

## The Changing Nature of Security in Europe: the Triangle between Russia's New Foreign Policy, the CSDP and NATO

**Katerina Veljanovska<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract:** *Russia's new foreign policy appears to be a potential turning point for the Euro-Atlantic security context. Having come as a surprise to many, some senior Western officials and politicians have talked of a changed European security landscape, and argued that the current situation creates new security realities for the twenty-first century and, at the same time, demands a significant response from NATO. The "triangle" formed by Russia – EU – NATO is a mirror of a number of wider and longer-term problems that have been increasingly visible for some time. Arguably, the most notable is related to the intensifying sense of strategic dissonance between Russia and the West. It is a fact that this relationship – particularly in terms of European security – has been deteriorating for some time. The developments in Ukraine and the ongoing crisis in the region is also a reason for the need of a new strategic framework. Europe is no longer limited to the European Union; this will still require undertaking certain actions closely connected to the security aspect of the relations between EU and Russia, Russia and NATO, and the EU and NATO respectively. Within the present paper we will give a general overview of the current threats to the CSDP of the EU, especially according to the new role of Russia in the Ukraine crisis, and in connection with NATO's role as a security provider for the Old Continent.*

**Keywords:** *security, Russian politics, CSDP, NATO, EU*

---

### Introduction

In the past, the security was retained as a dimension of the state. According to Roe<sup>2</sup>, the national security is concerned with threats to its sovereignty, but if the state loses its sovereignty, it will not survive as a state. Furthermore, the national security is concerned with threats to its identity which means that if the society loses its identity, it will not

---

<sup>1</sup> **Katerina Veljanovska** is a Professor of Political Systems at the Faculty of Security, Criminology and Financial control at MIT University, Skopje, the Republic of Macedonia. Currently she is benefiting from a scholarship for a scientific research project from the International Visegrad Fund and has an engagement as a professor at the prominent University of National Defence "Academia Obrony Narodowej", Faculty of National Security, The Republic of Poland, Warsaw. E-mail: [veljanovska\\_katerina@yahoo.com](mailto:veljanovska_katerina@yahoo.com).

<sup>2</sup> Roe, Paul, "Societal security", in Collins, Alan, *Contemporary security studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, pg. 177.

survive as a society. The national security problem is very important, especially when the state becomes insecure because of threats against its society. Namely, the national security problem, more precisely the state security can also be brought into question by a high level of societal cohesion<sup>3</sup>. According to Waever, this relates to those instances where a state's programme of homogenisation comes into conflict with the strong identity of one or more of its minority groups.<sup>4</sup>

National security is essential to an environment and geographical space in which people can live without fear. It consists, primarily, of physical security on both the international and domestic sides. This includes protection from external threats to the country and safety in one's homeland. This is generally accomplished through hard power and homeland security efforts.<sup>5</sup>

However, the new era of security is characterised by a whole new level of complexity. There is no longer sufficient security within the national boundaries in a digital era where the forces of globalisation long ago "wiped" the physical borders between countries when it comes to security. Especially within the European Union, where the security of the Union is not only the main preoccupation of the Member States, but is influenced by a set of external actors.

Within the paper, through theoretical and practical aspects, the current position of the security and stability in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is analysed. The paper especially pays attention to the possible implications of current threats to European security, particularly as a result of the actual impact of the external and internal actors across the continent. On one side is the European Union in the framework of CSDP, while on the other side is the new foreign policy of Russia, showcased through the current developments and the crisis in Ukraine. Last but not least, there is the NATO Alliance, the first military alliance ever formed during times of peace.

Theoretically, the paper will present attitudes and analyses of prominent theorists of contemporary security studies. The research is based on qualitative analysis of relevant data. In terms of qualitative methods we will use: a method of analysis and synthesis; analysis of the materials content; synthesis; comparative method; method of generalization and specification. Through proper application of the scientific methodology, we estimate that the paper will become a useful instrument that could serve as a relevant contribution in the process of formulating viable solutions to practical problems in the field of security studies.

---

<sup>3</sup> Romm, Joseph J., *Defining national security: the nonmilitary aspects*. Pew Project on America's Task in a Changed World (Pew Project Series). Council on Foreign Relations, 1993, pg. 122.

<sup>4</sup> Waever, O., "Peace and Security: Two Evolving concepts and their Changing Relationships", in H., G. Brauch, U., O. Spring, C. Mesjasz, J., Grin, P., Dunay, N., C., Behera, B., Chourou. P., Kameri-Mbote, Liotta, P., H. *Globalization and Environmental Challenges, Reconceptualization Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Heidelberg, Springer, Verlag, 2008, pg. 101.

