

Peer-reviewed academic journal

**Innovative Issues and Approaches in
Social Sciences**

IIASS – VOL. 8, NO. 2, MAY 2015

Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences

IIASS is a double blind peer review academic journal published 3 times yearly (January, May, September) covering different social sciences: political science, sociology, economy, public administration, law, management, communication science, psychology and education.

| 2

IIASS has started as a Sldip – Slovenian Association for Innovative Political Science journal and is now being published in the name of CEOs d.o.o. by Zalozba Vega (publishing house).

Typeset

This journal was typeset in 11 pt. Arial, Italic, Bold, and Bold Italic; the headlines were typeset in 14 pt. Arial, Bold

Abstracting and Indexing services

COBISS, International Political Science Abstracts, CSA Worldwide Political Science Abstracts, CSA Sociological Abstracts, PAIS International, DOAJ.

Publication Data:

CEOs d.o.o.

Innovative issues and approaches in social sciences, 2015,
vol. 8, no. 2

ISSN 1855-0541

Additional information: www.iiass.com

EUROPEAN UNION AS A FOREIGN POLICY ACTOR IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Patrícia Kaplánová¹

| 48

Abstract

This article explores the current relations between the most influential political actors in global politics by demonstrating that the European Union is a relevant foreign policy player. Clarifying the development of the European Common Foreign and Security Policy, regarding to the closer cooperation with North Atlantic Treaty Organization and also with the United States of America in the field of defence policy, the main finding is that except of the negative European integration, the European Community has a potential to create a closer political union. The main assumption of this paper is that the cooperation between the NATO and the EU has shown that in the field of hard politics the main role is still under the influence of the NATO/the USA. On the other hand, in the field of soft policy of economic and humanitarian support, the crucial role remains in the competence of the European Union.

Key words: European Union, security and defence policy, NATO, USA

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12959/issn.1855-0541.IIASS-2015-no2-art03>

Introduction

The European integration is based on a transnational consensus on mutual cooperation among its Member States. A neofunctional spillover of the political integration has already opened the European Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) in the 50s. Although the question what the European Common Foreign and Security Policy really means, has not been answered yet. Despite the European Union (the EU) has already built up the institutions to coordinate a foreign policy at the European level, this policy still remains in the hands of individual states. When we take the European foreign policy in a wider perspective (for example, a trade liberalization and expansion), it is possible to note its partial success. This success, however, in my opinion does not correspond with „hard politics“ of foreign security and defense policy. The inability of the European Union to fully intervene to resolve international conflicts, has showed disadvantages of being a "civilian power in non-civil world" (Keukeleire, 2010). The adoption of the Lisbon

¹ Mgr. Patrícia Kaplánová, Department of Political Science and European Studies

Treaty and the current escalating conflicts (especially in Ukraine) shift an effort to promote the EU as an actor in international relations, which is also an issue in my work. Development of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (in the sense of a neofunctionalism and liberal international relations theory) was characterized by overcoming a position of the European Union as "an economic giant and a political dwarf" (Cameron, 2007: 173). This means a closer collaboration in the field of political and military cooperation of the Member States and a creation of coherent strategy of foreign and security policy, which still has not been common. However, the military and security capacity should not be analyzed without a relation to the North-Atlantic Alliance (NATO), which since the end of World War II has been playing an essential role of military security of Europe. The Transatlantic relationship could be considered as the most important geopolitical and economic relationship in the international politics. The United States of America (the USA) and the European Union are seen as major players in the field of international politics and are also the most important partners both in terms of trade, as well as in solving international conflicts and crises (Moravcsik, 2010). Moreover there are different views on an extent of these relations. The aim of the article is to focus on those aspects of bilateral interactions, which make the transatlantic relationship complicated. The article deals with an assumption that the European Union is a relevant player in the international relations. The aim of my work will be to answer the question how to define the Union as a foreign policy actor within the context of the foreign and security policy. Meanwhile, in the background of the transatlantic relations I will try to impose the argument that the EU has a marginal role in international relations in the analysis of relations between Europe and the United States of America.

