

EUROPEAN SECURITY AND SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES IN THE CONTEXT OF CURRENT INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Jerzy Stańczyk

*Institute of Social Sciences
Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities, Poland
Gen. Orlicz-Dreszera Str. 19/21, 08-110 Siedlce, Poland
E-mail: jerzy@stanczyk.info.pl*

Received 15 August 2011; accepted 30 November 2011

Abstract: The author presents a new European security environment after the “Cold War”, including not only the challenges and threats to the international security but also the essential conditions and problems of the European security evolution at the beginning of the 21st century. He shows the dynamic and constant changes taking place within the international environment and those related to the progress of civilization. Moreover, he stresses that current policy and security measures are not capable of effective action against having to appear before the new challenges and threats. Then the problem of unity and identity in the transatlantic relationship is taken. According to the author, in complicating sphere of the international conditions the role of multilateral institutions effectiveness in the international cooperation increases. Due to the increasing importance of interdependence and internationalization, European security challenges are European-wide and even transatlantic. Addressing them requires the preservation of unity that will be possible by strengthening common identity based on shared values and common interests.

Keywords: Security, European Integration, Risks and Threats, International Organizations, International Cooperation, International Politics, International Relations, International Alliances, Regional Cooperation, European Union, NATO.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Stańczyk, J. 2011. European security and sustainability issues in the context of current international environment, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 1(2): 81–90. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2011.1.2\(1\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2011.1.2(1))

JEL Classifications: F01, F02, F51, F52, F55, F59, O19.

1. Introduction

It is a difficult task to make a long-term assessment of the perspectives of international security due to its own dynamics and the fact that both present and future conditions will rapidly lose their validity under the ongoing revolutionary changes in the international relations and civilisation progress. In this sense, the current policies and security measures cannot guarantee effective counteraction against potential challenges and threats. Now we know that their character is diversified and non-military to a high degree. Therefore, the relevant responses require corresponding non-military measures. Moreover, the boundary between

external and internal threats and challenges to security seems to get increasingly blurred, which necessitates, among other things, a closer cooperation between political and military institutions or even the assignment of some of their functions to a joint competence of national internal security services. Under these increasingly complex circumstances, the significance of multilateral institutions for international cooperation grows. Due to the deepened interdependences and internationalization, the challenges to European security become a pan-European and trans-Atlantic issue. If we are to face them successfully, we have to preserve our unity, which is feasible only by strengthening our common identity based on shared values and interests.

2. The New Environment of European Security

Any attempt to outline the perspectives of European security is bound to assume as the starting point an indication of the fundamental challenges and threats, whose perception in fact determines the actions undertaken in the area of security. The post-Cold War concept of security provides for the following basic dimensions: military, political, economic, ecological, and socio-cultural (Buzan 1991). It is perhaps characteristic of our times that even this versatile taxonomy evades a comprehensive classification of all the challenges and threats to security (Stańczyk 1999, Stańczyk 2005). This is due to the fact that today's multiple challenges and threats to security pertain to both domestic and external state affairs. Moreover, since the end of the Cold War there has been an essential growth in transnational and trans-border threats posed in an increasing number of cases by the non-state actors (Baylis and Smith 2001, Stańczyk 2001). Europe's openness towards an extended international cooperation between multiple actors and building ever-closer ties in joint networks of action yield not only expected benefits but also dependencies of such sensitive matters as transport, raw materials, and energy resources.

The threat of the military conflict in Europe has been replaced by the following major challenges to security (*A Secure Europe in a Better World*, 2004, Everts 2004):

- 1) International terrorism,
- 2) Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction,
- 3) Resource and energy shortage and blackmail,
- 4) Regional and local conflicts,
- 5) National domestic destabilizations and collapse of states,
- 6) Growth of organized crime,
- 7) Rise in xenophobia and social unrest over national, religious, and cultural differences.

The above-listed challenges do not exhaust the catalogue of all the potential threats by any means. The underlying feature that they share, however, is their overlapping political, military, economic, and cultural character. They are multidimensional and, in most cases, even non-military (i.e. according to the classic definition of an armed conflict), being strongly inter-related with political, social, and economic stabilization and thus today's international stability. Therefore, relevant responses to these modern challenges belong to the domain of soft security and moreover

require international rather than national counter-measures (Żukrowska and Grącik 2006).