<sup>5</sup> Mutimer, D., *The Weapons State: Proliferation and the Framing of Security*. Boulder: Lynne Rinner, 2000, pg.124.

## 1. The meaning of national security and stability in the 21<sup>st</sup> century

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century the concept of security underwent a series of transformations in terms of understanding. It is about taking into account different perspectives of the security, namely different from solely its military dimension. This approach was especially developed after the end of the Cold War. According to Mathews<sup>6</sup>, the level of security depends on economic, demographic, social and other aspects related to the society. For Mathews, the concept of the security went out of its military-centric confines.

There is this constant debate between the different theoreticians of the security studies about the main focus of this discipline. Nevertheless, it is essential for the main public to understand that the security issues depend on the core values that are being protected in and assumed as such by the society.

The main security dilemma when it comes to the national security and identity is the level of understanding of the security elements. On one side there are the institutional, coercive capacities and the lack of the national cohesion and, on the other side, is the power of the elites, that are trying to manage the society predicaments, but in their own favour. According to Jackson, there are differences between the perception of the developing countries and the developed countries<sup>7</sup>. Within the first example, citizens of the developing countries face profound security challenges, facing with perennial threats of intra-state war and communal violence, poverty and state failure, with a chance for complete state collapse. On the most basic level, there is a perception of the physical security. Furthermore, the developed countries are more focused on other aspects of the security, such as environmental issues, social issues and others. But what is common to both types of societies is the significant importance they confer to aspects of national security and to the main challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, including the fight against the plague of international terrorism<sup>8</sup>.

There is no single universally accepted definition of national security. In the 1943, Walter Lippmann, defined national security by saying that: "a nation has security when it does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interests to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by war"<sup>9</sup>. Later on, in 1960, Arnold Wolfers had a very interesting approach in defining national security as "an ambiguous symbol meaning different things to different people. National security objectively means the absence of threats to acquired values and subjectively, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked"<sup>10</sup>. For Wolfers, "security is a value, then, of which a nation can have more or less and which it can aspire to have in greater or lesser measure"<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Mathews, J., T., "Redefining Security". *Foreign Affairs*, 68/2, 1989, pp. 162-77.

<sup>7</sup> Jackson, Richard, *Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-Terrorism*. Manchester: Manchester Press, 2005, pg. 67.

<sup>8</sup> Jin, J.Y., "The Securitization of Infectious Diseases", *Contemporary International Relations*, 20/4, 2010, pg. 141.

<sup>9</sup> Lippmann, Walter., *U.S. Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1943, pg. 49.

<sup>10</sup> Wolfers, Arnold, *Alliance Policy in the Cold War*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1959, pg. 78.

<sup>11</sup> Wolfers, Arnold, "'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol", in *Political Science Quarterly* 67/4, 1952, pp. 481-502.

Unlike in the past and the former national security aspirations, today the focus is on different aspects that suggest retention or breach of the national security. But, in order for one nation to be secure, it needs to be safe in terms of economy, energy and environmental aspects, aside from the classical military one, which remains quintessential nonetheless. Namely, the national security threats involve not only conventional foes such as other nation-states, but also non-state actors, such as terrorist groups, narcotic cartels, multinational corporations and non-governmental organisations. And as a novelty of 21<sup>st</sup> century security preoccupations, there are also environmental security issues<sup>12</sup>.

According to Douglas<sup>13</sup>, national security can be achieved in several ways: by using diplomacy to rally allies and form alliances, and isolate threats in the process; by marshalling economic power to facilitate or compel cooperation; by implementing civil defence measures; by using intelligence services to detect and counter threats and espionage attempts, and to protect classified information; by using counterintelligence services or “secret police” to protect the nation from internal vulnerabilities. The security of the state is going through a process of theoretical and practical reinterpretation, moving away from the arena of daily politics and portraying itself as an existential threat to the state’s survival, which is the state’s ultimate goal that requires and justifies special measures. More important, the national security may be compromised by anything that compromises the national identity<sup>14</sup>.

The Western view says that nations must possess compact, well-defined territories. This is the essential element of the process of creating a national identity. From this point of view, we can analyse the problem of the national security. The classical Western model of the nation and the national identity refers to the historical territory, legal-political community, legal-political equality of the members of the community, and common civic culture and ideology<sup>15</sup>. In line with this approach, the common rights and duties refer to a national security problem, as a main issue in the state confronted with system collapse.

The national security problem refers to coordination between all the security policies that must be developed, coordinated, articulated and implemented. That is crucially important to the nation’s well-being. But, the security policies in a state refer to different systems in the society and they have different perceptions in the decision-making process. More precisely, the different systems in the society don’t have the same laws or regulations directing how policy decisions should be made<sup>16</sup>.