The development and shaping of European Foreign and Security Policy
After the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community in 1950 (The ECSC Treaty), which was a French initiative (the Pleven Plan), there was also an attempt to set up the European Defence Community. The Pleven Plan envisaged a formation of a common army and thus had an initiative to create the European Institute of Common Foreign and Security Policy. It reflected both geopolitical and economic context in those times. In this respect, the escalating Cold War had resulted in a "tighter" ties between the countries of the "West", particularly in the field of security policy. Former assumption of "spillover" policies supposed that the European Community would also create a political and security union. Important in this case of the Pleven Plan was an effort to delegate powers of defense policy from the national to the supranational level, which was at that short time after the

institutionalization of the ECSC extremely ambitious. The political and defense integration has left long in coming and finally in May 1952 was agreed as the European Defence Community. This plan, however, failed in the French national parliament (August 1954 due to the condition of domestic policy and changed balance inside the French Government) and interrupted the development of a common foreign policy by shifting its solution for decades. Therefore during this period, the security and defense policy remained as a part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and as a national policy of every member state.

A creation of the European Economic Community (the EEC) at the end of the 50s predestined the integration especially in the economic field, also getting a political union did not seem so unrealistic. Therefore next years of 60s are characterized by a predominance of the intergovernmental approach (Dinan, 2004). In December 1969, one of the conclusions of Summit in Hague was a consensus to establish a common strategy and the development of a political union. But „the Empty chair crisis“ and the ambition of national governments to dominate in the common European policy made the consensus unachievable. For specific circumstances, the project of the European Political Community had to wait a few years. The area of foreign policy was in fact characterized as "an international body of domestic policies and problems" (Bindi and Shapiro, 2010: 34).

Military conflicts that occurred at the end of the 20th century, such as the war in Yugoslavia, Bosnia or Kosovo, had shown that the Member States of the European Union could no longer cope with crises and conflicts in Europe without the implementation of common rules and a decision-making in military issues, and therefore in the field of security and defense. After 70 years of the European Political Cooperation (established finally in October 1970), the European Council put an effort to shape the Common European Foreign Policy. In these years there has been a number of institutional changes and two important steps of the integration. The first was the southern enlargement of the European Community (new members states such as Spain, Portugal and Greece), which played a major role in the establishing of a democratic political order in this region. The second step was the adoption of the Single European Act (SEA) in 1986. Acceptance of this treaty did not mean only a revision of the Rome Treaty, but also the efforts to reintegrate the principle of common decision-making by majority voting in the Council.

The international relations in the 90s had an significant impact on the European Common Foreign policy. The geopolitical changes in international relations which made the United States of America a global

hegemony and “the winner” of the Cold War, helped the USA to ensure their position in security policy in Europe. Moreover there had become an opportunity for former Soviet states to join the European Community which revived the Dynamics of the integration. In the early 90s, The European Community adopted the "Petersberg tasks" (1992) as a part of the European Security and Defence Policy. They included humanitarian and rescue tasks, tasks relating to the maintenance of peace and tasks of combat forces as a part of a crisis management, including peacemaking. The EU intended to create the rapid reaction forces, which would be able to intervene in a crisis which solution would require the United Nations and NATO mandate. The adoption of the Petersberg tasks has shown a willingness to deploy common military units, but the biggest problem was weak and inadequate ways and means of defense forces of most nationalities (Cameron, 2007: 74). Bindi and Shapiro characterized this period of the creation of common security and defence policy that: „Eventually the only result in the field of foreign policy was the so-called CFSP, which was actually an institutional upgrade of the EPC rather than a coherent foreign policy. The European failure to act decisively in the Balkans meant that the 1990s was also the period in which the Europeans started talking seriously about defense. The results were similarly relatively weak institutions (the ESDP) rather than a true common defense policy“ (Bindi and Shapiro, 2010: 342). Foreign and security policy indeed reached into the pillar structure of the Maastrich Treaty, but not under the exclusive competence of the EU, but was left entirely in the competence of Member States.

