THE FUTURE OF THE SECURITY IN EUROPE: FROM EUROPEAN UNION TO REGIONAL COMPLEXES

Abstract:
Nobody thought that the security in Europe which had become close to each other after formation of the European Union and collective security arrangement in 1992, would undergo dramatic changes in 21 century, so much so that the future of the security in Europe faces the shaky situation. The security which was expected by the European countries did not take place due to many elements like security internal variables of the European Union, the appearance of ISIS and terrorism in the Middle East, different views of the United States is related to security, unilateralism of the Russians and also complicated issues in Europe. Therefore, this paper seeks to answer the main question as to: what is the security pattern of the future of security in the European Union and how could it be maximized? The hypothesis to the question is based on the fact that the future of security in the Europe due to different approaches of Eastern Europe, Northern (Scandinavian Region), Southern and Western Europe, is moving from common union toward regional security complexes.
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Introduction

The vulnerability level of European Union is increasing due to three factors:

1. Being close to the new centers of threats which produce and export threats.
2. Neighboring with the Middle East and affected by terrorism.
3. The incomparable level of prosperity between the European Union and neighboring countries.

According to the security document which called "The Secure Europe in Better World", the new security challenges in Europe include:

1. The expansion of ballistic missiles technologies and mass destruction.
2. New terrorism.
3. Weak states and organized crimes.

The challenges caused by lack of political and economic development in region.

The Muslims extensive Immigration and unbalanced demographic composition in Europe.

At the present, all these elements are growing and increasing in European Union.

Today the common security policies of European Union are just as much as a name not more and really they have no efficiency. The European Union needs common discourse and understanding and similar conceptualization in related to security which has been threatened.

What more than the past has threatened the European Union in security effectiveness is the lack of perception and intersubjective understanding. Thus the objective and operational plans have faced many problems in Europe, as the security issues in Southern Europe has seriously become different with Scandinavian Region because of unbridled migrations and the consequences of it.

In recent years, while Western and Central Europe consider their security management in accordance with the international hegemonic stability, Eastern Europe experiences the different security issues in Ukraine and Russian security dominance.

In other words, if one could talk about the European political and economic identity, but the same is not possible about the European security identity as the gap has become really widened. The different nature of security crises and their polarity in all over the world, especially in European Union, will cause the exit of other actors like Great Britain in future, though these countries announce their initial reasons as political and economic yet, in fact, the reasons remain security matters.

In my opinion, the countries exited from European Union will shape new complexes, of course with the different perspectives from European Union.
Therefore, theoretically the world is on the verge of a new change with new conceptualization as neoliberal institutionalism in the form of the EU, no longer would be able to guarantee the national and global security in 21 century.

Postmodernist and poststructuralist interpretations and perceptions of the security, have caused inter subjective discourse and understanding of the concept of security that we can recognize in new security theories. In this regard the European Union is not the exception.

From other perspective, it could be emphasized that many conflicts in the European Union do not require comprehensive solution as we can offer different solutions for different cases.

The EUs security infrastructure would be significantly weakened. The terrorist attacks in Paris, Brussels and Madrid exposed serious practical problems with EU security and intelligence cooperation. Irregular and incoherent cooperation combined with conflicts of interest between member states may undermine a comprehensive defense and security strategy. Information leakage is also a concern, sharing data between 27 member states means the risk of breaches is high.¹

The nature of security threats currently facing the EU is wide-ranging and varied. Some of which, like transnational terrorism, have been a consistent problem for a sustained period of time. Other geopolitical development _ the resurgence of Russia, the rise of China, large-scale migration to Europe and civil war in the Middle East _ will test Europe s political and security resilience. Along with the US s rebalance to Asia, the EU faces myriad challenges.²

The security threats which created by massive, covers all over the Europe. Precise and objective understanding of this threat could not be found for all the EU from north to south and east to west. The impact of immigration is different from one country to another and an area to another one in which will be discussed. The other one is the level or threats and their solution to solving them for EU which have caused serious conflicts between them.

Finally, due to all above said, the security structure or EU is going to undermine day by day and changing to become many sub security regional system. This new structure of security will shape according to common threats ahead and more geopolitically.

---

¹ Sofia Patel, Brexit and security – a sleeper issue, Australian strategic policy institute. 21 June 2016
² Ibid
Immigration Importance and migratory pressure

Nowadays, migration stands on top of the European policy agenda. All in all, massive and unwanted migrants are deemed to threaten the stability of the Union due to the security interdependence existing among EU member states, policy coordination was a preliminary step to undertake efficient migration policy towards the external world, the coordination process, though has gone through pitfalls and drawbacks which testified to the distance between European aspirations and actual achievements.\(^3\)

What is so important in this part that how the understanding of migration as a security concern has determined the internal states of European Union?

