

Graduate Student Papers
Course: EU Democracy Promotion: Theory and Practice
Term: Fall 2016

**International promotion of Democracy: The USA, UN,
and the EU**

What type of more successful and strong regime could be besides ‘democratic promotion’? ...

There are many claims that for democratization needs to be preliminary conditions. These conditions have relation for achieving specific level of a state and building a nation. Another word, before beginning democracy, society must choose the method of peace styles of different ethnic groups, which composed of, and must create necessary institutions for state interests and solving problems. If democracy, or receiving democracy from outside, may create primary conditions, means that may bring the country to internal conflict and external intervention. To make useful the program of ‘democratic promotion’ for states, there is needs for creation of preliminary conditions for democracy, including economic development, formation of honest and effective bureaucratic apparatus for stimulating failure from practical patronage and repression as the main instrument of governing, as cooperation of supporting activists of democracy in civil society that serves internal push for democracy.

In the frame of conception of ‘democratic promotion’ of global actors, such as USA, EU, UN and other transnational Human Rights Watch networks, consciously and certainly trying dividing with any states the new types of thoughts, institutions and models of behavior in the sense of openly applying the aim for the democratic promotions in a state.

For describing strategy of the EU in the sense of democratic promotion, we need focus on ‘conditional’ term, which identifies as intro for sanction or promotion with the aim or democracy, or protecting democracy.

In the last decade, we may see the ‘retreat’ from political promotion of democracy from the USA. Association for democratic promotion with military intervention by the USA, violence of human

rights by the USA on the step-door on under-developing states, brought for the decrease of leverage, which may benefit the USA and other Western countries for the democracy promotion.

Study and research for the transition period in beginning years often suffered from systematic contempt with international aspects. Only in the end of 1990s researchers started attending to foreign measure of democratization. Interests to international cases increased with rapid speed. Till the January of 2010 in the bibliography of American works on promotion of democracy had the base with 340 cases on this topic, consultation on reports and political applications of tens gradual books and monographs.

My point is on the field of research on the ‘democratic promotion from outside’. As previous literatures overview, in my overview, I am bringing the leading notion and trend of real world that connected with ‘the democracy from outside’. The focus will be on different mechanisms of democracy such as; ‘conditional’, ‘control’, ‘socialization’, and ‘conviction’.

These classifications often match with literature like Schimmelfennig¹ and McFaul. An advantage in the survey gives opportunities to ‘specialists’ for democratic promotion such as the EU and the USA. One of my task is going to be analyze if there is distinction between these types of ‘distributors’ of democracy with distinction between methods of ‘promotion’ of democracy. The difference in the style of the USA and the EU for democratic promotion often characterized very categorically; said, that the USA committed to the ‘democratic promotion’, while the EU refers ‘supporting democracy’ (Merkel, 2010)². My goal is not to make differentiation between promotion and support, following those who use these term as ‘replaceable’.

¹ Schimmelfennig, EU Democracy in the European Neighborhood: Political Conditionality

² W. Merkel. Measuring Democratic Consolidation. 2010

The research on the promoting democracy is possible to divide to two scientific program, where the interest undergoes to different sources, learning international relations and learning the period of approaches. Learning international relations in the center of my focus is going to be actors of democratic promotion. Often extends the working hypothesis that actors in international politics always have to deal with beforehand situation and take a decision in accordance with any speculative model, ranging from neo-realism to constructivism. These speculative models and should explicate, to better understand the underlying assumptions of the international democratization, 'expanding democracy' in the world. Learning transitional period is important for understanding characters and dynamics of development of political regimes in each country. For researchers in this field often will be specialist of comparative political scientists that try to explore set of vectors of influences inside of learning phenomenon.

Basically, the study of democratic promotion tries to view the question, in which condition the interaction of foreign and domestic actors force in a country to become more 'liberal, 'free', or more 'stable'. Here we can see that foreign actors try to influence to political regime of another countries. Foreign actors are considered as an 'agents of promotion', 'apostle', or 'benefactor' of democracy (Burnell, 2004)³. All these three notions inevitably associated with intentional actions. On these basis, we can make different group of the whole literature, where democratization considered as the process of spreading democracy.

It is true that the notion 'spreading' is partly compatible with the idea of 'intentional' action; the democracy mostly will be spread than to be contributed. The process of spreading as its nature cannot be fully controlled actors of democratic promotion. That's in this group of study of

³ Peter Burnell. International Actors and Democracy promotion in Central and Eastern Europe. 2004

‘promotion’ of democracy seen under this angle of the view, where excludes side concept related for spreading such as adaptation of a competitive challenge to the situation up forms or examples of other people’s inspiration.

Another notion I am not bringing in my overview is ‘democratization from outside’, even though this term was brought by famous researchers like Whitehead or Merkel, and under brand name of ‘democracy from outside’, which had a lot success based on understanding democratic promotion as a purposefully changing political regimes. I decided to discuss about the democratic promotion, and separately about ‘the democratization from outside’. As my understanding the notion of ‘democracy from outside’, makes the process too easy, where will function huge number of foreign factors, where influence to the current domestic non-democratic regimes. Particularly, the event in the sphere of international politics, such as globalization of trade, belong to the subject of research on ‘democratization from outside’. Thus, the promotion of democracy can be defined as a set of actions outside actors who deliberately try win authoritarian regime, supporting actors of inside the countries, putting the same tasks. In that definition, can be identified three aspects of ‘democratic promotion’, which I am going to discuss in the following paragraphs: Agents of democratic promotion, recipients of democratic promotion and action, connecting those two groups of actors.

When we learn actors of democratic promotion, to our mind comes governments of different states, international organizations, transnational actors. There are many studies for democratic promotion, or support, from the USA, UN, OSCE, and the EU. Mentioning these types researches of democracy, there will be seen a distinction in characters of ‘promotion’ of democracy, and yet,

who is promoting it. But, far less will be effects of democracy from outside, which I am planning for my work in details.

Although, there is no comparison of the consolidated figures for the costs of promoting democratization from outside. Funds for promotion of democracy and for the *Good Governance* in the USA increased from 128 million USD in 1990s to 817 million USD to 2003. Based on some statistics in 2008 the USA spent 2.25 billion USD for supporting democracy in other countries. European states are also active in democratic promotion. Each of four leading countries of the European States spent in 2006 and 2007 more than 400 million euros for the promotion of democracy⁴. But that is not only the EU spending for outside promotion of democracy. Annually funding democratic promotion, The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights got 713 million euros in 2006. Comparing the program of the UNDP, shows spending 1.4 billion USD in year just for supporting democratic changes in the world.

Many authors underline that analysis of international influences to the process of democratization must be considered as unavoidable limits of foreign interaction. Democracy and democratization, for definition, dependent from relation between local elites and people (*demos*). These processes are always, in fundamental meaning, home-dramas (Magen, 2009)⁵. And actually, as given in the literature, that different regions are receptive of influences from outside differently. Latin America, Central and East Europe, are usually seen as the arena of extreme active for democratization. Followingly, domestic actors, inside of these countries, every time forced to reckon with powerful foreign influences on the transitional stages of political lives (Whitehead, 1986)⁶. In contrast, post-

⁴ A. Leftwich. The promotion of good governance and democracy. 2010

⁵ Megan. The democratic deficit in the European Union. 2009

⁶ Whitehead. The International Dimensions of Democratization. 1986

Soviet Eastern Europe, Central Africa, Central Asia, and the whole Arab world often characterized as less open to the effect of ‘democratization from outside’. That makes actors, which are writing about those countries, to focus on political economic situation inside of countries and to the possibilities of changing regimes in those countries.

What type of instrument use actors for the ‘democracy from outside? Because the democratization from outside needs a lot of work, trying systematize tools is not easy. Mainly, the list of this kind of levers includes international interaction, or international cooperation. It would be seen, as an example, in the list of Peter Schraeder from seven group of instruments and those are: Classical Diplomacy, Foreign Aid, Promotions of political conditions, An Economic Sanctions, Hidden Intervention, Semi-military intervention, and Military intervention. It might also be seen as in ascending order; from the weakest diplomacy to the strongest, - military intervention. These types of numbering list help to classify the difference on our field. The continuity effort for democratization from outside proves researchers in the necessities of counting all conditions and contexts of successful promotion of democracy⁷.