Shaping the European Common Security Policy

The European Security and Defence Policy until the end of the 90s had become as an attempt to overcome a vacuum of the creation of armed forces at the European level. The remarkable reasons for the formation of the ESDP were the escalating conflict in Kosovo and the ongoing crisis in Yugoslavia. Declaration of St. Malo in 1998 said that "the European Union needs to be in a position to play its full role on the international stage. To this end, the EU must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises, acting in conformity with our respective obligations to NATO" (Deighton, 2002: 725). On the basis of this declaration, signed primarily by France and the United Kingdom, it was possible to create the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in Cologne a year later (1999)¹. From the institutional perspective, the ESDP created

¹ European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) is an integral part of the European Foreign and Security Policy although they are two separate policies. Thus it should be said that „The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)

a common strategy in a formation of the rapid reaction forces known as "battle groups", which has been an important aspect of crisis management.

Due to the security and defence changes and the new geopolitical challenges after 11th September 2001, such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, energy security and climate change, was established the European Security Strategy (the ESS). In 2003, a document was adopted as the European Security Strategy, which has been the ambition to be the core strategy for further changes of the foreign policy. However, as Bindi and Shapiro pointed "creating a strategy document is not the same as having a strategy. The formulation of a security strategy is (or should be) a political process, an effort to build consensus around a broad approach to securing a polity's interests. It is much more than just a document." (Bindi and Shapiro, (2010: 343) Therefore Bindi and Shapiro considered the formulation of the ESS as an important step to utilize the potential of the EU (well as institutions and personal capacities), "a true European Union foreign policy would require a more strategic outlook to realize that potential. " (Bindi and Shapiro, 2010: 343)

CFSP and ESDP after the Lisbon Treaty

Even the European Security and Defence Policy represents a relatively young level of foreign policy, achievements and decisions have been gradually incorporated into the Lisbon Treaty. „In so far as ESDP is concerned, this evolution paves the way towards more structural synergy between ESDP operations and other EU instruments in crisis management and, notably, to a stronger connection between CFSP priorities and ESDP activities " (Grevi, Keohane, 2009: 62). According to Molling (2008), The Lisbon Treaty in 2007 brought a few challenges. First, the name was changed to the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), which includes both civilian and military capabilities. There was no change in the intergovernmental approach and the CFSP has still remained characteristic by unanimous vote. In foreign policy can be applied a qualified majority voting only in the cases of decisions that do not concern military and defense issues. Among other things, such as the effect of diminishing the powers of the European Parliament and the European Commission within the security and defense policy, there has

is an integral part of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), which 'shall include all questions related to the security of the Union' (Article 17.1 TEU). The institutional frameworks of CFSP and ESDP broadly overlap, although the specific operational character of ESDP has triggered the creation of a distinctive sub-set of institutions primarily charged with the planning and conduct of crisis management crisis." (Grevi, Keohane, 2009: 19)

become a creation of the new institutional framework for the foreign and security policy. There was appointed a double-hat position of the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, which provides the seat on the European Commission and also the chair of the Council of EU foreign ministers. The agreement also established the European Defence Agency for the first time in 2004, where member states could support each other in the time of a terrorist attack or other disaster.