Over the last two years, Europe has experienced a significant migration and refugee crisis as people have fled conflict and poverty in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Africa, South Asia and elsewhere. Greece and Italy have been major arrival and transit points.\(^4\)

During the course of 2015, various EU initiatives to manage the crisis proved largely unsuccessful. The EU came under criticism for lacking coherent and effective migration and asylum policies, which have long been difficult to forge because of national sovereignty concerns and sensitivities about minorities, integration, and identity. The flows also created deep divisions within the EU. Frontline states Greece and Italy and key destination countries farther north expressed dismay at a lack of European solidarity, while others charged that traditionally generous asylum policies in countries such as Germany and Sweden were serving as “pull” factors and exacerbating the flows. Some EU governments reportedly viewed Germany’s announcement in August 2015 that it would no longer apply the EU’s “Dublin regulation” (which usually deems the first EU country an asylum-seeker enters as responsible for examining that individual’s application) as unilaterally upending agreed EU asylum procedures and failing to consider the implications for the wider EU.\(^5\)

Efforts to establish EU redistribution and resettlement programs, in which each EU member state would accept a certain number of asylum-seekers and refugees (in part to relieve the burdens on Greece and Italy), were extremely controversial. Countries in Central and Eastern Europe were particularly vocal opponents, fearing that the newly arrived migrants and refugees, many of whom are Muslim, could alter the primarily Christian identities of their countries and of Europe. Although the EU approved a limited but mandatory plan to relocate some asylum-seekers from Greece and Italy in September 2015, this outcome was achieved using the EU’s qualified majority voting system rather than consensus (Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Romania voted against the

\(^3\) Michela Ceccorulli, Migration as a security threat: internal and external dynamics in the European Union, Forum on the problems of peace and war, Florence, Garnet working paper No 65/09, p 1, April 2009
\(^4\) U.N. High Commissioner for refugees, Refugee migrant’s emergency response.
\(^5\) Kristin Anarchic, Ibid, p11
plan, and Finland abstained). Adopting a proposal on such a sensitive issue directly related to a state’s sovereignty and territorial integrity by qualified majority is largely unprecedented in the EU, and many observers viewed the need to hold the vote as further indication of the profound cleavages within the bloc.\textsuperscript{6}

**Territoriality and geopolitics as key factors for regional complex**

Dealing with security threats means envisioning the strategies and the actors more suited to preserve stability. Both elements are today more difficult to identify because of the transnational character of the risks. As challenges overcome states’ borders, they end up encompassing more actors, requiring therefore broader patterns of cooperation. Global governance is pointless on some occasions though: when threats regard only some actors and manifest themselves in different modalities throughout the world, smaller schemes of cooperation seem more promising. This is so because ‘most threats travel more easily over short distances than over long ones’\textsuperscript{7}.

Buzan and Wæver’ emphasis on a neorealist variable such as ‘territoriality’ in their ‘security complex’ theory is noteworthy: not only threats involve neighboring actors in a similar way, but policy provisions to cope with them spread out their effects on specific areas.\textsuperscript{8}

The security environment has changed to the most complex, unpredictable and challenging security situation. Europe has seen in decades and this is unlikely to change in the near future. This situation materializes through two distinct security challenges, the East and the South, for EU. There is an arc of instability surrounding much of Europe. This complexity is a reality of our contemporary strategic environment and demand a sophisticated and pragmatic approach.\textsuperscript{9}

The integrity of security in EU, needs a delicate balance between states and it sees currently could not take place in short time.so, there is many deep security differences within the EU which will be caused to shape many regional complexes. These complexes will create regionally, according to closer geography and similar patterns of security.


\textsuperscript{8} Michela Ceccorulli, ibid, p5

\textsuperscript{9} General Peter Pavel, Current security challenges and the role of NATO and the EU, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, October 20, 2013.
UK – EU bargaining over security

Beyond counterterrorism, UK behavior also has consequences for its role in European security and defense policy. The UK is the second largest military power in Europe, holds a permanent seat on the Security Council and is a nuclear power. The British diplomatic service also has an extensive, global network. Although the UK has never been an enthusiastic supporter of European defense integration, the EU should aim to keep the UK close on security and defense matters.

If not, the credibility and effectiveness of European foreign policy will seriously challenge, and due to these issues, security could be take place from union to different complexes. The undermining of EU specially in security case, after September 11, will force to withdrawal in many areas of security and will reinforce the disintegrations of security geopolitics.

