Defence Policy

Security and Defence Policy in the European Union, by Jolyon Howorth, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2nd Edition, 2014, ISBN: 978-0-230362-35-2

Debating European Security and Defense Policy: Understanding the Complexity, by Maxime H. A. Larivé, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2014, ISBN: 978-1-472409-95-9

Strategic Cultures in Europe: Security and Defence Policies Across the Continent, by Heiko Biehl, Bastian Giegerich, Alexandra Jonas (eds.), Postdam: Springer VS, 2013, ISBN: 978-3-658011-67-3

Downloaded by [Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi] at 04:17 27 January 2016

Introduction

The European Union (EU) emerged after the Second World War with the aim of uniting European countries according to economic issues. The successful implementation of an industrial union led it to the creation/establishment of a 'common market' via the European Economic Community (EEC) with the adaptation of the Treaty of Rome (Devine 2011). Under the Cold War's circumstances of a bipolar word order, the EU achieved in maintaining the adoption of common economic policies on the one hand, and undertaking the gradual enlargement process on the other. The EU dealt with economic and trade issues called as *low politics* and focused on constituting 'single market' in the continent by holding economic borders.

The end of the Cold War not only ended the bipolar world system, but inaugurated a new era, witnessing new challenges and opportunities in world politics. In this sense, the dissolving of the Soviet Union, conflicts in the Balkans in the 1990s and terrorist attacks in the US on September 11, 2001 (9/11) subsequently forced the EU to revise the partnership policy towards adopting and implementing a common security and defence policy (CSDP) (Bossong 2014) rooted in the establishment of the Western European Union (WEU) in 1948 and the European Defence Community (EDC) in 1954. After the end of the Cold War, the EU began to play a significant role in international security matters (Dorussen, Kirchner and Sperling 2009; Howorth and Menon 1997; Koutrakos 2013; Kurowska and Breue 2011; Mérand 2008; Merlingen and Ostrauskaite 2006). In the post-9/11 era, political instability and insecurity – i.e. military intervention by coalition forces in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya, Russian military intervention in Ukraine and the threat of the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) — also led the EU to reinforce its role of playing a dominant security actor in

international politics. The New security challenges facing the EU force all members to rethink on the CSDP on the one hand, and constituting a new institutional framework on the other. The transformation of the EU in terms of *high politics* — security and defence matters — brought about the attempts of constituting CSDP, first establishing the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) with the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 and then the CSDP with the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009. Yet, the St. Malo agreement between France and the United Kingdom (UK) in 1998 and the Cologne European Council summit in June 1999 pioneered the initiation of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) (Grevi, Helly and Keohane 2009; Klein 2009; Weiss 2012).

The Security integration of the EU has prompted academic debate and a considerable literature has developed about the European CSDP since the 1990s. The CFSP or CSDP has been evaluated as *a sine qua non* in order to achieve full European integration both politically and economically. Academic debates on the European CSDP have focused on whether sovereign states would agree on handing over the high politics to the EU, (or Brussels); in other words, if it is possible to succeed in combining different state preferences with the aim of broadening union (Koenig-Archibugi 2004; Anderson and Seitz, 2006; Smith 2003). In another aspect, one of the main challenges of the European CSDP is concerns of many members undermining of the NATO's role and relations (Bailes 2008; Hunter 2002; Liewerscheidt 2010; Merlingen and Ostrauskaite 2007).

Security and Defence Policy in the EU

Security and Defence Policy in the EU begins with the claim that the CSDP of the EU is 'a work in progress'. Howorth argues that the project of ensuring a unique security approach and policy in Europe confronted many challenges and complexities due to local, regional and international issues; nevertheless, the project continues on its way despite the problems. The book puts forward the transformation process and a wide historical background of European security and defence policy from (from the 1940s to the early 2010s) European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI), Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP) and the ESDP to the CSDP in the introduction section. More importantly, Howorth attempts to clarify what the CSDP is not before jumping to an analysis what the CSDP is. Contrary to common criticism and allegations, Howorth claims that the CSDP is not a policy fault, because it does not aim to constitute a common European army or to undermine NATO, and is not a rival to the US in which aims to balance it.