The EU as a foreign policy actor in the field of security and defence

The European Union has already carried out mainly humanitarian and rescue missions. The EU has been playing also a primary role as a external factor in stabilizing democratic regimes in third countries, as well as offering a financial assistance to solve political and social crises in the world. European military activities focus mainly on disarmament, supervision, counseling and trying to keep the peace (Cameron, 2007: 82). The European CFSP is trying to fight against a crime, a corruption and a transnational organized crime, such as in Bosnia and Herzegovina (where civilian crisis management deployed police officers to carry out supervision and guidance controls). In the Democratic Republic of Congo, the first troops of the European Union were trying to stabilize security in the country and improve the humanitarian situation. The European Union also acted as an observer at the Ukrainian - Moldovan border, which improved a cooperation between these two countries. Last but not least, the important and successful mission has been ongoing "anti-piracy" naval action in Somalia. Also, the current attempt to resolve geopolitical dispute in Ukraine is the evidence of efforts to stabilize the position of the Union as a relevant foreign policy player in international politics.

Moreover, a growing number of missions and other institutional weaknesses of CFSP and ESDP have caused an increasing funding to implement these actions. These resources include military, human resources, although the equipment of weapons suffers from a lack of financial sources. While the financial resources are limited for security and defense missions, the successful one could be provided only through the cooperation with other security and defence organizations such as NATO, the Organization for Security Cooperation in Europe and the African Union. The EU has no permanent army, but, if it is necessary, the Member States are willing to provide the military forces, but not at least, states rely on the help from NATO. "All ESDP military operations, except Concordia, have taken place under a UN mandate. Aside from clear benefits at the political, operational and tactical level, good cooperation and coordination with these actors is also a key

dimension of EU support to effective multilateralism"(Grevi, Keohane, 2009: 408).

To sum up, the success in the field of security and military missions depends on the degree of cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the UN Security Council Committee and therefore on the multilateral agreements with so-called major global players, such as the United States of America. Analysis of the relations among the EU, NATO and the USA will be the main topic of next part of my work with regard to the assessment of impact of their development.

The European Union and the North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) We can perceive a relationship between the EU and NATO as a cooperative relationship which can be described as complementary rather than a relationship of rivalry. The relationship between NATO and the EU can be observed since 50s, after the failure of the EDC (European Defence Community), since a security issue was addressed to the competence of NATO. The EU-NATO relationship has evolved from the very beginning of their formation. Moreover, since the EU has depended on the Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which spoke for a collective defense. The Treaty obliged the signature countries in the case of attack of one of them to act against the aggression. Additionally, the Brussels Treaty adopted in 1954 provided the Council to rely on the authority of NATO. Direct to NATO partial involvement in the European military and defence policy had solved either the issue of security in Europe or the solution of the "German question". These two contracts can be regarded as a beginning of the relationship between these two organizations.

Before the establishment of the European Defence and Security Policy (1999) were the Western European countries dependent on a support from NATO, and thus largely to the United States of America. When NATO was at that time a major international player, especially before the "fall" of the Soviet Union, there was no effort to establish independent European security institutions. One of the main impulse for the European Union to shape its defense and security policy was the failure to solve the problem in the former Yugoslavia. At that time, NATO had to intervene, particularly headed by the United States. The European Defence and Security Policy was established in 1999 in Cologne under the previous agreement of Saint Malo (1998). The central political figures of this initiative were the former French president Jacques Chirac and British prime minister Tony Blair. After the long time, these representatives finally found a willingness and ability to somehow

formulate how the European Defence and Security Policy should look like.

The first significant issue, which ESDP faced to its institutionalization, was a split with the USA. The United States of America were trying to secure its primary and dominant role in the NATO's security policy and therefore were suspicious of the EU and its plans for the CFSP. These concerns had crystallized in 1998, when Secretary of USA, Madeleine Albright, warned the EU that the CFSP could continue only on the condition of attempting the "3D" project (Dinan, 2004, Grevi, 2009). This was an attempt to negotiate the conditions under which the United States, respectively the NATO, are willing to cooperate with the EU. For the USA, it was essential that the EU and the NATO would not compete in defense and security policy. Also the second condition was to solve the problem of incorporating countries that were not EU members, but had joined the NATO. The last and the third point was that these requirements were not the duplicating the military and operational capabilities which NATO had already own (Howorth, 2007: 139). Over time there were suggestions to revitalize and submit again the status quo of mutual relations. An appropriate example was a proposal of the NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, who drew attention to the lack of cooperation between the EU and NATO. In speech in April 14, 2005 he said that it is necessary to strengthen the relationship and dialogue between the two organizations. He responded to German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, whose proposal was to start transatlantic dialogue and negotiations. The debate then continued a year later, in 2006, which raised the dialogue about the position of the EU and NATO (Howorth, 2007).

