

EU security policy: new challenges and priorities

Iryna Grushko ^{1 A}

¹ PhD student, e-mail: grushko.iryana@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-8444-4706

^A Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine

Received: September 3, 2021 | **Revised:** September 22, 2021 | **Accepted:** September 30, 2021

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5544191

Abstract

The article is devoted to the study of a set of problems of European security policy, in particular the analysis of the new challenges to the priority directions of its development. It is noted that the current institutional system of European security policy is undergoing serious challenges associated with profound changes in international relations. The systematization of various aspects of EU security policy according to the following methodological approaches is proposed: the theory of behaviorism, the theory of political realism, liberal-idealist paradigm, postmodernist theory, alternative theoretical models. The conceptual substantiation of the development of European integration in the field of security and defense policy is the EU strategies, which are developed in accordance with current challenges and threats. It is proved that the real institutional changes in the EU foreign policy occurred after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and the establishment of the European External Action Service. The European Security Strategy (2003), the Global Strategy of the European Union (2016), the Security Union Strategy (2020) were analyzed, in particular, new challenges for the European security system and priority areas of EU security policy were identified.

Based on the analysis, the most pressing challenges, risks and threats are identified, the probability of which is considered high for the EU until 2025.

Key words: international relations, defense policy, integration, cooperation strategy, sovereignty.

Introduction

The aggravation of political, economic, social, humanitarian, technological, environmental, ethnic and other problems, which have become not only national but also international and global, have prompted security professionals to seek both universal and specific security mechanisms in various spheres of society and the state, protection and promotion of national interests and values.

The fundamental principles of the EU security policy are based on the need to establish peaceful coexistence, ensure equal opportunities for access to guarantees in the political, economic, military and humanitarian spheres. At the same time, the European security system has been facing new challenges over the last few years, including the rise of terrorist threats, explosive illegal migration and Brexit.

Today, the European Union security and defense policy remains a very painful topic of discussion. This can be explained both by the importance of preserving national sovereignty for the participating countries and by the fears of the new members of the Union of weakening relations with the United States and differences in the perception of threats. In practical terms, the most sensitive issue for implementation remains the functioning of the joint armed forces.

Among the factors that significantly influenced the discussion of the new paradigm of pan-European defense are the COVID-19 pandemic, which contributed to the deterioration of the economic and social situation (which affected European citizens), and the alienation of the government elite from the majority, which led to an increase in populist

and anti-systemic sentiments; tensions in relations with the Russian Federation in connection with the occupation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and comprehensive support for illegal armed groups in eastern Ukraine; Britain's withdrawal from the European Union; lack of a clear political vision of the situation and real leadership in the

EU; increasing the flow of migrants and refugees; the growing threat of transnational terrorism; the ambiguous position of the United States on a number of issues, especially during the presidency of Donald Trump, which resulted in tensions in transatlantic relations, etc. (Politychna systema Ukrainy, 2021).

Material and methods

The relevance of the study of the evolution of the methodological foundations of European security is due to the fact that today this scientific category is the most concentrated manifestation of social values formed by citizens of EU member states as an adequate response to environmental challenges. The significance of the political aspect of the security problem is further enhanced by the fact that at the theoretical and practical levels of its understanding there is still no clear idea of the relationship between social development trends aimed at deep integration and growing influence of security factors on political relations.

In recent years, many scientific publications have been published on security issues, including international security and its security factors. Most authors analyze and disclose various aspects of security, its types, levels, nature, features, dialectics of international and national security, explore political, legal and other aspects, and so on. There are a number of approaches to the study of security issues in scientific journals, but they are mostly considered in connection with the need to further develop security issues in modern conditions, to determine the place and role of various institutions in this process. Today, the institutional system of European security policy is undergoing serious challenges due to profound changes in the system of international relations. The study of various aspects of the phenomenon of EU security policy should be systematized according to the following methodological approaches:

- proponents of behaviorism have proposed an approach in which the concept of security is

based on the basic values of society. The classical teaching of behaviorism is based on the fact that the obligatory element of the study should be the analysis of the reaction of the external environment to changes in the object under study, which can be both positive and negative. Security is one of the values of the state and objectively reflects the absence of threats to the basic values of society, and subjectively – the lack of fear about the possibility of their destruction (Kaufman, 1985; The Insecurity, 1992);

