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This paper aims to tell out a “what next” question of the future scenarios that the European Union (EU), as a security community, is most likely to face in its development as a world power up to the year 2020. The EU is a rapidly evolving concept consolidating with comprehensive internal and external dimension and implication. Key concepts such as power, security, global governance and international order have been used as the underlying themes that will determine the course of the future. In this context Neo-realism, Constructivism and Security Community’s model have been used as the theoretical framework to examine how EU’s role in the international system can be analyzed in the conceptual framework of security. This is followed by a discussion on the concurrent ESDP instruments initiated by the new Constitution as a key momentum of security community buildup internally. To broaden understanding and to get a variety of perspectives, research reports and policy papers of some transatlantic think tanks were analyzed. While multi-perspectives of some prominent think tanks were reviewed, analyzed and discussed, the opinions of policy makers at the United Nations Head Quarters, New York, were also explored to reflect on how EU’s role in international affairs is being perceived in the corridors of power, both concurrently and futuristically. These views were consequently augmented by attending General Assembly and Security Council sessions during September 2004 to January 2005 to observe what sorts of power and influence EU exerts in the contemporary international system and what potential it has for the future. Based on these findings, the paper identified
three scenarios that EU is most likely to face in its efforts to be an international power. The paper concluded with the understanding that EU has vision and potential to be a power in the international system futuristically, which can be further enhanced if EU enhances its military capabilities and improves its power perception in the eyes of various stakeholders. However since the international system is volatile, its future role cannot be predicted with accuracy, only alternative options can be identified. EU’s roles are dependent upon the degree of success of the integration process internally and the structural interaction with other major actors in the international system. Whereas EU may enhance its role up to the year 2020, it may not enter into a power conflict with other major powers. However it will play its role comparable with the magnitude of its size, power and influence to manage the international system, futuristically in an improvised way.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

“A day will come when all the nations of this continent, without losing their distinct qualities or their glorious individuality, will fuse together in a higher unity and form the European brotherhood. A day will come when there will be no other battlefields than those of the mind - open marketplaces for ideas. A day will come when bullets and bombs will be replaced by votes”. – (Victor Hugo, 1849).

At no point in the history the stability and character of the international system are so deeply affected by what happens in Europe. EU of today holds a center stage in the current international affairs. It is committed to share its global responsibilities in preventing conflicts, promoting justice and equity, peace harmonization and to play an effective role in combating terrorism, proliferation of WMDs, and in securing the international system. It also has the vision to play an equally effective role in promoting socio-economic development, poverty alleviation, sustainable development, environmental protection and to promote strong European values in the international system. In the words of Chris Patten, “European Union is a major international force. Its member countries and citizens must accept the responsibilities that come with that status.”

The recently renewed interest in the Constitution has aroused a new debate about the “New Europe” and “Europe future”. The consideration of putting Europe in the international security order is both classical and pragmatic. It is interesting to address the

---

question in the paper, about how EU’s contemporary Constitution-making moment will impact upon the international structure, and how will the internal and external environment of European Integration influence the EU’s role in the world during the first twenty years of the new Millennium.

It is just too dogmatic to study EU affairs within the confine of EU territory; neither is it effective to apply any International Relation theory as a single plot to replace everything empirical. In trying to spell out the way in which an ambiguous concept orients perceptions of basic factors like the anarchy and the arms race, one relies on broad impressions of large and diverse literatures. The attempt to generalize is in permanent risk of tipping into caricature. Without rejecting the complexity and uncertainty, however in a US-dominated unipolar system, it is fascinating to explore the possible opt-ins and opt-outs of what would happen, and what would not, in the next decade.

The Present International System

The present international system is a unipolar system, with USA serving as its driving force and as a global policing authority. Multilateralism, Bretton Woods institutions and an unparalleled military strength, is undoubtedly the driving force behind the current international system with small powers like EU, China, Russia, for taking up small roles. While EU may not have intention to initiate a great power conflict or an arms race – thus avoiding the re-initiation of the Cold War in a totally different form – however as argued by Shepherd & Salmon, it may have the potential to be an indirect power balancer in the international system, (a gap left after the fall of the Soviet Union in the 1990s) to reduce the perceptions of a unipolar world and to serve as neutral power broker in conflicts.

However, a great power conflict is highly unlikely in the forseeable future as none of the other powers have the required political, military, economic and socio-cultural strength to match the might of the USA.

---

6 Ibid. P. 109-125.
7 Pattern C. (19…). P.79.
**The Unique EU**

EU offers an unique case study. This integration amongst former conflicting countries and bitter foes has brought together centuries of rivalry converged together towards common interest. Not only is the augmented EU the world’s largest trading unit, it is the richest commercial bloc and (with its member states) the largest provider of development aid to the rest of the world. Through integration of 25 member states, the EU community has formed a wider economic union, with stronger political objectives needed. The transition from European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) of 1951 comprising of initial 6 members – to – European Union comprising of 25 members in 2004 has been a unique case study.

**The Need for Reform in International System and the Desire for an Alternative Power**

There is a need for system reform. Presently there is growing skepticism about US policies, particularly with reference to Afghanistan and Iraq wherein international law was violated in complete contravention to the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and pre-emptive strikes were carried out. US’s pro-Israel policies have also resulted in growing discontent amongst the Islamic world who fear that US is playing a pivotal role in arming anti-Islamic countries; while in the meantime disarming Islamic nations or by engaging them in prolonged conflicts, de-estabilizing their economy and governments, promoting anti-state factors and rebellion – thereby advocating the necessity for regime change. The international scenario has taken a completely new turn after Sep.11 attacks in USA. New alliances have been formed while effectivity of existing multilateral structure has come under heavy criticism from all quarters.

**Moving Forward Through Multilateralism**

A way forward to handle issues confronting the international community would be of “cooperative multilateralism” but in its cloak will lie the emergence of a multipolar

---

10 Speech delivered by Representative of Pakistan during 59th Annual Session of the General Assembly on 22-11-2004 at New York, USA on the topic “Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields, and Follow up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit”. Available in UN library archives. [Internet]. UN webcast. Retrieved from
system which will be developed as a result of growing unsatisfactory sentiment amongst the world population which feels that today's international system is all about great power politics where might is always right and where justice is denied.\footnote{Speech delivered by Honorable President of Zimbabwe Mr. Robert Mugabe at the General Debate of the Heads of States and Heads of Governments during 59\textsuperscript{th} Annual Session of the General Assembly on 22-09-2004 at New York, USA. [Internet]. UN webcast. Retrieved from \url{http://www.un.org/webcast/ga/59/statements/zimeng040922.pdf} on Jan. 3, 2005.}

The need for an alternate power to manage the global affairs wisely and in a judicious manner is further strengthened with the emergence of - multilateral trading system of WTO, rapid globalization, technological advancement, growing north-south gap, global menace of terrorism, proliferation of WMDs, spread of diseases like HIV / AIDS, and environmental degradation – to name a few.\footnote{C. Fred Bergsten. \textit{American and Europe: Clash of the Titans?} Article reprinted from Foreign Affairs, March/April 1999, Volume 78, No. 2. Institute for International Economics [Internet]. Retrieved from \url{http://www.iie.com/publications/papers/bergsten0399.htm} - on Jan. 3, 2005.}

1.2 Delimitation
The focus in our study is to address the question as to how EU, as an expanding security community, would finally be demarcated into world politics with the space and power instituted in a certain configuration and what sort of future scenarios will it most likely face in a rapidly changing international system where globalization, response of various actors and conflicts are the key driving forces. For the study, we shed light on the most updated event, European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) innovation initiated by Constitutional Treaty, against the background of the successful enlargement of ten Central and East European States. The paper also delimited the study period from 2003 to 2020 so as to examine the possible and most updated development trend of process & outcome during a certain time span.

In a world of continuing diversity, mistrust, and uncertainty, however, it is likely that search for a more cooperative global society is likely to remain in conflict with the powerful pressures which exist for states, and wider communities, to look after their own...
national and regional security against threats from without and within.\textsuperscript{13} We have developed the \textit{hypothesis} that EU may have the intention to play its role in the world political affairs and to extend its influence across the globe. It may serve as a major power block in future with tendency to challenge US global hegemony in terms of economic, political and military influence and hence may serve as a balance of power to the US.\textsuperscript{14} To explore this hypothesis, we evaluate scenarios that EU is likely to face up to the year 2020 so that it may extend its \textit{Power and Influence} on the global front. For this reason we focused on some of the scenarios that EU is most likely to confront. In this regard we have also compared the scenarios of some think tanks of EU and US so that we may be able to compare the thinking pattern of the two regions. The think tanks provide a glimpse of how a nation’s / region’s policies will be devised in the near future in light of how they perceive the future and how they think it will most likely turn out to be.

We also have explored the opinion of some of the policy makers at the United Nations Head Quarters, New York and also the opinion of office bearers of some of the multilateral organizations represented at the UN. We also attended General Assembly and Security Council sessions as well meetings of various other UN bodies to observe the influence of EU at multilateral level and its anticipated future role in this regard.

To make sense to Neorealism as well as security communities of the constructivist camp, we primarily focused on military (i.e. defence and security aspects ) scenario analysis, in light of on going globalization and used it as a benchmarking indicator to evaluate EU’s global power and influence.


1.3 Research questions:
During this thesis, we intended to explore the following questions:

1) How can EU’s integration process and its likely future scenarios can be explained from the perspectives of Neorealism, security community and social constructivist perspectives?

2) What are possible scenarios that EU is most likely to face with regards to security concept in a globalized world up to the year 2020?

3) How do transatlantic think tanks differ in their perspectives about EU’s future scenarios?

1.4 Structure of The Paper
The entire thesis is divided into four main portions.

Part I (Chapter 1) deals with the introduction of the paper regarding the brief introduction to the topic, an overview of the background, the research questions and motivation as well.

Part II (Chapter 2&3) presents theoretical framework of the paper. It also deals with the method and methodological matters and presents an overview of the concepts that have been used.

Part III (Chapter 4,5,6,7,8) presents an in-depth coverage of scenario analysis wherein the concepts of security, power, influence and security community were introduced in line with the theoretical framework and in the context of ESDP and the New Constitution. Subsequently, the perspectives of the transatlantic think tanks regarding future scenarios of EU have been compared and analysed.

Part IV (Chapter 9,10) is the conclusive part presenting our own scenarios and conclusion in light of the combined theoretical framework and empirical findings.
1.5 Motivations and expected benefits of the Research

Throughout the thesis, the authors intended to develop a comprehensive understanding of EU’s role in international affairs based upon how it is being perceived by various think tanks and policy makers. By integrating the concept of security communities, the authors intended to see if such a European experiment will be successful in terms of the regional integration concept which is being pursued by NAFTA, ASEAN, SAARC etc. It is expected that this thesis will contribute in future research on such related topics and within the domain of future studies in security communities.
CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

2.1 Method and Methodology
Method and methodology is the key language throughout the discussions of research. Bryman distinguished between methods (ways of gathering data) and methodologies (epistemological positions).\(^\text{15}\) A method is a particular tool to gather evidence about a phenomenon. These methods, including survey, interviews, and participant observation etc. in a “tool box”, can be combined and used in the many different approaches to research.

Methodology however is the entire approach to research. Harding (1987) defined methodology as “a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed”\(^\text{16}\). Or it is understood as “the theory of knowledge and the interpretive framework that guide a particular research project”\(^\text{17}\). To put it simple, it is about what can be said from the data collected, or “what is the logic of justification, what is the nature of knower and knowledge, the nature of reality, and the nature of the inquiry come into play.”\(^\text{18}\)

Based upon above assumptions, with a holistic view in mind, the authors employed pluralistic methodologies and multi-methods to handle the inquiry of EU project in the paper. The complexity, uncertainty and interdependence of EU policies have shaped the polity into a multilevel governance (MLG) mode. The polity can also be regarded as a disjointedly, incrementally integrating community. For the sake of the pluralistic agenda in both authoritative Intergovernmental Committee (IGC) and functionally powerful EU supranational institutions, policy interdependence, resources pooling and intensive interaction through (policy) networks have tamed the power to some extent in some time; however it is still useless to be assertive about the endpoint of EU in any possible way. As

\(^{16}\) Ibid. P.5.
\(^{17}\) Ibid. P. 208.
\(^{18}\) Ibid. P. 270.
Robert Cox argued, Foreign Policy analysis in such sense offers both “problem-solving” (positivist) and “critical” (post-positivist) theories.\(^{19}\)

The authors have used multi-methods such as qualitative method (which include interview, participant observation, secondary literature review, data collection), scenario planning, policy analysis in the fieldwork of research. Multi-methods inquiry is useful in constructing *validity*. Knafl and Breitmayer indicated that the triangulation construct is used as “a metaphor to characterize the use of multiple methods to measure a single construct.”\(^{20}\) It also means this method is useful for abstracting empirics and cater to theoretical reflection. The triangulation involved the use of multiple methods in the study of the same phenomenon with the basic purpose being the goal of seeking construct validity through the establishment of both convergent and divergent evidence for the task of test under consideration that confirms expectation.\(^{21}\)

To summarize, Multiple methods has following benefits to research as:
1. “It provides the opportunity to look for corroboration in the results from different methods. The aim should be to examine if and where evidence for corroboration exists;
2. It has potential to find complementarities;
3. It is used as a means of advancing a study or program of research, so that the result could help guide the development of the next phase of research, such as sampling, measurement or both;
4. There is the opportunity to use the results for expansion, both by breadth and depth;
5. It provides the opportunity to investigate potential paradoxes and contradictions that emerge from the data.”\(^{22}\)

### 2.2 Qualitative Content Analysis

Qualitative method talks. Qualitative method in international relations is prevalent, because understanding of social science, and international relations, is very perceptual. Traditionally debate between quantitative and qualitative research are based on

---

\(^{19}\) White, Brian (2001). P.176.
\(^{22}\) Ibid. P. 279.
fundamentally different epistemology assumptions, and that making a choice commits you to a particular way of understanding social science, and studying human beings. Different epistemological positions are ample in social science research, and quantitative method sometimes can be successfully combined into it as part of the research instrument. Qualitative method makes it possible for researchers to shed their own light onto the previous research agenda.

Qualitative content analysis is one prevalent framework of analyzing data. According to Bryman, qualitative content analysis is a strategy of searching for themes in texts. Alternatively, Altheide outlined an approach (referred to by him as Ethnographic Content Analysis - ECA) in that the researcher is constantly revising the themes or categories that are distilled from the examination of documents. According to ECA, many of the studies in the extracted process are implicit and based. With preliminary categorization in hand, the researchers move back and forth between “conceptualisation, data collection, analysis and interpretation” comprehensively. Content analysis will be used to analyse the official documents, reports and pronouncements to unravel the explicit as well as the implicit meaning of the texts regarding the policies and their orientation.

2.3 Research Methods

2.3.1 Direct interview

Researchers did direct interviews with:

1. Ambassadors/permanent representatives of certain randomly selected countries (convenience sampling) from some regions. Accessibility and willingness to interview and share opinions of the official concerned was the major criteria for carrying out the interviews.

2. Other officials in situations when ambassadors / PRs were not available.

3. Office bearers of multilateral and regional organizations also based on convenience sampling and with their willingness to be interviewed.

These interviews were informal and were open-end as it is hoped to explore diversity of

---

25 Ibid. P. 381.
opinions.

2.3.2 Secondary literature review
For this thesis, the writers explored the perspective of think tanks and research papers of policy institutes through a secondary research and qualitative content analysis in light of some of the contemporary discourse. They went through findings of various
• Think tanks
• Policy research institutes
• Government agencies
• Web pages of authentic sources
• Official reports of international and multilateral organizations
• Speeches delivered at UN and other international and multilateral bodies.

2.3.3 Participant Observation
It is fieldwork, which means observing while participating in events, or doing research on certain human behavior in its everyday context. This technique bears in mind with quite subjective perception. The nature and extent of participant observation can be classified into four types as following (see figure 1 & 2):

Figure 1. Four forms of ethnography
(Note: This figure is a development of a table in Bell 1969.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of researcher</th>
<th>Open/Public setting</th>
<th>Closed setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overt/explicit Role</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert/implicit Role</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Or as following:

Figure 2. Role of researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of researcher</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant as observer</th>
<th>Observer as participant</th>
<th>Observer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Doing participant research entails the researcher to move along the continuum of role of researcher between the middle two types (participant as observer or observer as

participant) during the data collection phase, and occasionally drop into the one of complete role positions (participant or observer). The internship in the U.N. may be allocated into a significant role in the highlighted frame: participant as observer, by bearing an open role in a public setting. The one-coauthor observed the influence of EU in various bodies of UN by directly participating in various meetings of UN bodies and committees such as General Assembly and Security Council, using the participant observation technique.

2.3.4 Scenario Planning
Scenario thinking can be a bridge communicating the present with the future path in a scientific way. Pierre Wack, the originator of scenario thinking as it is commonly used today, described it as a discipline for encouraging creative and entrepreneurial thinking and action “in contexts of accelerated change, greater complexity, and genuine uncertainty.”

Scenario thinking entails building future environments in light of uncertainty. However it is perceptual and analysis is based upon how situation is perceived by the researchers in light of key driving elements. They are powerful planning tools presenting alternative images of the world rather than projecting prevalent trends and factors and assist in decision-making process. Therefore the typology of scenario thinking (See Figure 3.) includes the four inductive, deductive, normative and incremental methods. The paper has applied the most appropriate deductive method, since in the authors’ views, both EU’s internal and external environment is variable, the future role scenarios of EU internationally should be considered deductively.