International terrorism has become a strategic threat to European security especially due to its global reach. Combined with religious extremism and clashes over the developmental differences between states in the era of globalization, it constitutes a threat that requires a multilateral yet integrated action in many areas supported by the European and trans-Atlantic institutions.

The threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (since the end of the Cold War) is on a rising trend when accompanied by the growth in international terrorism. Due to the instabilities in many regions of the world (including Europe's neighbour the Middle East), the proliferation threat now appears to assume the form of a new "arms race".

Europe's dependence on external energy supplies (from the Persian Gulf, Russia, and North Africa) in the context of potential global instability may pose a substantial threat to its economic and political security. Today Europe is the largest global importer of crude oil and natural gas (already half of its daily energy intake is sourced from imports, whose figures systematically rise) (Koziej 2006). Raw material and energy resource shortages affect not only the area of economic security but also provide fertile ground for political blackmail.

Regional and local conflicts continue to affect European security directly or indirectly in terms of instability due to spreading armed struggles, unrest at the borders, mass migrations, violations of human rights and freedoms, growth in xenophobia and extremisms, organized crime, illegal trade in weapons, proliferation of mass destruction weapons and terrorism. That results in the internal destabilization of states and threat to international security (Stańczyk 2004b, Stańczyk 2010).

International instability is frequently conditioned by domestic instabilities, which sometimes result in a collapse of states. Such situations usually emerge in the context of weakened state institutions or their dysfunctions due to corruption, disturbed rule of law, growth in crime, national minority conflicts, and internal antagonisms. This leads, in turn, to regional instability combined with growth in organized crime and terrorism.

The alarming data on growth of organized crime

alone can threaten security in Europe. This threat to security springs from the trans-border character of the phenomenon, spread of organized crime over whole regions from the spots characterised by a non-existent rule of law and from what can be described as an import of crime to Europe from the non-European countries (trafficking in narcotic drugs, people, weapons, and illegal transfer of immigrants). Thus a comprehensive analysis shows a specific overlapping of internal and external effects of crime, its connections with terrorism, undermined state structures, and social or even international conflicts.

Growth in xenophobia and social unrest over the matters of nationality, religion, and culture constitute another challenge to European security, quite different from the military threats of the Cold War era yet still capable of inciting international disturbances, including armed conflicts. This observation also holds true for the closest neighbours of Europe, namely the countries of the South Caucasus region and the Middle East, which are the potential sources of threats due to the above-listed non-military challenges.

The European Security Strategy adopted in 2003 stresses the importance of countermeasures to prevent the threats (*European Security Strategy*, 2003, Everts 2004, Biscop 2004). Preventive action is definitely not a novel solution to combat terrorism, proliferation of weapons or regional conflicts. What is new, however, is the effect of globalization on the perception of challenges and threats to European security, which stimulates the analysis and counteraction of dangers originating from the closest neighbourhood, for instance, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East or nuclear threats from North Korea (Simpson 2003).

An essential component of today's strategic thinking about security is the focus on non-military factors and early prevention to counter crisis (Crocker, Hampson and Aall 2001). Under this approach, the challenges related to the destabilization of state systems collapse of states, growth in organized crime or in xenophobia and social unrest over national, religious, and cultural clashes have become as important as the armed conflicts. At the same time, all these problems may lead to military struggles.

It is also characteristic of today's world that potential conflict sources are controlled with non-military and diversified methods, including political, economic, and legal measures, police and intelligence opera-

tions, crisis management means, etc. Such control doubtlessly requires integrated joint action coordinated by the international institutions (Buzan 2000).

The analysis of the European security perspectives should therefore include due consideration of the needs of the European community in the context of the above-outlined challenges and threats. There is no doubt that strengthening democracy in the European countries and in the neighbourhood is one of the needs (Russett 1993). It is the democratic system that facilitates collective effort to contribute to a higher level of security, including countering potential crises.

Another need is intercultural dialogue, including the Muslim civilization. In this context due attention should be paid to the significance of Turkey in NATO structures or operations undertaken by the European institutions in such trouble spots as Bosnia and Herzegovina or Kosovo. The involvement of the European institutions in conflict-solving endeavours in the Middle East or Afghanistan is also of the utmost importance (*The EU's Mediterranean and Middle East Policy*).