Systematically attempts for connecting two groups of actors, agents of democracy and recipients of democracy, through methods of interaction appeared in science recently. The first relevant work in this field was the work of edition Laurence Whitehead ‘International Dimension of Democracy’, where in the introductory chapter of that book Whitehead develops three models related to ‘the democracy from outside’ such as contact, control, and consensus (Whitehead, 2001). In that approach, mainly equation of empirical definition of constellation; contacts called geographical neighboring (like countries in the South Europe in 1980s and countries in Central Europe in 1990s).

⁷ P. Schraeder. Evaluating International Influence on Democratic Development. 2006

as Control, as foreign actors, which asymmetrically use of force (like the act of the USA in Latin America). As Consensus, the situation of society, receiving aid from outside, consensus only accompanies already flowing process (like South-East Asia in 1980s).

Based on that assumption we see the main categories, which are important till now. There is another terminology with four 'c's; control, contact, convergence, and conditionality. Terms control and contact are still there but were given to new understanding for discussion. If we discuss about consensus and convergence, and Whitehead's "control" essentially collapsed to two categories; control and conditionality. Control is possible only in exceptional cases, where is not big place for maneuvering in democratic countries. If a country may not only illuminate ideas of democracy, but rejects them, then will be necessary for 'conditionality'. We may see it in existence of activities of the EU, as conditions for joining the EU as new state. For the expanding of the EU to the East, there is a lot monography about conformity of the EU requirements and about the development of democracy on other new states of European Union. We may bring the book of Shimmelfenning as the example of the most perspective to those question; "European Integration of Central and Eastern Europe" (2005).

Of course, 'unification' of Europe as the referential concept, not exactly, that 'democracy from outside' with two reasons: First, the democratic system promotion, one of many measures, on basis that the EU is trying to influence from outside system to candidate states. Secondly, the potential membership to the EU in the sum of democratic process, is not the direct path of democratization, but its circumstances. In the literature about unification of Europe could be found many confirmations about democratization from outside, and these literatures must be taken into account.

The main merit of Schimmelfennig is wide understanding of ‘social action’ in the field of ‘influence from outside’ on democratizing countries. Abstract categories are transforming into clear models of international interaction. They are; 1) model of meaning from outside, 2) the model of social learning, 3) the model of learning lessons. This step-forward comparison with previous schemes allowed as new vision to global politics, connecting these models with existed theoretical positions. The model of ‘motivated from outside’ is the ‘model of regional agreement’, where almost everything is dependent from actors and valid logics of reasoning and conditions. For the process searching for agreement of actors for exchange information, threat and promises in accordance of their preferences. Discussing this model may possible only inside of regional toolkit: needs to be clear that how reliable are the incentives or threats, what power may prevent the process, what are the costs of adaptation of treaty provisions and from non-symmetrical information exchange. The model of social learning, as actors say, responsible pivotal trends of social constructivism. The main premise of the model of social learning is that a state accepts the conditions of the EU, if the state is sure about its implementation within country (Schimmelfennig 2005)⁸. These two models are perfectly fits in to vision of European integration as dual process. The spread of ruling is built simultaneously and implementing instrumental logic, and in processes instrumental logics. This dichotomy was widely spread in the earlier studies of democratization from outside such as ‘control-contact vs consensus-convergence’. But now, we can see that the EU expand to the East became the event of global scale, which allow us to switch our knowledge, during of observing to the domestic dynamics of the EU, to different regions. Main latter works about democracy from outside doesn’t bring new types anymore and any new typologies interactions. Even though, the name of this typologies rarely change its terms. As examples we

⁸ Schimmelfennig. European Union Democratic promotion in the European Neighborhood. 2005

may bring Amikay Magen and Leonardo Morlino, who used for mapping the area of term ‘control’, ‘presenting the condition’, ‘socialization’, and ‘example’⁹.

The next important step in developing the notion was devoted to conceptualization of ‘transformation power of Europe’. These terms are more clear than others, who were trying to prescribe the similarity in the logic between non-instrumental types of democratization from outside. It is impossible to mark everything that is not compulsion or nominating the condition, ‘constructivist logics’. Contrary, these make differentiation between two constructivist fields; socialization and conviction. Socialization belongs to norms of reality, and convictions to communicative rationalization. Normative rationalities belong to widely group, written in the frame of ‘new institutionalism’, where individuals follow not only logics and reasons, or consequences, but to the ‘logic of applicability’, learning how to approach to the state. This logic was discussed in previous works on these topics, including Schimmelfinnig, naming this logic as ‘model of social learning’. Other authors were also suggesting these mechanisms, but not learning them with wide perimeters and indicating to true points that social learning divided to two types. First type represents following the logic of applicability in neo-institutionalism theories: actors formulate their decisions on the base of values they apply. In this approach norms are important but those are amount only to external behavioral variables. Second type is conceptualizing the value as some givens and based to ideas that they develop exchange during of communication. During of communication will be possibility for redefinition of interests, identities, and values. There is also another count for social communication mechanisms of democratization by Checkel¹⁰ and they are:

⁹ Leonardo Morlino. How to Assess a Democracy. What Alternatives? 2014

¹⁰ J. Checkel. International Institutions and Socialization in Europe. 2007

1. Compulsion. The model is built on those ideas that the democratic support injects its ideas to other states where has not been democratized. From receiving side of opposite actors is less for changing the ruling regime to be expected. The condition of democracy is impossible to say successful. The democracy from outside through compulsion often takes the form of direct conflict: Using force for democratic support differentiates from the form of compulsion from other types of democratic promotion. This type of model can uniquely be characterized carrying democracy its propelling and this democratic state or organization, which uses force, needs the democracy to be everywhere. But from recipient side it might be unexpected actors and its reaction also might be unpredictable. Compulsion is often used related to cruel authoritarian regime where political opposition might be driven underground. Also, democracy might be imposed by the power of weak states such as crash victims. In some cases, local actors, who receive democratic support with difficulties, could also be called as ‘citizens’ of non-democratic state.

2. Conditionality.

This model based on instrumental reality in the sense that two groups of actors, senders and recipients, enter to the game of ‘motivation’, promises and threats (nonviolent threat). Despite the fact that this concept originated in the interior of the World Bank's development plans and policies, democratization from the outside on the basis of the conditions put forward more often associated with the EU and its institutional structure. Followingly, the paradigm of international politics, more institutionalist perspective of transnational politics is obstructed. Thus, this condition moves further, more was used to those countries whose candidacy was justified more and ‘conditions’ was stopped if there was incomplete compliance or the failure

from the direction from earlier researches, where was an example of democratization in Central Europe.

3. Conviction. This model based on ideas that the value of individuals in significant portion; as the result of reasonable arguments. Nevertheless, a source of value usually straight and was not discussed in the literature for democracy, theoretically model back to the premise of the theory of communicative action of Habermas (Habermas, 1992)¹¹. This model implied for interpretation of international communicative actions that needs in resonant structure and the level of society as well as in the level of elites. Public actors, involved to this action, must be ready to 'social learnings', more clearly for acceptance of those norms and ideas, which change their personal identities. This leads to public access for mass communications, including new type of media. On the other constellation, intensive, or sometimes called complex, learning needs to strengthen structures in international politics. Particularly in the level of elite learning less similar to disorderly making international connections. That is usual arena of democratization from outside through communicative action will be international organizations, which involved in political dialogs and volunteer agreements.
4. Socialization. In contrast believe, this model based on normative of reality. In the core of interest is inactive political conviction, but exchange of social norms and values. The result of actual socialization, as the model of conviction, is social learning. But the learning, itself, not important if norms was changed or not, the idea and values in the result of communicative conviction or in the attempt on practical adaption. School of thought, declaring socialization as the main method of democratization from outside, usually

¹¹ Jürgen Habermas. *The Public Sphere and Democracy: A Critical Intervention*. 1992

doesn't reject that communication plays its role for standard-settings. But often this school discussed norms of legal nature such as the declaration on human rights of UN or European convention for human rights. From the point of view sociology, these norms endow developing institutions legal and illegal rules, and that is the main point that neo-institutionalism claim. This fulfilled socialization or not, public interaction rules and institutional logics show (sometimes it can be called as traditional or cultural). For instance, election might be more important for the public than 'democratic' idea of electing leader for specific term (Verdery, 1998)¹².

These four social mechanisms of interaction must be distinguished from potential action of democracy media; from one part, and from another, recipient of democracy from the other part. If the aim of the first is simple, supporting democracy from outside, the same aim of latter, the result will be difficult, the results will be different. Filling threat of their freedom of action, political elites can solve or not solved to give these institutions taking deep roots on domestic conditions. Usually 'democratic promotion' seen as recipient choose one of these two, focusing to its own chances on political survival. The same people of authoritarian or democratic states can solve or not solve overworking impulse from outside in political relevance of the action. But, actors of promoting democracy are convinced that the whole population is ready to achieve the main part of freedom, autonomy and self-identity.