Scenario thinking accords to three guidelines: a long-term view, outside-in thinking (see figure 4.) and multiple perspectives. The outside-in scenario thinking follows the road map of looking into driving forces in the contextual environment firstly, such as global liberal market, informational technology revolution, social chaos of national and ethnic conflicts, and environmental crisis as well as earnest pursuance for good governance, etc. Then the second layer comes the working environment such as the specific operational (institutional and administrative) settings as well as the social fabric and network. Scenario thinking does not give proposition, nor raise prediction, however just present a future domino by deliberately formula that is mostly keen to author’s insight.


2.4 Theoretical Literature Review

Waltz’s *Theory of International Politics* in 1979 has been the most popular doctrines of Neorealism disclosing interstates politics for international relations theorists in the last three decades. However Waltz’s Neorealism received challenges from Wendt’s *Social Theory of International Politics* in 1999, which claimed that international system is made up of not only material, but also social structure which include ideas, knowledge, culture and norms. Adler & Barnett’s *Security Communities* in 1998 refined a new theoretical framework for consideration of international security from a regional perspective, mostly positioning its theoretical roots in the constructivist camp. Warleigh Alex’s *Understanding European Union Institutions* systemically studied the institution set-up within EU both theoretically and empirically, which is regarded as a successful and unique character of EU’s security building practices.

2.5 Empirical Literature Review

Empirically the author mainly discussed analysis report on world security scenarios from two influential think tanks, European Institute of Security Studies and the Central
CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Since 1990s, Security Communities study has been an emerging area for both empiricists and theorists to shed light on traditional security politics, regionalism, post-cold war order, and globalization study. Security community provided a reflexive space for creating a stable order for those states that dwell in it, thus influencing the conception of hard security in international politics. Security community is also a most durable nutshell representing the vision of power politics through an image of mature anarchy.\(^{32}\)

In the theoretical part, the thesis addressed the central question of whether there would be more or less security in the world, and why and how Neorealism and social constructivism mutually reinforce and reflect, pacify power politics. The thesis read security communities from perspectives of Neorealism and social constructivism, identified intervening parameters such as power, security, ideas, competing interests, institutionalization, etc in an analytical framework of security communities.

3.1 Neo-realism
Most contemporary academics refer to Waltz’s *Theories of International Politics* for definition of interstate politics, named either as Neo-realism or structural realism, with essential focus on power-oriented states seeking and maintaining survival (independence, sovereignty, and territory integrity) in the international system. By not rejecting Neorealism, Realism claimed that states are seen as rational, unitary actors that derive their interests from an evaluation of their position in the system of state.\(^{33}\) In the self-help anarchy, Neorealism reads the cooperation between states extremely fragile because of the jealously guarded self-interests of national governments, the lack of trust and commitment to each other, and the fear of more relative gains of the competing counterparts.

---

\(^{32}\) Mature anarchy: “it is possible to ameliorate the security dilemma through greater cooperation between states by taking into account the interests of their neighbours when making their own policies. A process from fierce military rivalry to a security community.” Cited from John Baylis, *International and Global Security*, of Baylis John (2001). *The Globalization of World Politics*. P.261.

3.1.1 Structure (anarchy)
Structure in Neorealism means “there is no central authority capable of controlling state behaviour”\textsuperscript{34}. According to Waltz, structure is defined by the ordering principle of the international system, which is anarchy; and the distribution of capabilities across units, which are states.\textsuperscript{35} There is no differentiation of function between different units, or state actors. Therefore, states experience the same constraints by anarchy and strive to maintain their position in the system.

3.1.2 Balance of Power
David Hume called balance of power as “a constant rule of prudent politics”\textsuperscript{36}, which then became one of the longest standing and most frequently used concepts in international politics. Waltz concurs with traditional realists when he states that the central mechanism for order in the system is balance of power.\textsuperscript{37} The theory makes assumptions about the interests and motives of states, rather than explaining them.\textsuperscript{38} Or the theory can explain some things, but not the same things, about behaviour and outcomes at both levels (national and international level).\textsuperscript{39} Balance of power, alliance, nuclear deterrence, disarmament, etc. are real politic ways to reduce threat of war. However balance of power should not be regarded as a prediction of policy, but more of a description of how power is distributed.\textsuperscript{40} In another words, the major concerns of world politics tend to arise from inequalities of power, and particularly from major changes in the unequal distribution of power.

3.1.3 Power
Neorealism is represented by three ‘S’: State, Self-help, and Survival, which underlies a major assumption of the characteristics and instrument of the central state agents: power

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid. P.123.
is the “the combined capabilities of a state.”  

Herein security is a language of force and deterrence. States are differentiated in the system by their power and not by their function. Power gives a state a place or position in the international system and that shapes the states’s behavior. A state with more power would have more influence, although influence has gained more and more attention in the globalizing age. Neorealists are used to explain any differences in policy by differences in power or capabilities. In another word, states would react to anarchy according to the total sum of capabilities they accumulate, and accordingly evaluate its position in the system. Institutions from the perspective of power then underly the range of control and action of a self-interested state, hence its existence is quite subordinate to the motivation of states.

In conclusion, Neorealism thinks international politics is fundamentally conflictual in the long run since the structure of anarchy is durable. Therefore, seeking for security turns out to be the primary task of states, with anarchy and uncertainty easily causing security dilemma.

### 3.1.4 Criticism of Neorealism

It is important to notice that while the self-help logic is attributing to systemic level of analysis, it fails in figuring out why the same form of state is differently structured and why the structure is valiantly related to various (state) agents in contemporary world politics. In other words, “Neorealism is a theory of why, in ‘international political’ society, the establishment of stable norms is either unlikely or impossible, why formal institutions do not develop meaningful autonomy, and therefore why a constitutional international regime is unimaginable.” In a word, Neorealism is biased in limiting what cannot happen in international structure, negatively; but weak in setting up what have already developed in formalities, positively.

---

42 Ibid. P. 185.
43 Ibid. P.185.
44 Security dilemma was first clearly articulated in the 1950s by John Herz: a structural notion in which the self-help attempts of states to look after their security needs, tend regardless of intention of lead to rising insecurity for others as each interprets its own measures as defensive and the measures of others as potentially threatening. Cited from Herz 1950. P.157.
In line with Neorealism, the end of cold war has brought about a major shift in the global balance of power.\textsuperscript{46} Realistically we also intend to explore as to how EU will exert its Power and Influence in a rapidly changing world. The international scenario is anarchic and is marked by volatility, power struggle, growing discontent amongst the masses in calling for a need of a “New World Order” with changed polarity in the system, rising terrorism, growing North-South gap etc. These are some of the reasons as to why there is a need / room for another power in the system which has the ability to exert its influence. Can EU respond to this need? What will be the likely scenarios that EU will face in its desire to be a global player?

At this point, we would mean that Neorealism model is quite ambiguous in state socialization of mistrust, miscalculation and uncertainty; the margin of self-defining position in foreign policy is thin, and “Waltz’s account of anarchy is not fully generative”\textsuperscript{47}.

\textbf{3.2 Social Constructivism}

The Conventional Social Constructivism, as represented by Alexander Wendt in his \textit{Social Theory of International Politics}, shared major Neorealism assumptions about international politics, such as anarchy, survive, rationality of state behavior, uncertain of intention, etc. Social Constructivism is concerned with the issue of whether state action is influenced more by system structure (neorealism) or by the processes, interactions, and learning of institutions (neoliberalism).\textsuperscript{48} The approach is useful since it raised a new inquiry about what and how the international system is made up of (both material and social structure); as well as who are the actors and what they do. Social structures are defined by shared understandings, expectations, or knowledge.\textsuperscript{49} Wendt held that, “the most important structures in which states are embedded are made of ideas, not material forces…Ideas determine the meaning and content of power, the strategies by which states


\textsuperscript{47} Ibid. P.33.


pursue their interests, and interests themselves”\textsuperscript{50}. Far from denying a reality to the material world, constructivism claims that how the material world shapes, changes, and affects human interaction, and is affected by it, depends on ‘prior and changing epistemic and normative interpretations of the material world (culture)’.\textsuperscript{51} So it is more important that to begin with a small number of big and important things about world politics we would do better to focus first on states’ ideas and the interests they constitute, and only then worry about who has how many guns.\textsuperscript{52}

Wendt argued contrarily to neorealist claims that “self-help and power politics do not follow logically or causally from anarchy, and if today we find ourselves in a self-help world this is due to process, not structure.”\textsuperscript{53} Wendt takes interests and identities not as given (as Neorealism claims), but being formed in the process of interaction. In a certain society of given culture, identities causally generate specific interests of actor, and then the sum of identities and interests lead to specific action (or practices), which is labeled as structural effect. These social practices are capable of reproducing “the intersubjective meanings that constitute social structures and actors alike” and, most importantly, the capacity “to produce predictability and so, order.”\textsuperscript{54}

Social Constructivism thinks the anarchy is what states make of it. In another words, the logics of anarchy are a function of how deeply culture is internalized. And which pathway to choose to realize a given anarchy is an empirical question (See Figure 5) which will be discussed in subsequent chapters of the paper. Culture is known as shared ideas in the social structure that has three distinct forms of anarchy: “Hobbesian, Lockean, and Kantian…based on three different role relationships, enemy, rivalry and friend.”\textsuperscript{55} A key aspect of culture form is its role structure, the configuration of subject positions that

\textsuperscript{52} Wendt (1999). P.256.
\textsuperscript{55} Wendt (1999). P.309.
shared ideas make available to its holders. By subject positions Wendt means that “...constituted by representations of Self and Other as particular kinds of agents related in particular ways, which in turn constitute the logics and reproduction requirements of distinct cultural systems”. A role structure cannot be reduced to individuals since it underlies “collective representation, properties of macro-structure”. And a structure might not survive with no filled roles by states or non-state actors.

Figure 5. A Social Constructivism Model of the Multiple Realization of International Culture

3.2.1 Criticism of Constructivism
The argument of Social constructivism claimed a bridge between two traditions: rationalism and reflectivism by developing views that liberal institutions can transform state identities and interests, which is extended into further discussion of and comparison with New Institutionalism (NI) in political science, a little beyond the discussion of the paper.

Rationalism such as Neorealism and Neoliberalism recognized the exogenous of identity, and Social Constructivism offered a possibility of identity transformation implicated by sociological institutionalism. While Social Constructivism is in accordance with major neorealism assumption such as state, survive, it diffused a possibility of violent change into process change, or as peaceful change.

The issue of identity touched by rational and reflexive camps has to be deliberated and

---

operationalized in stringent observance to current international affairs. The disputes in power of identity therefore shed a critical light to constructivism that theorists maybe have to rethink about the methodological, ontological and empirical ground which they are used to.

3.3 Security Communities
Since last decades of accelerating globalization and rationalization, the emerging of security communities shift more and more theorists’ interests to the configuration of conflict and co-operation which in a transformative manner shaped regional stability. Karl Deutsch, Buzan Barry, Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, Ole Waever are all important theorists who contributed to generate a framework of security communities, which hosts a comprehensive understanding of regional integration by incorporating traditional schools and innovative constructivism camp, adds a rich conceptual and definitional camp to international politics such as community, dependable expectation of peaceful change, governance and institutions, etc.; and broadens their analysis of interstate security and defense to a multi-dimension that includes security in military, economy, environment, politics and society.

3.3.1 what is Security?
International politics is fundamentally relational matters. As an ‘essentially contested concept’, security has its own form and expression in international politics. For Neorealism security is a language of power. For security communities it represents the logic of community. According to Wolfers, (traditional) security is a value “of which a nation can have more or less and which it can aspire to have in greater or lesser measure.” In the anarchy system, more security for one state would mean less for another. Hence here it is the so-called “zero sum game” from Neorealist perspective, especially in a two-polar system.

As Wolfers noted that, security can be approached both objectively (there is a real threat) and subjectively (there is a perceived threat) and that nothing ensures these two

---

approaches will line up. From above statement, it is found that security is an absolute concept, which cannot be achieved absolutely. Therefore in this section the author argues that, the essential quality of security “is a social area, a part of discursive, socially constituted, inter-subjective realm.”

Furtherly, Buzan Barry raised a new framework of analysis – security, which attempted to examine variant logics of threat and vulnerability in different sectors with a broadened and holistic dimension of relevant factors leading to securitization. Attributed to the widening concept of security, it is open to different types of threats, both military and non-military (such as economically, socially, politically and environmentally). The new framework aims to build coherence not by deviating from traditionalists’ approach with the core of military and force, but “exploring the logic of security itself to find out what differentiates security and the process of securitization from that which is merely political.”

### 3.3.2 what is Security Complex
Security complex is in this sense a concept defining regional situation as, a group of units within which the main process of securitization or desecuritization are tightly linked together, so that their security problem can not be separately analyzed or resolved. Security complex to a certain degree reflects the interdependence of security between states, although usually quite negatively. The interdependence composes a shared area of understanding to each other’s power and position, as well as an epistemic arena on the enemy or friend relations that shaped policymaking or security strategies.

### 3.3.3 what is Security Community?
Security community is the achievement of security within a region or among a group of states. It can either be geographically or socially organized, with the examples of the former like EU, ASEAN, and the latter such as transatlantic region. In the “pioneering 1957 study” by Karl Deutsch, the concept of security communities was for the first time entitled a whole set of theoretical and empirical vision. A security community was

---

61 Ibid. P.5.
defined as a group of people that had become integrated to the point that, there is a “real assurance that the members of that community will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way.”

Integration is the buzzword of regional studies especially relevant to EU. Regarding to the high-end politics of security, Deutsch observed that,

“by integration we mean the attainment, within a territory, of a ‘sense of community’ and of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough to assure for a long time, dependable expectations of ‘peaceful change’ among its population. By a ‘sense of community’ we mean a belief…that common social problems must and can be resolved by processes of ‘peaceful change’.63

This definition was then articulated into two types of security communities: “amalgamated and pluralistic security communities” by Deustch. Adler classified pluralistic security communities into two ideal types, loosely and tightly coupled one. Pluralistic security communities ‘retains the legal independence of separate governments’. By loosely-coupled pluralistic security communities, it means a transnational region compromised of sovereign states whose people maintain dependable expectations of peaceful changes.65 By tightly-coupled pluralistic security communities, it has two aspects: on the one hand, there is a “mutual aid” society in which the members build collective system; on the other hand, there is some rules special between national, international and transnational levels which form a “collective security system”.

---

64 Adler E. & Barnett M.(1998). Security Communities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.. P.43. Deutsch thought pluralistic security communities were more stable than amalgamated ones. He argued that more “potential destabilizing factors” would influence the amalgamated communities, such as increased military burdens, very rapid increases in social mobilization and political participation within component units, relatively swift shifts in social differentiation, a decline in administrative capabilities, a closure of political elites and a dissonance between government action and societal expectations. Relatively impacting factors to pluralistic security communities only require three conditions to exist: compatibility of major values among the units, a capacity for politically relevant groups to respond to each other’s stimuli without violence and a mutual predictability of the relevant aspects of one another’s political, economic and social behaviour.
3.3.4 Logic of Community
The distinctive feature of security communities is that a stable peace is tied to the existence of a transnational community. A community is defined in three aspects: firstly, common language, common understanding and common meanings makes the basis of community; secondly, units in community encounter and interact in numerous settings; thirdly, reciprocity, long-term interests and altruism express the community spirit in knowledge of those whom one is interacting. By a sense of community, we refer to

A matter of mutual sympathy and loyalties; of “we feeling,” trust, and mutual consideration; of partial identification in terms of self-images and interests; of mutually successful predictions of behaviour... in short, a matter of a perpetual dynamic process of mutual attention, communication, perception of needs, and responsiveness in the process of decision making.

By dependable expectation, it means dependable expectation from consistent identities and interests derived from environment or context of operation; by peaceful change it means member states neither expect nor prepare to solve interstate conflicts by organized violence between themselves.

The logic of community here is that, although actors may derive interests and beliefs from the social interaction of the groups, they may also keep producing distinct interests (out of identity) that possibly lead to competitive behavior and ultimately conflict. And for security communities, the critical question is how the assurance mechanism of war-avoid practices, such as legal provisions, institutions, rules, conventions, consensus works as resolution to conflicts.

3.3.5 How Security Communities Develop?
Security Communities eventually develop along logic of community that is based on shared meaning and understanding in a specific context of regional culture. Adler and Barnett developed an analytical three-tier model of the security communities development: (1) precipitating conditions; (2) process variables (transactions, organizations, and social learning) and structural variables (power and knowledge); and

---

66 Ibid. P. 31.
(3) mutual trust and collective identity.68 (See Figure 6.)

The first tier is marked with basic conditions that foster the emergence of security communities. These include broad environmental factors such as demographic or technological change, shifts in the global economy or alterations in the pattern of external threats.69 Besides the effects of globalization, it also incorporates the broad epistemic shift in the “development of new interpretations of social reality” and redefined threats and vulnerability. The second tier is a complex web made up of mixed-motives and power structures, interaction processes represented by institutions, organizations and socialization processes. Adler and Barnett paid attention to knowledge as the social structure that they refer to as “cognitive structures...shared meanings and understandings...part of what constitutes and constrains state action...as categories of practical action and legitimate activity”.70 The third tier, either as end point or the basis for next stage development of security communities, consists of mutual trust and collective identity among involved actors.

Herein the three tiers compose a full circle of confidence building mechanism in a scope of regional wide. With the foot rooted at communities, power and knowledge constitutively add dimension to the legitimate practices; however, whether the effect should arrive at mutual trust and collective identity will depend on the appropriate interpretation of changing environment and the path followed through interaction.

Figure 6. The development of security communities

Tier One

**Precipitating conditions**

1. Change in technology, demography, economics, the environment
2. Development of new interpretation of social reality
3. External threats

Tier Two

**Factors conducive to the development of mutual trust and collective identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure:</th>
<th>Process:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tier Three

**Necessary conditions of dependable expectations of peaceful change**

Mutual trust  Collective identity

Dependable Expectation of Peaceful Change

### 3.3.6 Criticism of Security Communities Framework

With rich empirical examples of regional cooperation beforehand, Liberal and Democracy values were found not necessarily to be exclusive and dominating for security communities building. As security communities possibly would also be a “war community”, whether liberal or democratic ideas are a mandate for security communities remains to be an area of further study.