- representatives of the school of political realism justify the concept of security through the prism of national interests. The source of the dynamics of interstate relations is military power, which is the basis for the formation of national interests. The content of the “central interest” consists of three factors: the nature of the interest to be protected; the political environment in which the interest operates; rational necessity, which determines the choice of goals and means. Statesmen must have a rational mind, which is based on a correct understanding of the national interest. The latter presupposes that the peculiarity of the manifestation of politics, including international politics, should be the constant struggle for power. At the same time, the objective contradiction facing the head of state is that “the very nature of power hinders deep knowledge, creates moral dilemmas, political risks and intellectual uncertainties”. In fact, international policy aims to achieve the following goals: the desire to benefit; avoiding situations of disadvantage; impartial attitude towards other state institutions (Morgenthau, 1951);

- liberal-idealist paradigm involves the consideration of two different concepts of security: the first one appeals to international institutions and legal norms (refers to the “rationalist” tradition); the second insists on the universality of moral values and respect for human rights as the main security criteria (corresponds to the “revolutionary” tradition). Since the first concept pays considerable attention to the need to create the broadest security community in which all interested countries could participate, this type of concept is also called “participatory security”. Within this concept, the term “security community” includes a comprehensive system of collective security and is accompanied by rules of conduct developed during the negotiations. The main thing for such a security system is the presence of three elements: the focus on creating strong guarantees to prevent aggression; alternative political alliances; progress in the field of military and non-military security (Acharya, 2007; Maher, 2021; Viotti, 2019).

In another version, the security community should actually be limited to a fairly narrow circle of participants. At the same time, collective security should not impose some form of a separate comprehensive political regime and arms control agreement. Similarly, it should not strive to establish an international government and claim the destruction of all weapons, the prevention of all forms of violence. The focus of its interest is to prevent accumulation of funds for large-scale, deliberate, organized aggression. The theory emphasizes conflict prevention, reasonable sufficiency, stability and measures of transparency, trust and control. This is a security for a narrow circle of selected states that for the sake of their common interests will not stop before using force against countries that are not members of this system (Schmidt, 2020; Wojnicz, 2020). The reorganization of the security system on the Old Continent must be adjusted to new approaches in order to prevent the return of the new Cold War, eliminate the system of blocs, spheres of influence, etc. (one of the options is to create a new security system

modeled on the OSCE) (Koops, 2020).

- postmodern theory comes from the fact that the overall security will be achieved only when its actors as people will be treated as individuals, not citizens of any state and, moreover, not those nations themselves. This view of security has been expressed by new social movements whose members are concerned with the preservation of peace, cultural differences, the environment, poverty, the protection of civil human rights, and not with the military and political security of the states in which they live (Walker, 1998). In today's world security discussion should go beyond just professional competence of the military and politicians. Traditional means of ensuring national and international security are unable to cope with new threats. The new concept of security cannot be single, unified and no one can have a monopoly on its interpretation (Tickner, 1995).

Quite interesting are the alternative theoretical models that explain the nature of the EU as a security actor in the international arena. Some scholars propose a hypothetical model that represents international organizations in the form of rational actors who are bureaucratic entities capable of acting autonomously. This autonomy has arisen because of the effect of two main factors: the legality of values representing international organizations, and the control that these organizations have over special knowledge and information. In this sense, the European Union has a fairly high level of autonomy and the ability to influence member states. Moreover, the existence of supranational bodies and broad cooperation between European countries gives the EU considerable powers to manage their activities (Larivé, 2016).

Thus, current trends in the development of methodology for studying European security issues are associated with a change in its value paradigm from military-political doctrine to the concept of sustainable development, expanding the content of the relevant conceptual apparatus with the allocation of its non-military segments.