National security depends also on the ability of a country to generate and use its nation’s power and to project its national values over its natural borders. This, in turn, depends on long-term factors that contribute to nation growth and increase the total

---

<sup>12</sup> Rollins, John, Henning, H., Anna, *Comprehensive National Cybersecurity Initiative Legal Authorities and Policy Considerations*. Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2009, pg. 41.

<sup>13</sup> Douglas T. Stuart, *Creating the National Security State: A History of the Law That Transformed America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008, pg. 68.

<sup>14</sup> Bhadauria, Sanjeev, *National Security*. Allahabad: Dept. of Defence and Strategic Studies, University of Allahabad, 2002

<sup>15</sup> Scherer, Lauri S., *National Security*. Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2010.

<sup>16</sup> Nun, J., *The End of Work and the Marginal Mass*. Thesis, Latin American Perspectives, 27/1, 2000, pg. 25.

resource base available not only for defensive purposes, but also to provide security in every field (science, technology, innovation, economic, finance, etc.)<sup>17</sup>.

Traditionally, the security debates are analysed on different levels. The first level of analysis refers to the nation as a whole. In this context, the military and economic security aspects, which can also have a broader meaning, usually come into the spotlight. Broader view of the national security problems imply dealing with different kinds of issues, such as, immigration, international trade, and even innovation, be it social or technological. But also, national security refers to global trends. In addition, it is about the nature of the external threats to the physical security and integrity of the state, especially the rise of terrorism and religious extremism. Furthermore, it is about the global financial crisis, and budget deficit, as and the slow rate of recovery for the state. Finally, there is a problem with the growing presence of emerging nations that may have influence to the national security, on some level<sup>18</sup>.

Different challenges of the twenty-first century can highlight some traditional perceptions that can help each country to shape its own security policy. There are five large ideas that seem to have influenced the politics in the Western world<sup>19</sup>:

- Peaceful resolution of conflicts and the rebuttal of war;
- Tolerance of some powerful foreign policy in order to keep the peace;
- Democratization instead of authoritarianism;
- Market capitalism has won the battle with the socialist economic model;
- Appropriate government fiscal and monetary policy.

One of the main points of analysing the complexity of the security aspects is to be able to make valid predictions about the consequences and the possible threats and vulnerabilities that undermine one's security. These can be horizontal competitions, such as migrations, or vertical competitions, such as integrations and secessions. Each of these, when it comes to the national security problem, can also affect the national identity. The threats to the national security and also national identity are differently perceived in the Western and Eastern Europe. Inside the European Union, the national security and the national identity are more vulnerable and threatened because of immigrations, foreign ideas or products, which means that the control of the state is going over these issues.

## **2. Essential feature of the CSDP: Consolidating European security**

The European Union may as well be considered the most supranationally integrated polity in the world. At the same time, it represents an attempt by the European politicians to safeguard peace on the European continent after the two devastating world wars

---

<sup>17</sup> Nanto, K., D. *Economics and National Security: Issues and Implications for U.S. Policy*. Congressional Research Service, 2011, pg. 12.

<sup>18</sup> Williams, M., C., Krause, K., "Preface: Toward Critical Security Studies". in Klause, K., Williams, M., C. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997, pg. 178.

<sup>19</sup> Nanto, K., D. (2011). *Economics and National Security: Issues and Implications for U.S. Policy*. Congressional Research Service, pg. 4.

of the last century. From its beginning in the early 1950's as a customs union, the EU has developed its own institutions, has gained significant power in policy creating, has reduced the national barriers for free trade, created a single currency and expanded its borders through successive waves of enlargement. The security and defence challenges of the EU are an important part of its existence as a political phenomenon, but also a challenge for the future of the whole continent<sup>20</sup>.

The most fundamental function of each European state is to achieve security and ensure its survival as such. Traditional maintenance of military forces as security guards, and the right to use military force for defensive purposes is an indispensable attribute of the sovereignty of states.

In the contemporary world rapidly changing, the EU is confronted with different security challenges inside its territory and its near abroad. The Common Security and Defence Policy of the EU allows it to take a leading role in peacekeeping operations, conflict prevention and maintenance of international security. Since 2003, the EU launched a huge number of peacekeeping missions and operations, which contributed to the overall stability and security in Europe and the rest of the world.

As a normal evolution, the European Union at this time aims to have a single foreign and security policy. In support of this desiderate, the Lisbon Treaty created the position of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. The security policy of the EU is part of the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU.