Obstacles arise only when social or economic difficulties become so oppressive that hanged the expected benefits of the democratization of the regime.

¹² Katherine Verdery. Democratic Designs: International Intervention. 1998

The last two types of democratization I am going to bring here are: Democracy through convergence and Democracy through diffusion.

The democracy through convergence happens in the process of accession of non-democratic state with not losing its sovereignty with existing community of democratic state. As an example here we may bring the case of Spain, Portugal, and Greece, where these countries were under the process of integration into European community. The main difficulties for measuring the influences of international factors appeared in the intermediate event of democracy through convergence, when 'key actors', involved in the process of regime changes, could absolute internal, but, their strategies and measures clearly formed under pressure created outside the rules and structures.

The concept of 'penetration into the system' is similar to understanding of the 'regime of convergence' of Whitehead. Having long term characters of foreign factors, some others may penetrate to existed political system, showing influence on background conditions and preparing regime changes. Followingly, if during of democratic transition won't be direct participation of foreign factors, the influence of long-term foreign factors and levels of 'penetrating into the system', should be considered as regime changes. Approaches of convergence and penetration are helpful for understanding the influences of foreign factors on political regimes of those countries, which are not under the political or economic dependences from any foreign superpowers. The trap of this approach is that these are not theories. It is more like conceptualized frames that could be built explanatory models for specific observed cases.

The second view of the combination of foreign and domestic factors in the processes of democratic conceptualization on the idea of 'diffusion'. Under diffusion we may understand multiple

interactions and interconnections between two structures, which one of is the international context, and another is the different state, which is within this context.

Despite of following elaboration of different studies are more concentrated to models of diffusion, as know the theory of ‘three waves’ of democracy of Huntington, which could be considered as predecessor of this approach. In the book of ‘the third wave; democratization in the end of 20th century’, Huntington said about effects of ‘snowball’, or effect of demonstration, strengthening by new international communication, about democracy in another country as one of factors that made the way for the third wave for democratic transition (Huntington, 1991)¹³. In the later article ‘Twenty years later: the future of the third wave’ Huntington made an accent for understanding diffusion for explaining possibilities of transformation of electoral democracy in liberal democracy. In that article, he claimed that the degree of susceptibility non-western society to liberal or electoral democracy depends on direct degree of influence, which came from the west. For him, the influence of the western influence meant being in the area of influence with the sphere of ‘civilization’, which formed on the base of norms and values of Christianity. That is why, according him, from non-western countries the greatest chance of turning electoral democracy to liberal, had catholic countries of Latin America and Orthodox countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Moving deep, for suggestion of creation the idea of network, or club of liberal democratic states in the form of democratic international, which he called “Dimentern” with the linkage to Communist International, or Comintern. The main function of Dimentern became ‘the expand of democracy global scale and increase in efficiency of democratic states. Dimentern, as in sense,

¹³ S. Huntington. Democracy’s Third Wave. 1991

institutionalized the mechanisms and channels of diffused ideas and institutes of liberal democracy between countries of all over the world.

EU Democracy Promotion: Theory and Practice

Research Paper:

It has been argued that the Eastern Enlargement of the EU has been the most effective case ever of democracy promotion. Analyze if the *transition paradigm* is useful to understand the process of democratization in Eastern Europe and how those aspects are linked to the *mechanisms of democracy promotion* in the Eastern Enlargement of the EU.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Democracy promotion and Europeanisation in its broadest meaning refer to responses by different international and governmental actors with regards to the impact of European integration. Enlargement is often seen as the most successful foreign policy of the European Union (EU). Most efforts involve the identification of appropriate levels of socio-political analysis in diverse circumstances, party system, policy competence ownership and key institutional actors, all as part of the attempt to build a process of adaptation and transformation which is understood to be a consequence of the development of the European Union. According to Milada Anna Vachudova's book, *Europe Undivided*, two are the dates that are recognized as markers of contemporary European history, 1989 when the Cold War ended and 2004 when eight formerly communist countries joined the European Union (EU).¹ In 1989 the Soviet-type communist regimes collapsed in East Central Europe, in countries such as Hungary, Poland, East-Germany, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Bulgaria. The collapse of communism between 1989 and 1991 throughout the region, accompanied by the disintegration of the Soviet Union itself, was a critical moment for the socio-political development of all East European states. Straight after that historical period a new complex era of democratization just began for these states. This paper aims to analyze the trajectory path of development of East Central Europe from "revolution time" to "integration

¹ Vachudova, Milanda Anna. (2005), *Europe Undivided Democracy, Leverage, and Integration after Communism*, pp. 1-3. Published by Oxford University Press Inc., New York.

phase” into the EU. The approach of the transition has been an important and very significant paradigm that has strongly influenced different analyses on democratization processes worldwide.

However, what is important to take into account after analyzing the transition period, is also the phenomena of democratic regression after the integration process of some of these countries. As explained in the article written by Dr. Meka, some of the former communist states experienced a different pathway of democratization during the pre and post-accession. What he is explaining in essence, is that the more Eurosceptic or problematic a party system is during the pre-accession, the higher are the chances of this country to have a higher degree of democracy promotion and consolidation in the post-accession period.² In my opinion this fact has a lot of meaning, because it shows how important the natural and gradual process of democratization is, no matter if the pre-accession period is more conflictual within a party system. The socio-political variables of an aspirant country should be analyzed accordingly during the process of joining the EU, in order to understand and debate the roots of different problems. Apparently, this approach has proven to help the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovenia, and the Baltic States towards a more effective consolidation of their democracy, differently from Hungarian case for instance that after integration was criticized for its distorted democracy especially referring to media restrictions, minority rights, etc.

This research paper is only a general overview over the Eastern Europe region and its purpose is to examine the “transition paradigm”, and some key concepts and assumptions in order to better understand the curve of democratization that has happened in this region over the last 25 years. The “transition paradigm” concept is primarily oriented toward the objective to see democracy

² Meka, Eltion. "European Integration, Democratic Consolidation, and Democratic Regression in CEE: An Institutional Assessment." *Journal of European Integration* (2015): 1-16.

prevail in those states that had just emerged from totalitarian or authoritarian communist regimes. On the empirical level, maybe it is acceptable to mention that the socio-political contexts in these countries, after the liberation from their previous totalitarian regimes, did not respond always to the expectations and assumptions of the “transition paradigm” because it has failed to explain various political developments that have taken place (and still do) in many Eastern European states, mainly in its claim to change the array of these processes toward the institutionalization or “consolidation” of a democratic regime.

2. THE END OF THE COLD WAR AS A STARTING POINT FOR THE PROCESS OF DEMOCRACY PROMOTION AND EUROPIANISATION IN EASTERN EUROPE:

The Cold War was not a “war” in its first meaning; it was mostly a sustained period of bipolar rivalry climate and a militarized geopolitical tension between East and West. Luckily it ended in peace. This began with President Mikhail Gorbachev's articulation of "new thinking" in Soviet foreign policy aimed at smoothing East-West tensions and creating a more stabilized political atmosphere across Europe. This political climate improvement helped to push different domestic reforms in the Easter Europe countries. Gorbachev decided to cooperate with West in order to end the Cold War because he understood that the Soviet Union could not be reformed and developed if the Cold War would have continued. He also gave a signal and allowed some space for Soviet tolerance of political change within Eastern Europe itself, announcing that the "use of force" is not the right choice to use as an "instrument of foreign policy," and he also declared that "freedom of choice" was a universal principle that applied to both socialist and capitalist systems.³ But

³ Melvyn P. Leffler & Odd Arne Westad (2010), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War (Volume 3)*, pp.244-266. Published by: Cambridge University Press.

nevertheless, the profound changes that happened in the Soviet Union during the second half of the 1980s were not simply the work of one leader. It was evident that Eastern Europe citizens did not have the kind of personal experience and belief which would have enabled them to call into question the story of the Soviet Union's struggle for peace in the face of "provocative acts" by capitalist forces.