Later in 2002, the cooperation between the EU and NATO was based on certain commitments of common collaboration. The declaration of ESDP was adopted as a strategic partnership between the EU and NATO, based on sharing the same values, the indivisibility of security and the decision to overcome the challenges of the new century. These organizations (EU and NATO) should have ensured that their risk management was strengthened each other despite the different nature of these organizations. They also committed to mutual consultation, dialogue, cooperation and transparency. Both of them pledged to respect the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Otherwise there raised a demand to autonomous decision-making of security policies inside the European Union.

Later was approved an agreement, known as the Berlin Plus, which simultaneously followed the Washington Summit in 1999. The Berlin Plus included a number of agreements, but the point was that the EU and NATO finally made a consensus on the utility of this enlargement. The formal elements of the Berlin Plus agreement (details of which are classified) include:

- A NATO-EU Security Agreement that covers the exchange of classified information under reciprocal security protection rules;
- Assured access to NATO planning capabilities for EU-led operations;
- Availability of NATO assets and capabilities for EU-led civil-military operations;
- Procedures for release, monitoring, return and recall of NATO assets and capabilities;
- Terms of reference for using NATO's DSACEUR (Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe) for commanding EU-led operations;
- EU-NATO consultation arrangements in the context of an EU-led operations making use of NATO assets and capabilities;
- Arrangements for coherent and mutually reinforcing capability requirements, in particular the incorporation within NATO's defence planning of the military needs and capabilities that may be required for EU-led military operations. (Source: European External Action http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/berlin/index_en.htm)

The first military mission of ESDP in Macedonia (Operation Concordia, launched in December 2003) can demonstrate a deepening cooperative relationship between NATO and the European Union. That specific relationship between the two organizations at least appeared to be supporting to the gradual adaptation of divided competences. NATO has been responsible for collective defense and the EU should have been in charge of crisis management in cases, where NATO was not involved. The Macedonian case of close coordination between the EU and NATO, was based on the understanding that NATO had to be a indispensable political and military support for the EU (Dinan, 2004). On the other hand, NATO (and the USA) recognized that the EU could play a unique and important role in providing credible Macedonians prospectus and the possibility of "Europeanness". This fellowship clearly has shown that organizations could cooperate with each other, indeed, if it is necessary to achieve the desired results and thus fix conflicts in affected countries. All these common steps were taken by the two organizations and appeared to be in balance, but responses of lead countries of organizations were different. The European Security and Defence Policy

has opened the discussion in many ways. Professor Howorth (2007) recognizes the three main themes, such as: 1. Various reactions of the United States of America towards the ESDP 2. USA defense policy which divides Europe and 3. Complex and difficult relationship between the European Defence and Security Policy and NATO (Howorth, 2007: 135). USA formally welcomed the new EU policy (ESDP), but with concern that the EU could gain strength and thus become a major threat to US dominant position in world order¹. These concerns could be also interpreted as an evidence that the global constellation of the international relations has been based on the uni-polarity of American dominance.

The ability of autonomous European actions without the assistance of NATO

The ability of autonomous action is the capability to send the European forces where is needed, regardless of decisions of the USA and NATO. This ability was significant because of the previous experience of the EU in the Balkans (Bosnia and Kosovo) in the 90s, when the European Union was unable to prevent or at least enter into the conflict, and fully proved its dependence on the USA and NATO. Moreover, according to Keukeleire (2010: 58) the European leaders realized that the peace in the neighborhood region is a priority for them, the USA had interests in the other parts of the world (particularly in the countries like Iraq and Afghanistan) and their interest might not coincide. In short, the EU should have been able to take care of peace where it is considered an appropriate.