The idea of a common defence policy in Europe begins with the signing of the Treaty of Brussels in 1948 by the UK, France and the Benelux countries. Consequently, the Western European Union (WEU) was formed, to ensure dialogue and consultations in the area of security and defence in Europe. The end of the Cold War and the conflicts in the Balkans stimulated the interest of the EU to improve its responsibilities in the fields of conflict prevention and crisis management. The conditions under which they can deploy military units have been agreed upon by the Council of the WEU in 1992. These agreements are known as the Petersburg Tasks and are integrated in the Treaty of Amsterdam from 1999.

The first steps towards the formation of a common European security and defence policy began with the establishment of European Political Cooperation (EPC), which was later renamed with the adoption of the Treaty of Maastricht as the Common Foreign and Security Policy. The Treaty of Maastricht describes the central area of activity of the foreign and security policy of the EU<sup>21</sup>. The key moments in development of the European security policy are the reforms stages of the Treaties of Maastricht (1993), via Amsterdam (1999) to Nice (2003). The purpose was to create more effective decision-making structures and instruments for the implementation of the security policy of the EU.

In 2003 the European Council approved the European Security Strategy prepared by the former High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy. The

---

<sup>20</sup> Katerina Veljanovska, Goran Shibakovski, "Shaping, Progress and the Future of the Security and Defence Policy of the European Union and its Impact on the Process of Enlargement", *Security Dialogues*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2014, pg. 135.

<sup>21</sup> Vajdenfeld, V., *Evropa od A do S*, Skopje: Fondacija Konrad Adenauer, 2009, pg. 249.

Strategy, still in vigour today, defined the EU security priorities: combat against terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, active engagement in order to help solve regional conflicts, support the stabilization of fragile states, and fight against organized crime. It is one step further toward the consolidation of the European security policy and building of the institutional framework of the Common Foreign Security Policy of the EU<sup>22</sup>.

The role of the CSDP (Before the Lisbon Treaty CSDP was ESDP – European Security and Defence Policy) can be seen in different aspects (positive or negative). CSDP achieved many positive results that serve to emphasize its strong points, in sharing the security idea of the Union. Since the establishment of the CSDP and CFSP, the EU aimed at sending peacekeeping missions in crisis regions around the world. In April 2003, the EU launched the operation “Concordia” to keep the peace in the Republic of Macedonia with 250 troops from 15 EU Member States. In June 2003, the operation “Artemis” was launched to keep peace in parts of Congo, consisting of 1 500 troops and being the first EU mission outside Europe. In 2004 with the operation “Althea” the EU took the responsibility for peacekeeping in Bosnia and Herzegovina from NATO. Also, in 2005 in Indonesia, the EU launched its first mission in Asia. In that context, the EU in style of the great powers imposes as a dominant player in the international political arena in the field of security.

Still, there are some weakness in the way the CSDP is functioning. Mostly, they are related to the budget available to accomplish the missions and potential worldwide actions. For example, through this security policy, it may be argued that the EU competes for influence in world politics with the United States. There are of course cases of international developments, like for instance the war in Iraq, where the European countries cannot hope to achieve the same power as the US<sup>23</sup>. A lot of defence analysts argue that European forces risk to be surpassed in terms of technological prowess or forever to be dependent of the US advanced technology<sup>24</sup>.

Current trends in the security and defence aspects of the EU need a “comprehensive approach” in dealing with serious crises, in order to allow the future security environment to be less focused on traditional military threats, and more perceptive and proactive in regards to various trans-national challenges, different in character and especially complex in nature. Indeed, the future success of this European policy indicates the need for a comprehensive integration of civilian and military facilities. According to the Petersburg Tasks, the concept of the European Union covers taking and keeping the most complex operations of crisis management<sup>25</sup>.

The European Union clearly understands the purpose of developing timely security policies, in accordance with the everyday challenges. The main problem of the framework

---

<sup>22</sup> European Union External Action, About CSDP – The Treaty of Lisbon, [http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/lisbon/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/lisbon/index_en.htm) accessed on 09.02.2015.

<sup>23</sup> Bejl, T., *Evropska politika. Komparativen voved*. Skopje: Akademski pecat, 2009, pg. 368.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid*, pg. 370.

<sup>25</sup> Ginsberg, Roy H., Smith, E., Michael, “Understanding the European Union as a global political actor: Theory, practice, And Impact”, in McNamara, Kate, Meuiner, Sophie, *The State of the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Vol. 8, 2007, pp. 14-21.

that is highlighted in the research series says that one of the main reasons for the failure of the European Security comes from the diversity and complexity of the decisions delivered on a short notice. However, despite its complexity, the European Union takes serious actions from civil, military and humanity aspects<sup>26</sup>.