Results and discussion

The process of integration of European countries in the field of security began in March 1948 with the conclusion of the Treaty of Brussels between Belgium, Great Britain, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and France, which provided for joint activities in the economic, social, cultural and defense spheres. In May 1952, a treaty on the European Defense Community was signed between Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, France and Germany, which provided for the establishment of supranational institutions for the management of the armed forces and the budgets of the participating countries. Although the formation of the European security system was carried out by European countries that were members of the EU, but European security policy was conducted on the basis of NATO. One of the main tasks of the EU, defined by the Maastricht Treaty of 7 February 1992, is to conduct the Common Foreign Security and Defense Policy. At the same time, the development and formation of such a security policy was due to joint efforts of the EU and NATO. The introduction of foreign and later security policy in the European integration process of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century required its organizational design, the creation of structures for planning and implementation of these innovations. Such structures began to emerge quite chaotically, but at the same time adapting to the general system of governance of the European Union. The highest institution of this system, the European Council – the summit of leaders of member states, has become the main center for making strategic decisions in foreign and security policy.

Institutional changes in the EU foreign policy since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009 and the establishment of the European External Action Service in December 2010 have created the conditions for more consistent and therefore more effective steps by the European Union in the international arena. This institution included units from different structures of the European Union: departments of the European

Commission, EU Council committees, the governing bodies of the Common Security and Defense Policy, intelligence and information structures. The unification of all of them into a single organization was by no means mechanical, but involved mergers, divisions, and the necessary restructuring. In the first years, the structure of the European External Action Service worked relatively efficiently, but later ceased to meet its purpose due to the bureaucratization of the structure. In 2015, its leader, Federica Mogherini, began its restructuring, giving the system more orderly character (HQ Organization, 2015).

The conceptual justification for the development of European integration in the field of security and defense policy has always been the relevant EU strategy. Thus, the European Security Strategy (2003) identified the main challenges for the coming years: globalization and its consequences, the growing role of non-governmental organizations and groups in international relations, the interdependence of EU countries on transport, energy, information infrastructure, the vulnerability of the EU itself and the risks involved. The problems of coexistence in the conditions of wars and regional conflicts, forced migration, hunger, poverty, diseases and their spread, excessive and uncontrolled competition for natural resources, energy dependence on third countries were further identified.

The threats facing the European Union were determined to be “more diverse, less visible and less predictable”. These include terrorism, religious extremism, the alienation of young people living in multinational societies, the pressures of modernization, and cultural, political and social crises. Other security risks include the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as regional conflicts. The close link between extremism and terrorism, as well as the rise in organized crime and the demand for weapons of mass destruction, has been called threatening (European Security Strategy, 2003).

The first years of implementation of the

European Security Strategy have demonstrated its imperfections, especially in terms of ensuring the EU defense capabilities. After all, the document does not provide for a collective security system and directs efforts to counter new threats, create a secure environment for the EU and maintain international order. As a result, the EU military capabilities have not reached the level of countering global threats. The EU has also shown that is not yet able to independently manage large-scale military operations. As a result, in December 2008, the European Council adopted the Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy entitled "Ensuring Security in a Changing World" (Report, 2008). The report, in particular, stated that this document "does not replace the ESS, but reinforces it", and that the Strategy itself remains in force.

There are no sections in the European Union's Global Strategy (Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, 2016) that describe the EU's problems and risks, the strategic goals, as well as the consequences of their implementation for the EU. The new strategy is more focused on individual tasks to eliminate the risks and challenges that the EU may face in the future. Their order is characterized as follows: the interests of EU citizens; principles that will guide the EU to implement its interests; priorities pursued by these actions, as well as methods of implementation. The new security strategy creates the image of the European Union as a major world partner and defender of European values, while emphasizing the increasing responsibility of other international, regional organizations and government agencies. It is also important to cooperate closely with societies that share European values, as well as to deepen partnerships with civil society and the private sector as key players in today's world (Shared Vision, 2016). Thus, in October 2016, the European Border and Coast Guard Service was established on the basis of the FRONTEX. Its main function was to assist EU external states in protecting the community's borders, including the deployment of border guards to support

national forces to stop illegal migration and fight cross-border crime. In June 2017, the EU Council adopted the decision establishing of the military planning and conduct capability outside the EU's area of responsibility. In fact, this decision meant the creation of a permanent headquarters to conduct EU overseas missions in accordance with the previously achieved Franco-German initiative.