European Security and Defence Policy has developed relatively quickly since its official creation in 1999, mainly after launching the first European Union missions (Operation Concordia in Macedonia and the European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina). Since 2003 the European states have been willing to release soldiers and civilian experts to military and civilian missions (police, monitoring or targeted to support the rule of law). These missions have been provided across Europe, especially in the Western Balkans, but also for example in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia, Iraq and Afghanistan. These European Union missions have confirmed their willingness and ability to actively participate in addressing humanitarian and / or security crises and contribute to peace and stabilization in the world (Cameron, 2007: 84).

¹ Also Kenneth Waltz pointed out that it is undesirable if the European Union would become one of the global super powers (Waltz, 2008).

The EU missions under the support of ESDP therefore showed that EU Member States could cooperate in security policy and jointly sent its troops abroad without the support of the USA and NATO. On the other hand, Cameron (2007) pointed out that other (especially new) member states may prefer to act militarily only or primarily within NATO and/or with the USA because of the fact that the EU has no military capabilities at its own disposal (Cameron, 2007: 85). One of the largest operations, Operation EUFOR-Althea (Bosnia and Herzegovina), and the first ESDP mission, Operation Concordia (Macedonia), both purely military operations were implemented by Berlin Plus agreement, which is one of the possible ways of keeping the standard of these missions (in addition to operations under the leadership of a country and operations led by Brussels, Keukeleire, 2010: 61-64). When we look at other military operations (Operation Artemis and EUFOR RD Congo, EUFOR Tchad and EU NAVFOR Somalia), we find that they were all led by one country (France, Germany, Great Britain) rather than the common foreign policy of the EU (Sperling, 2014).

Relations between the USA and the European security policy

To define the issues of security and military relations between the USA and the EU, it is necessary to point out the two most important events that have greatly affected these relations to this day - the end of the Cold War and the terrorist attacks of the 11th September 2001 followed by intervention in Iraq (Cameron, 2007: 91). The first event meant a loss of the primary American interest in Europe, and also a strengthening the European further expansion, as well as a deeper economic and later foreign policy integration. This could be said that the EU was able to gradually take over responsibility for security and regional stability within its neighborhood. The second event resulted in sudden, but a fundamental change in the USA foreign and defense policy and hence a breakthrough with the European most important foreign policy priorities. The result is a number of political issues to be analyzed from different point of view. One of these different perspectives of the understanding of international relations between the EU and the USA could be an inability to mutual understanding of their own interests and priorities, not least structural constraints.

While the Cold War priorities and interests of the USA and European countries have been relatively clear - the promotion of liberal and democratic values and to counterbalance the Eastern communist bloc – but after 1989 it is increasingly arguable whether or not there any common priorities and shared interests exist (Cameron, 2007: 96). On the contrary, it seems that the perspective of looking at the international relations is vastly different. The European Union places the emphasis on

the non-military instruments in crisis management, like the critical dialogue and conflict prevention (Hill, Smith, 2011: 355), and post-conflict management, like building structures and capacity of the state, which is not always in line with "black and white" perception of international relations for the USA¹.

The willingness of the European Union to carry out military operations is, moreover and unlike the USA, hampered mainly by public opinion, which is not keen on providing military operations in third countries in general². This is undoubtedly related not only to the American public attitudes to USA foreign policy after the events of September 11, but also with how McCormick points out that the USA military has a different position in a society where soldiers are presented as heroes, while in Europe the Army perceived rather negative connotation (McCormick, 2007: 60). In addition, we can add own perception of terrorist attacks as something which traumatized American society to such an extent that the pursuit of revenge was made by the European partners hardly understandable, as reflected in their reluctant to intervene in Iraq (Cameron, 2007: 95). It follows that the fundamental issue between the USA and the EU is primarily the difficulty in understanding the interests and motivations of the other, leading in particular to the already mentioned different view on the way to resolve conflict and crisis situations.