Besides the hanging question of norms as regarding to security community, Whether the transition from security complex to security community is another question relevant to possible or feasible dependence not only on socialization, institutionalization, securitization, but most of all the willing and awareness of power, identity, historic relations and geopolitical interests. Security communities, by more focused at a regional level cooperation, somewhat ignores the limited space constraint by the power politics. Hence from this regards the further integration between new and old Member States

---

within EU boarders must coordinate overlapping and crossing interests, identities as well as historic relations from multiple level.

Furthermore, there are some other disadvantages of security communities studies, such as: institutionalization is good practice, but it is variant in extent in different precipitating context of security communities so that it causes a widened agenda of research in a wider social background; Mixed identities and interests in a same community network also create a rich however puzzling research ground; and it is hard to evaluate the degree of mutual trust and collective identity as well as how “dependable” the expectation of peaceful change would be for achieving a “real” security community, if any.

3.4 Theoretical Reflexivity: Sociological Institutionalism Works?

Institutions matter, in a configuration way it has impact on the political outcomes. By referring to rational starting engine, rational institutionalism (neorealism institutionalism and neoliberal institutionalism) model state behavior with motives of interests and the assurance of power. New institutionalism (NI) (see figure 7) claims more reasoning to the cognitive turn itself. Common institutional practices are said to emerge from a more interactive process of discussion among the actors in a given network -- about shared problems, how to interpret them, and how to solve them -- taking place in a variety of forums that range from business schools to international conclaves.72

Sociology's institutionalism does not only claim social structure matters; they tell us what social structure is.73 Distinct with rational approach, sociological institutionalism offers three characteristics for analysis. First, it admits the marriage of institutions with culture. This has two important implications. First, it challenges the distinction that many political scientists like to draw between 'institutional explanations' based on organizational structures and 'cultural explanations' based on an understanding of culture as shared attitudes or values.74 Second, this approach tends to redefine 'culture' itself as

72 Ibid.
'institutions'. In this respect, it reflects a 'cognitive turn' within sociology itself away from formulations that associate culture exclusively with affective attitudes or values toward ones that see culture as a network of routines, symbols or scripts providing templates for behaviour.

The high interaction between institutions and individual comes from the notion that action is bound up with interpretation. Individuals once entitled in social action, he would simultaneously internalize the norms of the convention and reinforce it during the process of participation. “Thus, the sociological institutionalists insist that, when faced with a situation, the individual must find a way of recognizing it as well as of responding to it, and the scripts or templates implicit in the institutional world provide the means for accomplishing both of these tasks, often more or less simultaneously. The relationship between the individual and the institution, then, is built on a kind of 'practical reasoning' whereby the individual works with and reworks the available institutional templates to devise a course of action.”

Sociological institutionalism prescribes the relationship between institutions and individuals as highly interactive and mutual-constitutive from the point of social constructivism. Institutions are supposed to affect individual’s behavior through cognitive scripts, category and models provided by social life. The impact is indispensable from action since it not only guides people about what they should do, but also what they can imagine to do in a given context. From this sense social actors’ self-image and very identity is produced and sustained from the institutional forms, symbols and signs; and then the institutions managed to gradually change the preference and identity of individual.

Sociological institutionalism opens the gate of concern about the origin and change of

---

75 Lynne Zucker, 'The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence' in Powell and DiMaggio, The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis, pp. 83-107; John Meyer et al., Ontology and rationalization in the Western cultural account' in John Meyer et al., Institutional Environments and Organizations.


institutional practice. The ultimate argument sociological institutionalism takes for lies in “the logic of social appropriateness.” Different from rational institutionalism’s approach that institutions always embrace the means-end efficiency instrumentally, sociological institutionalism cater to the social legitimacy of the organization or its participants; in other words, it is sociological institutionalism’s interest to be valued within a wider cultural context appropriately.

Figure 7. The three new institutionalisms. Based on Hall and Taylor 1996.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Definition of Institution</th>
<th>Main Tenets</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Formal and informal behaviours and beliefs which are embedded in the polity’s organizational structure</td>
<td>Institutions are the main determiners of action. Past behaviors govern present and future context and action (path dependency)</td>
<td>Shows how institutions and individuals are linked, formally and informally. Allows the analysis of contestation between actors. Shows how action shapes future choices and has unintended consequences.</td>
<td>Imprecision about how exactly institutions shape behavior. Can underestimate actors' power of choice. Can focus too narrowly on structural factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational choice</td>
<td>Tool for solving policy problems created by key actors and preserved if it provides more benefits than costs.</td>
<td>Institutions allow actors to meet their self-determined aims when unilateral action is impossible.</td>
<td>Focus on actors and the instrumental use of institutions. Explains how and why institutions survive.</td>
<td>Excessive reliance on the concept of predetermined actor choices. Narrow view of what shapes behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological</td>
<td>The means by which actors interpret both their action and that of others.</td>
<td>Institutions make political action possible by providing the means by which the need for, and best course of, action is interpreted.</td>
<td>Emphasises the role of institutions as legitimisers and framers of behavior and identity.</td>
<td>Underestimates the role of contestation in politics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Theoretical Conclusion

The theoretical framework by combining debatable theories as Neorealism and Social Constructivism has raised a question of whether the international order is an issue of cooperation or of political association. To be specific, for Neorealists, the problem is to getting people to work together toward mutually beneficial ends
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like reducing violence or increasing trade, and for this reason it is sometimes known as the “cooperation problem”. For Sociologists, the problem might be called “sociological... which is creating stable patterns of behavior, whether cooperative or conflictual.” The possible scenarios may be determined by whether the political association is capable of lifting its power onto the “cooperation” agenda, materially. Therefore, here is the focus of the paper’s empirical observance on the role of EU’s Security Strategy, as well as the Military and Defence integration, upon the possible configuration of EU’s “dependable expectation of peaceful change” with the world.

Why Neo-realism is cogent here is because the constant environment of international politics is still under anarchy; and the key agent - state, would define its properties by who exerts power, influence; who defines the social meaning of reality; and who is affected by the process variation. Neorealism also states that the absence of war comes from a perspective of conflict prevention, but not with dependable expectation. Power still plays the role of drivers behind the forging of security communities, since power consist the ability of influencing policies and shaping preferences in a wider area, it inevitably form “the cores of strength around which in most cases the integrative processes developed”82. Power also defines the boundary of “we-feeling” and “conditions which confer, defer or deny access to the community and the benefits it bestows on its members”83.

In line with Neorealism, Social Constructivism concerns more with process issues instead of structure. This process is based on actors’ ideas about the nature and roles of Self and Other, and as such social structures are ‘distributions of ideas’ or ‘stocks of knowledge’. Due to the process view, it is not one-stop induction. The dialectical relations between structure and process argue for the mutual reinforcing of material and ideational structure, at different levels. Knowledge, policies, institutions, norms, shared
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81 Ibid. P. 251.
83 Ibid. P. 39.
beliefs, etc. represents the ideational structure that is indispensable with constructivism’s world. Knowledge, as shared meanings and understanding, can be taken either as epistemic communities or as capability of influence. Cognitively speaking, knowledge precedent what people practice and interact in the social fabric since there is always a mental map guiding what people can and should do under which principles or consensus. And usually shared and systemic knowledge would make the script for socialization. The connotation of ‘stable peace’ goes beyond a (long) absence of war to include the absence of expectations of war, apparently indicating that we should look at collective perceptions rather than at war statistics.\textsuperscript{85} Herein the paper focused mainly on the professional interpretation from prominent think tanks, and its role in leading to new thinking strategies and institutional matters that possibly will yield more structural cooperation.

The two trams (of anarchy and community) departing from different platforms meet in the framework of security communities. The analytical framework of Security Communities in the case of EU best incorporated both possibilities and constraints from Neorealism and Social Constructivism. By focusing more on a holistic conceptual ground of security, following the logic of community, the security of Security Communities is not variated but segmented into multi-dimensions, militarily, politically, economically, environmentally, and societally. The system security requires that power is operationalized, through highly integrated foreign policy network, to ensure realization of extensive dimensions of security. The exercise of power thus is reevaluated segmentedly in international system, and brings forward the changing perception of power relations. Hence this is how security communities imprint upon international system.

PART III EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

CHAPTER 4. A KEY MOMENTUM OF SECURITY COMMUNITY BUILDING, THE INITIATIVES FROM THE NEW CONSTITUTION

4.1 The New Constitutional Treaty
Constitution-making imports the development of political concept into the area of International Relations in terms of Europe’s backyard. A quasi-constitutional order, a sense of political community is emerging, according to Pinder, in efforts of making alliance “between neofunctionalism’s emphasis on economic and political linkages and federalism’s concern with constitutional principles and problems”\(^86\). Both incremental and constitutional federalism tell us a story of positively community building process and procedure. *Institutions matter, either as human creations to inaugurate a transnational federalist legal order, or as advocates shaping mass ideational change in favor of federation as a preferred structure of governance*\(^87\). It is in the area of external action that the draft Constitution makes the most radical changes, more by means of institutional modifications, notably in the creation of the post of Minister for Foreign Affairs, than by improvement of procedures, which will remain practically unchanged.\(^88\)

By retaining the traditional Intergovernmental decision model (unanimous consensus), to maintain the foremost commitment of obtain peace, stability and prosperity, European Elites have to sustain the rationale they originally created and brought where European Union is to be situated at present, rather community.

The new Constitution means a diffusing border of European nations, an emerging story of Europeans, and possibly a *changing identity of all Europeans*. Constitution gave name to a common mission, a common future, for all European Union Member States; and laid down a common playground for all European Union Member States, which is the

---

\(^86\) Rosamond Ben (2000). P. 44.
\(^87\) Ibid. P. 44.
coordination work by the Union on a community basis. And the Union is also entitled to be open to all European States (not only current 25 Member States) and respect all of their values and committed to promote them together.

Undoubtedly, the contemporarily most contested paradigms are given new life in the treaty, such as peace and security, sustainable development and internal market of free competition without distortion, values and interests etc. To the extent these terminologies are used and conveyed, interacted, the most vibrant inner core of political life in Europe is supposed to be unveiled.

Constitution paved the way toward a European federal state as most federalists advocated. It is also the representation of the ultimate development of supra nationalism, with the consent of Inter-governmental Committee. From legal perspectives, constitution entitled European Union a legal personality, as well as the superiority of community law over the Member States laws. It introduced a new concept for all Member States citizen, a EU citizenship.

4.2 Enabling Articles for CFSP
Constitution provided “an enabling text” for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). Administratively, constitution cancelled the structure of previous pillars and organized EU activities from legal, institutional and personnel aspects. Constitution set up a special Foreign Affairs Council, to be responsible for the foreign policy making and ensuring its consistency. A post of EU foreign minister would be set, who will be responsible both for the Union’s CFSP and coordinating external activities in the Commission as a vice president. Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) could make some decision-making easier; however the traditional and credible model of unanimity consent for CFSP should retain its supreme position (veto power of Member States). As we have seen from above institutional settings, new constitution has provided guidelines and political space for precluding the constraints on CFSP in the future.

A positive timetable of ratification is vital and necessary. Set the agenda means “to decide what subjects other people should discuss and deal with.”\(^{90}\) Once again the Member States hold a historic choice in their hands, respectively. The agenda of ratification somewhat underpins the progressing or unwillingness of conferral upon the institutions competence from national governments. Therefore relevant procedures and scheduled data compose a prospect about which direction EU will go, and raised an interesting question about how EU will cope with the reinvented reality once again, historically.

4.3 CFSP
A Union CFSP was established by Article J of the TEU in 1992, as one of the three pillars of the European Union.\(^{91}\) The Article J requires Member States to coordinate their external action and carry common positions in international affairs. Since CFSP is organized under intergovernmental mechanism, it lies outside the community framework, which means the shortage of competence (but not influence) of the community in reaching for the Union’s foreign policy. CFSP for the first time strengthened Union’s commitment to the development of joint action in foreign policy, as against the EPC, which was established in 1970, without a treaty basis, and had neither security nor defense component. Under TEU, the CFSP made a commitment to the eventual framing of a common defense policy which might in time lead to a common defense.

Under the new draft Constitution signed on Oct 29, 2004 in Rome, a Union defense identity was formally recognized under the Article I-12, Categories of competence, which conferred upon the Union the role of defining and implementing Common Foreign and Security Policy, including “the progressive framing of a common defense policy.”\(^{92}\)

As it is articulated specifically in Article I-16,

1. “The Union's competence in matters of common foreign and security policy shall

---


\(^{92}\) Ibid.
cover all areas of foreign policy and all questions relating to the Union's security, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy that might lead to a common defence.

2. Member States shall actively and unreservedly support the Union's common foreign and security policy in a spirit of loyalty and mutual solidarity and shall comply with the Union's action in this area. They shall refrain from action contrary to the Union's interests or likely to impair its effectiveness.”

In the new Constitution, the Article I-12 formally announced the termination of the overlapping function of WEU via EU and OSCE, as well as the assimilation of defence policy into the Union. The sign that over fifty years of existence of OSCE and WEU would transfer their function, explicitly, to the EU marks the boundaries of security frontier of Europe much clearer. The former complicated web of structures and facilities, and the subsequent overlapping political relations and administration, would be streamlined or simplified. Another new security order of Europe is to be established in the early 21st century (comparing to the post-cold war situation). It also is a symbol that community control over CFSP will be strengthened in the future, against the current intergovernmental cooperation. However the prospects of success of CFSP not only marks the progressing efforts of institutional interaction within and with Member States, it also overshadows the nature and direction of the European Union’s final destination. It is to this extent that CFSP became the top issue on the agenda of the Union.

A new Union CFSP definitely works against the previous hesitance and fragile political will of EU. However, substantial elements would make the future defining and implementation of the Union’s CFSP quite obscure in efficiency. Different expectation generated from different Member States around different issues would entitle distinct negotiation pattern with EU, which would prioritize some issue rather than others, or push it sooner or later. EU has a capability-expectation gap not only between political will and military power, but also between internal political transformation and external power projection. Can the apparently more powerful EU (institutions) shoulder the
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responsibility of coordinating CFSP, coherently, effectively and consistently, is an interesting question to be discussed next. Furthermore, how common would the interpretation be about the common future of EU, in the eyes of the Union’s citizens, entrepreneurs, political elites in EU-making, and the third party roles in the world?

4.4 ESDP
The historical curve of European defence is closely revolving around the end of second world war and the cold war. Although since 1970s, EPC handled some coordination European foreign policy, EU as an economic organization, has not incorporated defence issues into its agenda. The end of cold war, the Petersberg Declaration in 1992, especially the Helsinki Summit in 1999, which raised and settled the issue of ESDP, denoted a significant turn of EU from a civil power to military power.94

Petersburg Conference, held by the Council of WEU in June 1992, set out the new mission for WEU in the post cold war era. The Petersburg Tasks include: implement humanitarian tasks within the framework of UN Security Council and OSCE; crisis management and peace keeping; establish peace in conflict area when necessary. That same European Council decided that "the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises without prejudice to actions by NATO"95. A Euro-Corp of over 50,000 soldiers from WEU member states was established under the initiatives of France and Germany. And subsequent elementary facilities in military competence and supervision agencies were set up, such as various working groups, planning units etc. WEU also established Institute of Security Studies (ISS) in Paris.96

At the same time NATO also adjusted its role and tried to heal the identity crisis due to the post cold war situation. NATO raised famous European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) in 1994, Brussels. According to the definition of NATO, ESDI was an internal
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pillar of NATO; WEU was entitled new role through the construction of ESDI. A Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) was established to implement military missions led by the West European Union (WEU) in a way of borrowing. NATO practically possessed the properties and facilities and had the right of information and authorization. WEU in such condition became the strong arm, as well as a coordinator, of both EU and NATO.97

Following St. Marlo meeting of France and Britain in 1998 and the Kelong Summit in 1999, two important statements were issued: statement on European Defence Issues, Declaration on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence. In the year end Helsinki Summit, European Union set out the action plan to establish a rapid reaction troop of 60000 soldiers capable of being deployed within 60 days and maintaining over 1 year of military action. The militarization of action plan marked the birth of the ESDP out of the CFSP. The steps forward are still small, but the change is enormous; the focus would be within EU instead of NATO; however, partially strengthening Defence identity within NATO.98

European Security and Defense Policy has opened an edge for the mild, complexedly coordinated Common Foreign and Security Policy. Usually viewed as a soft power, ESDP is designed with the purpose of extending ‘a strong arm’ for EU to cope with international conflict management and peacekeeping tasks. The unfolding of ESDP unraveled unprecedented and unexpected problems from various level of actors and sectors, such as the evolving independent actors of EU, the redefining of the EU & NATO relations, and even the future global security order.

97 Ibid
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CHAPTER 5: POWER AND SECURITY IN THE ENVIRONMENT OF EU

This chapter sets the stage by discussing the concepts of security, and power with reference to EU. The authors elaborated the two concepts in detail here and their linkage to the EU’s future role of EU in the international affairs. They then discussed the impact of new constitution and CFSP process and its implications in consolidating EU as a major power block. The next chapter will present a discussion on the scenarios as perceived by think thanks.

5.1 Security

Both John Hertz and Arnold Wolfers represented the traditional thinking from national security perspectives. Hertz made the idea of “security dilemma” in the early 1950s, which emphasized the principle of states rather than international system, and it inevitably led to the dilemma. Wolfers similarly held that “the ambiguity of security as a concept” and thus “unlikely proved it to be a broad concept to interpreting the field.”

According to Wolfers, security is a value “of which a nation can have more or less and which it can aspire to have in greater or lesser measure.”