On account of what the CSDP is, the book sets four principal dynamics that promoted its formation. First, the end of the Cold War opened a new era, in both the US and Europe; hence, a Washington-based security logic for the EU began to lose its meaning. The EU began to consider the EU-based mechanisms to eliminate threats. Second, the fall of the Berlin Wall also demolished the Westphalian states system and a new debate, the so called 'new world order', began to be argued. In this context, the EU was designed to play both a regional and international role in international politics: crisis management, peace-building and peace-making, etc. Third, the Balkan crisis just after the end of the Cold War showed the threat of ethnic conflicts in the European continent and led to the EU producing and implementing a CSDP. Fourth, the growing European defence industry significantly affected the CSDP.

Downloaded by [Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi] at 04:17 27 January 2016

In the following section, the book explains why the EU cannot move forward without a CSDP and security architecture in the post-Cold War era. It shows that regional security challenges and threats drove the EU to becoming a security actor; it faces institutional and actor level challenges as well. St. Malo was a turning point in encompassing common security culture and agreeing on CSDP. The book surveys the institutional framework and developments after St. Malo. The book emphasizes the importance of establishing a High Representative for the Common Security and Foreign Policy (HR-CFSP), and the appointment of Javier Solana, former Spain foreign minister and Secretary-General of NATO, as the first HR-CFSP — he served between 1999 and 2009. During Solana's term, the EU was relatively successful both in ensuring coherence between intergovernmental institutions in the EU and in interoperability with NATO. Successor Catherine Ashton was however criticized for having a low political profile and being ineffective in intergovernmental controversies.

The book reveals the need for rapidly deployable and sustainable military forces, and moreover, focuses on the pooling and sharing of military resources in order to create a synergic military force against international conflicts and to respond to humanitarian crises, reducing expenditures and military equipment procurements as well. The book argues that by establishing combined joint military forces, the EU (with the CSDP) would complement, enhance and assist with transatlantic relations (with the US) rather than weakening or diminishing the US or NATO's role. Though the book offers an empirical analysis, its last part searches for mainstream international relations (IR) theories, whether explanatory or not, in European security integration. The book asserts that both traditional IR theories and European integration theory fail to analyse the CSDP and insists on the preference of 'empirical reality' rather than academic theory. The book lines up with *co-ordigration* (combination of coordination and integration) in explaining the CSDP and puts forward the establishment of a European grand strategy in order to overcome challenges and obstacles of the CSDP which is still a 'work in progress'.

Actually, Howorth's book is adroitly designed and makes a great contribution to the existing literature through its empirical research. The book has a considerable literature review of European security and defence policy and examines its logic, capacities and challenges. The second edition of the book (first published in 2007) presents an updated and revised framework in understanding the development of the CSDP; on the other hand, it follows a comprehensive approach, including the effects of both internal and external factors in shaping European security and defence policy. It also could be considered as an original textbook of European security and defence policy.

Debating European Security and Defense Policy: Understanding the Complexity

Debating European Security and Defense Policy: *Understanding the Complexity* by Maxime H. A. Larivé has a highly interesting design and structure, namely offering a comparative approach based on *yes* and *no* answers to the questions of EU security and defence by focusing on the period form the 1990s to today. The book deals with the positive sides of the CSDP by answering with "yes" on the one hand; also presenting the negative perspective with "no" answers on the other in order to reveal the complexity and to develop a critical understanding. The positive responses, "yes" answers, present opportunities, the possibility and applicability of European security integration; on the other hand, negative responses, "no"

Downloaded by [Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi] at 04:17 27 January 2016

answers, focus on the challenges and difficulties and adverse effects of the lack of common sense about the CSDP.

The book is composed of three parts and deals with ten important themes of European security and defence policy with ten chapters (in addition to the introduction and conclusion) divided into two subsections, *yes-no* answers to the questions. The first part of the book examines the theoretical framework and tests traditional IR theories – neorealism, neoliberalism and social constructivism — in explanation of the EU security integration. The theoretical debates of the book seek the answer to the question of whether theory is better in understanding European security and defence policy. In neorealist view, the book analyses the effect of the international system on the CSDP; whether the international system has the power to bring EU members together under a common security umbrella or if it is a completion area rather than competition. In the neoliberalism debate, the book analyses the CSDP in terms of the power institutions; supranationalism vs. intergovernmentalism and the limits of theory in clarifying European security integration. Last, within the social constructivist approach, the book debates the role of the big three – Britain, France and Germany – and the identity – Europeanization and Brusselization – in the high politics enlargement process.