Regard to the greatest security threats nowadays, there is a clear consensus between the EU and the USA how to identify them – in addition to a terrorism, there could be for example the Iran's nuclear program, as well as the presence Russia in the Ukraine crisis and the growing potential of China in global politics. However, problems have shown how to address the implementing measures. An example of the above-mentioned is not only the war in Iraq, but also the so-called "War on terror" in general. In the case of war in Iraq, there have been tensions and conflicts among the European countries also, not only between the USA and the EU. On the one side stood Italy, Spain, United Kingdom, etc., which supported the war in Iraq and on the other side were France and Germany which were against. Gradually, however, Spain left the so-

¹ Robert Kagan defines these two distinct perspectives through different philosophical approaches: Europe, according to him "has entered a post-historical paradise of peace and prosperity, and found a Kantian peace" while America was "mired in history, applying power in the anarchic Hobbesian world in which international laws and rules are unreliable "(Cameron, 2007: 96).

² One example was the public's attitude towards the intervention in Iraq: the USA public opinion was mostly inclined to the intervention, by contrast in Europe, there occurred mass protests and demonstrations (Cameron, 2007: 98).

called coalition of the willing and Ukraine, Hungary and Italy withdrew its troops from Iraq. As Moravcsik said (2010: 205): „The United States now recognizes, just as most Europeans do, that that intervention was an unsustainable mistake, not something that the United States would be inclined to do again. It was so costly that it could not be repeated more than once a generation. Thus, in the post-cold war period there is a record of almost total agreement between the United States and Europe on the use of military force out of area”. Because France and Germany disagreed with the war in Iraq in 2003, there have been many debates on the rejection of the French and German goods in the United States of America. French fries were renamed as "freedom fries" in restaurants on the Capitol Hill (Cameron, 2007: 99).

On the other hand, we must take into account the relation of the USA and the EU that is not necessarily perceived as conflicting and therefore seriously problematic. The fact that both actors have their own ideas about international relations, actually can complement their activities. Based on the theory of comparative advantage, the USA could be understood as a military and the EU as a civil power, and there is a low probability that the European Union would gain that military power as the USA already has (Hill, Smith, 2011: 358). On the other hand, the strength of the USA in the so-called hard security has its limits, especially in terms of financial costs, the deployment of military forces and questionable effectiveness of war and violence as a tool of foreign policy (McCormick, 2007: 63-65). The main point from this perspective, therefore, it is a perception that the intensification of the European Union as a relevant actor, which could threaten the USA position in global politics, could be understood in the terms of post-conflict management, not as a complementary security power to the USA forces.

In this sense, I partly agree with Moravcsik (2010), who states that the problems in the field of security policy are now much more smaller than in the period before the end of the Cold War. Additionally Moravcsik used the argument of a counterbalance to each other and a supplement to military and civilian forces (Moravcsik, 2010: 218). On the other hand, we can not forget to the argument above that one thing is the complementing of their forces, but there is also an important condition that there should be a mutual respect among different positions in order to fulfill the future cooperation.

The European Union and the USA have been criticized for failing to speak in foreign and defense policy with a single voice. Lack of authority represented by the Member States as well as the principle of the rotating presidency, was a result why the USA has seen a discontinuity in the

priorities in the field of common foreign and security policy, and the European Union could only stand alongside the USA, for example, in already mentioned the war against terrorism (Cameron, 2007: 97). After the Lisbon Treaty, the creation of the institution of a High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy has already strengthened its competence, however, these problems of EDSP have been partly solved. However, the consequence is that an unified European interest is not always agreed by the USA (Cameron, 2007: 105). It was seen not only in the attitude to events in the Middle East (Libya) and the intervention in Iraq, but for example, in the case of the Kyoto Protocol and certain economic policies that will be the interest of next coming months in particular by promoting of the Transatlantic trade agreement (TTIP). It should be kept in mind that, given the extent of mutual Euro-American relations is more or less self-evident that any problems occur, and just a matter of perspective, if the problems are seen as serious potential threats to the future, or as a natural part of the international relations between the two powers, which will always be the biggest partners and rivals at the same time (Cameron, 2007: 105).