Apart from those, there is the issue of a reinforced unity over Europe's own values. Therefore, it is essential to preserve the trans-Atlantic ties between Europe and North America under the North Atlantic Treaty. This unity and identity constitute the binding factor of a strengthened security in Europe, which is necessary if it is to retain its freedoms and diversified character (Stańczyk 2008).

The analysis of the European security perspectives should also cover the significance and transformations of the European institutions with the key role of the trans-Atlantic political and defence organization, i.e. NATO and the integrative European Union.

NATO used to be treated as the organization responsible for international security in both military and political dimensions. However, the transformations that took place during the extensive process, which put the end to the Cold War era, have modified the perception of NATO role in contemporary circumstances (Stańczyk 2004a). The bipolar world disappeared together with its clear-cut opposition between the military blocs and a precise definition of the enemy. Is it really so? Or perhaps bipolarity still exists in different dimensions? It may be that today the enemy is not a state or a group of states but rather everything which threatens democracy, human rights, and partner relations be-

tween international actors. If so, the role of NATO is bound to change as well. It seems that NATO *raison d'état* in the future will be its responsibility to promote the Euro-Atlantic values on the global scene; the values that have always been the pillars of this community. These values include democracy, respect for human dignity, tolerance towards diversity, i.e. the core values of pluralism and liberalism. Solidarity, as required in the international relations, appears to be the final component to complete this list.

It should be noted that NATO has been subject to transformations virtually since its establishment. The subsequent strategies of the Organization or the five enlargements of its member panel give the best testimony here. Since the end of the Cold War NATO has been transformed from a strictly defensive organization into a political and military alliance (with the emphasis on the development of political functions); while currently it is assuming the shape of a regional system of collective security rather than an alliance of collective defence (Kupchan 1991). Moreover, the geostrategic context of NATO activities is also changing much more quickly now than in the Cold War era as evidenced particularly by its growing global character (Lindley-French, 2005).

Reformulated rules of the policy for accepting new members may in fact determine the future of NATO. The issue of future relations with Ukraine or Georgia as the latter still declares a desire to join NATO. These countries apparently need a stimulus and support in their reformative endeavours. It could help if NATO was able to offer these countries separate programmes tailored to their domestic situations and declared expectations.

For the sake of the ongoing extension of the security zone, the Alliance should undertake actions for rapprochement with other would-be NATO members. This is especially true for Albania, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Successful reforms in these countries would essentially contribute to an enhanced stability in the region. It is also necessary for NATO to find a relevant resolution to the post-Yugoslavian states, including the role of NATO in the Balkans.

Moreover, NATO still faces a wearisome task of re-considering the relations with both Russia and the European Union. Definitely, these relations cannot be structured along a new line of division into the West and East, which would be nothing more than

a Cold War clash. New Europe, free from the Yalta burden, and new NATO, free from the Iron Curtain, are bound to determine their identities in terms of the actual status of relations with Russia (Serfaty 2006).

However, the analysis of the EU perspectives in the context of anticipated transformations in the area of European security should cover both strictly understood defence initiatives and capabilities of the EU and the political and economic stabilization it can provide the continent, including the promotion of relevant social attitudes and awareness, which indirectly strengthen security. If the former aspect relates mainly to the deepened institutional reform, the latter depends on the expansion of the EU territorial range. In this sense, the enlargements should be deemed an investment in European stability as they contributed to a revitalization of the EU even if it was mainly the new members that gained the greatest benefits while the old ones became sometimes tired of the enlargement processes (Bradley, Petrakos and Traistaru, 2004).

In 2006 Russia reduced its gas supplies to the Western Europe twice. It pointed to the insufficiencies in the European energy security and the need for a diversification of raw resource and energy supply sources. In terms of current question, challenges still remain the problem of gaps in Europe's energy security, which implies the urgent need for diversification in the supply of raw material and energy (*Green Paper – Towards a European Strategy for the Security of Energy Supply*, 2004; *Study on Energy Supply Security and Geopolitics*, 2004).