### **3. Challenges for new Security Policy of Europe: critical aspects**

#### **3.1. European Union - security aspects**

The current developments in Europe are important not only for this part of the world, but also on a planetary level. The terrorist attacks in France and the crisis in Ukraine are just a couple of examples for the need of a new security strategy for the whole Europe. Currently, there is a need for visionary answers that will contribute to the process of creating a new security policy for the years to come. As the defence budgets are critical within the EU, the European countries should unite and act as a whole. This will be the first contribution to a safer life in Europe.

NATO and the EU must be complementary in their defence capabilities. The tools for national rebuilding are different, but they should be united. In this way, the current instability will be neutralized, and that is what the current actors of EU should aim at. The current challenge also should be pointed on the Eastern part of Europe, in the face of what most analysts called Russian “aggression” on its neighbour Ukraine. According to this, there should be a response to those actions from the other actors at international level. There should be commitments and firm decisions, implemented in a credible and sustainable way. Finally, there should be reliable measures in order to provide long-term security and stability. This new action plan needs to present the most ambitious measure yet, keeping in mind that collective defence will safeguard the European security, refraining from military intervention and favouring strategic planning and acting. Furthermore, there will be a lot of work for finding solutions on a political level, but at this point this is of crucial importance. Last but not least, it is time NATO and the EU set up a joint strategy aimed at improving the relations with Russia. The Minsk Protocol provides the best arguments for a political conclusion to the Ukrainian crisis. It is about an agreement, signed in Minsk, Belarus (5<sup>th</sup> of September, 2014) that will halt the war in the Donbass region of Ukraine. The agreement was signed under the auspices of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), but also with representatives from Ukraine and Russia. In the essence of the Protocol, there was supposed to be an immediate ceasefire taking place. The text of the Protocol consists of twelve points, among which: ensure an immediate bilateral ceasefire; continuing of the inclusive national dialogue; taking measures to improve the humanitarian situation in Donbass; withdrawal the illegal armed groups, military equipment, as well as fighters and mercenaries from Ukraine; and adopting a program of economic recovery and reconstruction of Donbass region. However, despite the idea of a truce and building peace in the region, the Minsk Protocol had completely failed. Although there was a second attempt for a meeting in Minsk, in

---

<sup>26</sup> Glaser, Charles L., “Why NATO is Still Best: Future Security Arrangements for Europe”, *International Security*, Vol. 18 (1), 1993, pp. 20-28.



order to review and revive the protocol (January 31), the meeting was postponed without any result<sup>27</sup>.

Germany and France, spearheading the European Union's mediation efforts, represented by German Chancellor Angela Merkel and French President Francois Hollande, initiated separate meetings in February 2015 with Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko in Kyiv and Russian President Vladimir Putin in Moscow. Through these mediation efforts, they are trying to consolidate their influence in the EU's backyard. The main reason for the meeting in Kiev was the revision of the Protocol of Minsk, in order to obtain a lasting cessation of the ongoing hostilities between the Ukrainian army and the separatist rebels. Still, both US Secretary of State John Kerry in Kyiv and, on the same day, Vice President Joseph Biden in Washington conclusively ruled out the provision of defensive arms to Ukraine, although the best defensive weapons in this case are the reforms<sup>28</sup>.

Germany and France also tried to mediate a dispute between Russia and Ukraine in June 2014, when there was no dialogue between Russian president Putin and Ukrainian president Poroshenko<sup>29</sup>. That was one step of EU Member States in helping to find the way out of this crisis. The EU has showed remarkable cohesion in this period, in regards to the sanctions regime against Russia, and the conflict as a whole. These sanctions are limited in time and must have a close relation with the Minsk Protocol. It can be said that the European reality is permanent in these aspects. In order to increase the impact of CSDP in Europe, new European tools have been developed, especially in the frame of EU cyber-security strategy.

EU should tackle the security dimension in a more competitive way, especially in a way that will be in the long-term interest of a potential EU army. Nowadays, European countries can develop a self-defence industry. This will be a significant contribution to the security European process, and will also strengthen the European defence industry. The modernization of CSDP will be a unique opportunity in that direction. The EU defence is at a crossroad and there is a need for a new strategy with new priorities and concepts. The new concept should be an answer not only for the current and future threats, but also to consolidate solidarity among Member States.

Against this backdrop, the NATO summit that will be held in 2016, Warsaw, the Republic of Poland will be of particular interest. On the other hand, the security of Europe is shattered by increased terrorist activity. The most important message in this context was delivered by the terrorist attacks in France, 7 January, 2015. France was confronted with one of its worst security crises in decades after three days of attacks by gunmen fuelled bloodshed in the capital Paris and its surrounding areas. It began with a massacre at the offices of satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo on 7 January, 2015, and ended with a huge police operation and two sieges two days later<sup>30</sup>.