However writers during the same period as Wolfers, Bernard Brodie held different view. He cited as an example a statement by Jacob L. Devers: “National Security is a condition which cannot be quantified. We shall either be secure, or we shall be insecure. We cannot have partial security. If we are only half secure, we are not secure at all.”

Knorr also noted that a conceptual uneasiness is caused by the approach of degree on security. Buzan also points out the alike puzzle: “The word itself implies an absolute condition – something is either secure or insecure – and does not lend itself to the idea of a graded spectrum like that which fills the space between hot and cold.”

It is note-worthy that for a country that has or seeks for security, absolute security is

99 Baldwin. P. 110.
100 Ibid. P. 110
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unattainable. As Herbert Simon notes, “the attainment of objectives is always a matter of degree.”

Therefore, the degree we achieve our objectives should be entailed by the way we perceive it, subjectively. As Wolfers noted that, security can be approached both objectively (there is a real threat) and subjectively (there is a perceived threat) and that nothing ensures these two approaches will line up. It is impossible to predict the future of international system. A zero-sum security represents a secure superpower at the center with the rest insecure peripheries around. And it is hard to determine whether they are good, or bad neighbors. And stability and prosperity in neighborhood is the expectation.

5.2 Power
As Rosenau pointed out, efforts to control and influence, to exercise power on behalf of goals, evolve in a relations context. Power, unlike control, cannot be used as a verb. Hence, we intend to feel it from the exercising of it. Power is defined as “the ability to make people (or things) do what they would not otherwise have done. In relative terms “A is said to have power over the behaviour of B if:

1) A has effects on B’s choices and actions.
2) A has the capacity to move B’s choices and actions in ways that A intends.
3) A has the capacity to override opposition from B.
4) The relationship between A and B described by propositions 1,2, and 3 is part of a social structure (not necessarily the social structure) and has a tendency to persist.”

It is noteworthy to infer here that power of possession (resources) won’t turn out to be effective until it is shifted from capabilities to durable tendencies. Hence capabilities (or capacities) are used here to mean possessional side of power, and control to the relational side. With respect to any situation, issue, or problem, boredom is bound to set in if analysis does not turn soon from capabilities to relationships. Therefore it is of more interest to assess the responses externally rather than totting up internal possessions. EU is a global power in the sense that it is compared and assessed in the global climate by the
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concerns of how and why EU responds (or not) to global affairs, effectively.

**a) What constitutes Power?**

Power is often classified into five principal forms: force, persuasion, authority, coersion, and manipulation. Namely this is the hard power. Parallelly, influence is a term which is interrelated with soft power. Influence can be defined in many different ways such as “a power to affect persons or events especially power based on prestige etc”. It can also be defined as “causing something without any direct or apparent effort”. Furthermore it can also be regarded as “a cognitive factor that tends to have an effect on what you do”. It can also imply “the effect of one thing (or person) on another”.

Nowadays we are presented with emerging synthesis of both “hard power” and “soft power”. Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, globalization of commerce, finance, democracy and information technology has denoted a significant turn of thinking as to the boundary problem of hard & soft power, as well as the channels of transmitting them. Power in a global information age is distributed among countries in a pattern that resembles a complex three-dimensional chess game. This chess game elaborates that:

- Military power on the top is largely uni-polar with the US’s global military capability;
- On the middle chessboard, economic power is multi-polar, with the US, Europe and Japan representing two-thirds of world product, and with China’s dramatic growth likely to make it the fourth big player;
- The bottom chessboard is the realm of transnational relations that cross borders outside government control. This realm includes actors as diverse as bankers electronically transferring sums larger than most national budgets at one extreme, and terrorists transferring weapons or hackers disrupting Internet operations at the other.
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In such a three-dimensional new power model, intensified interdependence in various issues on a newly formatted agenda of world affairs is a must. Today there is a much bigger payoff in “getting others to want what you want”, and that has to do with cultural attraction and ideology, along with agenda-setting and economic incentives for cooperation.\textsuperscript{116} Furthermore, the globalization and information revolution is transforming and shrinking the world. More and more things are falling outside the control of the even most powerful state. Military power is essential to maintain global stability, but it cannot produce the outcomes we want on many issues that matter to the prosperity and safety. And this is the reason why no single actor can go alone in the war against terrorism.

b) Between Power and Influence

There is a thin line of demarcation between Power and Influence. “Power is the force you use to make things happen in an intended way. Whereas influence is what you have when you exercise power, and is expressed by others' behavioral response to your exercise of power.”\textsuperscript{117} In other words, power is cause, influence is effect.\textsuperscript{118} Power and influence more likely present to be the two building blocks of political goals, whatever it might be, there could be various usage of power and influence that attribute and reflect the contingency of time and space, which might affect when, how, and what matters most to the formation of a political unit.

According to E. M. Forster: Howard’s End, “Don’t ask for power. Seek influence. It lasts longer.”\textsuperscript{119} Hence the international horizon up to the year 2020 will be a game of power and influence. Whichever country / entity is able to combine these two factors in an effective way, it will thus be able to generate the effects that, lead the international system and generate considerable fellowship, alliance and support bases. Hence in case of EU a security community concept will give it a more structural form.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid. P.99.
\textsuperscript{117} Schemerhorn, Organizational Behavior, 2000
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid.
Alternatively another general belief is that, future is of ‘cooperative multilateralism’ – a power system which is marked by zero sum game amongst all major players of the international system.\textsuperscript{120} It would be interesting to note EU’s role in this aspect.

5.3 Multilateral Organizations as example of security community
It is particularly perceived that multilateralism depicts the mood of the 21st century. Multilateralism is “an approach to international trade, the monetary system, international disarmament and security, or the environment, based on the idea that if international cooperative regimes for the management of conflicts of interest are to be effective, they must represent a broad and sustainable consensus among the states of the international system. Multilateralism therefore lends itself to issues where clear common interests in the international community are identifiable. It should be thought of in contrast to strictly unilateral or bilateral initiatives”\textsuperscript{121}. This is also like a security community in a mature anarchic international structure. From security communities perspectives multilateralism is a type of architecture that “reflects the high degree of trust present in the relationship and that common interests are handled through common and consensual mechanisms that automatically incorporate the interests of all members”\textsuperscript{122}. From realist tradition multilateralism has “a tendency for functional aspects of international relations to be organized around large numbers of states, or universally, rather than by unilateral state action”.\textsuperscript{123}

Another interesting point raised by the thesis is about whether the regional security community can form a preliminary stage for mature anarchy that is characterized by multilateralism. Or if the cooperation problem between powers avail more or less fear to their categorized interests to build up common security.

5.4 Foreign Policy and Security Community
There are three parameters for thinking that foreign policy roles may be a bit more structural phenomenon than is often assumed. Briefly introducing, firstly, they are the equal recognition of state sovereignty in terms of substantial rights and obligations; secondly, they privilege the materialist understanding of structure over a cultural one, for example the friend has been as much weighted as enemy; thirdly, the level of interdependence (Wendt calls intimacy) of Self and Other. It should be cautious of the intervening parameters of role so as to appropriately understand that when “those parameters are breached, or absent to start with, then role identities are contested.”124

There is a gap between what the project is studying on EU foreign policy and the Member States foreign policy in terms of EU’s impact in world politics. This means there is a gap to use Neorealism to analyze EU’s role. The assumption of neorealism’s security-seeking (as states’ primary end for survival) says nothing about states’ relations toward each other as they think about their security, however, and as such is logically compatible with a collective rather than competitive security system.125 The outcome of national foreign policy is mostly conditioned by international structure, however not decided to every detail. This deduction produced embryonic margin to continue with a variety of reflexive discussion as suggested by constructivism.

5.5 Security community and Volatile Situation Internationally
The international arena is marked by volatility. According to Nye126, the international security situation in the post-cold war period presents to be uncertain in there aspects: firstly, it marks a uncertain transformation period without any single military resistance or post war negotiation; secondly, the decline and changing speed of technology, economy, culture is accelerating; thirdly, root causes of conflict in the future may not be the same as the cold war which ended 15 years ago. And the most recent turn of 9.11 event marks a stunting point that demands serious reconsideration of the root causes of and the possible means leading to resolutions, of future conflicts.

---
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5.5.1 The need to share global responsibility of peace, security and development.
Genocides, state failures, terrorism, proliferation of WMDs, cross-border conflicts and intra-border instability have undermined the credibility of international system. The notion of pre-emptive strike is being wrongly used by nations without approval of UN as was the case in Iraq. This has led to a dire need for emergence of a power which is capable enough so as to augment the prevailing multilateral system and which is politically, economically and militarily strong enough so as to have a genuine influence in international affairs. In this regard, all eyes are set on EU. However Iraq war, war against Afghanistan, Palestine problem, crisis in Balkans and Rwanda and slow response of EU to handle these situations have undermined its credibility in this respect.

5.5.2 Iraq War Split
Recent Iraq war split within the EU also indicated that EU needs to unify in terms of its security policy and must strengthen its security community. There was a division amongst the member states for contributing troops to Operation Enduring Freedom. Hence in this regard, EU must ensure that it avoids future splits within the members as it would be detrimental to the Union and handles all defense and security related issue with one voice. The following table depicts favorability viewpoint regarding US-led war on Iraq without seeking UN Security Council approval. The following table depicts some EU-member countries’ position on Iraq within a span of one year.
Figure 8 Country’s decision about use of Force in Iraq war

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The “Willing”</th>
<th></th>
<th>The “Unwilling”</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Mar 2004</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Mar 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Wrong</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3 Crisis in The Balkans
In the Balkans crisis, EU failed to rely on its own networks and had to rely on NATO facilities to defend a territory within Europe. Defending a territory within Europe is primarily a responsibility of the EU. However because of the division within the Members States and due to lack of proper readiness level, EU failed to respond timely and intervened only when US took the leadership.

5.6 Security council/UN Reforms
There has been growing emphasis on reforms for the UN in general and of Security Council in particular. The High Level Panel of Eminent Personnel has already delivered its report to the General Assembly and on its basis a future course of direction will be determined. In this regard, a Franco-German initiative has been taken in which has called for an increase in the number of seats in the membership of the Security Council, both in the Permanent and Non-permanent categories. In this regard, Germany, Japan, India, Brazil, two seats from Africa on rotatory basis are being tipped for Permanent Membership in the SC.

---
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Furthermore, it has also been suggested that EU as a community should also be represented in the permanent members of the SC. Also seat for eastern European states is being highly demanded. 129 In this scenario, it is anticipated that EU and its member countries will get more seats in the permanent and non-permanent members of the SC. This will ensure that EU has a greater say in global power politics, from a security perspective. The General Assembly and the Security Council expect this decision in the near future subjected to endorsement.

5.7 Changing Perceptions of US
EU and US share cooperability on major international forums. “(I)t is still a fact that the peoples of the United States of America have much in common with the peoples of Europe - shared ancestry and shared cultural, legal and philosophical traditions.”130 “It is in the long-term interest of both the United States of America and the European Union to draw ever closer and co-operate.”131

However, the perception of the general public is somewhat different. According to survey carried out under Pew Global Attitudes Project, around 5,500 people were interviewed in USA and eight other countries from March 10-17, 2003.132 And their opinions have been tabulated in the following table.

129 Based on author’s observation during General Assembly and Security Council sessions at UN from September 2004 to December 2004.
131 Ibid.
“The poll finds strong support for the idea that Western Europe should take a more independent approach to security and diplomatic affairs. Majorities in four of five Western European countries surveyed hold this opinion, and a 48% plurality in Great Britain agrees. In the U.S., by contrast, 62% believe diplomatic and security ties with Western Europe should remain as close as they have been.” 134

Furthermore, the image of the US in the eyes of the general public has gone down as reflected in the following table.

From the above tables we analyze that there has been decline in favorability perceptions of US. Furthermore, strengths and requirements of Trans-Atlantic relations are being re-analyzed. Thus the international system has a gap for another super power that is capable enough to handle international requirements of peace, development and security. In this
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context we shall evaluate the possibility of EU to fulfill that role and what scenarios it is most likely to phase to be perceived as a capable entity with sufficient power and influence. This is presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 6 FUTURE SCENARIOS OF EU PERCEIVED BY THINK TANKS

What distinguishes postmodern methods from modernist or positivist methods is that modern methods limit inquiry to prediction and control, while postmodern methods extend inquiry to policy and evaluation. (J.W. Lacey, 1996) \(^\text{136}\)

Scenarios are powerful planning tools that present alternative images of the world rather than projecting prevalent trends and factors and assist in decision making process. \(^\text{137}\) Scenario method is the technique which not only extrapolates and projects existing trends of key drivers but it also identifies and presents situations wherein key drivers may not be able to continue with their existing growth rates. It identifies unrealistic and extreme situations that are likely to be confronted by an entity strategically. Hence it is a planning tool that helps decision makers in preparing themselves better for the uncertain future and the eventualities during policy making and policy change.

6.1 Think tank, scenarios and theoretical framework

The link between think tanks, scenarios and the theories of security communities reflect the evolving process of social learning, which is crucial for the diffusion of collective identities. It was discussed in this section about how think tanks, as typical form of epistemic communities, in which phase, coordinate the security policy evolution of EU. Think tanks compose important part of social structure by possessing and transmitting systemic knowledge. Policy coordination is, ultimately, based on consent and mutual expectations. \(^\text{138}\) Policy coordination is a technique used to develop light cooperation and coordination in order to make the case for direct policy powers. \(^\text{139}\) The section identified

---


three aspects of policy coordination in the sector of security: agenda-setting, think tanks and policy network.

6.1.1 Agenda-setting

Conventional accounts of how public policies are made divide the process into essentially three phases: policy proposals; policy decision; and policy implementation. Also, the main stages of policy making are: problem recognition and issue identification; agenda setting; policy formulation; policy adoption; policy implementation; policy evaluation. It is clearer to see table below to elaborate the interrelations between the two approaches:

Herein we focus on the agenda-setting stage of the Union Foreign Policy. Agendas are shaped on the basis of shared knowledge and the power and bargaining dynamics of vested interests. Agenda setting means deciding what things to do for others. Stone Diane conceptualized agenda setting as three largely unrelated streams:

- A policy stream, which refers to policy communities of advocates, researchers and other specialists that analyze problems and propose solutions;
- A problem stream, which consists of information about “real world” problems and feedback from past government policies;
- A political stream that includes turnover of key administrators and legislators, and ideological contests among political parties.

Government normally holds the political and problem streams on the agenda. When issues rise and fall on the agenda, changes in the political or problem streams will offer an opportunity to rejoin or unite the three streams together. In other words, policy is always attached to problems.

---
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6.1.2 Think Tanks
Think tanks pay pivotal attribute to ideas, expertise, and knowledge. They generate new ideas, produce analysis and structure debate. They are “organizations which seek to assist in the strategic coordination of government policies, establish relative priorities, offer new policy choices, and ensure that the implications of policy options are considered.”\textsuperscript{145} Therefore think tank has a technocratic role in self-defining the context or framing political problems onto the agenda of foreign policy making.

Think tank actually is also a significant actor in international coordination in terms of policy evolution: namely, \textit{policy innovation}, \textit{policy diffusion}, \textit{policy selection}, and \textit{policy persistence}.\textsuperscript{146} Due to the involvement of independent techniques and specialist, think tank mainly influence the first two phases of evolution: that is policy innovation and policy diffusion. During the phase of policy innovation, think tanks exert influence by:

1. \textit{Framing the range of political controversy surrounding an issue;}
2. \textit{Defining state interests,}
3. \textit{Setting standards.}\textsuperscript{147}

And usually it is the government that holds authority in the last two phases of policy selection and policy persistence.

In European context, policy coordination served as a mechanism of transition from

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Wallace & Theodoulou \\
\hline
Policy Proposal & Issue identification \\
& \textbf{Agenda setting} \\
& Policy formulation \\
Policy decision & Policy adoption \\
Policy implementation & Policy implementation \\
----- & Policy evaluation \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
nationally rooted policy-making to a collective regime.\textsuperscript{148} Hence the way that think tank transmitting and turning ideas into proposals connect national and supranational level of socialization process, which is vital for policy innovation in the EU.

\textbf{6.1.3 Policy network}

The framework of foreign policy analysis is complementary with policy network - "venues for the pooling or exchange of information and resources."\textsuperscript{149} Epistemic communities (with most important form as think tanks), as well as issue networks, advocacy coalition, or policy communities, all refer to different kinds of "policy network". However, policy network aims to explain the continuity of policy making through identifying the range of actors involved with relevant motivation and interests. In this regards, think tanks or epistemic communities can be seen as a floating indicator of the stability of policy network, since think tanks are the agents of innovation.

John Peterson describes a policy network as "\textit{an arena for the mediation of the interests of government and interest groups.}"\textsuperscript{150} Policy network may include interest groups, think tanks, researchers, journalists, universities, educational agencies, consultants, as well as government officials, ministers, parliamentarians, etc. This group of actors may not necessarily hold shared principled beliefs or validity tests.\textsuperscript{151}

The term ‘network’ implies that clusters of actors representing multiple organizations interact with one another and share information and resources. ‘\textit{Mediation}’ implies that the networks usually are settings for the playing of positive sum games: they facilitate reconciliation, settlement or compromise between different interests that have a stake in outcomes in a particular policy sector.\textsuperscript{152}

Given the multinational, multi lingual and multi-level policy networks of EU, think tanks from across national boarders emerge as a focal point of theories, doctrines which begin to wield influence on the policy agenda during the deepening and widening process of EU.

Although with limited and indirect influence upon the climate of opinions and formed
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only as forum for debate or developing medium-long-term ideas, think tanks bring out their influence from “three interrelated sources: authority based on expertise, promotion of an independent balance view, and recognized legitimacy out of academic authority”\textsuperscript{153}. Based on different political infrastructure, both Europe and the United States has long, however different traditions of coalition from think tanks, and differently focused think tanks packaged and promoted different formulation of ideas onto the political agenda serving the divined national interests.