These are not the only security shortages of the European Union. It should be remembered that the EU is neither a classical political and military alliance nor a state, although the political integration processes are often described as a straightforward simulation of state structures and institutions (including the common foreign, security, and defence policies). According to Jan Zielonka, "the EU is becoming something like a neo-Medieval empire with a polycentric system of government, divided sovereignty, vague borders, multiple overlapping jurisdictions and outstanding cultural and economic diversity" (Zielonka 2006). Additionally, the European Union seems to have stopped at crossroads due to the enlargement eastwards or the rejection of the draft Constitutional Treaty and now the deepening crisis of the euro area. Without having a defined government centre led by a multi-level management system (with overlapping competencies of

various national and supranational institutions), vexed by the divergent positions of the Member States and constant modifications of its external borders, the EU is exposed to a lack of unity and identity (De Burca 2005). It may be true that the power of Europe lies in its diversified unity yet this insufficient homogeneity sometimes poses significant problems. It must also be acknowledged that the enlargements, despite their unquestionable political and symbolic value, have transformed the EU in a way that necessitates a more precise definition of its identity.

In this context, the efforts to agree on a common foreign and security policy, defence policy or the establishment of joint military units as a surrogate for the European army are not actually equivalent to the capacity to guarantee security. Of course it would be unreasonable to deny such facts as the Common Foreign and Security Policy (1992), European Security and Defence Policy, EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (1999), EU Military Committee and EU Military Staff, or the initial police and military operations of the EU in the Balkans and in Congo (2004) (Missiroli 2004). However, Europe still lacks a strong decision-making centre for foreign and security policy matters, while the enlargements make things more complex (although noticeable reforms are already arising from signing (in 2007) and implementation (since 1 December 2009) of the Lisbon Treaty). New Member States always have different priorities in this area, particularly towards the key partners of the European Union, i.e. the USA and Russia (Grabbe 2004). As a consequence, European foreign policy is maintained by other international institutions, such as NATO, the OSCE or the UN together with more or less formal *ad hoc* coalitions (*Towards Complementarity of European Security Institutions* 2005).

As anticipated, the upcoming enlargements of the European Union will be conditioned mainly by the geopolitical reasons and undertaken with a strategic view to ensuring stabilization and security initially under the convergence processes enforced on the candidate states.

3. The Problem of Unity and Identity in Trans-Atlantic Relations

In spite of their geographical remoteness, Europe and America face common challenges and threats. This, of course, requires that they assume shared positions and

undertake joint actions. Therefore, European security is always to be considered in the trans-Atlantic context (Gryz 2004, Kagan 2003). Euro-Atlantic security is conditioned by the political situation between the European countries, relations between NATO and the EU, bilateral relations between the European countries and the USA, and the situation within NATO itself.

Even if the significance of the threats of armed aggression in security definitions has diminished since the end of the Cold War, the issues of hard military power will always constitute a part of security strategies. This point is taken seriously by both international institutions and nation states. In the context of trans-Atlantic relations and allied connections between Europe and America, the European defence capabilities fall short of expectations for guaranteeing European security. The newly united Europe may have become an economic power with increasing political influence, yet there are no signs that it stands in a position to turn into the European military power capable of competing with the USA on equal terms. The defence spending of the EU Member States reaches 40% of the US defence budget. The European expedition potential now accounts for only 10% of that of America (Lellouche).

The future of trans-Atlantic relations will depend on Europe and America's ability to act jointly and counter constantly changing threats in solidarity (Stańczyk 2011). *Power in unity* as the adage says. However, before Europe and America can agree on a unified approach, first of all unity must become the practice among the European countries. The Old Continent still struggles over the issue of continued integration, which emerged after the referendum votes against the Constitutional Treaty (*Summary of the Agreement on the Constitutional Treaty*; Krzysztofowicz et al. 2005).

Moreover, the European countries remain undecided upon their positions since the end of the Cold War. Some of them reach out across the Atlantic to support cooperation with the USA and ensure European security based on NATO structures. There is a growing concern, however, about the potential situation where a Member State of the European Union, which is not a NATO member, becomes the victim of military aggression. A group of European countries opposes the power and global domination of the USA and makes it clear that their aim is to strengthen the position of Europe (Zaborowski 2006, Serfaty 2005,

Walt 2005, Stańczyk 2002).

Between the extremes, there is a group of countries for which neutrality is the best solution. This, however, is a luxury only a minority can afford. In this situation, Europe, even unified by the EU structures, cannot be approached as a self-contained international actor. A sceptical conclusion from experiences to date is that such unity is a very long-term perspective for Europe. On the other hand, a rather perverse question may be posed whether this unity is necessary to ensure trans-European security.