Lack of comprehensive approach regarding to security

This is reality that it could not be able to speak about comprehensive activities for many years. The efficiency in all dimensions, especially in security is decreasing in EU. For example, the ongoing humanitarian crisis to south of EU is not defined as threats for western of EU as the same.

The north of EU (Scandinavian States) is seeking to strength and increase the prosperity and welfare to boost public insurance and services, while the East of EU confronting vital interests due to territorial challenges.

The NATO military efforts and missions could not easily add synergy to EU security and stability efforts wherever and whenever applicable. The states of EU assets in the different geopolitical areas with different missions and they could not be complementary.

Different histories and geography often influence member state’s policy preferences. The EU’s enlargement to the east has brought in many members with recent memories of Soviet domination, which may make some of them more wary of EU ties with Russia. Meanwhile, southern of EU countries that border the Mediterranean may have greater political and economic interest in North Africa than EU members located farther north. 10

Beyond the conflict in Ukraine, fundamental differences exist among EU countries about how to best manage Russia in the longer term. Some still hope that Russia can be a partner for the EU, maintaining that Russia is too big to isolate or ignore and that, ultimately, Europe’s stability and security depend on forging good relations with Moscow. Many EU countries have extensive commercial ties with Russia (including Germany and

Italy) and rely on Russia to help meet their oil and gas needs. Some European policymakers also argue that Russian cooperation is essential to solving key international challenges, including the ongoing conflict in Syria.

Some analysts also suggest that the EU’s collective response to the broader crisis in the Syria-Iraq region and its ability to counter the Islamic State has been constrained by differing views among its national governments, especially regarding the use of force. While some EU countries are participating militarily in the U.S.-led air campaign against the Islamic State, for example, others are not, and there appears to be little appetite within the EU for a stronger military response. Following the November attacks in Paris, the EU invoked its “mutual defense clause” (Article 42.7 of the 2009 Lisbon Treaty) at France’s request, obligating other member states to provide France with unspecified “aid and assistance.” Invoking this clause, however, was viewed largely as an act of political solidarity, and EU officials asserted that it did not imply the establishment of an EU security mission.\(^{11}\)

**Conclusion**

In the longer term, the EU likely faces a fundamental choice between those supporting further integration as the solution to the block’s woes and those contending that integration has gone too far and should be put on hold or possibly even reversed in certain areas.

If we want to refer some missions which EU facing in the 21 century, it must be:

- Maintain and build on the peace established between its member states.
- Bring European countries together in practical cooperation.
- Ensure that European citizens can live in security.
- Promote economic and social identity.
- Preserve European identity and diversity in a globalist world.
- Promulgate the values that European share.\(^{12}\)

Public debates on the future of the EU show that that many Europeans are concerned about where the borders of the European Union should be drawn, and even about Europe’s identity. There are no simple answers to these questions, particularly since each country views its geopolitical or economic interests differently. The Baltic countries and Poland are in favor of Ukraine joining the EU, so what about Ukraine’s neighbors? Difficulties arise from the political situation in Belarus and the strategic position of

---

12 Pascal Fontaine, Europe in 12 lessons, The European Union explained, 2014, p3
Moldova. If Turkey joins the EU, then what about Armenia, Georgia and other countries in the Caucasus?\textsuperscript{13}

It seems that not only EU does not have the same procedure in all six elements, but also the states member have taken different missions. Development rate, geographic location, their understanding of the threat and look at near abroad in security cases are the most important which determine to follow the EU or not.

Possible scenarios for the EU in the years ahead include the following:

1. The EU would continue to pursue integration and common policies where possible, although doing so could be increasingly difficult.

2. The EU would become a two-speed entity, consisting of a strongly integrated group of “core” countries and a group of “periphery” countries more free to pick and choose those EU policies in which they wish to participate.

3. Further EU integration would essentially be put on hold, and possibly reversed in some areas, with sovereignty on certain issues reclaimed by national capitals.

4. The EU would become more different identity especially in security, consisting of many independent region. Many close states geographically with the same pattern which shape new sub region called security complex.

The gap between expectation and performance remains high. While the EU’s strategy primarily concentrates on the neighborhood in the East and South, some states regional focus is not visible. With regard to the EU Global Strategy, Romania believes that trans-Atlantic boundaries, based on democracy, freedom and security should not stop at the country’s Eastern border, showing an active support for the Republic of Moldova and the Balkan countries in their efforts for EU integration, but also Georgia in its intention to join NATO.

The perception from states as the member in EU is permanently changing, so the decision does not make commonly and jointly. Convergences have been weakened in EU. Multiple and sophisticated threats have caused that it is impossible to speak and then performance about every security topic.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid,p9
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