\textbf{6.2 CIA Scenarios}

CIA under the auspices of the National Intelligence Council (NIC) conducted a scenario analysis in 2000 in which scenarios were developed by interviewing various non-governmental experts. That study had a more global focus that was later extended on each region. It identified key drivers that will affect the globe by the year 2015 and hence came up with four scenarios of the world:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Inclusive globalization (comprehensive)
\item Pernicious globalization (destructive)
\item Regional competition.
\item Post-polar world.\textsuperscript{154}
\end{enumerate}

The above stated scenarios are based on the following six key drivers which will shape the globe in the period up to 2015:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Population
\item Resources
\item Technology
\item Economy
\item Identity and governance
\item Conflict.\textsuperscript{155}
\end{enumerate}


\textsuperscript{155} Ibid
To facilitate understanding, this portion focuses primarily on **conflict** (point 6) as it is mainly covered under CFSP and the security community’s framework that has been used in the thesis. Other factors (from point 1-5) will however be touched slightly.

According to the US perspective, “Europe’s agenda will require it to demonstrate influence in world affairs commensurate with its size in population and economic growth. The EU’s global reach will be based primarily on economics: robust trade and investment links to the United States and growing ties to East and Southeast Asia and Latin America”. 156

According to US, “Europe will not achieve fully the dreams of parity with the United States as a **shaper of the global economic system**”. “Many Europeans will see the role of foreign policy as protecting their social and cultural identities from the excesses of globalization – and from its “super-patron”, the United States. One of the ways in which leaders will respond will be to clamor for greater political control over international financial and trade institutions.” 157 This thinking however reflects a different paradigm altogether as US doesn’t view EU as a potential military power block for next couple of years.

From US perspective, up to 2015 EU will primarily focus on institutional reform and for further consolidating its Europeanization program. Thus as explained by the security community school of thought, EU will develop its security community in different spheres.

However EU intends to play a more dominating role in the global politics by consolidating its regional focus through greater vertical, horizontal and deeper integration. In this context, CFSP will play a significant role. Whereas bringing the Union closer through constitution and CFSP will enable EU to develop security communities in different spheres. However as per neo-realist stance EU’s member nations will promote

---
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self-interests and their own individual strategic calculations that may dilute the impact of a unified Europe.

Constructivism that tends to facilitate empowerment of institutions so that all nations meaningfully gain from their interaction, will still try to bring member nations together thus facilitating the community concept.

6.3 EU Scenarios
EU think tank ISS has developed the following five scenarios that it feels EU will most likely be confronted with:

1. Large-scale peacekeeping.
2. Humanitarian intervention
3. Regional warfare to protect strategic interests
4. Counter terrorism
5. Homeland defense.\textsuperscript{158}

Key assumptions
While drawing scenarios a researcher has to determine the key driving factors and then work out various permutations and combinations of the constants and variables involved in a situation. In this study, we have come up with the following assumptions so as to have a focused scale and scope of the thesis and these are based on NIC study.\textsuperscript{159}

- World’s population\textsuperscript{160} will increase by around 1 billion by 2015 thereby posing an increase in global legal and illegal immigrants movement to areas of greater economic benefit.
- World’s resources,\textsuperscript{161} environment and energy reservoirs will show a declining trend-fostering quest for alternative sources and greater efforts at the multilateral and regional level for sustainable development.


\textsuperscript{160} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid.
• Greater development in the fields of science and technology, particularly in IT in all developed and emerging economies leading to greater north-south gap and posing greater gap with the developing, least developed and low income countries.

• Global economic situation may improve in developed countries due to greater benefits of globalization, trade liberalization, greater integration, information diffusion and greater developments in the field of science, technology etc and greater investments in capital-intensive projects.

• Because of increased globalization, there will be greater emphasis on good governance, promotion of better practices, transparency, greater adherence to values/identity, human rights, gender mainstreaming, greater participation of the all sectors of the community in the socio-political and economic development process.

• Because of inter-state and intra-state conflict, emergence of non-state actors, terrorism, state-failure, greater north-south gap, greater feelings of deprivation and injustice, inability of multilateral organizations to do justice with underprivileged, economically backward, conflict ridden and affected areas of the world, proliferation of WMDs, etc., the likelihood of conflict will increase in the coming years up to 2015. This would require greater role of the nation states to defend their strategic interests but also to secure their territory. They will have greater role to play at the national, regional and multilateral level, in peacekeeping operations (PKOs) and peace support operations (PSOs) sustaining operation, humanitarian intervention etc.

For the sake of simplicity of the study and because of the word constraint, we shall dwell on the last point that is increased conflict in the globe and the build up of EU
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scenarios in that context. We will assume that these 6 factors will remain constant in accordance with the criteria mentioned above. However the world will witness variation in pace of globalization that varies in each of the four scenarios, thereby promoting different responses on part EU.

**Two Alternative Scenarios**

The following section presents a general comparison between EU and US scenarios by focusing on the pace of globalization as according to the CIA scenarios:

A. Inclusive globalization

B. Post-polar world.

**Time period**

Time period from 2004 till 2020 (after post enlargement period) has been selected as the basis of our analysis. This period has been selected as Turkey’s fate as well as fate of other applicant countries will also be decided. EU will have greater intra-regional stability and enlargement process will get consolidation.

**6.3.1 When globalization is moving on at an increased pace (inclusive globalization)**

When globalization is taking place at an increased pace, all major drivers will have a consequent impact on national / regional / global scenarios. Population, resources, technology, economy, values, identity &governance, and conflict will have a significant impact on EU from the perspective of security community. Europe’s demographic balance which is on a declining trend presently, such a shortfall will be balanced through enlargement. Consequently, it will also entail greater influx of immigrants and asylum seekers who will endeavor to reap the benefits of a better economy of Europe. Hence EU will have to have stricter controls on labor mobility.

Labor mobility will also result in influx of menaces such as terrorism, HIV / AIDS/ environmental issues, law and order problems. Furthermore because of globalization, there will be an increase in the north – south gap which will result in a greater feeling of
discontent in the under developed areas. Class differences, corruption will result in intra-state conflict leading to further pressures on EU borders. Consequently homeland defense and security will play a pivotal role in easing the pressure.

**Map Of UN Peacekeeping Operations**

The table mentioned below shows the major peacekeeping operations of the UN. Such operations are expected to continue for a few more years and the same areas or adjoining areas will most likely serve as theaters of future theaters of conflict.

According to US perspective, the occurrence of an event entailing a power conflict may be unlikely as economic interests will be the key factors for state involvement in political affairs of another state. Hence most of the period covered under inclusive globalization will entail non-military intervention by great powers in the affairs of another state. 169

However EU foresees its military role even in the period of inclusive globalization. Such a role will be determined as to how US responds back to a given conflict. Such a role will be marked under the following scenarios.

**Figure 12 Map of UN Peacekeeping Operations** 170

---


1) Large scale peace keeping operations:171

According to the EU’s perspective, “Europe’s aim here is to be able to assemble and, if politically appropriate, to lead a multidimensional peace support operation in a complex environment, where under chapter VI or VII of the UN Charter, without a priori restrictions in terms of geographical location.”172 Peace support operations (PSOs) will emerge in the next 10-20 years as the consequence of the widespread collapse of states.173

These operations will be further based on making the country / territory ready for civilian administration and for post-conflict reconstruction. Such a force may be formed under a UN, NATO, or EU umbrella. Such operations require adequate training of forces, troops mobilization at short notices, logistics and appropriate equipment in accordance with the geographical terrain and potentials of the warring groups in the hostile territory.174

Such operations are likely to emerge in Africa, Middle East or Asia. It appears difficult to appear in Balkans or in the immediate neighborhood of Europe. However EU has a responsibility to ensure that no conflict takes place on the European soil, like the tragedy of Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.175

If EU troops are deployed outside the European borders, it will be under the auspices of UN forces or of allies as was the case in Iraq (although EU troops in totality were not represented.). It will need to have greater economic interests in such operations or may need to participate in peacekeeping operations with even greater political will. All these factors will have to be driven by a willingness of the EU member states, making enhanced defense contributions, getting necessary public mandate.176
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of the operations (PSOs), legitimization through the UN Security Council will tend to be both required and obtainable. The basic issue for the EU will tend to be of a pragmatic nature: which PSOs to enter into, in view of competing claims on European military, political and financial resources.”\(^{177}\) Furthermore such operations will be governed under the Petersburg task. \(^{178}\)

Such operations may require EU to draw on NATO assets and will be more successful if they also utilize EU’s soft skills such as appropriate institutional framework for negotiations, infrastructure and past experience in preventive diplomacy as well as for performing civil stabilization operations. \(^{179}\)

**US position:**
According to US perspective, EU will have a more inward outlook thereby it will strengthen its integration. However in dealing with matters outside the region, European leaders will demonstrate their global responsibility by giving greater emphasis on institution and legal procedures, preventive diplomacy. EU will occasionally respond to international crisis situations either through coalitions with allies under US, or under UN supervision. However they will refrain from committing troops overseas. Furthermore by 2015, NATO’s acceptance of some Central and Eastern European countries, EU’s CFSP will be established to augment NATO rather then to serve as a replacement. \(^{180}\)

Thus it appears that the US is viewing the scenario by foreseeing a rather submissive role of EU in the coming years while EU foresees a greater role in global peace keeping.

2) Humanitarian intervention\(^{181}\):
According to the EU perspective, in situations involving state failure, as was the case in
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Rwanda, Kosovo, Bosnia, - the chances of occurrences of such catastrophe are increasing. Such situations also pose a sizeable threat to EU citizens. However intervention in such situations requires a political justification. Such interventions are also covered under Petersburg task.\footnote{Ibid p-77}

Kosovo, and Bosnia are the cases in which EU response was slow. This could be attributable to the fact of a lack of a political coherence on vital security and defense matters, inadequate state of conflict anticipation because of reluctant intelligence sharing and slow speed of intervention owing to limited sea – and airlift capabilities.\footnote{Ibid p-80} This shows that the security community building process being pursued by EU countries still has a long way to go.

However according to the US perspective, EU will lack the political will to commit troops abroad singularly and would rather do it under NATO / UN backing.\footnote{[Internet]. National Intelligence Council (NIC) Report. “Global Trends 2015: A dialogue about the future with nongovernmental experts”. December 2000. Retrieved from http://www.cia.gov/cia/reports/globaltrends2015 on 26-10-2004. p-76.} Madeline Albright, former US Secretary of State, while mentioning about EU-NATO partnership, once stated that EU’s defence buildup should be devoid of 3Ds i.e. no decoupling, no duplication, no discrimination.\footnote{[Internet]. Lutz Streibel Moving at Light Speed on a winding Road? – The European Security and Defence Policy. Retrieved from www.zens.uni-goettingen.de/ euroculture/ip/Goettingen/LutzStreibel.pdf - Supplemental Result on. 5-11-04} Hence there is a difference in the way US views EU’s humanitarian intervention role. At one point it wants EU to take on its responsibility of preserving defence of Europe while on the other hand, it wants a no-breakup in Trans-Atlantic alliance.


According to the EU perspective, future regional warfares beyond European borders will take place in instances when:
strategic (economic and security) interests of EU are under a direct threat, such as energy sources in the Middle East, any obstruction in trade routes concerning EU, any situation across borders which results in migration/influx of people to the EU. \textsuperscript{187}

It will also depend upon what implications such a regional conflict will have on US-EU relations. \textsuperscript{188} The same was also reflected in a non-unified stance of the EU in the recent Iraq crises. Whereas EU has European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF), it is most likely to intervene on its own only in situations wherein US shows a lack of interest in an armed conflict as was the case in the Balkans or if such an intervention can be strategically justified.

As far as point 1) is concerned, it is also “in concurrence with the Treaty on the European Union, Title V, Article 11, i.e. ‘to safeguard the fundamental interests and independence of the Union, in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter’.\textsuperscript{189}

Such a trans-regional military expedition requires greater adherence to logistics, training of troops in a different environment altogether and with greater requirement of power projection. However equally important is the impact of such a conflict on EU-US relations. Operation Desert Storm, and Operation Enduring freedom are the examples in this regard wherein EU members in their individual capacities were restricted to the role of mere bystanders while US took the lead.

Whereas strategically such an operation requires a greater resource commitment by the EU in R&D, operations, and supply chain management, it equally entails member states to show a greater political will and public opinion in support of such operations. It also requires greater contribution to the overall defense budget of the EU, in addition to their own individual defense budgets. The current budget, being managed by Javier Solana is “26 billion euros budget (formerly reserved for the Commissioner of External Affairs)”.\textsuperscript{190} Such conflicts are most likely to occur in Middle East, Africa and Asia.
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However according to the US perspective, owing to the geo-strategic position of Turkey, it will serve as a determinant of EU and US relations and the extent of future strategic collaborations. Turkey is a candidate country for the EU, however its fate is not so certain. As Turkey is in close proximity to Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia, and Middle East hence its partnership with EU and NATO will be a major factor in identifying response to future avenues of conflict. 191

EU has showed a keen interest in resolving crises in the Middle East by particularly participating in the Palestinian - Israeli peace process under the supervision of the quartet. While US has reserved for itself a more dominant role in the development of bilateral negotiations, Europe has transformed itself into a multilateral role which entails participation of all stake holders. 192

As far as defense of strategic interests is concerned, it is observed that EU and US have often exhibited a complimentarity of interest. This is with particular reference to the vast oil resources of the Middle East. However, there is likelihood that if strategic interests are threatened, US and EU will collaborate with each other.

4) Counter Terrorism / Prevention Of An Attack Involving WMDs: 193
“Following the 11 March 2004 terrorist attacks in Madrid, the European Council declaration on combating terrorism reaffirmed ‘the political commitment…to act jointly against terrorist acts, in the spirit of the Solidarity Clause contained in Article 42 of the draft Constitution for Europe’.” 194 This entails preserving all strategic interests located within and outside the Union from potential attacks of terrorists / who are non-state actors.
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This requires greater intelligence sharing amongst the member states, better policing abilities and counter terrorism measures. Furthermore, proliferation of WMDs will also pose as a serious threat. In this regard, EU may also participate in activities that entail regime change against potential adversaries. This can be in a situation where a state is harboring terrorists against EU’s strategic interests, such as in Iraq and Afghanistan.

While “terrorism and proliferation of WMDs poses as a serious threat to US interests”, it may mobilize alliance of collaborating countries (with or without UN backing )to counter any such threats to US interests. US in this regard may also carryout pre-emptive strikes against potential terrorist nations and consequently other nations may also team up in order to fulfill their strategic interests / obligations.

From the European perspective, acts of terrorism and the potential of non-state actors getting hold of WMDs, pose a serious threat. At Laeken in December 2001, the European Council realized that through Crisis Management System of EU and under the provisions of the CFSP, EU should be able to safeguard its interests and its population against threats posed by WMDs and terrorist acts.

Hence in this regard, it can be observed that EU is building up measures to prevent any terrorist act by building up legal instruments with potential nations, engaging them in meaningful dialogue, and in developing international regimes. Recently Britain France and Germany held talks with Iran on its nuclear issue. Although so far no agreement has been reached, however EU has shown that it wants an assurance by Iran that it will not enrich Uranium for purposes other then power generation. US on the other hand is more interested in the use of sanctions and force to prevent WMDs proliferation and can even carryout a pre-emptive strike in order to prevent any repetition of an attack as that of the
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magnitude of September 11, 2001.\textsuperscript{198}

5) Homeland defense:\textsuperscript{199}

According to the US perspective, EU will not face any major threat to its territorial integrity because of wider, deeper and horizontal expansion. However it may have to engage Russia in diplomatic dialogue so as to contain it, while increase the pressure on towards expansion of EU towards the Caucuses.\textsuperscript{200}

However EU has worked out the scenarios fearing attacks from countries outside of EU and from terrorist attacks from within the Union. Defense of the Union against any form of act of aggression is covered under the Solidarity Clause of the Draft Constitution of the EU. Under such a situation attack on one member state will be deemed as an attack on the sovereignty and collective identity of the EU and will lead to pooling of resources and assets by member states to defend the territory.\textsuperscript{201}

As per our understanding this scenario is the one which will enable EU to have completely independent forces, devoid of any backing from NATO / USA. Furthermore this scenario entails greater degree of: proactivity, vigilance and intelligence sharing and for adherence to latest standards of spying through satellites. EU’s decision to invest in Galileo space project is a decision with this aim in mind.

\textbf{6.3.2 Post-Polar World}

This scenario reflects extremity of negative effects of globalization. It is marked by growing discontent amongst the under-privileged of the society, greater north-south gap, enhanced trade war amongst various nations, growing terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, immherence of multi-polar system, declining influence of the US,


greater regionalization in the world resulting in the formation of more and more regional powers, dilution of US influence and the decline of US backed international institutions, state failure, religious extremism, intra-state conflict owing to ethnic clashes. Such a situation will lead to a total failure of the international system. This is based on the study conducted by the NIC under auspices of CIA in 2000 and primarily reflects a probable US pessimistic view of the world by 2015. 202

It is marked by emergence of powers such as China, India and their desire to extend their economic and military influence, geo-strategic shifts of priorities of US and EU, changes in the economic progress of Japan, its militarization, possible unification of North and South Korea, a volatile Middle East (a situation most likely to aggravate after death of Yasir Arafat), declining influence of Russia, growing powers and unrest in South Asia and South East Asia, greater disharmony in sub-Saharan Africa, Caucasus, Latin America, Asia, buildup of weapons by Iraq, Iran, Libya, Korea, increase in non-conventional warfare and terrorism, greater need for justice in the international system, a failing UN and Breton Woods institution, volatility in Gulf countries such as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, global warming, environmental degradation, spread of HIV/AIDS, greater anti-globalization campaigns, growing unemployment and recession in the world economy, barriers to labor mobility in order to prevent acts of terrorism, 203 and most importantly, “collapse of US-EU alliance, owing to intensive trade disputes and competition for leadership in handling security question.” 204

In such a scenario, according to our assessment, EU will try to take the lead in bringing stability in the world. It will extend its military, economic and political influence in the world. Although the 5 scenarios in terms of CFSP as mentioned earlier are most likely to extend in the post-polar world, however, need for a greater EU influence in global affairs is most expected in a multi-polar chaotic and failing international system. European values will be more called for to give a sense of direction to the world through preventive
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diplomacy, legal instruments, and cooperation rather than through coercion. Although EU envisages a role of cooperation with the US in managing global affairs, however, “according to Kissinger’s analysis, the biggest, strategically threat for America, irrespective of the existence of a Cold War situation, would be one single power ruling either side of the Eurasian continent. This threat has to be avoided at any cost, even if the dominant power seems to be friendly, for should the intentions change, America would find itself in a disadvantageous position concerning efficient defense, and would have less possibilities in practicing its influence.”