---

<sup>27</sup> OSCE, Chairperson-in-Office welcomes Minsk agreement, assures President Poroshenko of OSCE support, Bern, 5 September, 2014 <http://www.osce.org/cio/123245> accessed on 07.02.2015.

<sup>28</sup> Socor, Vladimir, "Angela Merkel, Francois Hollande Attempt to Mediate Between Russia and Ukraine", *Euroasia Daily Monitor* Volume, Issue (12): 24. The Jamestown Foundation.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>30</sup> BBC News Europe, "Charlie Hebdo attack: Three days of terror", <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-30708237>, accessed on 08.02.2015.

### 3.2. Russian influence in the European security discourse

Security issues must have become a priority on the European agenda in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in France and in the context of the Ukraine crisis. The new security strategy should have at heart the core values of the different European societies and cultures, building and consolidating cohesion among them. But the threats scenario for Europe is rather wide. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the jihadist attacks, the rising of China, the unpredictable regime in North Korea, are all important variables that constantly change the security landscape. It will take some time to see if Russia can truly be a partner to Europe and vice versa. Europe went out of its way to propose Russia a partnership relationship, especially on a political level. Maybe that will help for opening modern pro-Western society in Russia. Although rhetoric on both sides can create the impression that Russia is either for or against the West, we should remember that Russia has often walked a middle line. Its unique view of the world is a direct consequence of its history, and not one that should be reduced to the strident positions of either the Europhiles or the Slavophiles<sup>31</sup>. However, it seems that the Russian political and economic system would not be compatible with such a transformation. The open society, transparency and rule of law in a fair competition seem to be not enough in this international order. Furthermore, the nationalism, chauvinism, and the propaganda work on the field. Everything is happening in order to induce the image of a strong leadership in Kremlin.

The Cold War and the old bipolar world order provided stable security architecture in Europe, but Russian politics nowadays has become more and more unpredictable. We can now see how Russian units are challenging NATO air forces in the Baltics, etc. The European Union has to react to this, but there can't be any military solution to the Russia-Ukraine situation. This situation is, expressed through sociological terminology, an "escalation dominance". More weapons only mean more civilian victims, so a political solution must be found. Such a solution can only be found by means of dialogue and diplomacy, which is essential. This should be a clear position on an international level, both for NATO and EU. This is one of the reasons why the EU and the USA have imposed sanctions on Russia. The sanctions against Russia are in political, economic and diplomatic level<sup>32</sup>. EU member states also supported the suspension of negotiations over Russia's joining the OECD and the International Energy Agency. Bilateral talks with Russia on visa matters as well as on the New Agreement between the EU and Russia were suspended. EU nationals and companies may not provide loans to five major Russian state-owned banks. Services related to the issuing of such financial instruments, e.g. brokering, are also prohibited. There is also an embargo on the import and export of arms and related material from/to Russia, covering all items on the EU common military list. While the

---

<sup>31</sup> Romanov, Pyotr, The Moscow Times, "Being Pro-West Doesn't Mean Being Anti-Russian", <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/being-pro-west-doesnt-mean-being-anti-russian/504984.html>, accessed on 07.02.2015.

<sup>32</sup> European Council, Statement by the President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy and the President of the European Commission in the name of the European Union on the agreed additional restrictive measures against Russia, Press EN, Statement, EUCO 158/14, Brussels, 29 July, 2014.

Greeks representatives did call for the decision on tighter sanctions to be delayed, they were not alone: other countries such as Italy and Austria also favoured a delay<sup>33</sup>.

There are aspects of keeping security in Europe that are related to the unity of the countries. As for the sanctions taken against, the German politics is clearly divided and is sometimes sending mix signals. On the other side, there is this thinking that the sanctions against Russia are in order with the rule of law inside the EU, but from the other side there are some representatives who think that EU should recognize the annexation of Crimea by Russia. According to Russian president Putin, overcoming the external factors' pressure by strengthening the national financial sovereignty "is an extremely important task of which we have kind of forgotten, believing that finances and the economy will always stay outside politics, as we've often heard from the outside. However we've found out that this is quite the contrary – because this is used as a very powerful political pressure tool"<sup>34</sup>. For the Kremlin leader, the Russian economy certainly should and will remain an inseparable and natural part of the world economy. Putin reminded that the Russian government has approved an anti-crisis plan to ensure the sustainable development of the country's economy and social stability. The plan also envisages the support of the agricultural and industrial complex and the stabilization of the labour market.