Despite a number of changes, the security strategy of 2016 contains a list of risks, which basically coincide with their list in the previous document, but it should be noted that the way they are presented, has changed. The new strategy takes more global approach to security. Based on the fact that the new strategy contains a much greater amount of text, the issues contained therein are considered much broader and include additional characteristics.

In July 2020, the European Commission presented a new EU Security Union Strategy (EU Security Union Strategy, 2020) with a focus on protecting critical infrastructure, fighting cybercrime, combating hybrid threats and organized crime. The main goal of the new Strategy was to eliminate the contradictions between security in real and digital space, within the European Union and beyond, adequate response to cross-border threats (terrorism, cybercrime, hybrid attacks). It should be noted that the Security Union Strategy was created during the fight against the Covid-19 pandemic, which changed the perception of security threats and proved the need to ensure security in both physical and digital environments. The pandemic was a test of the resilience of the EU's critical infrastructure, as well as its readiness to resolve the crisis.

Within each priority block, the Strategy envisages the following tasks for 2025: increasing the resilience of the EU's physical and digital infrastructure, fighting cybercrime and hybrid threats, combating terrorism and organized crime; development of the institutional and administrative landscape of European security. To meet the objectives of the Strategy, three Action Plans against organized crime were presented: combating online child sexual abuse, countering arms trafficking and

drug trafficking, especially synthetic drugs.

Analyzing the correlation of the new strategy with other EU security initiatives, such as the ongoing structured cooperation on security and defense (PESCO), which partially duplicates the Security Union Strategy on cybersecurity priorities and countering hybrid threats, it should be noted that the Strategy emphasizes the close link between security and the EU's fundamental rights and values.

Brexit has become an important factor influencing the modern European security system. Most documents envisage that further cooperation between the EU and the UK will be carried out within the framework of the «strategic partnership» program, such as “Foreign policy, defense and development” project (Foreign policy, 2017), “Security, law enforcement and criminal justice” (Security, law enforcement, 2017). It should be noted that the practical implementation of these projects remains quite problematic, since the basic EU integration documents assume that access to key security institutions, such as the Foreign Affairs Council and the Political and Security Committee, is possible only for EU member states. However, despite the fact that Brexit is considered a negative event, any crisis is always a chance to develop new qualities of the EU.

Conclusions

Thus, the security factors that affect the nature of political relations should include, first of all, global trends that potentially act as sources of threats to international security. These are, first of all: intensification of competition between world centers of power; attempts of states to solve their problems at the expense of others, unable to effectively protect their own national interests; the crisis of the international security system, the weakening of the role of international security institutions; uncertainty of the foundations of the new international security system, which in combination with the imperfect system of international law allows for the impunity of the use of force in the international arena to pursue their own interests; the presence of self-proclaimed quasi-state formations on the

Problems in the field of modern migration policy make the issue of effective migration law policy in the European Union one of the most relevant on the agenda of both national and supranational levels. Illegal immigration has long been a security challenge not only for individual countries but for the EU as a whole. It should be noted that the problem is not only the Europe's migration policy, but also the policy of countries that export illegal migrants. The war in Syria, conflicts in other Eastern countries provoke an additional influx of refugees to Europe. Therefore, the existing problem requires its solution not only in Europe, but also in countries where there are military conflicts. It is necessary to emphasize the need to resolve the contradictions that exist today between the EU countries. For example, the countries with the largest influx of illegal migrants insist on imposing tough sanctions on those countries that do not restrain their citizens and their illegal entry to European countries. Another group of European countries is convinced that they will not be able to achieve effective socio-economic progress in the near future without migrants from abroad, so their leadership is not so categorical against illegal migrants and the countries from which they come.

territories of sovereign states, the emergence of dangerous precedents, the recognition of some of them by other states, which became an incentive for the processes of regional separatism; spread of terrorism, piracy, drug trafficking, illegal trade in arms and nuclear materials, cross-border organized crime, money laundering, illegal migration, human trafficking, cyber threats, etc.