“Another interesting dimension to this is the opinion of Swedish based think tank Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research (TFF). According to its findings, “It was quite predictable that the EU would militarize itself. In fact, one of the world's leading peace researchers, TFF adviser Johan Galtung, predicted that in his book about the EU from 1972, "A Superpower in the Making." It is not in the nature of big powers to see greatness in nonviolence, dialogue, and tolerance or in playing the role of one among many. The EU whose main players are former colonial powers and present nuclear powers and/or culturally violent -began their militarization some ten years ago with the French-German military co-operation, and it got another boost with the French-British agreement in 1998 in Saint Marlo. And EU Nice Summit is likely to put the militarization of EU on an irreversible path, most likely to a new Cold War.”

From realist perspective, international system is anarchic and is based on conflictuality and competitive side of the international relations that entails survival of the fittest. Thus EU would reflect tendency to balance the power in the international system and to exert it on other nations in European ways that may also have a military element associated with it.

From neo-realist perspective international system is marked by growing interdependence amongst nation states.\textsuperscript{208} Hence EU would seek to promote greater harmony in the international system keeping in mind that the international system has turned very chaotic wherein US influence has undermined the effectiveness of the United Nations system, Iraq’s invasion being an ideal case in point in this respect.

If EU takes the role of power balancer, then the world may have polarity, whether bipolarity or multipolarity. Some countries may ally with EU, hoping to extract greater benefit through its influence, in terms of military, economic, technological abilities etc.

EU is likely to face an era of greater acceptability, follower ship, influence in arbitration, and diplomatic and political negotiations because of its strong European values in areas pertinent to human rights, preventive diplomacy and post conflict re-construction.

Being in closer geographical proximity to Africa, Asia, CIS countries, it is expected to intervene in those areas with greater swiftness and to exert greater diplomatic influence for resolving conflicts.

After the reform of the Security Council, EU will have greater say in worlds security related affairs, preventive diplomacy as Germany may also be included in as Permanent Member and hence European representation in the permanent members would rise to three i.e. UK, France and Germany.

**Sphere of Influence**

As can be seen that while EU is focusing on its CFSP and ESDP, one of the objectives is to engage a weakened Russia, and a way to extend European influence across Caucasus so as to access their vast oil resources. Furthermore because of its closer geographical proximity, EU can play a central role in the three conflict zones which are very much interrelated i.e. Balkans, Middle East and Caucasus. While EU consolidates foreign policy, it may antagonize Russia, India, China as well and could well mark the beginning

\textsuperscript{208} Ibid, Definition of neo-realism. P. 457.
of a new cold war, this time in a multi-polar global system.\footnote{Internet}. Alternatively this can also mark greater cooperation amongst these powers for collective good of the world in general.

In particular Africa region will be of particular emphasis for the EU as it is enhancing its trading role with it under the slogan, anything but arms. It will also strengthen its relations with Mediterranean region through the MEDA program.\footnote{Internet} Hence while EU uses economic, social and political / diplomatic tools to promote European values, it may also exert military influence as power cannot be fully perceived without a military element as well as projection capabilities.

**Position of Member States on the Adoption of New Constitution.**

As far as EU Constitution is concerned there is widespread skepticism, support, as well as lack of opinion amongst the masses of each member state. Furthermore governments have their own perceptions also which are often different from the general public. While Constitution’s ratification is being worked out at each country’s level, Euro barometer carried out a survey by interviewing participants from various member countries of EU. Respondents were asked to express the opinion on the theme "The European Union must adopt a Constitution." The following table depicts interesting findings.


Figure 13 Whether EU must adopt a constitution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“No.”</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Position of Euro-barometer reading</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of people saying, “rather agreeing” to need of EU constitution.</td>
<td>% of people saying, “rather disagreeing” to need of EU constitution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite variance in opinion, Constitution will give a concrete structure to the CFSP and will thus play a significant role in shaping EU’s responses to various scenarios that it will face in the future.

From the discussion mentioned above, it is evident that both EU and US based think tanks have different perceptions about the future scenarios of EU. Whereas there is coherence on some aspects, there is significant deviation as well. This shows that future of EU is a very interesting issue and there is variety of perceptions on it, based on the school of thought that each think tank pursues. However one aspect in which both thank tanks is coherent is in the realization of the fact that EU’s security community is still

---

evolving. It will get definite structure when Members States have an element of shared understanding on key security and foreign policy related issues and when the new constitution is ratified.

6.4 Summary
This section has studied the different scenarios provided by both think tanks of ISS and CIA in regards to the role of EU in the future world affairs. The author has compared analytical approaches of scenarios primarily in the context of security and defense, in a world governed by globalization and unknown consequences. These scenarios present an overview as to how EU’s responses are being considered by the think tanks and how these suggest policy orientation and alternatives for EU Member States.

The analysis focused on the mutual constitutive framework of shared ideas that lay the foundation of interpretation of world environment. The conclusion is that US and EU is in collaborative structure in the major framework of UN and the role of EU is both “a new realism and a new activism in the Union’s security policy”212. These scenarios will also be evaluated in light of the theoretical framework that is mostly presented in the concluding chapter of the thesis. In the later part of the thesis we have developed our own scenarios that EU is most likely to face, basing the analysis on the prior findings of ISS, CIA/ NIC and the empirical evidence collected by the one coauthor at the UN, New York.

CHAPTER 7 DIRECT INTERVIEWS

These informal, unstructured and exploratory interviews were conducted from Sept’ 2004 till Dec’ 2004 at the UN Headquarters at New York, USA. However to give reader a basic idea, we have included a sample format of interview questionnaire that we asked from each respondent. This format is attached as appendix – A. These interviews were conducted in the backdrop of security community building process within EU, its internal and external impacts and how would a coherent policy orientation would effect EU’s future role scenarios in international affairs in a which will be driven by rapid globalization and conflict. In this context as to how policy makers perceive future scenarios of EU from a security dimension and how they perceive its strategic thrust

7.1 Pakistan

According to an official “S”, of the Pakistan’s Mission to the UN, during an informal discussion, “the international scenario witnessed a significant change in global power politics, following the end of the Cold War which was purely of military nature.” The present international scenario is marked by other factors also wherein economic affairs are given due importance as well, besides military and security aspects. Following the emergence of regional powers in 1990-2000, US has although been the main driver of the international system has not been able to impose significant influence on international issues which culminated in crisis of unprecedented intensity, in Rwanda and Balkans. Hence international system became chaotic and “there was a lack of a predictable order.”

---

213 For the sake of exploring opinions at the geographical and multilateral level of decision making, we explored the opinion of some ambassadors, permanent representatives of UN member states and office bearers of multilateral organizations – based on convenience sampling method. This was a qualitative exploratory research as we were interested to find out the informal views of people and their opinions. It should be noted that this doesn’t reflect the official position of the state or of the multilateral organization. At some places we have concealed the identity of the respondent upon his / her request and paraphrased their words.

214 Following the war on terrorism, Pakistan has been regarded as a close ally to the international community. It is a key player in the SAARC region and in the OIC. In 2002, Pakistan was elected as a member of the Security Council till the term 2004. Pakistan being the first Muslim nuclear state also enjoys a significant say in global issues and particularly those concerning the Islamic world. As being the largest troops contributor to UN Peace Keeping Operations, Pakistan’s opinion receives due importance in international issues. Pakistan is also a close ally of US since many decades and their relations have seen many crests and troughs over the passage of time.

215 Interview with Pakistani diplomat at Pakistan’s Permanent Mission to the UN, dated 11-11-04.
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However following September 11, 2001 attacks in New York and through war on terrorism, under Bush administration, “US has re-attained its global dominant position. The National Security Strategy paper of September 2002 of the US government states that - there is no room for a rival”.

He was of the opinion that, Previously there was emphasis on multilateralism. “We now have entered a phase wherein unilateralism has become a requirement. The policy of deterrence, containment and disarmament has significantly declined. The main determinant of the international system now would be as to how Iraq crisis will be resolved?”

Whereas there is a spirit of cooperation between US and EU, and EU’s emerging role is acknowledged globally, however, according to the subject diplomat, US prefers an insignificant involvement of EU in security related issues and aspires to be the sole super power of the international system. However the concept of burden sharing does prevail which prompts US to have a cooperative relation with EU. US also has given security guarantees to Japan, Europe and Germany, it is most likely to maintain its influence on EU region for the coming years.

Hence it is against US to see EU as completely self-sufficient in security related issues. On major international issues there is “apparent convergence of ideas between US and EU.” Most significant of these issues are Terrorism and Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. Divergence of ideas is observed primarily in trade related issues. Furthermore “it is against bilateral interests to risk Trans-Atlantic spirit.”

He was of the opinion that the current and futuristic international system is marked by a
sense of mutual need between EU and US. This is primarily because EU lacks capacity in
general and militarily in particular. It lags behind in having a foreign policy. Hence it is in
mutual interests to maintain Trans-Atlantic alliance and US still defines and determines
its extent.  

How EU will balance the international system is primarily to be determined by intra-EU
relations between member states and in particular between UK, France and Germany. Furthermore to a major extent it will be determined by Russia’s policies which views
eastward expansion of NATO as detrimental to its interests. In order to have a stable
world order, a split in NATO is quite unlikely in the foreseeable future.  

“A comprehensive bipolarity in the international system to the extent of the cold war, is
quite unlikely as EU lacks coherence. It is economic alliance rather then a political
alliance. EU needs to be clearer on where it is heading and what is its ideology – with
significant reference to security and foreign policy related issues. Furthermore there has
to be a convergence of values and objectives for EU to be regarded as major driver of the
international system.”  

As far as Pakistan’s relations with EU are concerned he was of the view that these
relations have been traditionally strong because of historical ties between UK and
Pakistan. Pakistan significantly developed its military capabilities with European
collaboration on an individual country level. Pakistan has a considerable trading and
economic relations with EU. In the month April 2004 Pakistan and EU have signed a
draft cooperative agreement to explore future avenues of cooperation and assists each
other in handling issues of mutual concern. In this regard there stands to be a strong
potential of EU-Pakistan relations. However traditionally Pakistan has been a close US
ally, with the military and bureaucracy reflecting a tilt towards US and this trend is likely
to continue in the foreseeable future.  
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Regarding future scenarios, he was of the opinion that EU is most likely to be involved in peacekeeping troops and will also maximize its efforts for homeland defense particularly against terrorism.\textsuperscript{231} However, “it will continue to be part of international missions under the patronage of the UN rather then purely using its own forces.”\textsuperscript{232}

7.2 Interview with member of EU Parliament\textsuperscript{233}
According to Mr. Laschet, “after the end of World War II, Europe was devastated. Everything had to be rebuilt from scratch. Countries had to be brought closer together so that they may never go on war again. In particular Germany and France had to keep peace with each other. In light of these challenges, EU was the answer.”\textsuperscript{234}

According to him, the main problem (as evident from Iraq crisis also) is that the union has to go through foreign policies of 25 countries before arriving at conclusion / consensus. Hence a need has been felt that there should be a single voice of Europe in a common international platform.\textsuperscript{235} With the appointment of Javier Solana as High Representative for the CFSP and is proposed to be the first foreign minister of EU and with the appointment of Chris Patten as the Commissioner of External affairs, EU is most like to have a formal structure on foreign and security related issues which can be divided into domestic and external issues. In 2007 the Constitution is most likely to be ratified by parliaments of all member states after which CFSP will also have formal existence.\textsuperscript{236}

Mr. Laschet stated that “According to Solana strategy, EU will only react to situations which are within ambit of the UN charter.”\textsuperscript{237} As was the case in Afghanistan, the situation required an action against state sponsoring and harboring terrorism. It required

\textsuperscript{231} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{232} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{233} Mr. Armin Laschet is a member of the EU parliament. He is from Germany. He is also a member of the Committee for Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defense Policy. During the course of our research the author had the opportunity to interact with him as he was heading a delegation of EU Parliament to UN. He has been actively involved in defense and security related areas. During the brief informal interview dated Nov 18, 2004 at UN with the author, he gave a brief recount of the EU and its integration and provided useful insight regarding our thesis.
\textsuperscript{234} Based on verbal discussion with Mr. Armin Laschet. Further information about the interviewee can be gathered from www.armin-laschet.de. Accessed 10-1-2005.
\textsuperscript{235} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{236} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{237} Ibid.
regime change so as to promote regional stability. However EU wants to capitalize more on its post-conflict peace building strength rather then military strength. 238

He was categorical in his statement that “EU is not against US in terms of power politics. However it wants to have shared competence in its military resources and to have a system wherein forces can be mobilized to respond to emergency situations and to compliment international efforts.” 239

As far as international scenarios are concerned, he was of the opinion that peacekeeping operations and homeland defense would constitute around 30% each of all military expeditions. Humanitarian intervention and regional warfare to protect strategic interests would require 10% each of entire military involvement of EU and around 20% efforts would revolve around 20% of the efforts. 240

As far zones of influence are concerned he said that defense of Europe against any form of aggression or instability would be of top most priority to EU. The area of most significance to EU outside the European continent is Africa. It would be the area where EU expects to be involved in peacekeeping operations and humanitarian intervention. 241

He further reiterated that “EU is committed to address global concerns and hence is not in search of protection of its own interests.” 242

7.3 Interviews with Official of UNCTAD 243
According to UNCTAD official, “L”, “EU is a continental power with a continental dimension and trans-continental capabilities” 244. However if balance of power theory is

---
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243 Interview conducted with an official “L” of UNCTAD on 8-11-2004 at UN head quarters New York. However this should not be regarded as an official point of view of the multilateral organization as a whole. Hence the official requested not to be named and the identity may not be disclosed. Hence some of the viewpoints have been paraphrased instead of quoting the actual words. UNCTAD is a UN body that deals with United Nations trade and development related issues. The author interviewed one of its office bearers who on the condition of anonymity gave an informal insight about their perception of EU.
kept in mind then EU doesn’t fully fit on such a criteria.\textsuperscript{245} Since “EU is in a state of transition hence it is not clear as what its future is going to be like”.\textsuperscript{246} However chances are that “EU will not be so united so as to have the status of a single nation”.\textsuperscript{247}

According to the UNCTAD official, “EU at present is an economic entity. However its Constitution will determine its stature as a political and defense entity.”\textsuperscript{248} “Economically it is a big and strong power. Its share in international trade, investment, technology and expansion will play a crucial role in its ability to extend power and influence in the international system in future.”\textsuperscript{249}

The official further stated that there is “a considerable potential of EU to be a worthy competitor as well as a worthy partner to US”.\textsuperscript{250} Future scenarios of EU will have been significantly dependent upon EU’s role in the WTO regime. At present EU is under a lot of criticism for its Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) sector. Till the year 2017, it has introduced reforms in its agricultural sector so that there is level playing competition for all and the spirit of WTO is fully enforced in letter and spirit.\textsuperscript{251}

“EU has potential to serve as a major strategic partner to the developing world with whom it has share of 35% in trade related activities.”\textsuperscript{252} As far as future scenarios are concerned, intensive globalization is the order of the day and hence EU is most likely to determine its policies in that context. The main thrust of EU would be homeland defense. It will have minimum participation in international peace keeping or military operations. It will utilize its economic thrust to solve problems of international security and development.\textsuperscript{253}

\textbf{7.4 Views from African region}
An African diplomat on the condition of anonymity while having an informal discussion...
commented that EU has the potential to be major power in the next 20 years. This is the period wherein EU will gain considerable economic strength and African countries in particular are expected to show a pro-EU stance owing to their colonial past. However EU’s development as a military power remains a doubtful point as US military might remain unbridled. In this context it may be analyzed that EU may use economic tools to achieve political objectives. As an economic power it will overtake US but in terms of military strength, it will still lag behind.\textsuperscript{254}

7.5 OIC (representing 54 Muslim countries)\textsuperscript{255}
According to the OIC official “S”, OIC is consolidating its relations with EU and last year the two parties held a joint meeting in Istanbul, Turkey to review bilateral relations and to seek further avenues of mutual cooperation.\textsuperscript{256}

According to him, “nothing can be predicted with accuracy in international relations. There tends to be a greater adversarial relations between China and US rather then EU and US. Hence a total polarity concept between EU and US is highly unlikely as there is no major ideological difference. Currently and futuristically US defense expenditures are likely to increase while EU is most likely to have decreasing defense budgets and defense commitments.”\textsuperscript{257}

According to S, “US have got a comparative advantage as its decision making is easier because it is a single country. Hence there are minimum bureaucratic hurdles and response time to security related issues is much less then EU which has to get opinion of 25 member states before deciding upon its reaction to international security situations.”\textsuperscript{258}

\textsuperscript{254} Interview conducted with an African diplomat “M” on 11-11-2004 at UN head quarters New York. However this should not be regarded as an official point of view of the continent or the country as a whole. Hence he requested not to be named and his country may not be disclosed. Hence his point of view has been paraphrased instead of quoting his actual words.