On the other hand, it is important to understand that the "political personality" of the Eastern Europe countries is also a product of historical circumstances and certain ideology that they conduct in their trajectory of development. Some post-communist states are now liberal democracies with functioning market economies; others are ruled by authoritarian regimes that have introduced limited democratic and economic reforms. Looking back in history, it seemed like the Soviet Union for many of the Eastern Europe countries was an "unreplaceable symbol" where people strongly believed in. The maintenance of Soviet Union power has always patterned in a unitary way in pursuit of the national interest of these countries (mainly of Russia), existing in an anarchic international system. After the disintegration of the Soviet Union (post-Cold War era) and the chaos that characterized the nation's post-communist transition, Eastern European countries undertook difficult internal reforms, facing challenges as it converted from centrally planned to capitalist economy, joining the world capitalist economy and international monetary system. Transitional paradigm has already shown for a long time that it does not fit the reality (phenomenon) that it attempts to explain. The transition signs that these countries experienced during the past have been cured through *political conditionality*⁴ imposed on them by more powerful states or Western European countries, which in my opinion is the most effective

⁴ Schimmelfennig, Frank, and Hanno Scholtz. "EU Democracy promotion in the European neighbourhood political conditionality, economic development and transnational exchange." *European Union Politics* 9.2 (2008): 187-215

instrument that EU uses for the adoption of democratic practices and rules to candidate states that have the aspiration to join and become a member on the international community. Under specified conditions for each mechanism, such as political conditionality, economic development or transnational exchange, each of them contributes to the overall progress in the democratization processes. Therefore, the EU has a stronger impact on democratic change in its community if it offers more neighbouring countries the membership status and if it makes the *political conditionality* component credible enough for each candidate country. For these countries, in order to receive rewards such as institutional and financial assistance, or membership, a set of conditions must be fulfilled. Also, International Organization's membership increases the probability for successful democratization and functioning institutions for political competition, as well as law and policy implementation. In absent of the offer of membership, EU incentives such as cooperation and partnership do not always reliably promote democratic change.

According to the Leffler's and Westad's book, "Soviet acceptance of the collapse of East European Communist regimes in 1989 must be defined as the most significant historical moment leading to the end of the Cold War. Until Gorbachev's reforms, Soviet domination of Eastern Europe had been an accepted reality both in the East and in the West."⁵ The Eastern Europe's governments after the Cold War have shown efforts to take rational decisions acting in the name of their national interest, trying to ensure more sovereignty and security by increasing their nation's domestic capacities, structuring and building up their economies, and forming alliances with other western states based on similar European democratic values. What I just said may seem a bit too idealistic in comparison with the reality in these states, but it is true that after the Cold War these

⁵ Melvyn P. Leffler & Odd Arne Westad (2010), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War (Volume 3)*, pp.311-332. Published by: Cambridge University Press.

countries have shown significant progress towards their democratization processes. Anyhow, the transition into the post-Cold War era was a turbulent time for Eastern Europe if we take into account the globalization of International Relations.

On the other hand, western relations with Eastern Europe have been mixed and complicated since the 1990s. Different conflicts, including Cold War and its post-era, basically have resulted to competition among these states over the right to expand their sphere of interest and maximize their economic prosperity. It is quite evident that Eastern European states are much stronger than they were under Soviet Union, because they have equal say in the European Union, but as post-communist countries, their progress in a semi-socialist system, has continuously created and imposed new challenges for adopting good democratic standards and practices. In order for these countries to integrate with the rest of the developed Western European countries, they must leave behind the frustration of their past which has built up during the transition period since the Soviet Union collapsed. The continued emphasis of different hypotheses and assumptions of the transitional paradigm in Eastern European countries proves that these countries still need to progress on the way towards promotion and the consolidation of their democracy.

3. THE TRANSITION PARADIGM FOR UNDERSTANDING DEMOCRATIZATION IN THE EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES:

Structuralism or modernization reforms in Eastern Europe states were the main factors that influenced the birth and consolidation of democracy in these countries, even though as a slow and evolutionary process that required the fulfillment of many preconditions. In order to explain the transitional paradigm, there are some key assumptions as Carothers (2002) describes in his famous essay *The End of the Transition Paradigm*. First of all, he mentions that “any country moving

away from authoritarian regime can be considered a country in transition toward a democratic system.”⁶ Different political analysts, academics and activists of democracy, tend to consider and explain the forces of political changes taking place in different Eastern European states as part or jumping steps toward transition to democracy. Another assumption of this paradigm is that democratization tends to follow or unfold through what is known as a “transition model” consisting on the crucial importance that the elections have for the development trajectory of democratization in states emerging from communist regimes. So, the author argues that “while various analysts believed in putting the mark of equality between democracy and elections, they intended to hold high expectations of what elections’ impact will be for democratization, believing that they would serve to consolidate and strengthen the democratic institutions of the Eastern European states, and would serve to deepen and broaden democratic accountability and political participation of the state to its citizens.”⁷

The transition paradigm has been useful during a time of often political upheaval in the world. Nowadays, sticking with the transition paradigm beyond its useful meaning is imposing evolution in the field of democratic assistance and is leading theoreticians to find other ways of explaining the concept. Considering the Eastern Europe, the modes of transition from a communist regime to a more open and democratic system has had strong impacts on shaping the stability of the Eastern European states’ institutions. The transition paradigm gives a bold emphasizes to the importance of different sensitive agreements between the elites and other forms of consensus dialogue among actors that are considered crucial for the subsequent process of democratization in a country. Policy

⁶ Carothers, Thomas. “*The End of the Transition Paradigm.*” *Journal of Democracy* 13:1 (2002). Published by Johns Hopkins University Press and the National Endowment for Democracy.

⁷ *Ibid.*

makers are more unified around the idea that it is not something inevitable that transitional countries will move more steadily on this predicted path from breakthrough and opening to consolidation. Transitional countries such are some states in the Eastern Europe time to time go backward on their path towards reforming their systems, moving with a slow rhythm forward along the path.

According to Crothers (2002), there is another important assumption about the transition paradigm in transitional countries, and that is the political history, economic level, institutional accountability, socio-cultural values, ethnic attitude or other “core” features that are considered to be major factors influencing the outcome of the transition process.⁸ Also, the transition paradigm rests on the assumption that the democratic transitions is assumed to include some reshaping of state institutions, such as the parliamentary reform, the judicial system, the creation of independent electoral institutions, allowing civil society to express its views and act in freedom, etc. To arrive at understanding democratization, it is crucial to give a significant attention to the challenge of a society trying to democratize itself. This was considered to be a fundamental aspect for each of the Eastern European countries to shorten their transition period and to consolidate their democracy. Therefore, the efforts of the state-building and democracy-building in Easter European states have been considered two sides of the same coin. The concept of the transition paradigm has been central to various panel discussions of democratization during the last three decades. “The transition paradigm” has been the primary term used to analyze the political changes that defined what Samuel P. Huntington has cited as the “third wave” of democratization⁹, which represents

⁸ Carothers, Thomas. “*The End of the Transition Paradigm.*” pp. 8-9 *Journal of Democracy* 13:1 (2002). Published by Johns Hopkins University Press and the National Endowment for Democracy.

⁹ Samuel P. Huntington, (1991). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* Published by University of Oklahoma Press

the birth of new democracies in around fifty countries that has made democracy the most common system in the world today.¹⁰ By the turn of the twenty-first century, the birth of new democracies appears to have slowed down, mainly because many countries had already become democratic systems. Different policy makers have turned their attention not only to issues of democratic consolidation, but also to the quality of democracy. In my opinion, this is very important for the real progress of a country. It is not always enough to reach the consolidation of democracy, what matters is also how you manage to build up the right processes that are both strengthening the institutions as well as galvanizing a positive culture on the issues of state-building and democracy-building.

4. THE REFORM TRAJECTORIES AND THE PATTERN OF DEMOCRACY PROMOTION AND POLITICAL CHANGE IN THE EASTERN EUROPE:

Milada Anna Vachudova explains in her book *Europe Undivided* that in order to compare the performance of governments across Eastern Europe during the post years of 1989 in terms of the transition paradigm, the most important ingredient that stands out for democratic success is “a competitive political system” based on equal and democratic rules within the party system.¹¹ One of the questions that she very cleverly raises is about the alternation in power between liberal democratic parties and illiberal parties that polarized the political system and suppressed the political competition. According to her analysis the collapse of communism was happening faster

¹⁰Diamond, Larry., Fukuyama, Francis., Horowitz, Donald L. and F. Plattner, Marc. *Reconsidering the Transition Paradigm*. Journal of Democracy (January 2014). Published by National Endowment for Democracy and Johns Hopkins University Press.