### 3.3. NATO position in the security policy of Europe

After the NATO summit in Wales, the Alliance sent a clear message to Russia that the aggression against Ukraine or some other country in the region will not be tolerated. The reaction plan will be implemented by the EU and the USA. One part of the plan is to have bigger support from the NATO forces in the region. But not only NATO needs to react. Europe cannot rely uniquely on the American protection. US will no longer be easily available for European purposes, as it engages in the so-called Asian pivot. Secondly, economic difficulties have forced the US military to concentrate and restrain its efforts. Europe should do more in order to become a security provider rather than a security consumer. Europe must do more but must do more efficiently and that is why Europe needs CSDP. The biggest advantage is to have a broader concept that will comprise military and civilian aspects. There are 16 missions and operations currently on going, especially in the Balkan and in Africa. It is no coincidence that the CSDP and NATO missions are largely in Europe. Each mission of NATO and CSDP has its own straightens and advantages. However, the EU and NATO cooperation needs to be improved and better coordinated.

There is a need to develop a new strategic framework for the CSDP. The security field has dramatically changed since 2003 when the first and last European security strategy was adopted. There is need for a strong and competitive technological base of

---

<sup>33</sup> Emmott, Robin, Reuters, "EU wins Greek backing to extend Russia sanctions, delays decision on new steps", January 29, 2015, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/01/29/us-ukraine-crisis-idUSKBN0L22B720150129>, accessed on 07.02.2015.

<sup>34</sup> TASS, Russian News Agency, Russia must overcome outside pressure by strengthening economic sovereignty – Putin, January 29, 2015, <http://itar-tass.com/en/economy/774135> accessed on 06.02.2015

the CSDP. Furthermore, there is need for operational improvement of the current abilities of CSDP. European security means increasing European cooperation. Sharing capabilities and information, promoting peace and stability and cooperation in various fields has become more and more important. Europe and its defence industry must take a step for deeper cooperation and understanding. Each country of the EU must be a part of the big “enterprise” that will further unite and strengthen Europe. Increasing European security also means increasing European solidarity. Each Member State has a special responsibility for upkeeping the security in Europe. Nobody wants another Cold War to start and, as such, achieving security in Europe simply cannot be made at the expense of fuelling Russian anxiety. The sanctions regime against Russia should be implemented in the name of the greater good in a political sense. In the end, Russia should also have a significant place in the international structure of peace.

\* \* \* \*

There is a need for a dual strategy in order for Russia to implement the Minsk Agreement. There is a need for NATO–Russia cooperation; however, the sanctions regime should be maintained and even expanded until Russia fulfils the Minsk Agreement’s points. This will have a strong impact on Europe. If Ukraine collapses economically that means that Russia will achieve its goal, and this can be threatening for whole Europe. That is why the EU is supporting Ukraine financially. Ukraine can only survive if it fights corruption and makes its economy competitive. On a broader level, in order to have more security, Europe needs to reduce its energy dependency on Russia. That doesn’t mean not to buy anymore gas and oil from Russia, but rather that the EU should find alternative suppliers, especially for the countries that rely completely on Russia.

## **Conclusion**

The national security problem refers to the public and to the state in order to be perceived as a main bond between the state and its institutions. If there is something wrong in the process of functioning of the institutional system in the society, then there is a big possibility of having a threat to the national security of the state.

More precisely, the national security is compromised when a community perceives a threat as a threat to its national identity. Each state contains individuals as members of different groups. Furthermore, the nations are abstract, cognitive communities, and the national identity is the most important reference object of their existence.

In order to have a clear picture on the importance of security in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we must evade the old nation-state framework of analysis. The European Union, from its beginnings until present times, has reformed its security policy a few times. However, since 2003 it has been guided by the same security stereotypes which are no longer sufficient and no longer correspond to existing realities. It is necessary to revise and reorient the CSDP of the EU towards internal reorganization, technological development and sufficient budget for improving security in Europe. Not only the European Union, but also Europe as a whole can no longer rely solely on NATO’s security umbrella.