\textsuperscript{255} These are paraphrased reviews from the interview with an informal interview with an official of OIC, “S”. This interview should not be regarded as an official viewpoint of the organization or of the Islamic world. This is just to explore diversity of opinions. This interview was conducted at OIC’s Mission to the UN at New York on 19-11-2004. The identity of the official interviewed has been purposely concealed on request. Also some of his actual words are not quoted. Organization of Islamic Summit Conference (OIC) is the representative body of 54 Islamic countries of the world. It seeks to promote and safeguard the interests of the Muslims countries.

\textsuperscript{256} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{257} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{258} Ibid.
US has got a highly integrated defense industry which consists of private enterprises also. In case of EU there is a requirement of consensus that hampers decision-making. Furthermore social commitment to defense related area is much less in the case of EU then US.\textsuperscript{259}

Hence he was of the opinion that “US has potential to be stronger and stronger. But it doesn’t imply that EU will have a declining influence. It will also enhance its influence on global issues but will not enter into adversarial relations with US. EU is most likely to enhance its economic strengths. Owing to diversity of resources and capabilities, EU is most likely to achieve cost advantages in production. US on the other hand is most likely to capitalize on its entrepreneurial capabilities to exert its economic influence.”\textsuperscript{260}

According to OIC official, “whatever inherent weaknesses that EU has in its defense structure, it will offset that with economic strengths. Member states will have also have to overcome dilemma of sacrificing national sovereignty so as to have a single voice. Although US will not lose its economic might however it is most likely to face intense competition with EU, China and other Asian powers such as Japan, and other ASEAN countries.\textsuperscript{261}”

As far as future scenarios are concerned, “EU is most likely to divert 60-70\% of all its military efforts towards peacekeeping operations while remaining efforts will most likely be in the area of homeland defense against terrorism.”\textsuperscript{262} In this context EU is most likely to extend its relations with the African countries as they have strategic partnership with the continent because of the colonial past. Some countries in the African continent are “Francophone or were under British, Spanish or Portuguese domain.”\textsuperscript{263} Hence EU will most likely extend its strategic relations with these countries and instead of comprehensively global focus, it may have a regional focus.\textsuperscript{264}

\textsuperscript{259} Ibid
\textsuperscript{260} Ibid
\textsuperscript{261} Ibid
\textsuperscript{262} Ibid
\textsuperscript{263} Ibid
\textsuperscript{264} Ibid.
CHAPTER 8 EMPIRICAL OBSERVATION AT THE UN

While attending most of the sessions at the UN and its bodies, from Sept’2004 till Dec’ 2004, it was observed that EU mostly supported US decisions. However there were few instances of disagreement between and EU and US on various voting/debates. Some instances also reflected that there was a lack of consensus within EU member states on certain policy issues and hence EU was not acting as a single entity on international issues.

8.1 Voting Resolution
During the Security Council meeting no. 5051-dated Oct. 5, 2004, draft resolution no. S/2004/783 titled “Situation in the Middle East including Palestinian question” was vetoed by the US on the pretext that the resolution failed to contain Palestine in its militant operations against Israel. The resolution was co-sponsored by Pakistan, Algeria and Tunisia, the non-permanent members of the SC. Out of the 15 members of the SC, 11 votes were in favor of the resolution, 1 veto by US and abstentions by Romania, Germany and the UK. SC session for the year 2004 had 5 members from Europe, including 2 permanent members UK and France, and 3 non- permanent members including Germany, Spain, and Romania. France and Spain voted the resolution in favor

Hence here EU and its candidate country could not have a single voice despite the fact that EU is a member of the quartet for resolution of the Middle East problem. Furthermore, abstention also reflected a non-confrontative approach of some members against the US that has got crucial stakes in the Middle East peace process. During the 61st plenary meeting of the GA dated 29-11-2004, the following draft resolutions were presented on the Question of Palestine and on the Situation in the Middle East.

On seeing the above voting pattern it can be analyzed that on the vital issue of Middle East and Palestine, whereas US has maintained a pro-Israel stance, EU has adopted a neutral policy. Whereas it has endeavored not to offend US, but it has furthermore added
much needed vitality to the peace process by maintaining its neutrality.

In the 74th Plenary meeting of the GA dated 20-12-2004, draft resolution number A/59/499 was presented on the assistance to Palestinian children. The vote was adopted with 117 in favor, 5 against (including US and Israel) and 62 abstentions (including 23 member states of EU). 266

267 Figure 14 Table depicting voting pattern of EU at the UN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA - Resolution number:</th>
<th>Resolution titled</th>
<th>Votes in favor</th>
<th>Votes against</th>
<th>Abstentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/59/L.34</td>
<td>the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7 (including US and Israel)</td>
<td>63 (23 EU countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/59/L.35</td>
<td>Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8 (including US and Israel)</td>
<td>64 (22 EU countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/59/L.36</td>
<td>The question of Palestine of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7 (including US and Israel)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/59/L.37</td>
<td>The peaceful settlement of Palestine</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7 (including US and Israel)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/59/L.39</td>
<td>Status of Jerusalem</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7 (including US and Israel)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/59/L.40</td>
<td>Syrian Golan</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6 (including US and Israel)</td>
<td>60 (19 EU countries)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8.2 Disarmament
In the 66th Plenary meeting of the GA dated 03-12-2004, draft resolution number A/59/459-X was presented on “towards a nuclear-weapon-free world". The vote was adopted with 151 in favor, 6 against (including US, France, UK) and 24 abstentions (including 11 member states of EU). Here there was a mixed trend of voting with main members of EU following same voting pattern as that of US while other members abstaining from the vote.

8.3 Culture for Peace
On general matters, EU had a policy stance similar to the US. A case in point in this regard can be on the General assembly draft resolution no. A/59/L.17/Rev.1 dated 15-12-2004 titled “Promotion of religious and cultural understanding, harmony and cooperation”. The Second Committee of the GA approved it initially after intensive negotiations since a year and a half. This was an initiative by Pakistan. As the author was involved in the informal consultations, it was observed that EU and US complimented each other’s perspective. During consultations and negotiations on the text of the draft, EU was often observed to say “we agree with the point of view of the United States on this issue.” US was also observed to state “we agree with the point of view of the EU on this issue...” Hence both blocks complimented each other’s perspectives.268

8.4 Divide Within the EU
On 22-11-2004 during the 58th and 59th plenary meeting of the GA, a controversial draft resolution number A/59/L.28/Rev.2 to commemorate 60th anniversary of end of the second world war and to declare 8 and 9th May as days of remembrance and reconciliation, was presented. This resolution was sponsored by Russian Federation. This resolution asked all member states of the UN to commemorate the above days as days of remembrance and reconciliation to pay tribute to all those who lost their lives in World War 2. However, EU was divided on the resolution with regards to the date. Whereas Western Europe had no problems with the resolution, the new entrants from the former communist block had problems with the proposed dates. Although on this day war ended in Western Europe in

1945, yet on this day former communist countries came under the dominion of Soviet Union. Hence for these countries this day marks the beginning of another struggle. This day also marked the beginning of the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia in 1992. Hence Eastern European states asked for a renaming of the resolution and for making slight adjustments in the text. After intensive negotiations and consultations the resolution was adopted after modifications.\textsuperscript{269}

From this event it was inferred that because of certain historical basis and diversified strategic objectives, it would be difficult for EU members states to have a common voice on all international forums and there is a possibility that EU may get divided into two blocks eastern and western European states or between old and new entrants. Hence EU may try to avoid these gray areas so as to have a collective benefit for all member states and to have a common view point on foreign policy related areas. Furthermore non-EU countries should not get the impression that EU is divided otherwise this would neutralize power perceptions.

**8.5 Analysis from Empirics**

From the empirical study, we observed that EU was committed to compliment the US rather then to oppose it at the international and multilateral forum. On occasions it also acted in neutrality so as not to offend US concerns. Hence no concept of polarity / or opinion divergence was observed during SC or GA meetings between and EU and US. Furthermore, power and influence of EU could have been prominent if EU had a different policy orientation / polarity of opinion on international issues with the US. However this was not observed to be prevalent.

EU’s position on international issues and its possible future scenarios are very much dependent upon success of the institutionalization process, and security community building phase. Security of interest is possible when there is commonality of goal and shared perceptions of the outcome. Furthermore future scenarios are very much dependent upon how the international arena will look like in the coming years especially

at the multilateral level. They are also strongly dependent upon the behavior of US in the international system. EU’s policies generally augment US position and this trend will continue as long as the EU is in a transition phase. Once EU attains a definite structure on in its security community building process as well as in its CFSP related areas, only then EU could have a more assertive voice in the international system. In its present form, EU policy orientation on international issues can be regarded as more neorealist. As a block, EU is committed to position of cooperation in the international system and this is serving its strategic objectives. Once the structure is strong and member states cooperate more with each other only then EU will assert more power and influence in the international system and its behavior will not be much dependent upon US position.
PART IV ANALYSIS & CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 9 OUR SCENARIOS

For this section the authors presented combined analysis of how EU scenarios would likely to be up to the year 2020 according to a “should-can do” model. The suggested scenarios and analysis were based on the opinions covered earlier in the thesis, i.e. the theoretical perspectives based on theoretical framework of security community, the scenarios from transatlantic think tanks, observations of EU’s role at the UN, and the insights provided by various officials at the UN. What EU’s scenarios would likely to be in the foreseeable future might to a large extent be determined by the gap between what EU probably can do and what EU is expected to do in the international system. The discrepancies between ‘should’ and ‘can’ therefore compose the three most possible scenarios of EU to the 2020 as following.

Figure 15 Identify the three models of EU’s role scenarios to the year 2020, based on Wendt’s model of ‘the multiple realization of international culture’

Theoretically according to figure 5 in chapter 3, the possible outcome of EU’s international role follows a process of constructive and cultural selection. Two key factors compose the range of roles that EU possible would play world wide: firstly, the intensity of integration process in terms of the concurrent instrument of Security and Defense Policy initiated by Constitution; secondly, the degree of cooperation between major powers in the international system. Hence both neorealism and social constructivism

---

converge in the axles above, there are two important implications for thinking about EU’s role scenarios in the future decade. The first is that, the amount of conflict in a system does not bear on the relative utility of idealist and materialist theories.\textsuperscript{271} It depends on how conflict and cooperation are constituted.\textsuperscript{272} The second implication means “structural change”. For realists, it is even easier to escape the culture matters; and for communitarians, even harder to create Kantian beliefs. It is reasonable to believe that Realists should pay more attention to ideational things than communitarians since “the more deeply shared ideas are internalized,.. the more they matter… the sticker the structure they constitute will be”\textsuperscript{273}.

Based on this model from Wendt, the section mainly aimed to analyze the three most possible results of EU’s positioning in the international system, from a Union level.

**9.1 Scenario 1: A Competitive Partner - (recommended scenario)**

![Scenario 1](image)

Figure 16. Scenario 1, the scenario of competition with other powers and EU

This scenario goes with the assumption that EU’s securitization and integration process moves smoothly and with a growing strength. It is assumed that in this period of competition between various powers, EU will maintain its strategic focus at both regional and global level through continuous growth in all frontiers with both soft and hard skills. While other international powers show a mixed trend, leading to zero-sum game, EU continues to move forward and turns out to be a major power block. This period may also be marked by some turmoil at the international level, wherein EU capitalises on the opportunity while other powers lag behind in availing that opportunity.

\textsuperscript{271} Ibid. P.255.
\textsuperscript{272} Ibid. P.255.
\textsuperscript{273} Wendt (1999). P.255.
or by mismanaging it. 274

For every leadership, there should be followership. If other powers may lose their influence, EU may grab this opportunity and capitalise on its vast economic resources, soft skills like diplomacy, multilateral governance, European values, and an increasing military influence which may have a polarisation tendency. This scenario requires an extended collaboration between EU and developing countries.

From neo-realist perspective, individual member states of EU should feel secured if they move ahead with the security building process of EU on all spheres i.e. political, economic, military and socio-cultural issues. Their respective strategic calculations should coincide with EU’s strategic calculations. In this scenario the member states should feel that by moving ahead with the EU integration process, they will individually get benefits than what they otherwise would not have done had they not participated fully with the integration process. To move ahead with the others as long as individual benefits are being achieved is the main notion behind this scenario.

From constructivists perspective, EU’s growing interdependence through growing empowerment of the institutions, greater power sharing through the new constitution and a single perspective on foreign policy related issues would ensure that EU is perceived as a single entity globally, with proper powers and influence to act and implement. However this may entail dilution of certain sovereign rights of individual member states for the collective benefit of the Union as a whole and its institutions, which may attract widespread criticism specially from euroskeptics in each member state.

As a security community, this is a desirable situation as the community building process gets strengthened. Mutual expectation and interdependence not only would benefit the Member States internally but would also augur greater credibility to EU externally. The world should feel secured with EU’s growth in global power and influence. They should not feel threatened but rather as a point of mutual cooperation in sharing global

responsibilities of maintaining peace, security and development. Other nations benefit by forming mutually beneficial alliance with EU on policy and strategic issues. This may entail greater interaction on business at national, institutional, regional levels with EU. Furthermore strategic calculations of other states should be strong enough to convince them of enhancing their cooperation with EU.

Perceived global power of EU would enhance if EU maintains a single policy stance on CFSP related issues and there is no confrontation amongst the member states on various issues, including failed expectations. EU’s ability to maintain global peace and security would also increase if it goes ahead with its militarisation process, which may not be aimed at building EU’s forces to thwart against any potential conflict with an other super power (balance of power theory) however, it is potent enough to reflect that EU is not dependent upon any other power to maintain its territorial integrity as well as peace and security in its neighbourhood.

Without a strong military, security, defence and foreign policy related dimensions to its credibility designed by the European Security Strategy, EU’s perceived global power and influence will not be achieved. The economic success of EU should also be followed by corresponding success in political and security related dimensions. Sustainable security community structure of EU would augur stronger role of EU in world affairs and enhanced internal cohesion amongst member states. EU’s global influence and role is likely to increase as time and the international society progresses.

9.2 Scenario 2: Disintegration and Failed Expectations

Figure 17. Scenario 2, the scenario of uncertain growth and decline in global power and influence of EU (marked by international volatility and lack of internal coherence.)
This scenario could be result of inefficient governance within EU boarders of EU economy, social and political system, which is marked by factors such as failure of ratification agenda of the new Constitution, conflicting priorities of Member States and the Union, regime changes, lack of public support. Thus European process turns anti where it is not filling internal and external requirements. It is followed by lack of opportunities at the international level or the growth of influence of other powers. Hence EU’s power may decline which may result from a decline in the integration process or a failure in the competition with other emerging powers.

This is marked by a failure in the institutional building process or that it becomes too bueratic, unsteady and slow, the security community building process also fails such that Union is unable to meet the expectations of the member states and that nations think compeltely from a self-interested, inward mindset. It can also occur due to non-agreement between the Member States on the Constitution and that there is hardly any progress on further integration of foreign and security policy.

From a neo-realist perspective this situation of disintegration would most likely occur if strategic calculations of members states do not coincide with that strategic calculations of the Union as a whole. There is conflict of interests and opinion is involved and that member states cease to coordinate with the Union and disintegration takes place.

It can occur if individual member states feel that they are not gettign in return to what they are investing in the Union. The gains of membership are off-set by losses that individual member are bearing because of the integration process. The proceedings of the institutions and community building has become too slow such that it is difficult to meet public requirements and that there is too much of an overlap and conflict amongst policies of different member states and that of the Union as a whole. It can also be in such situations wherein sovereignty of individual member states are far too diluted by the Union as a whole to such an extent that vital national interests are being set aside to maintain coherence with the Union. issues. In such a perspective individual members just

275 Ibid. P. 238.
think from their own dimension and from their relative position and gains in the international system.

From social constructivist perspective, this situation could possibly occur if interdependency, mutual expectations and cooperation through institutionalization is neither enhancing group gains nor individual members gains. It can occur when some polarisation develops within the EU and that some members apparently would have more powers to determine the strategic direction of EU, due to their greater political, economic, social and military stake in the process while weaker members feel isolated. In this way the concept behind institutionalization would be rendered futile as it would result in gains for few at the expense of others. It can also occur in such situations wherein the power of EU institutions have gained so much control that matters of individual sovereignty are being diluted and for every matter the country is required to take EU approval. In this dimension there would be a very strong institutionalization at the expense of sovereignty, which may not be an agreeable situation for member states. Hence in this scenario, mutual dependency is not doing any good for any one and hence disintegration might take place.

From security community’s perspective, this situation can occur if the community building process is not helping for the collective good of the community as a whole as well as for the member states. Securitization of interests in different fields is not taking place and that such a process is neither promoting collective gains of the actors nor individual gains of constituents. Hence disintegration may most likely take place.
9.3 Scenario 3: great power conflict

At present, EU is unlikely to enter into such a power conflict nor does the US reflect any possibility of a decline in its global influence. This is an undesirable situation wherein the international system turns out to be multipolar. All major powers attain the same level of influence and growth at the international level, or that they have a clash of strategies and interests on key international issues which tend to undermine national sovereignty.

This situation would estimate a considerable decline of US influence, rising of other regional powers and their influence in their reach of zone. It may also be marked by growing regionalism, proliferation of WMDs, non-adherence to international treaties. This situation can also lead to a great power conflict of the magnitude of a world war, or a period of cold war.276 This will entail greater investment in troops. It could also be result of a trade war and may be marked by a period of recession or decline in the world economy wherein globalization doesn’t yield as per common expectations. This can also be a result of greater influence of non-state actors / phenomena, like terrorism.