¹¹ Vachudova, Milanda Anna. (2005), *Europe Undivided Democracy, Leverage, and Integration after Communism*, pp. 12-14. Published by Oxford University Press Inc., New York.

when the strengthening and the creation of a competitive democratic political system was occurring, building more liberal democratic institutions and a market-based competitive economy rather than a monopolist market-based economy. Whether, in states where the collapse of communism was followed by the creation of non-competitive political system, the results showed that in these countries slow progress towards promotion and consolidation of democracy.

For example, in Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia, Poland, and the Czech Republic we can identify a synchronized political pattern of the leading role of the communist party in 1989 and the socialist state, together with the emergence of democratic system and the attitude how it occurred.¹² But we can also see many divergences in the fundamental policies evoking in the name of building democracy and regulating the market economy. In Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic the first governments in power after the 1989, tried to lay the foundations of liberal democratic institutions, promoting ethnic tolerance, and implementing comprehensive economic reforms. These patterns appeared to be not so successful in the Czech Republic during the first years. Whether in Bulgaria and Romania, the first governments in power suppressed the political competition, slowing down the process of creating new democratic institutions. They also tried to use ethnic nationalism to build their legitimacy throughout the years.

As we know, the European Union has been considered as the most ambitious project of regional integration in the world. It has helped Eastern European countries to stabilize their democracy standards and their economic growth after the end of the Cold War. Since 1989, building market economies and liberal democracies in Eastern European states has been strongly influenced by the process of their integration in the European Union. The benefits combined with

¹² Vachudova, Milanda Anna. (2005), *Europe Undivided Democracy, Leverage, and Integration after Communism*, pp. 12-14. Published by Oxford University Press Inc., New York. pp. 20-21.

the pre-conditions requirements of membership have set the stage for the European Union's leverage on the domestic policy choices of aspiring Eastern European countries. As years pass from the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is increasingly clear that the framework of "transition" is less and less applicable to the Eastern European countries. Carothers (2002) was correct in arguing that policymakers and scholars should "discard the transition paradigm," given that democratization has stalled in many countries. It is maybe better to analyze these states in terms of "integration," given that they have completed their transition period since most of them have now joined the European Union.

The transition paradigm theory was developed as an effort to analyze the process by which different autocratic regimes in Eastern Europe have projected and moved towards democracy, tied this transition period to specific times and contexts. A central problem with this theory was the significant role that society mobilization, and particularly changes in the external political environment, played in bringing about democratic changes and openings, which at the time seemed to make the conceptualization of the transition paradigm less relevant. As a matter of fact, the concept that has been used in theory about authoritarian consolidation seems to be applicable to authoritarianism than democratization. Both the authoritarian persistence and democratic consolidation literatures agree that the framework of state, the government, and its effectiveness or abilities are fundamental in determining regime survival.¹³ Another central factor of political life in Eastern Europe within the non-democratic systems was the manner by which different autocrats closed off various alternative paths of political patterns and fortified their power within the political system, which kind of helped them to exercise their autocracy.

¹³ Article: Ambrosio, Thomas. *Beyond the transition Paradigm: A research agenda for authoritarian consolidation*. Published by North Dakota State University.

5. CONCLUSION:

Over the past three decades of the twentieth century, political upheavals involving different Eastern European countries have shown that the transformation of their autocratic regimes towards establishing a liberal democracy and well-functioning governance has not been a mechanical fast process. In my opinion, it is true that the transition paradigm approach with its conceptual and theoretical framework has served mainly as a guide to explain why the democracy promotion trajectory in Eastern Europe has occurred not easily and which were some of the fundamental factors that have influenced the progress or the regress of these countries. However, based on the empirical level it is clear that the political contexts of many of the so called “third-wave” Eastern European countries is now liberated, maybe not fully yet, from their previous authoritarian experiences. At the same time, the transition paradigm approach has sometimes failed to justify the emergence of new authoritarian regimes. It has become more and more clear that the conceptual arrangements of the transitional paradigm are sometime inadequate to explain the complex political developments and realistic conditions in many of the Eastern European countries. Its assumptions are becoming no longer valid in the conceptualization of democratization processes. On the other hand, I have the belief that the European integration is going to increasingly encourage competition among parties with a governing aspiration through mechanisms of promoting a degree of consensus across government and oppositions.¹⁴ Beyond its hopeful vision, the transition paradigm has failed to explain various political developments that have taken place

¹⁴Ladrech, Robert. "Europeanization and political parties towards a framework for analysis." *Party politics* 8.4 (2002): 389-403.

in Eastern Europe, mainly in its claim to influence and change the direction of these political processes towards the consolidation of a democratic system.

While analyzing the historical events in Eastern Europe, it is profoundly evident to assume that most of the Eastern European states are still in a transition to democracy and moving away from authoritarianism approaches to follow the processes of democratization consisting of consolidation, breakthrough, opening, as well as deepening of democratic accountability and civil participation.¹⁵ The experience suggests four ways under which international factors may be analyzed: *control, conditionality, contagion and consent*, mechanisms and approaches that are used for democracy promotion.¹⁶ In the post-war world democracy has spread from one country to another with a high degree of intentionality encouraged or imposed by International Organizations. The close linkage between International Organizations (IOs) and Democracy Promotion has been used as an important justification for the enlargement and expansion of organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or the European Union. This was a *controlled* way how democracy was “exported” from the consolidated Western democracies to the fragile or weak Central and Eastern democracies. I strongly believe that the chances for successful democratization in Eastern Europe depend on the actions and political intentions of the elites and citizens. I think that the transition paradigm was a product of a certain period in the Eastern European countries which seems to have changed. What is crucial to absorb is how these countries are going to ensure democracy promotion, starting with the democratic performance of their governments, as well as allowing the basis for empowerment of a democratic

¹⁵ Carothers, Thomas. “*The End of the Transition Paradigm.*” pp. 17-20 *Journal of Democracy* 13:1 (2002). Published by Johns Hopkins University Press and the National Endowment for Democracy.

¹⁶ Whitehead, Laurence. *The International Dimensions of Democratization: Europe and the Americas.* Oxford University Press, 2001. pp. 3-25.

society. Such vision and strategy will guarantee that institutions not only can produce policies and legislation, but they have also the credibility to implement them in compliance with the democratic standards imposed by the EU.

Nowadays, new global and regional challenges impose the necessity for a new paradigm of political change in order to diagnose and explain the complicated political landscapes of today, in order to move on to new debates and new frameworks about the future of Eastern Europe. Also, while analyzing the process of democratization in different countries it is important to consider the relationship between democracy and globalization which is proven to be very complex. The institutional and structural changes associated with globalization have a strong impact on the protection of Human Rights, particularly in the developing countries which have unconsolidated democratic system, or countries that are governed by autocratic or totalitarian regimes. Over decades, democracy has been subjected to different competing interpretations and definitions. I would prefer to define democracy with the statement of US President Lincoln in 1863 as “Government of the people, by the people and for the people”. Of course the concept of democracy is much broader than this and it has many other implications and indicators. It is important to mention that whether this concept is broad or narrow, almost all of the definitions of democracy have as a focal point the “citizens”. As conclusion to this section I think that globalization presents a considerable level of challenge to democracy promotion in developing countries. Under existing political institutions and communities, globalization is likely to undermine democracy promotion, because if decisions are shifted to decision-making International Organizations, the people will increasingly lose influence over the course of politics. This has been the case somehow with the European Union and the precedent of “Brexit” that happened partly influenced by this reason, which in essence has to do with the democratic representation in the EU.

Nevertheless, the process of European integration has continued to expand and deepen. Its strategic policies have enlarged to engage with all identifiable sectors of public interest. Its requirements have become more political although political motivation was always evident in the economic content of its policy concerns. Enlargement has acquired more international presence and weight than ever before. These developments were demonstrated by more demanding political conditions placed on accession countries. The EU and its member states have developed an extensive portfolio of support mechanisms for the new democracies to the East, while articulating a more insistent form of democratic conditionality. However, democratic conditionality is also dependent on the responsiveness of domestic actors, with their European commitment being the main decisive factor. Thus, one limitation on conditionality may arise in relation to transition paths being played out in different individual countries. This problem most appears in the case of ‘hybrid party systems’ which meet only minimum standards for democracy and function in some way contrary to normal democratic practice. It is likely that the scope for European influence through convergence on such party systems is constrained unless they are particularly vulnerable to international pressures. In any case, aspirant countries have to always satisfy the *Copenhagen political conditions* and achieve stability of institutions guaranteeing human rights, a consolidated democracy, the rule of law and respect for and protection of minorities’ before being invited to negotiate for membership. This has been the case in Eastern Enlargement, and this is going to be the case for Albania and Kosovo, too.