Since the end of World War II, Europe has successfully avoided armed conflicts for over 60 years excluding the ones in former Yugoslavia. This way of thinking, however, may be dangerously deluded. Europe may have learned the lesson about preventing wars between two or more states yet today such wars are not a major challenge to security. The terrorist attacks in Madrid (2004) and London (2005) testified that Europe is bound to face a new danger, namely terrorism and proliferation of weapons. Another essential challenge is to neutralize the clashes between the Western and Muslim civilizations and to ensure energy security for Europe. The catalogue of threats and challenges is a never-ending story adding, for example, the need to ensure energy security. New threats require novel measures to counter them. Diplomacy, a verified instrument in preventing armed conflicts, is of no use in the fight against terrorism, since the enemy is particularly unwilling to negotiate and apart from other things there can be no negotiations with those who declare contempt for their own lives and those of others. Nuclear deterrence, successful in the Cold War era, appears equally useless today.

However, note that trans-Atlantic community is not the whole contemporary world. There are societies in the neighbourhood of Europe and in the Middle East which follow other hierarchies of values. Therefore, it is essential for Europe to manage successfully its relations with the Muslim world. We cannot afford waiting passively to see whether the Arab states will be governed by the extremists whose interpretations of Islam are oriented towards a confrontation with the West or those Muslims, who will aim to introduce the Islamic world into the modern era. The two civilizations do not only neighbour each other, they are interwoven. There is a substantial Arab diaspora in Europe (Savage 2004). On this background there is particularly important initiatives in support of the

implemented (in 2004) European Neighbourhood Policy and the intensification of activities especially for the most sensitive areas, such as the southern (the Union for the Mediterranean established in 2008) and eastern (Eastern Partnership Program since 2009).

These challenges, very visible today, will acquire even greater significance in the perspective of the changes in the global governance structure anticipated in the coming decades. The post-Cold War period we have been living in since the breakdown of the bipolar system is due to end in 20-30 years, while the new global order will feature a relatively weakened position of today's West as a consequence of the rise of Asian powers (Gnesotto and Grevi 2006; *Mapping the Global Future* 2004). This will increase cooperation between the European Union and the USA. The analysis of the feasible scenarios of the relations between the European Union and the USA should take account of both the divergence of their interests (which *de facto* may provide for the EU position to counterbalance the global hegemony of the USA) and ever closer partnership over their common interests arising from their shared values. As a consequence a selective partnership model appears to be a likely solution sometimes referred to as "*a la carte* alliance" (Kessler 2005). It would allow the partners to retain independence and enhance cooperation over the shared goals. The above-outlined model of trans-Atlantic cooperation may play the essential role in solving future problems of international security, including global scale especially if the necessary deep reform of the United Nations will not succeed in the coming years. Even today the need for cooperation between the EU and the USA is hailed in the matters of the Middle East, Central Asia, India, and Pakistan (Drozdiak 2005). A global joint action of the USA and the EU in the area of security is welcomed not only because of current political interests. Cooperation strengthening will also arise from the growing attention to economic security in the conditions where both American and European economies depend on external sources of raw resource and energy supplies and have to protect their own outlet markets.

NATO, as the trans-Atlantic institution competent in security matters, should play special role in solving trans-Atlantic problems of security and maintaining trans-Atlantic cooperation. Today security is mostly a non-military phenomenon because the threats are non-military. The most immediate challenges include

not only international terrorism but also energy security, which should be moved up to NATO agenda (Shea, 2006).

Although multiple arguments for the strengthened trans-Atlantic partnership were put forward, it remains a fact that the agreement between America and Europe is a vexing issue. It results not only due to the differences in the military potential (economic ones are rather balanced), political interests or simply lifestyles. Both partners have assumed different models for their foreign and security policies. The essential reason for this is the geopolitical character of Europe manifested in its diversity/complexity as opposed to the federal system in the United States (Kostecki 1996). Europe is very concerned over the principle of sovereignty due to its diversification; priority is given to the legal and institutional solutions. While respecting most of the legal and institutional conditions, the USA displays a higher degree of autonomy in its actions giving priority to its own sovereignty over other states' independence (which does not hinder it in calling upon multilateral institutions if needed) (Layne 2006). As a consequence, European diplomacy is based rather on consultations and multilateral initiatives, while the balance of powers is the main principle of its security policy, which stands in clear opposition to the USA, which prefers actions, supported by alliances and selected allies. It is also the European practice to perceive sensitive issues in all their complex dimensions and to search for preventive solutions (Welsh). Therefore, non-military activities using mainly political and economic measures are decisive in Europe unlike in the USA, where even foreign policy tends to be dominated by security matters in the traditional sense resolved frequently by the use of troops. In general, Europe's most serious concern is failed states, while that of the USA is rogue states (Zielonka 2006).