According to the latest Security Union Strategy, the challenges, risks and threats, the probability of which is considered high until 2025, include: the existence of conflicts and unresolved differences, as well as frozen conflicts; attempts of some political forces of foreign states to provide support for certain political parties, ethnic groups, language, religious grounds; international competition for

access to energy resources, control over transportation routes and facilities for processing of these resources; maintaining the danger of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; implementation of destructive information actions of foreign states and strengthening their presence in the information space; development and aggravation of regional separatism, ethnic and religious confrontation, manifestations of national selfishness, the emergence of political forces that create a real danger of splitting the state; increasing threats of terrorism, extremism; increasing risk of large-scale natural and man-made disasters, in particular due to human intervention in the planet's ecosystem. The above-mentioned threats are exacerbated by internal factors that significantly increase the likelihood of crisis situations.

As a result of global changes in the world balance of power, following the emergence of new centers of influence and changes in the international interests of the United States, Europe is increasingly forced to take responsibility for its own security and the security of the immediate periphery. The

process of developing a consolidated policy of the states and institutions of the Euro-Atlantic community is complicated by the heterogeneity of the positions of its individual subjects. The political elites of some of the leading EU states, being supporters of the multipolar system of international relations, are pursuing the hidden goal of balancing the excessive influence of the United States on the European continent.

The current realities of the European security environment call for qualitatively new challenges related to ensuring their own protection against internal and external threats in the face of unpredictability of international processes, as well as rethinking the role of traditional security institutions in Europe, in particular, allied relations with the United States, which are undergoing profound changes in the context of adopting a common European security and defense policy that seeks to cover all levels of security.

Prospects for further research in this area are a theoretical justification and explanation of the causes, features of functioning and prospects for the development of a common EU security policy.

References

- Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2007). Why is there no non-Western international relations theory? An introduction. *International relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 7(3), 287–312.
- EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGY. (2003). Available from: <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-15895-2003-INIT/en/pdf>.
- EU Security Union Strategy. (2020). Available from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1596452256370&uri=CELEX:52020DC0605>.
- Foreign policy, defense and development: a future partnership paper. (2017). Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/643924/Foreign_policy_defence_and_development_paper.pdf.
- HQ Organization Chart as of 26 September 2015. Brussels: European External Action Service.
- (2015). EUISS Yearbook of European Security. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.
- Kaufman, D., Mc Kittrick, J. and Leney, T. (1985). *US National Security: A Framework for Analysis*, MA «Lexington Books», Lexington, USA.
- Koops, J. A., & Tercovich, G. (2020). Shaping the European external action service and its post-Lisbon crisis management structures: an assessment of the EU High Representatives' political leadership. *European security*, 29(3), 275–300.
- Larivé, M. H. (2016). *Debating European security and defense policy: understanding the complexity*. Routledge.
- Maher, R. (2021). *International Relations Theory and the Future of European Integration*. *International Studies Review*, 23(1), 89–114.
- Morgenthau, H. (1951). In *Defense of The National Interest; A Critical Examination of*

- American Foreign Policy, By Hans J. Morgenthau. New York, Knopf, 160-167.
- Politychna systema Ukrai'ny za umov global'nyh vyklykiv i lokal'nyh problem. (2021). [Ukraine's political system in the face of global challenges and local problems]. Zb. materialiv XXXIV Harkiv. politol. chytan'Harkiv: Pravo. P. 58-59.
- Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy. (2008). Available from: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/104630.pdf.
- Security, law enforcement and criminal justice. (2017). Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/710802/FINAL_INTERNAL_SECURITY_COMBINED.pdf.
- Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy. (2016). Available from: https://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf.
- Schmidt, J. (2020). The European Union-United Nations Partnership in Practice. In the European Union and the Use of Force, 177-201.
- The Insecurity Dilemma: National, Regime, and State Securities in the Third World (1992), ed. by Brian. L. Job, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, London, UK.
- Tickner A. (1995). Re-visioning security. International relations theory today. Pennsylvania.
- Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2019). International relations theory. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Walker R. (1998). One world, many worlds. Struggle for a just world peace. London.
- Wojnicz, L. (2020). Theoretical aspects in multi-level security management of the European Union in the framework of Security Sector Reform (SSR). *Przegląd Europejski*, (3), 35-51.