The book goes beyond the evolution of European security and defence policy since the end of the Cold War in the second part. Larivê draws attention to how the EU has challenged severe security threats near its borders since the end of the Cold War, so the EU attempted to constitute an integration process in the security and defence field. He also debates the US strategic role in European security integration and the sensibility about NATO's influence. His last discussion in this part is about whether the 2008 financial economic crisis led to the strengthening or weakening of the CSDP. He emphasizes the necessity of the CSDP in the post-Cold War era by cooperating with the US and NATO and should use Eurozone economic crisis as an opportunity to force the EU members into unifying the security sector. He also highlights the strategic impact of the 2003 European Security Strategy (ESS) and the 2008 Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy (RIESS) in creating a European security identity. According to the findings of the book, ESS prefers more political, multilateral solutions for global threats in comparison with the US 2002 National Security Strategy.

The third and last part of the book studies actors, players and institutions in particular, member states' role in decision-making process. In this sense, the book explores the complex relationship between the Commission, the Council, the European Parliament, HR-CFSP, the European External Action Service (EEAS-established by the Treaty of Lisbon) and member states; it surveys whether EU institutions compel its members in decision-making or if the national interests of the members are decisive in the process. The book also illustrates the personal characteristics of Representatives' influence in practicing the CSDP. The book's contribution to literature lays down its designed in which analyses two opposing views in terms of IR theory, strategic and actor-based evolution in a comparative approach. It offers white and black sides; challenges and opportunities of, and the complexity of understanding, the CSDP.

Strategic Cultures in Europe: Security and Defence Policies across the Continent

One of the main challenges for the CSDP is the relative reluctance of member states toward security and defence policy integration. Both Howorth's and Larivê volumes argue that the

Downloaded by [Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi] at 04:17 27 January 2016

different approaches of the member states on this issue stem from having different historical experiences, hostility–friendship relationships, threat perceptions; that is, having varied strategic cultures. The concept of strategic culture emerged in the 1970s and aimed at understanding state behaviour; the role of actors' preferences, identity, shared norms, common historical experiences and cultures and state preferences and politics. Alastair Ian Johnston, one of the important third-generation representatives, defines strategic culture as 'a limited, ranked set of grand-strategic preferences that is consistent across the objects of analysis (e.g., textual sources for potential answers to the central paradigm) and persistent across time' (Johnston 1995, 48). In order to understand states' security and foreign policy preferences, their strategic cultures need to be analysed (Erdağ 2013, 52).

Biehl, Giegerich and Jonas' edited volume examines 28 states' (27 EU members — except for Croatia — and Turkey) strategic cultures. The book brings together security and defence experts and aims to comprehend the reluctance and diversity in security and defence policy and the sharing of military capabilities on the one hand, and differences in security approaches and threat perceptions among big and gradually small states on the other. The book focuses on each states' strategic culture, the period from focusing establishment to date while analysing the level of ambition in international security policy, the scope of action of the executive in decision-making, foreign policy orientation and the willingness to use military force.

The book provides a strategic culture map of Europe and emphasizes that the different historical experiences, security cultures, threat perceptions and state identities are substantially explanatory in the emergence of different approaches to the CSDP. Hence, it is because of strategic culture that former East bloc states still perceive Russia as a security threat so they are prone to be more cooperative with NATO in security and defence issues rather than the EU. On the other, states such as the UK, France and Germany act in a more European-centric manner, without undermining relations with NATO. Theoretically, one criticism is that the book goes with the presupposition that each state has a strategic culture that affects its strategic choices. On the contrary, as Johnston (1995) argues, strategic culture may not exist at all times and may not affect strategic preferences. For all that Biehl, Giegerich and Jonas' edited volume yields a great contribution to EU strategic culture as all (even the first). The book also provides a useful tool in understanding why states have different strategic preferences and approaches in the field of security and defence.