From a neorealist perspective, such a great power conflict could possibly occur when presumably EU has a totally single dimension to external scenario. It acts as a single unit whereby cooperation amongst member states is strong enough to achieve Union objectives as a whole. The member states are willing to dilute national sovereignty towards collective benefit of everyone. The notion of state, survival and self-help is

potent enough and that strategic calculations of individual member states match with that of EU and that there is greater or equal benefit to have group conformity. This scenario may also occur when wherein the Union as a single unit on all policy related issues, particularly CFPS. The military aspect is so strong amongst member states that attack on one nation is deemed as attack on all.

However on the international front the situation is marked by great volatility so much so that the system turns extremely chaotic and ends in a deadlock. A power confrontation evolves amongst major international powers. The notion of international conflict takes predominance over cooperation and competition.

From social constructivist perspective, such a great power conflict could possibly occur when institutions are strong with excellent command and control structure. There is no conflict of authority or overlap between institutional powers and jurisdictions. The Union is particularly united on CFSP related area and its institutions are well structured for mutual cooperation and interdependency amongst the member states. Only then EU could successfully maintain a single voice on international issues and will be able to survive through the international conflict of such magnitude. In this context the ratification of the constitution by member states would be of paramount significance which would strengthen the institutional structure of the Union as a whole, and will empower the member states for joint action in the event of a situation calling united efforts to thwart aggression, and to defend strategic interest of EU both within and outside the European land.

From a security community’s perspective, such a great power conflict could possibly occur when strategic interests of EU are threatened. In this context, the security community as formed by the member states would ensure safeguard of individual and collective interests of the member states and would promote their joint action on external frontier. When overall interests are securitized, it may facilitate swifter action as a single structure and unit. However center of the community would get more powers in this context while residual powers will remain with other members. Such a community would
thus move from a conflict preventive position to a more potent form.

The situation of a great power conflict once again reminded the failure of shared understanding between various players in the international system. This is an extremely undesirable scenario and its occurrence may not be likely in the foreseeable future unless some drastic event internationally triggers cyclic effects amongst major international powers. Hence the problem of getting along of different regional communities is raised to the agenda which concerns mainly around the root cause of cultural coexistence and competition, embodied as extreme nationalism and ethical conflicts elsewhere, perhaps more severe in the future.

9.4 What EU should do?
Externally, in a global atmosphere of liberalization and globalization, EU has to meet the needs of maintaining strong competitiveness in GDP growth and considerable influence in the world affairs equivalent to its economic and geographic size. At the same time as a major player in promoting freedom, democracy and rule of law, EU would be committed to contribute to a complex world with the added value of upholding universal standard of human spirits as it usually advocate. Militarily, EU will participate in coalition of the willing so as to avail power projection opportunities in areas and issues identified by European Security Strategy as terrorism, international crimes, failed states and intrastate conflicts.

Internally, defense against terrorism will be of paramount significance. Based on a comprehensive harmonization of European integration projects in various policy sectors, EU will primarily focus on defense of homeland and thus concentrate its efforts on the further implementation of ESDP. Hence most of the resources will be channeled through enhanced political will and cooperation, Union level institutional coordination headed by the Union Foreign Minister, intelligence sharing, increase in defense budgets, integration of research & development resources, training of troops, etc.

Based on discussion above, EU is identified with an agenda for the sake of building a stronger Europe in a comprehensive dimension with expectations in demographic,
economic, social and technological areas. This perspective was best illustrated by the statement recently published by the President of the European Council, the Luxembourg Prime Minister, Jean-Claude Juncker on the Lisbon Strategy: ”What Europeans really want is work”. In the press release, he identified 10 areas for reallocating resources and strengthen the integrative capabilities of EU among all players in the world. They are “research, technologies and the industrial fabric, the information society, the environment, the internal market, the Doha Development Round and the regional agreements, reforms of the labour market and social protection, education and training, lifelong learning and social inclusion. These vital areas will become concrete reality for Europeans as a result of the implementation of the measures approved by the European Council”\textsuperscript{277}.

9.5 Anticipated challenges
There are areas identified to be constraint for security and defense policy building, such as
1. Potential tension of transatlantic relations;
2. Hesitancy of national government for guarding national interests,
3. Strategic divergence between Central and East European Countries (CEE) and West European Community as a result of historic tradition,
4. formation of sub-groups within EU;
5. Unbalanced development and economic size of Member States;
6. Geopolitical strategic importance, therefore influence of bargain of new Member States on the table of EU conferences;
7. Difficulties for the foreign ministers to coordinate external functions located in the Commission, IGC, and the inability to take concerted military and defense action together, and so on.

CHAPTER 10 CONCLUSION

Why defence dimension?

Whether the new Europe could cope well with a new security dimension incorporating previous socialist camp of CEE countries and old European states, as well as the volatile global consequences of power shifting in a liberal economy, is quite fascinating for all stakeholders to focus on. Based on researchers’ findings, the paper concentrated at EU level on security consolidating in terms of military strength as a means for conflict resolution mainly in the background a shifting global security environment. The project did not mean that it will ignore other tools such as diplomatic, political, economic and cultural, “nor does it mean that most major international contingencies will call primarily for the use of defence forces”\(^{278}\). The paper aimed to analyze the vital importance of defence as coping manifestations to the uncertainties in the world affairs. The paper emphasized that, a new type of security communities is forged which is characterized by the strategic conversations between both EU and US think tanks, and new institutional settings initiated by treaty change in EU.

The role or identity of EU is best deconstructed in terms of not only “How the global structural environment contributes to the collectivization of an EU identity, but also about how actors within the EU define the global structural environment so as to create the rationale for a cohesive EU identity.”\(^{279}\) Buzan’s book, the European Security Order Recast: Scenarios for the Post-Cold War Era in 1990, reflected the typical post-cold-war complex on European security. Fifteen years of continuing and engaging in the project of integration, however, has turned the then concerned security structure to a different nature. A New Europe with ten new Member states from Central Eastern European Countries marked with its Constitution a new mission to fulfill for a successful transformation of East-West. While the then hot debate about security in Europe is now departing for the security for Europe.


Power, fear and interdependence placed priorities on the agenda of European security dialogues. They are still robust actors in security concerns. Interests and identities are in a need of sustaining and renovating for both old and new actors. By recalling Walker, time and space enable the contingency of politics a constant variable. And this is where history departs and depends upon. With the aim of locating present and future trends meaningfully, the paper has looked into the hub with substantial significance and frequently maintained to examine the direction and nature of history. Therefore the authors have to go into the place that talks and exchange of ideas endurably take place, interaction, consideration of cost and benefits processed, amendment signed, and even new revision given to birth. This is an area formally or informally organized, where the convergence of rules, norms, conventions, code, culture and ideas, take place either explicitly or implicitly. And this is the main research ground they’re worked on, the institutions.

Sociological institutionalism in such sense combined both structural and social elements of international order by being based on EU level of integration, hence told something new about the revised role of a new military troop in world battlefield marked with “European”. Sociological institutionalism reinforces that social learning, as a key element of security community building, play the function of prescribing what people can do and what they can imagine to do thus guide the course of action that sustains and cultivates the interests and identities that people used to hold. Security Community building calls for both institutional transaction and learning processes that coordinate “the structural and process conditions which are necessary for the development of mutual trust and collective transnational identities.”

Comparatively the meaning of (military) action was preliminarily entitled with multiple missions and visions that are indispensable with the external roles that EU is going to play, both regionally and globally.

**Think tanks, scenarios and theoretical framework**

Think tanks research offered a reflecting space for the two most powerful strengths on the earth to share either somewhat common, or more diverging ideas to each other (with the

---

disputes over Iraq War and other strategic gaps still lingering around), both talked in their own style of language surrounding the same security topic and about the means utilized to solve disputes and conflicts in some certain areas. Thus it is a relatively isolating, prior and vital channel to produce, and maintaining key information as regards to key issue. The knowledge which is already shared by another player would cause less destructive modes of forces in international relations, which means that knowledge is constructive in the sense that it is variating the direction of concepts and priority of security agenda in the mind of other parties, and hence change the course of action supposed to follow in a given network.

On the other hand in terms of the functions of think tanks, it cannot be denied that their work “is facilitated by transactions that typically occur in organizational setting and core powers”\textsuperscript{281}. Why EU and US is complimentary is because they belong to the similar regime type which possess similar governance culture, therefore ‘closer’ understanding. Power, as the given network, decides on the distribution of ‘subject positions’ of various players in the system, and hence here is the position of EU in a global framework with less weight due to its unbalanced capabilities. On the other hand, the nature of security community of the European Union variants the strategic direction of this entity in terms of both security visions and military missions, and subsequently leading to a broader approach in the use of force. As the White Paper proposed, “While the Union recognizes that bad governance is a major source of instability, it advocates the extension of good governance rather than regime change.”\textsuperscript{282}

Think tanks depend upon their traditional resources and funds while they were thinking. Attributing to its global position, US based think tanks identify alternative scenarios so that they may know as to how a country/region would behave if its critical factors are altered and how in turn would they have an effect on challenging American strategic interest and global role. They want to see potential impacts of situations, variation in critical factors and their possible outcomes.

\textsuperscript{281} Ibid. P.44.
\textsuperscript{282} Ibid. P.27.
However another critical factor for US based think tanks is that they are much concerned with the outcome of the Europeanization process. How successful will it be and how much can this interdependence amongst nations through institutionalization within EU Member States could best be utilized in ways that serve US interest.

EU integration process is a very challenging task as many political, socio-cultural and economic issues of many countries are involved. For US their key interest lies in engaging European countries so that there is peace in the region, Russia is contained and that Europeans may be right involved in setting their house straight so that they may not have leadership ambitions in the global context.

Main thinking behind EU based think tanks is that they have a more inward focus on how global security situation will have an impact on EU as whole. They are more interested in the institution building and security community building process of EU. Their main focus mainly remains on three main member countries of EU i.e. UK, France and Germany while rest of the members and their policies are not so well balanced. They focused on the security dimensions of EU, peace and stability within and in the surrounding region of EU. In this context they foresee EU’s role in international affairs as more of a peacekeeper. The major goal is that US and EU relations are not adversarial but of mutual cooperation, and dependency. In their background there is nothing like a great power conflict theory and hence most of their studies are towards regional dimension. How future Constitution and CFSP will play its innovative roles in embodying EU’s position in international affairs and how nations will forgo their certain sovereign rights for the collective power of institutions as a whole is a point of further interest for study.

Through analysis of the think tank scenarios it was observed that it is easier for US based think tanks to affect government’s policy outcomes as they only deal with one government i.e. US government. *Social learning may not be sufficient for the development of a security community unless this learning is connected to functional processes that are traceable to a general improvement in the state’ overall condition.*

---

In this context, CIA and NIC have got a strong influence on government’s policies due to its more involved in policy shaping processes. However EU based think tanks have to keep into considerations of the concerted concerns of the 25 Member States, although with the policy network complicated and channels of information, interests unevenly distributed. One point worthy of consideration is that think tanks of EU should think from rather a European dimension more than developing scenarios just from sponsor nation’s perspective. Hence the way European think tanks foresee future from a common vision and the way they cooperate and exchange information with each other will have a significant role in the way EU’s policies will be determined in the future.

There is variation in the way transatlantic think tanks see the future of EU. For EU think tanks, the future scenarios are more inward within the boundaries of EU and its immediate neighborhood. For US based scenarios, the future role scenarios are more in a global context and the impact on challenging US position and power. Whereas EU think tanks are predominantly focusing on their securitization and institution building process i.e. reflecting a more constructivists and security community’s perspective, it does not guarantee shelter from the international structure. Member states need to mutually coordinate with each other so as to achieve strategic aims with a more certain nature. Hence here it comes the utmost importance of a comprehensive strategic thinking at scenarios that served better for policy debate and defence planning.

**Our Scenarios**

The paper at last concluded with three typical scenarios of EU in the year of 2020. The scenarios were listed as:

1. *A Competitive Partner*
2. *Disintegration and failed expectation*
3. *Conflict of great powers*

The paper drew this conclusion according to the logic of formation of international society as suggested by Wendt (see figure 15 in chapter 9). The future world situation is not a linear trend. The discontinuity and change taps state actors all the way down. The interdependence and interpenetration of various agents in the globalization marks more autonomy in security as well as less insulation in other layers of political, economic and
societal and cultural life.

Therefore competitiveness and partnership of EU in the world is a most possible scenario with an estimation that all strengths like US, Japan and China improve along a steady growth in a stable framework. This scenario also underlies the trend of a smooth globalization and social awareness of liberal economy and necessity of the sustained identities and interests.

Failed expectation and disintegration is not that possible, however it is used to show the preliminary importance of internal dimension of EU. Military strengths as a strategy to cope with crisis and conflicts should be utmost a defensive and neighboring strategy. A holistic dimension of knowledge-competitive society of EU promoted by Lisbon Strategy best incorporated this fear of Europeans. Disintegration will also mark the suspension of a security community and warn a possibility of wars against each other, which is absolutely against the wishes of all Member States.

Conflict of great power is an early-warning scenario that is not fulfilling the author’s intention, and should be avoided. The context might be either post disintegration or a highly institutionalized security community. It is mainly utilized to demonstrate the extreme extent of paradoxical global consequences and failed governance of global structures such as finance, environmental, production and education etc. The unpredictability of cooperation between stubborn and skeptical powers as well as newly emerging ethnical disputes and nationalism due to the freer movement of information and labor across boarders might intertwine with each other, and finally triggered by a singly plot. The two world wars in the history of human kind breaking out in Europe marks the memory of this scenario.

At last but not the least, it is generally agreed that EU’s role in international affairs will increase up to the year 2020, it will be directed towards cooperating with other international powers – mainly USA towards fulfilling global responsibilities. The chances of polarization and fragmentation of Europe will largely depend upon the success or
failure of the integration process with the fate decided at the crossroad of globalization and its consequences, and the impact that it will have on the life of the common individual in general and of Member States in particular.

**Other Theoretical and Empirical Issues**

Multidimensional characters of EU have left few certainties but overwhelming puzzles to theorists, academicians, policy makers, and students. It is even hard to detect the way to identify the political forces behind development of EU in each different, unilinear path. Theories are quite contingent to empirics and reflected as aspects of understanding of EU development in the paper.

**Comparative Politics**

EU project is noteworthy for its real laboratory effect in world politics. The integration process EU is undertaking since 1950s has initiated passion for regional integration in the rest part of the world from 1980s, either by absorbing its near neighbors, the Central East Europeans (CEEs), or attracting regions like Africa, Latin America, or ASEAN who have shown an inclination to develop similar models in light of success of EU integration process. With the Comparative Politics factors in mind, it is our interest to focus on the drivers behind integration within a 10-15 year timeframe to detect what dynamics is shaping the sporting of international order, especially from the viewpoint of particular positioning in the world system.

**Regional Integration and Regional Security**

While it is not certain if EU would fulfill the ambition of federalists, a positive security building community is already underway. It is also clear that EU is promoting pluralistic security values both administratively and institutionally, from multi dimensions of economy, society, culture, and military, defence etc. From this point of view, EU would play important role in post-conflict management or crisis prevention in the world. The role scenario from this regard would be determined by the degree of maturity of institutionalization in the final, vital area of high politics, such as defense and culture. And this is where the cutting edge posits that the paper started to discuss about.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following questions were asked from various respondents at the UN:

1. What is your name, designation, organization / with which Permanent Mission of the UN are you associated with?
2. How do you see the role and influence of EU up to the year 2020 in the following areas:
   a. Global politics
   b. Global economic development.
   c. Global security and defense.
3. From economics perspective, what scenarios do you think EU is most likely to confront with up to the year 2020?
4. What do you think are the strengths, weaknesses opportunities and threats for EU in up to the year 2020?
5. How do you foresee EU’s role as a balance of power against the US?
6. What do you think is the vision of EU?
7. What are the expectations of your country from EU?
8. What is EU doing uniquely which you think will benefit the world in general?
9. How do you foresee relations of your country with EU up to 2020?
   • Will they increase?
   • Will they decrease?
10. What are the key areas of cooperation between your country and EU, as of now and in future?

In Terms of CFSP

11. Do you foresee a greater role of EU in global affairs, in terms of global defense and security related areas?
12. After proposed expansion of Security Council and possibility of inclusion of Germany as a non-permanent member, do you think EU will have a greater say on matters pertinent to defense and security issues?
13. In terms of defense, what do you think are the Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for EU up to 2020?
14. What scenarios do you foresee for the EU in terms of global defense and security?

15. What do you think are the likely defense and security scenarios that EU is most likely to face up to the year 2020?

16. How do you foresee EU-US relations, with a general reference to NATO and cooperation on global security related issues?

17. According to your understanding, what is Vision of EU in terms of CFSP?

18. From the following 5 scenarios mentioned below, if you have to rate as to what are the chances of a particular scenario to occur, then according to your assessment, what will be there percentage weighting:
   a) Peace keeping, peace support operations………..(chances of occurrence in terms of percentage)
   b) Humanitarian intervention…………(chances of occurrence in terms of percentage)
   c) Regional warfare…………(chances of occurrence in terms of percentage)
   d) Counter terrorism…………(chances of occurrence in terms of percentage)
   e) Homeland defense…………(chances of occurrence in terms of percentage)

19. Which are the most likely zones of conflict and what do you think will be EU’s level of interest in resolving those conflicts?
   a) Africa
   b) Asia
   c) Middle East
   d) Europe
   e) Latin-America

20. For EU to be really considered as a military power, it must buildup its joint capabilities and must participate in power projection opportunities such as Afghanistan and Iraq. Do you think it be easy to gather domestic support for wars in terms of
   a) Budgets
   b) Political will

21. Any other viewpoint for discussion? That you would like to state or want me to cover during this interview.

*Thank you for your kind cooperation and for your time.*