Conclusion

From the development of the European foreign policy, which I demonstrated in my work, we can postulate several arguments. Unlike national states (eg. USA), the European Union still has not defined clear goals of its foreign policy since the EU established the Common Foreign and Security Policy (Bindi and Shapiro, 2010: 340). Another finding is the fact that the CFSP has always been reactive, not proactive - that the competences of foreign politics were awarded following to immediate needs or specific needs, not on the basis of a coherent strategy (Bindi and Shapiro, 2010: 343). Nevertheless, the EU has established a foundation for greater use of its potential by deepening efforts for the common security and defense policy. The European Security and Defence Policy is a result of the successful European integration, although it is a relatively new area within the common decision-making and creating rules on security and defense at the European level. The current form of foreign and security policy is the result of historical progress and changes that have occurred since 1999. In my view, a definition of the mutual relationship between the EU and NATO shapes the European common security policy gradually, and a clear demarcation of responsibilities of each transnational organizations are pointed to the EU's relationship to the USA. The European Union and the United States of America are the most important global players who need each other to successfully solve many of the world's problems. They need to learn how to work together, where necessary; differ where is necessary to reduce differences in the same areas. Both parts must

continue to successfully cooperate in various fields (Cameron, 2007: 104). As well as the enhanced cooperation, as well as disagreement and dissent, are part of the political, security and economic relations between the EU and the USA. In the case of political relations, the USA and the EU have committed to set up a regular political agenda at all levels, as well as to strengthen their further partnership in order to promote democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and individual freedoms, to ensure peace and promote international security, act together with other nations against aggression and coercion, contribute to the resolution of conflicts in the world and so on. The European Union alongside the NATO and the United States of America, is becoming an increasingly relevant player in the international politics. For example, the Ukraine crisis and the case of Palestine have showed a clear way forward to closer cooperation in the field of security.

Resources:

- BINDI, F., SHAPIRO, F. (2010): EU Foreign Policy: Myth or Reality? In: Bindi, Federiga, ed. *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Inst. Press.
- CAMERON, Fraser (2007): *The Defence Dimension*. In: *An Introduction to European Foreign Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- DEIGHTON, A. (2002): *European Security and Defense Policy*. In: *JCMS*. [online], Vol. 40, No. 4.
- DINAN, D. (2004): *Europe Recast: A History of European Union*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- GREVI, G.-Helly, D.-Keohane, D. (eds.) (2009): *European Security and Defense Policy. The first 10 years (1999-2009)*. Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies.
- HILL, Ch., SMITH, M. (2011): *The Changing Shape of EU-US Relations*. In: *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: OUP.
- HOWORTH, J.(2007): *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union; Selling it to Uncle Sam... ESDP and Transatlantic relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- KEUKELEIRE, Stephan (2010): *European Security and Defense Policy: From Taboo to a Spearhead of EU Foreign Policy?* In: Bindi, Federiga, ed.: *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Inst. Press.
- MCCORMICK, J. (2007): *Europe's Civilian Power*. In: *The European Superpower*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- MOLLING, Ch. (2008): *ESDP after Lisbon: More coherent and capable?* In: *CSS Analyses in Security Policy*. [online]. Vol. 3, No. 28.
- MORAVCSIK, A. (2010): *U.S.-EU Relations: Putting the Bush Years in Perspective*. In: Bindi, Federiga (ed.): *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Inst. Press.
- SPERLING, J. (2014): *Handbook of governance and security*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- WALTZ, K. N. (2008): *Realism and International Politics*. New York: Routledge; 1 edition.