Conclusion

The end of the Cold War led to considerable changes in the international system and the balance of power was disrupted. In the post-Cold War era the 9/11 attacks as well as the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, and eventually the Arab Spring uprisings forced the EU to adopt and implement the CSDP. Taken together, the three books under review in this essay present readers an understanding of EU defence and security policy. By analysing empirically, theoretically and strategically, the books provide the basis for a CSDP in the EU, not just the opportunities in the development process, but also more general challenges, limits and the lack of common consensus. The three books also offer a complementary analytic tool in understanding and analysing the CSDP. Whereas Howorth's book offers a revised empirical analysis (since the 1940s) and includes interviews with a large number of

Downloaded by [Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi] at 04:17 27 January 2016

EU experts, defence officials and ambassadors, Larivê's volume presents a 'debate' approach to search for answers to yes-no questions related to important themes of the EU's security and defence policy, in particular between the 1990s and 2010s. Biehl *et al.* demonstrates a broader strategic culture analysis of the countries examining the complexity and diversity of CSDP in Europe. Although an improvement in the context of institutional and capacity has been provided, the future of EU security integration – supranational gains vs. national interests – still remains vague. Nevertheless, taken together with the historical background and development, European security and defence policy can best be characterised as a 'work in progress' as Howorth rightfully argues.

References

Anderson, S., and T.R. Seitz. 2006. European security and defense policy demystiried – Nation-building and identity in the European Union. *Armed Forces & Society* 33, no. 1: 24–42.

Bailes, A.J.K. 2008. The EU and a 'better world': what role for the European Security and Defence Policy? *International Affairs* 84, no. 1: 115–30.

Bossong, R. 2014. *The evolution of EU counter-terrorism: European security policy after 9/11*. New York: Routledge.

Devine, K. 2011. Neutrality and the development of the European Union's common security and defence policy: compatible or competing? *Cooperation and Conflict* 46, no. 3: 334–69.

Dorussen, H., E.J. Kirchner, and J. Sperling. 2009. Sharing the burden of collective security in the European Union. *International Organization* 63, no. 4: 789–810.

Erdağ, R. 2013. Türkiye'nin Stratejik Kültürü ve Dış Politikada Yansıması [Turkey's Strategic Culture and Reflection of Foreign Policy]. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi [Journal of Academic Inquiries]* 8, no. 1: 47–70.

Grevi, G., D. Helly and D. Keohane, eds. 2009. *European Security and Defence Policy: first ten years (1999–2009)*. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.

Howorth, J., and A. Menon, eds. 1997. *The European Union and National Defence Policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hunter, R.E. 2002. *The European Security and Defense Policy: NATO's companion – or Competitor?* Arlington, VA: RAND Corporation.

Johnston, A.I. 1995. Thinking about strategic culture. *International Security* 19, no. 4: 32–64.

Klein, R. 2009. *European Security and Defence Policy in 2003: why ESDP is important for Europe, the transatlantic relationship & world security*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

Koenig-Archibugi, M. 2004. Explaining government preferences for institutional change in EU Foreign and Security Policy. *International Organization* 58, no. 1: 137–74.

Koutrakos, P. 2013. *The EU Common Security and Defense Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kurowska, X., and F. Breue, eds. 2011. *Explaining the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy: theory in action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Liewerscheidt, M. 2010. *European Security and Defence Policy: an analysis of decision-making processes towards military deployments*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

Mérand, F. 2008. *European Defence Policy: Beyond the Nation State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merlingen, M., and R. Ostrauskaite. 2006. *European Union peace building and policing: governance and the European Security and Defence Policy*. New York: Routledge.

Merlingen, M., and R. Ostrauskaite, eds. 2007. *European Security and Defence Policy: an implementation perspective*. New York: Routledge.

Downloaded by [Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi] at 04:17 27 January 2016

Smith, M.E. 2003. *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: the institutionalization of cooperation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Weiss, M. 2012. Transaction costs and the establishment of the European Security and Defense Policy. *Security Studies* 21, no. 4: 654–682.

Ramazan Erdağ
Department of International Relations, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Eskisehir, Turkey
ramazanerdag@yahoo.com

© 2015 Ramazan Erdağ
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2015.1115240

Downloaded by [Eskisehir Osmangazi Universitesi] at 04:17 27 January 2016