In the debate on the guarantees of trans-Atlantic security, voices are heard increasingly frequently regarding the need for the frequent reform and redefining NATO and the EU roles (Bartolini 2005). Such transformations would be these organizations' response to the changing threats and challenges. One of the ideas for trans-Atlantic cooperation in security matters is a deepened institutionalization, for instance, via the establishment of NATO-EU Council or even the introduction of the EU Representative to NATO. For the time being, these are rather far-reach-

ing proposals brought up for free discussions only, yet they should be included in the comprehensive analysis. One could imagine the EU Representative introduced into NATO as a consultant for political decisions but any role in the decision-making process is very hard to contemplate as long as the European Union does not assume the state structure. On the other hand, the establishment of the political Council, especially for the purposes of decision-making, although of course capable of contributing to NATO effectiveness in Europe (possibly mainly due to the enhanced political influence), could result in overlapping competences with the OSCE or even the UN.

As the final evaluation of the essential conditions and problems of the evolution of European security at the beginning of the 21st century, we should point to its dynamics due to the ongoing changes in the international alignment of forces, emergence of novel challenges and threats to security and the effect of such new phenomena and processes in international relations as globalization and modernization. All these necessitate institutional reform, stepped-up international cooperation and support for weaker international actors, if they choose to undertake the political and economic system reform. The fight against terrorism, today's embodiment of the armed aggressor, cannot exhaust the whole scale of challenges to modern security. These include also the dangers arising from violations of international cooperation rules, infringements of commonly accepted legal standards and liabilities, growing number of national minority conflicts and xenophobic attitudes, conflicts of interests between states, weakening of legitimate and lawful state structures, increase in organized crime, loss of control over arsenals of weapons or blockage of energy supplies. The potential effects may include domestic national destabilizations and international unrest.

4. Conclusions

In this context it must be noted that there are witness of growing importance of social and cultural security, which constitutes the framework for inter-ethnic and national minority-majority relations and the protection of national, cultural, and religious identities, i.e. the issues that may lead to the emergence of local conflicts and uncontrolled waves of migration (not only resulting in temporary social problems or an increase in organized crime but also changing the long-term relations between nations). In the context of

social and cultural security, attention should also be paid to the rise in nationalist ideas, which sometimes bring about a re-nationalization of security policies.

The above-mentioned examples do not constitute the whole list of challenges to European security. The majority of problems discussed belong to the area of political and military security. However, besides the above-mentioned economic or social and cultural challenges, there are also the issues of ecological security (which encompasses both destabilization of the eco-system through human activity and natural disasters), social security (provision of food and health care systems) or information security. Therefore, the analysis of European security matters should cover a comprehensive spectrum of the emerging issues and integrated counteraction based on stepped-up international cooperation.

In addition, the European security environment involves strictly European, trans-Atlantic and trans-European matters, meaning the competencies, scope of activity and responsibilities of such multilateral institutions as the European Union, North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. For the sake of European security, it is essential to provide for the continued efficiency of the current multilateral system supported by respect for the UN Charter and the strengthened position of the United Nations in its security-related competencies after the long-expected reform. Reforms are also needed within the EU and NATO structures as evidenced by the discussions on their reconsidered strategies. In a way both these organizations are at crossroads in terms of their still unsettled partnership status. It is important that the reforms undertaken do not deprive these institutions of their core competencies, i.e. the military functions of NATO as a military alliance and the integrative functions of the European Union, which will be lost if the EU is burdened with tasks it is unable to cope with. They both are specialized in their activities and it is precisely their diversity and complementarity that should constitute the basis for trans-Atlantic ties.

One needs, perhaps, to explain the absence of the OSCE in the considerations regarding the perspectives of European security. The grand principles that the Helsinki process introduced in international relations cannot be simply overlooked. These principles are discernible in the activities of the European Union as the basis for preventive diplomacy and peaceful set-

tlement of disputes. However, the principle of equality brought to the European policies under the Helsinki Process seems to be gradually disappearing from the European institutions. Perhaps it is precisely in the context of current controversies over the institutional development of the European Union that the OSCE heritage should be taken into account as manifested in the principles of openness (including transparency) and equality (giving the right of a “veto” vote to all and not only to the selected members) (Ascherson 2006).