REFERENCES

Ambrosio, Thomas. *Beyond the transition Paradigm: A research agenda for authoritarian consolidation*. Published by North Dakota State University.

Balcerowicz, Leszek (1994). “Understanding Postcommunist Transitions,” *Journal of Democracy* 5(4): pp. 75–89.



Carothers, Thomas. "The End of the Transition Paradigm." *Journal of Democracy* 13:1 (2002). Published by Johns Hopkins University Press and the National Endowment for Democracy.

Diamond, Larry., Fukuyama, Francis., Horowitz, Donald L. and F. Plattner, Marc. *Reconsidering the Transition Paradigm.* *Journal of Democracy* (January 2014). Published by National Endowment for Democracy and Johns Hopkins University Press.

Featherstone, Kevin, and Claudio M. Radaelli, eds. *The politics of Europeanization.* Oxford University Press, 2003. Chapter 13 by Grabbe: "Europeanization Goes East: Power and Uncertainty in the EU Accession Process".

Ladrech, Robert. "Europeanization and political parties towards a framework for analysis." *Party politics* 8.4 (2002): 389-403.

Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan A. Way. "Linkage versus leverage. Rethinking the international dimension of regime change." *Comparative Politics* (2006): 379-400.

Mair, Peter. "Political Opposition and the European Union." *Government and Opposition* 42.1 (2007): 1-17.

Meka, Eltion. "European Integration, Democratic Consolidation, and Democratic Regression in CEE: An Institutional Assessment." *Journal of European Integration* (2015): 1-16.

Melvyn P. Leffler & Odd Arne Westad (2010), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War (Volume 3)*, pp.311-332. Published by: Cambridge University Press.

Pridham, G. 2005. *Designing democracy.* New York, NY: Basingstoke. (Chapter 1)

Pevehouse, Jon C. "Democracy from the outside-in? International organizations and democratization." *International organization* 56.03 (2002): 515-549.

Poast, Paul, and Johannes Urpelainen. "How International Organizations Support Democratization: Preventing Authoritarian Reversals or Promoting Consolidation?." *World Politics* 67.01 (2015): 72-113.

Samuel P. Huntington, (1991). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* Published by University of Oklahoma Press

Schimmelfennig, Frank, and Hanno Scholtz. "EU Democracy promotion in the European neighbourhood political conditionality, economic development and transnational exchange." *European Union Politics* 9.2 (2008): 187-215.



Vachudova, Milanda Anna. (2005), *Europe Undivided Democracy, Leverage, and Integration after Communism*, pp. 1-3. Published by Oxford University Press Inc., New York.

Vachudova, Milada A. "Tempered by the EU? Political parties and party systems before and after accession." *Journal of European Public Policy* 15.6 (2008): 861-879.

Whitehead, Laurence. *The International Dimensions of Democratization: Europe and the Americas*. Oxford University Press, 2001. (Chapter 1 & Chapter 2).



Invasions and objectives of the enlargement of the European Union

By / (STUDENT NAME REMOVED)

- *The impact of enlargement of the Union... Revenge Europe from history?*
- *American influence in the enlarged Europe*
- *Europe and Turkey... Religious, cultural, political and security attraction*
- *The future expansion... "Copenhagen" draws the Geographic future of the Union*
- *Europe's borders... Where to?*

Introduction

The eastward expansion of the European Union under the Copenhagen summit resolutions (12 to 13 December / December 2002), a historic event in the course of European construction, but what the significance of this expansion? What goals? Will European construction was completed or that the borders of Europe are still vague? The European and global implications? Is Union is a "Christian club" or that the political-security approach are determined by the trends in the current expansion and the future?

The impact of enlargement of the Union... Revenge Europe from history?

"Berlin Wall fall and then join some Eastern states to NATO completely ended the division of the continent, but the process was an American engineering essentially fall within the framework of Washington's overall strategy, and this expansion is a European process exclusively Thus they remove the last remnants of Yalta and the Cold War on the European way."

This is the fifth expansion (after 1973, 1981 and 1986 and 1995), the largest and most important in the history of Europe is in retaliation for European history, especially of the Cold War, which brought down the curtain of iron divided the continent into two hostile camps, it was revenge of the Yalta system.

Of course the fall of the Berlin Wall and then join some Eastern states to NATO completely ended the division of the continent, but the process was essentially an American engineering and fall within the framework of Washington's overall strategy. But this expansion is exclusively European process and therefore they remove the last remnants of Yalta and the Cold War on the European way, political and economic integration. It seems European pride in this historic achievement was clear, as it was in head lights of the French newspaper "Atrion" which allocated for this historic event a column called "the real fall of the Berlin Wall."

The ten new members join (Poland and the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Cyprus and Malta) Union 40.7 billion euros assigned for the period between 2004 and 2006. Although the number of these members do not add only a very small percentage of the richness of the Union, which is equivalent to 5% of the gross domestic product of the Union organs 15. And it will cause their joining in a decline in gross domestic product per capita (EU) increased by 16%. But the Union will increase the size of its territory as far as the quarter and won the 75 million people added to its population of 378 million people. Consequently With a population estimated B453 million people will become the European Union (25-nation) third population bloc in the world after China and India. Thanks to this expanding population will rise by 20%, and the number of members by 66% and the number of official languages to 80% (for up to 23 languages). Despite the importance of the

financial cost to join, the matter will not have drastic repercussions on the level of economic exchanges, so that Central Europe exchangers, for example, are mostly with the European Union, and are therefore incorporated in it, and the first trade surplus of the Union achieved with Central Europe. Accordingly, it is unthinkable that this expansion much impact on intra-European trade by more than 60% of the total foreign trade of the Union of proportion.

But the economic obstacles lie primarily in inflicting new members of the economics of the economies of the current members in terms of performance. The former is not yet at the desired level, and must wait for two or more even beyond the economic level to the level of the current members. Most of the new members is impossible for us to join the euro zone in 2007.

Overall, the expansion of profitable operation of the European Union, it increases the weight heavier and his voice importance in international, particularly economic organizations having become the first economic power in the world, it strengthens the EU's negotiating position in the global trade negotiations, and increases the firearms Economic Union force in the event of an economic wars . As the capital and economic power are the lifeblood of war and peace, the political weight of the Union will support this expansion, especially after it merges completely new members.

But it may be for this expansion a negative impact on some of the neighboring countries and the partner of the Union, such as the Arab states, The expansion eastward will increase the scarcity of European funds and thus leads to a reduction of aid granted to the Mediterranean countries, and the rehabilitation of Eastern Europe may focus European eastward investments on the south of the Mediterranean account. Some Arab countries exporting agricultural products to Europe may face difficulties in competing products such as the new members Poland, especially as the EU agricultural protectionism practiced. These countries may lose what is left of their advantages on the European market, will also be more vulnerable to the European Economic pressures (as happened in the past with Morocco - tomato wars, or Mauritania – the ban on fishes).

In the latter it should be noted that the accession treaty will be signed in April 16 / April 2003

in Athens, and then ratified, it (before January 2004) of the European Parliament and the national parliaments of the Member States of the Union (15) and 10 countries. In case of refusal Parliament Member ratify the treaty, the enlargement process will continue without him, but if he refuses to current Member of Parliament, the process will stop. The ratification procedures are, in some cases through the referendum, which could lead to unexpected results. If all goes as a programmer countries officially join the 10 European Union in May 1/ May 2004.

But how the European Union considers the impact of global expansion, or how they perceive the European role after enlargement? Features of the European role and direction of the Union globally monitored by the European Commission in a report released on the future institutional European Union entitled "For the European Union: peace, freedom, solidarity" in the December 4 / December 2002. The Commission considers that the "founder to build on the historic reconciliation between the nations and peoples European, support for the peace and security of West Europe. It is produced from now this stability. Enlargement is certainly a political action... The most decisive for the security of the continent. The immediate vicinity of the Union in the south and east represents practically preferred space common foreign policy. European and union special role to play towards globalization.