## Bibliography:

- Bhadauria, Sanjeev, *National Security*. Allahabad: Dept. of Defence and Strategic Studies, University of Allahabad, 2002
- Bejl, T., *Evropska politika, Komparativen voved*. Skopje: Akademski pecat, 2009
- Douglas T. Stuart, *Creating the National Security State: A History of the Law That Transformed America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008
- European Council, Statement by the President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy and the President of the European Commission in the name of the European Union on the agreed additional restrictive measures against Russia, Press EN, Statement, EUCO 158/14, Brussels, 29 July, 2014
- Ginsberg, Roy H., Smith, E., Michael, "Understanding the European Union as a global political actor: Theory, practice, and Impact", in McNamara, Kate, Meuiner, Sophie, *The State of the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Vol. 8, 2007
- Glaser, Charles L., "Why NATO is Still Best: Future Security Arrangements for Europe", *International Security*, Vol. 18 (1), 1993
- Jackson, Richard, *Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-Terrorism*. Manchester: Manchester Press, 2005
- Jin, J.Y., "The Securitization of Infectious Diseases", *Contemporary International Relations*, 20/4, 2010, 139-59
- Katerina Veljanovska, Goran Shibakovski, *Shaping, Progress and the Future of the Security and Defence Policy of the European Union and its Impact on the Process of Enlargement*, Security Dialogues, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2014, pp. 133-145
- Lippmann, Walter., *U.S. Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1943
- Mathews, J., T., "Redefining Security". *Foreign Affairs*, 68/2, 1989, pp. 162-77
- Mutimer, D., *The Weapons State: Proliferation and the Framing of Security*. Boulder: Lynne Rinner, 2000
- Nun, J., "The End of Work and the Marginal Mass". Thesis, *Latin American Perspectives*, 27/1, 2000
- Roe, Paul, "Societal Security", in Collins, Alan, *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013
- Rollins, John, Henning, H., Anna, *Comprehensive National Cybersecurity Initiative Legal Authorities and Policy Considerations*. Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2009

- Romm, Joseph J., *Defining national security: the nonmilitary aspects*. Pew Project on America's Task in a Changed World (Pew Project Series). Council on Foreign Relations, 1993
- Socor, Vladimir, "Angela Merkel, Francois Hollande Attempt to Mediate Between Russia and Ukraine", *Euroasia Daily Monitor* Volume, Issue (12): 24. The Jamestown Foundation
- Scherer, Lauri S., *National Security*. Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2010
- Waever, O., "Peace and Security: Two Evolving concepts and their Changing Relationships", in H., G. Brauch, U., O. Spring. C. Mesjasz, J., Grin, P., Dunay, N., C., Behera, B., Chourou. P., Kameri-Mbote, Liotta, P., H. *Globalization and Environmental Challenges, Reconceptualization Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Heidelberg: Springer, Verlag, 2008
- Williams, M., C., Krause, K., "Preface: Toward Critical Security Studies", in Klause, K., Williams, M., C. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997
- Wolfers, Arnold, "'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol", in *Political Science Quarterly* 67/4, 1952
- Wolfers, Arnold, *Alliance Policy in the Cold War*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1959
- Vajdenfeld, V., *Evropa od A do S*. Skopje, Fondacija Konrad Adenauer, 2009

#### Online sources:

- BBC News Europe, Charlie Hebdo attack: Three days of terror, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-30708237> accessed on 08.02.2015
- Dempsey, Judy, Which Leader Had a Successful NATO Summit?, Carnegie Europe, September 5, 2014, <http://carnegieeurope.eu/strategieurope/?fa=56546> accessed on 08.02.2015
- Emmott, Robin, Reuters, EU wins Greek backing to extend Russia sanctions, delays decision on new steps, January 29, 2015, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/01/29/us-ukraine-crisis-idUSKBN0L22B720150129> accessed on 07.02.2015
- European Union External Action, About CSDP – The Treaty of Lisbon, [http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/lisbon/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/lisbon/index_en.htm) accessed on 09.02.2015
- OSCE, Chairperson-in-Office welcomes Minsk agreement, assures President Poroshenko of OSCE support, Bern, September 5, 2014 <http://www.osce.org/cio/123245> accessed on 07.02.2015

- Romanov, Pyotr, The Moscow Times, Being Pro-West Doesn't Mean Being Anti-Russian, <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/being-pro-west-doesnt-mean-being-anti-russian/504984.html> accessed on 07.02.2015
- TASS, Russian News Agency, Russia must overcome outside pressure by strengthening economic sovereignty – Putin, January 29, 2015, <http://itar-tass.com/en/economy/774135> accessed on 06.02.2015
- Welcome to Germany.info, Joint Declaration by the Foreign Ministers of Ukraine, Russia, France and Germany, July 2, 2014, [https://web.archive.org/web/20140908184451/http://www.germany.info/Vertretung/usa/en/\\_pr/P\\_Wash/2014/07/02-JointDeclaration-Ukraine.html?archive=1992708](https://web.archive.org/web/20140908184451/http://www.germany.info/Vertretung/usa/en/_pr/P_Wash/2014/07/02-JointDeclaration-Ukraine.html?archive=1992708) accessed on 07.02.2015