References

- A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy.* European Union. Paris 2003
- Ascherson, N. 2006. *Przyjaciele, bracia i partnerzy – przyszłe sojusze w Unii Europejskiej*. “Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny”, No. 2 (30): 7-19. [A Russian language version of the article available in the quarterly “Europa”, Vol. 5, 2005, No. 4 (17): 7-19.]
- Bartolini, S. 2005. *Restructuring Europe: Centre Formation, System Building, and Political Structuring between the Nation State and the European Union*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Baylis, J., Smith S. 2001 *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Biscop, S. 2004. *The European Security Strategy. Implementing a Distinctive Approach to Security*. Royal Institute for International Relations, Brussels, <http://www.irri-kiib.be> [online]
- Bradley, J., Petrakos, G., Traistaru, I. 2005. *Integration, Growth and Cohesion in an Enlarged European Union*. Springer, New York
- Buzan, B. 1991. *People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-cold War Era*. London
- Buzan, B. 2000. *The Concept Complex Security Theory*. “COPRI Working Paper”, Copenhagen
- Cameron, F. (ed.). 2004. *The Future of Europe: Integration and Enlargement*. Routledge, London
- Crocker, C.A., Hampson, F.O., Aall, P. (eds.). 2001 *Turbulent Peace. The Challenge of Managing International Conflict*. UN Institute of Peace Press, Washington
- De Burca, G. (ed.). 2005 *EU Law and the Welfare State: In Search of Solidarity*. Oxford University Press, Oxford

- Drozdiak, W. 2005. *The North Atlantic Drift*. "Foreign Affairs", January-February
- European Security Strategy, adopted by the European Council*, 12 December 2003 in Brussels
- Everts, S. 2004. *The EU's New Security Strategy is an Important Step Forward*. "European Affairs", Winter
- Gnesotto, N., Grevi, G. (eds.). 2006. *The New Global Puzzle. What World for the EU in 2025*. Institute for Security Studies, Paris
- Grabbe, H. 2004. *The Constellations of Europe: How Enlargement Will Transform the EU*. Centre for European Reform, London
- Green Paper – Towards a European Strategy for the Security of Energy Supply. Technical Document*. European Commission. The Hague, January 2004
- Gryz, J. 2004. *Proces instytucjonalizacji stosunków transatlantyckich*. Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczno-Ekonomiczna w Łodzi. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa
- Kagan, R. 2003. *Paradise and Power. America and Europe in the New World Order*. London
- Kessler, G. 2005. *An 'A La Carte' Coalition between U.S. and Europe*. "Washington Post", February 24
- Kostecki, W. 1996. *Europe after the Cold War. The Security Complex Theory*. ISP PAN, Warszawa
- Koziej, S. 2006. *Między piekłem a rajem. Szare bezpieczeństwo na progu XXI wieku*. Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania Personalem, Wyd. Adam Marszałek, Toruń
- Krzysztofowicz, M. et al. 2005. *Przyszłość Unii Europejskiej po odrzuceniu Traktatu Konstytucyjnego – dwa kierunki*. "Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny", Vol. 5, No. 6 (28): 15-33
- Kupchan, C.A. 1991. *Concerts, Collective Security, and the Future of Europe*. "International Security", Vol. 16, No. 1
- Layne, C. 2006. *The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment*. "International Security", No. 2
- Lellouche, P. *Dokąd zmierza NATO?* <http://www.e-polityka.pl/a7503.d.58.drukuj.html> [online]
- Lindley-French, J. 2005. *Big World, Big NATO*. "NATO Review", Winter
- Mapping the Global Future: Report of the National Intelligence Council's 2020 Project*. Washington D.C., December 2004
- Missiroli, A. 2004. *CFSP and ESDP after Enlargement*. EU Institute for Security Studies, Paris
- Russett, B.M. 1993. *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-cold War World*. Princeton
- Savage, T.M. 2004. *Europe and Islam: Crescent Waxing, Cultures Clashing*. "The Washington Quarterly", Summer, pp. 25-50
- Serfaty, S. (ed.). 2005. *The United States, the European Union and NATO*. The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington,
- Serfaty, S. 2006. *A Challenged and Challenging Europe: Impact on NATO–EU–US Relations*. "The International Spectator", No. 1
- Shea, J. 2006. *Energy Security: NATO's Potential Role*. "NATO Review", Autumn
- Simpson, G.J. 2003. *Great Powers and Outlaw States in the International Legal Order*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Stańczyk, J. 2005. *Central Europe and Regional Cooperation Security Problems*, in: *Regioninio bendradarbiavimo saugumas*. Mokslo darbu rinkinis. *The Security of Regional Cooperation*. Ed. by A. Makštutis. Generolo Jono Žemaičio Lietuvos Karo Akademijs. Tarpautine Organizavimo ir Valdymo Mokslo Akademijs. Vilnius, pp. 204-215
- Stańczyk, J. 2010. *Contemporary Geopolitical Transformations in Europe in the Context of the Process of European Integration*. "Revista Română de Geografie Politică" ["Romanian Review on Political Geography, University of Oradea, Romania], Year XII, no. 2, November 2010: 437-444
- Stańczyk, J. 2004a. *Kres "zimnej wojny". Bezpieczeństwo europejskie w procesie zmiany międzynarodowego układu sił (na przełomie lat osiemdziesiątych i dziewięćdziesiątych XX w.)*. Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń
- Stańczyk, J. 2001. *Regional Cooperation in Trans-border Aspect*, in: *Chosen Problems of Political Geography in Central Europe*. Eds. by J. Wendt, A. Ilies. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, pp. 79-83
- Stańczyk, J. 2004b. *The Changes in Security's Area of Central and Eastern Europe*, in: "Revista Romana de Geografie Politică" ["Romanian Review on Political Geography"]. Volum coordonat de dr. J. Wendt.