After the expansion will be the Union first economic power in the world, its ability to influence global economic governance will support, which requires him to take into account more than ever, "the interests of the rest of the world in economic policy choices... Europe effective international force can contribute to the governance and stability the international system. "Also on the Union should do more for sustainable development and the fight against some of the new risks threatened the economic and social balance in the world. And he has to "defend the sustainable development strategy is based on the organization of a multilateral and multipolar world economy, contrary to every approach dominance." To give an international dimension to the Union line and the credibility of the Commission recommends merging job High Representative for Foreign Policy and the Commissioner in charge of external relations.

American influence in the enlarged Europe

Enlargement of the Union to 10 new members increases the complexity of the work of the European institutions, without radical reform with the work of Seychelles, particularly in the field of making federal decisions, and although the European Treaty of Nice has put the first building blocks of reform to amend the voting rule and the adoption of voting qualified majority rather than unanimity but without circulate , It is expected that the European Commission in charge of Tibet prepare the constitution of the European Union on the issue of the vote, and in anticipation of the recommendations to be presented to Member States in June 2003, the European Commission took the initiative to provide a set of commandments on the reform of EU institutions, in its above-mentioned Commission recommends the adoption of majority rule eligible to vote and to circulate. It considers that, in the Union of 25 members or more, the objection of one member of the union's work could quickly lead to paralysis. And therefore it recommends to "abandon consensus" even in the "fiscal and social issues," a proposed asylum in "certain sensitive cases, majorities supported, allowing to facilitate the abandonment of unanimity." It also recommends allowing euro zone countries to decide themselves in cases involving currency, especially since it was in the year 2004 will be a number of countries outside the euro zone is greater than the number of involved States.

The Commission believes that "the majority of eligible voting must respond to the requirements of simplicity and democratic legitimacy." It recommends "a review of the complex decisions emanating from the Treaty of Nice and replace its system of dual simple majority." Considers that the decisions "are established if they won a majority of member states representing a majority of the population of the Union," and recommends that its rule. But she says it could be the European Council decides in some special majority higher than the qualified majority, or to "subsidized majority", meaning that the decision should be given in these special cases, the cases "a positive vote of three-fourths of governments representing

two-thirds of the total EU population."

Generally, talking about European political decision not be complete without addressing the relationship with America and its role in European policy. Of course America's support of the European construction, but it is not satisfied with the independence of the European political decision to play one way or another role in European politics through NATO or through Britain, which play a role on behalf of Europe, where hamper European initiatives to build a European defense identity separate from NATO. But Britain is America's allies such as Italy and Spain. It is no coincidence that countries that defended Turkey's accession in Copenhagen, Britain, Italy and Spain, in an attempt to pass the US pressure as European demand. It is expected to strengthen American influence within the Union with this expansion, so that some of the new members such as the Czech Republic, Hungary known for its loyalty to the Atlantic and its emphasis on the Euro-Atlantic Association in the same place of Europe, if not more. (Hungary joined NATO in 1999 and maintains close ties with Washington. It seems that the Tazsar Air Base, where there are members of the US-forces may turn into a training center for Iraqi oppositionists at the request of Washington). America will try to take advantage of this expansion more pressure on EU countries individually and settle scores with Germany, which Schroeder is seeking to marginalize because of its position on the Iraqi file.

It will seek to benefit from the enlargement of the Union to serve their interests. It has pressed the Europeans in Copenhagen to accept Turkey, because this strengthens Turkey's role in the anti-terrorist coalition and exploits a paper to persuade Ankara to join the anti-Iraq camp. The accession of the Union means to reduce US aid to Ankara. US pressure has raised the resentment of Europeans as noted. From the American point of view, it is declared as the European Union expands geographically dilute the political consciousness and eluded political unity. This view is consistent in some aspects with the British perception that sees the union without a common political interests of the economic entity. Some of the new members who share this view because they favor the survival of the security issues under the banner of "Euro-

Atlantic Association" led by America.

Europe and Turkey... Religious, cultural, political and security attraction

The Copenhagen Document says (The Final Regulations issued by the presidency Danish Union) the Union expresses its appreciation for the progress made by Turkey in meeting the Copenhagen criteria (stable institutions that guarantee democracy, the rule of law, human rights, respect for and protection of minorities) and he encourages them to bridge the deficiencies remaining in the with regard to the political criteria and to continue reforms. She says that if the European Council decides in December / December 2004 that Turkey responds to the Copenhagen political criteria, the Union will open accession quickly with negotiations. To reassure Turkey that Europe's serious intent in the annexation, the same document says that "the Union will increase considerably from private, including financial help him before joining Turkey. And that starting from 2004, will fund this assistance from the budget line" expenses of the pre-accession". The other reassurance to Ankara came in another paragraph of the Copenhagen document does not belong to Turkey exclusively and explicitly, where it was reported that the Union and the acceding States agreed on a joint statement, "one Europe" will include as an appendix to the final text of a treaty of accession, and the nature of "inclusions and irreversible process of expansion." understand from this that the 15 EU countries want to close the door to any objection in the future to a new 10 members on the enlargement of the Union. This reassurance prompt course of the States concerned in the short term, namely Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey.

What justifications for this European attitude towards Turkey? 2004 busy schedules European critical, such as the ratification of the Treaty on the accession of the 10, and the referendum on the Constitutional Treaty, the European parliamentary elections, and therefore understand the fear of a negative reaction to the voters Europeans that Turkey traditionally on the agenda densely this, especially as the European public mood towards Islam and Muslims has increased

extreme since September / 11. But regardless of the objective and subjective factors that affect the EU path, it remains that the European leaders, the problem is that they made promises to Turkey in 1999 to silence a profit of time and without telling European public opinion, came the events of September / September 11 to make it difficult mission, which was originally difficult. European public opinion is opposed to Turkey's accession to Europe, as is the French public opinion, on the basis of religious criteria often. Moreover, the European position and other parameters resulting from the opposition lobbying activity for Turkey's entry into the Union, such as the Armenian lobby in the West, especially in France where the French were able to grab a recognition of "Armenian genocide". These factors combined make us say that the hypothesis that the evaluation of Turkey's candidacy through the Copenhagen criteria in December / December 2004 is an attempt to buy time in order to avoid going into the heart of the matter, even for some of the time correct to some extent.

As for Cyprus, Europe's attitude is to accept the Greek Cypriot membership without requiring the unification of the island, but the Union decides that he prefers accession as a single state. And it encourages the continuation of the negotiations between the two parts of the island for a comprehensive settlement based on the UN plan by February 2003. The document says that the EU Copenhagen ready to take the necessary adjustments in the event of reunification of the island to become a member of the Union. He adds that in the absence of a comprehensive settlement, the Union decided to suspend the application of the acquired (join South Cyprus) on the northern part of the island to "the Security Council decides otherwise unanimously ...” And this sentence very important because it means that the Union does not completely rule out Turkish membership of Cyprus without the unification of the island.

How to explain the behavior of European enlargement, especially selective about Turkey? In our opinion, the European Union and drawn two approaches, the first political-security and religious second-cultural. The first approach says that political stability in the candidate country and in the geographic borders thereof is necessary for its membership, Europe

considers that the expansion aims in what aims to export stability and prosperity to new members. This means that they do not want to import crises and instability of those. This political-security approach is manifested through the Turkish case, its integration to the Union will widen the border of the union up to Iraq, Syria, Iran and the former Soviet republics of Asia. This geographical horizon frightens Europe because they put it in direct contiguity with these tense areas. So what will be the Union's position if the member Turkey has entered into a conflict with Iraq and Syria over water? Or responded violently to an armed Kurdish rebellion within its territory? Moreover, the Union has proved so far the political inability in crisis management and conflict resolution, even the recent Spanish-Moroccan dispute over the islet called American intervention. According to this political-security approach from the epicenter of Turkey internally and regionally tension. Internally in terms of its political system in which the army protects the secular system, while the core of the Copenhagen criteria are democratic civil and secular, is also suffering from stress because of the Kurdish question. Regionally Turkey in disputes with its neighbors over water and even sea borders (the demarcation of the borders of the Aegean Sea) and the Cyprus issue, they also have ambitions in the Turkic-speaking boundaries, making it in a power struggle with Russia and Iran. Obsessed with immigration also weigh on European Union decisions and fear of exposure to the Turkish border to the flow of immigration.

This political-security approach also belongs to Hungary. This is a country that is growing currents of populism and nationalism built (parliament overwhelmingly) a law in June 2002 stipulates help Hungarian minorities estimated 3.5 million people in neighboring countries (Romania, Slovenia and Slovakia ...) granting "Hungarian card", which is the nationality of the card if they have proven Hungarian origins. This issue conceals the issue of territorial demands, so that Hungary carved out of which two-thirds of its territory under the Trianon Treaty in 1920. Romania, Slovakia strongly condemned this attitude, since this law contradicts the principles of the European Union based on good neighborliness and the sanctity of borders,

it has committed Hungary to withdraw it before accession.