- Universitatea din Oradea. Anul VI, no. 1-2, 2004: 73-82
- Stańczyk, J. 2002. *The Determinants and Directions of the Polish Security Policy*, in: *Transformation in Central European Security Environment*. International Visegrad Fund. National Defence University. Warsaw, pp. 111-132
- Stańczyk, J. 2008. *The Perspectives of European Security – the Problem of Unity and Identity*, in: *Poland and Ukraine in the European Security Processes*. Eds. by W. Gizicki, A. Podraza. The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin. Lublin, pp. 130-150
- Stańczyk, J. 1999. *The Strategy of Poland's Socio-Economic Development*, in: *International Conference „Economic Reform in Eastern and Central Europe”*. Klaipedos Universitetas. Ekonomikos, Vadybos ir Teises katedros. Valdymo problemu tyrimo centras. Klaipeda, vol. II, pp. 278-280
- Stańczyk, J. 2011. *Transformations of Euro-Atlantic Link towards Contemporary Global Challenges and Security Problems*, in: *Regional Development Studies in Poland and Romania*. Coordinators: A. Ilieş J. Wendt. University of Oradea, Department of Geography, Tourism and Territorial Planning. University of Gdansk, Institute of Geography, Department of Regional Development Geography. Oradea – Gdansk, pp.71-84
- Study on Energy Supply Security and Geopolitics. Final Report*. Institute for International Relations, The Hague, January 2004
- Summary of the agreement on the Constitutional Treaty, <http://europa.eu.int/futurum/documents> [online]
- The EU's Mediterranean and Middle East Policy. Creating an Area of Dialogue, Cooperation and Change*, http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/med_middleeast/intro/index.html [online]
- Towards Complementarity of European Security Institutions. Achieving Complementarity between NATO, EU, OSCE and the Council of Europe*. Report of the Warsaw Reflection Group, January 31 – February 1, 2005, Warsaw 2005
- Walt, S.M. *Taming American Power*. “Foreign Affairs”, September-October 2005
- Welsh, S.C. *Preemptive War, Unilateralism and Multilateralism – EU Security Strategy*, <http://www.cdi.org> [online]
- Zaborowski, M. (ed.). 2006. *Friends Again? EU–US Relations after the Crisis*. Paris
- Zielonka, J. 2006. *Europe as Empire. The Nature of the Enlarged European Union*. Oxford University Press
- Żukrowska, K., Grącik, M. (eds.). 2006. *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe. Teoria i praktyka*. Szkoła Główna Handlowa w Warszawie, Warszawa