The religious-cultural approach are included, because its declaration contradicts the European principles of secularism. This approach says that the religious idea fundamental to the European construction on the grounds that the Christian Democrats are the founders of the European project, and that the Catholic Church played a role in his support. Accordingly, they constitute one way or another "Christian club", or at least a club of nations with Christian culture. It seems that the owners of historical analysis, especially opposed to Turkey's accession. Hence Some Europeans want to keep the "cultural purity" of the Union. Turkey is fortunate unhappy that the two approaches are applicable on them, it is a stable country both internally and regionally as we have said, which a Muslim country is also. It is clear that the Islamic factor in Turkey plays against it, especially after the events of September / 11. (I say the Islamic and not Islamiyah proportion of Islamic movements, because Turkey's application to join back to 1963, and because the Islamic phenomenon modern and exploit additional argument to obscure the real argument is the religious part). For his part, the Turkish position seems to contradict the one hand, Turkey relies on European Then (Ottoman history), on the other hand, ignores one way or another of the legacy of the Ottoman's refusal to delve into issues such as the massacre of the Armenians. Notably, the two parties used the religious argument all their own way. Some union members are hesitant about Turkey's accession because of her conversion to Islam, despite its model secular although secular orientation. As Turkey considered that the religious argument is not with them but, because of its accession would signal that the EU is not a "Christian club" to prevent the Islamic countries to enter. To indicate that despite these religious-cultural approach to the Vatican, for example, does not show his opposition to Turkey's accession, although it called for apparently taking into account the Christian dimension in the next European Constitution.

Turkish veto and NATO.

The European Union and NATO signed an agreement on strategic partnership whereby the Europeans used the means of NATO in joint European military operations. This agreement was necessary for the actual formation in 2003 of the European rapid reaction force and the strength of 60 thousand men. Possible autograph after the lifting of the Turkish veto (which lasted two years) within the alliance three days after the Copenhagen summit. Turkey used paper pressure on the EU to speed up its accession, which objected to it, citing the possibility of using these European force (fitted with means of the alliance) against Northern Cyprus, or its threat. It seems at first glance that the evolution of the Turkish position expresses its goodwill towards the Union. But the truth may be, it is likely that this change is an attempt by Turkey to rectify things and play European paper to emphasize the conviction to build European defense enshrined in EU treaties, especially the Europeans resented exercise pressure on them through Washington to accept a specific date for the start of accession negotiations. This position may be an attempt to prove its loyalty to Europe more than their loyalty to the Association of the Atlantic. Union welcomed this change and responded to the demand, as stated in the Copenhagen Document that Cyprus and Malta (when they join the union) will not be participatory in the military operations of the Union assisted by means of the Atlantic Alliance.

The future expansion... “Copenhagen” draws the Geographic future of the Union

Union will expand to Romania and Bulgaria in 2007, as stated in the European Treaty of Nice and in the Copenhagen Document. Union in this document has confirmed that Romania and Bulgaria's accession negotiations, "fall into the same overall framework of the enlargement process, which is irreversible." This is politically important phrase, it means that the accession only a matter of time until the required conditions are making it also means preventing the 10 new members from blocking their accession. The question is not theoretical, Hungary could hamper Romania joining the Union, with the pretext of defending the Hungarian minority in Romania.

After the expansion in 2004 (ten countries) and expansion in 2007 (Romania and Bulgaria) and possibly the expansion of 2008 (Turkey) The number of members of the Union may be up to 28 countries at the end of the first of the twenty-first century decade. But the Union may embark on further expansion again in the next decade to bring the European Balkans. Speaking summits of Copenhagen for the years 1993 and 2002 on the "European horizon" for "the Western Balkan countries involved in the stabilization and association process," without referring to accession. Copenhagen Document and considers that the expansion in 2004 will document the relations with Russia and the EU also aspires to develop its relations with Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus and the southern Mediterranean countries, in an effort to promote democracy and economic development and trade through continuous reforms, and think to ask "new initiatives for this purpose."

Thus, this document sets the general geographical features of the European Union where the keep the door open to join the Balkans while exclude other European countries and Russia. The fact that Russia's political and military giant of the European Union is not able to swallow, and the accession mean the demolition of the European-American alliance in one way or another. And thus the probability of Russia's accession to the Union is unthinkable even in the long term. Europe wants to be an economic power speak with one voice internationally, and thus Discipline within the Union cannot possibly with strategic accounts hegemonic power and political superiority of the size of Europe's strategic. Moreover, the political-security approach applies to Russia because they like the Asian geographical neighborhood is stable and far from democratic European standards. But all this does not mean that Russia ahead in Europe, A part of them European, but that her feet inside the Union through the besieged enclave of Kaliningrad Polish soil. To indicate that 40% of Russia exchangers made with the European Union.

The borders of Europe... Where to?

It raised the issue of Turkey joining the debate about private EU borders with the new expansion. Talk about the Union's borders raises the question of European identity, and what is the (European country) and what is not European. Texts and documents of the Union does not serve to answer these questions because they are talking about with the principles of European countries Institution: institutions statist stable and democratic states of law and the market economy and respect for human and minority rights... but this is "essentially Copenhagen criteria" political criteria and the lack of any geographical distance. And it remains on the table the question: Why join the Baltic republics, Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey, while probably exclude the Balkans (at least in the medium term) Belarus and Ukraine?

The first dawn of the debate about Europe's borders is Valerie Djiyskardestan (former French President), who heads the European Commission in charge of the preparation of the Union Constitution of what sparked the Turkish case where said that "Turkey is a country close to Europe .. But it is not a European country."

He said implicitly that her candidacy before the imposition of the anti-Europe, such as Britany, which are not seen in the Union only major free trade zone and economic. In his view, opening the door to Turkey means open to candidates outside of Europe, which means "the end of Europe." French official position appears to be contrary to the position of Giscard, with French Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin in the December 2 / December 2002, after the fall of the Berlin Wall on the Europeans to determine freely the border (in an implicit criticism of US pressure). It is suggested that includes Europe, the Balkans and Turkey borders. It is a circle first is the European Union, followed by a second circle includes "partner countries" which are adjacent to the European nations expanded, especially the Mediterranean countries and Russia, which will take place with a special relationship, and the third circle combines the countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia.

In an article published in the newspaper "Le Monde" the beginning of December / December 2002 questioned Huber Vedrine, French Foreign Minister, former "Is Europe a geographical or political?", and says it is time to determine its borders and identity. He believes that the only country that rejected a request to joining geographical reasons is Morocco, but raised the question of European identity strongly with Turkey. In his opinion, the Europeans erred in 1963 because they did not understand the Turks that their country, which is located 95% in Asia has nothing to point to join Europe, and so you see them after 40 years provoke arguments "cultural or religious, to delay the hour of truth." He says that Europe cannot join proposes to no end, but by proposing solutions and other means. It is considered that "The Union needs to find a clear identity, but certainly political dirt [geographic] as well." He believes that the EU authorities to think about the proposal of "neighborly partnership strategy, political and economic" on Russia, Ukraine, Turkey, and all the Maghreb country, and why not one day Israel and Palestine. He says that because of "ambiguity" and "hypocrisy" what was said to the Turks, it was proposed in 2000 when he was secretary of state to offer such a partnership to Turkey. Today, he says it was too late because of the promises made to them and the reforms initiated, but to decide after its accession to the Union that "the expansion was completed," and put on the enlarged Europe "neighborhood partnerships" this. In his view, the expansion of Europe (10+ Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey) may stop when you join nine other European countries as possible not mentioned by name. It may be related to the Balkans (Serbia and Montenegro, Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia and Croatia) and Switzerland.

All this made the European Commission considering the borders of Europe, where he confessed to President Romano Prodi that he should "initiate a real debate about Europe's borders and our relations with our neighbors the next two and must not accept that we should impose the border from abroad" (in reference to US pressure regarding Turkey's accession). In any case Europeans need to think carefully about the fee Union limits clearly, because their adherence to the definition of "ideological" through the political criteria (in Copenhagen)

criteria and view the existence of stable institutions that guarantee democracy and the rule of law and respect for rights and respect for and protection of minority rights, without any geographic criterion means that no country fulfills these requirements may be asked to join the European Union.