THE EVOLUTION
OF THE EUROPEAN SECURITY COMPLEX
AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR
The Delimitation of the Security Complex
of the European Union

SANDA CINCĂ[*]

Abstract. *Starting from the European security complex that was shaped in the context of globalization and transformations brought about by the end of the Cold War, the article proposes to identify the EU security complex and its evolution toward a security community. We are going to analyze the concept of security from the perspective of the Copenhagen School, and for the purpose of the case study of the EU security complex, we are going to use the framework offered by the theory of the regional security complexes. This European model is recognized today as the most complex model for the description of a new type of interaction among states and also it can explain the evolution of the security complex toward a security community.*

Keywords: *security, Copenhagen School, the European Union, regional complex of security, security community.*

Within the context of globalization and transformations brought about by the end of the Cold War (the collapse of communism, the reunification of Germany, the dismantlement of the Soviet Union and the debut of regional conflicts in Europe) we are assisting now at a displacement of the analysis centre from the security in traditional (political-military) sense toward the security in modern, non-military sense, oriented toward the individual. As well at the general level of the UE as at the particular one of the member states, have appeared new security challenges, as well as the need for the securitization of new domains.

The European Union represents a particular case among the international organizations due to the centripetal process s of evolution; from one treaty to another we can notice a continuous coagulation, tending to become a more unitary actor. Although it is a great global economic power, the EU plays a marginal

role in the security policy at this level. Even if it is not a security organization per se, the European Union acquired an aspect of a security complex attempting to create their political role and to develop its own security system within an extended regional framework.

The objective of this study is to identify and delimit the security complex of the European Union, as well as the mechanisms that led to the formation of a security community within this complex, in the context of the evolution of the general European security complex, which was shaped beginning with the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century when the international security environment changed due to the apparition of new risks and threats to the security of the international system.

In order to attain the proposed objective, we are going to organize our approach around the following questions: (1) how do we define the security concept, (2) which theories and explicative models describe best the security from UE's perspective, (3) how does evolve the UE's security complex.

We are going to approach the security concept from the perspective of the security studies belonging to the *Copenhagen School*. In order to present and analyze the European security complex we are going to use the framework offered by the *Theory of the Regional Security Complex* (one of the most important directions of research from the theory of international relations for the last two decades) taken forward and developed also by Barry Buzan and his collaborators from the same School. This theory is destined to the understanding of the diverse regions of the globe (among which Europe) and it proposes an examination starting from the particular (regional) toward the general (global) for the understanding international security system. Our investigation is constituted thus of the unfolding of a case study where we apply the theory of the regional security complex to the security complex of the European Union, which will help the investigation, to the end of revealing the mechanism that led to the formation of a European security community.

The Security Concept and its Post-Cold War Evolution

Security is a central concept in the security studies and in international relations, a concept which, despite its extensive use, did not benefit from a widely accepted definition among the practitioners and the theoreticians alike. The definitions presented by different currents and schools of thought emerged within a specific historical context and they have emphasized several of the characteristics of security, but none seems to be complete. "When we are searching for an adequate conceptual bibliography on security", noticed researcher Barry Buzan, we find that "there is no coherent school of thought"[1].

One of the definitions that is mostly used for this term belongs to A. Wolfers, who considered that security includes two dimensions, "a objective one, referring

---

[1] Barry Buzan, *Popoarele, statele și teama. O agendă pentru studii de securitate internațională în epoca de după Războiul Rece* [*Peoples, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies after Cold War Era*], 2nd edition, Chişinău, Cartier Publishing House, 2000, p. 15.

to the lack of threats to values, and another one, subjective, understood as the absence of the apprehension that they are to be attacked/endangered"[2]. Starting from this definition, a whole branch of international relation developed after WWII, known as security studies.

During the years of the Cold War the main threats to security came from the political and military areas. Thus, security was defined in military terms, reflecting the main preoccupations of the two opposing blocks (East-West). From this perspective, the reference object of security was the state, this being the one who should have ensured the existence and which had to be protected, especially from the possible military threats. The dominant theoretical perspectives were realism and liberalism[3]. Once with the development of the institutional liberalism a wider approach of security began to be encouraged, starting from the type of the actors involved, and from the types of threats that they could face. During the 80s emerge the first tendencies of the redefinition of the security studies which had as a starting point, on the one hand, the international political economy that had to offer explanations for the turbulence generated by the globalization process and, on the other hand, the social sciences which were to offer plausible explanations for the new issues emerged on the agenda of security, such as identity, ethnicity, religion, poverty, terrorism, organized crime, the degradation of the environment, etc.[4]

The dismantlement of the Soviet Union created an acute theoretical problem and it has compromised the realist paradigm. The implosion of the USSR, generated by the serious deficiencies of the social and economic system, proved that security cannot be regarded solely from a military perspective anymore. Until then, security was seen by most of the practitioners and theoreticians as a derivate of the issue of power, perspective which cannot ensure societal, economic and environmental security, which led to be considered an "incompletely developed" concept, according to researcher Barry Buzan, who noticed this way the conceptual deficit of the domain[5].

The end of the Cold War brought along the modification of the perception of the individuals concerning the types of threats at their security. The problems related to the non-military dimensions replaced the ones with a military nature, without eliminating them though. Thus, we assist at the sociological development of security, at the nearing of security to society and its gradual departure away from the military structures[6]. At a theoretical level the redefinition and the re-conceptualization of the idea of security imposed itself.

---

[2] Arnold Wolfers, "National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol", in *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 67, no. 4, 1952, p. 485.

[3] See Martin Griffiths, *Relații internaționale. Școli, curente, gânditori* [*International Relations. Schools, Currents, Thinkers*], Bucharest, Ziua Publishing House, 2003, pp. 17-183.

[4] Ionel Nicu Sava, *Studii de securitate* [*Security Studies*], Bucharest, Center for Regional Studies, 2005, p. 29.

[5] B. Buzan, *op.cit. (...)*, p. 15.

[6] Darie Cristea, *Prognoză și prejudecată. Dilemele metodologice ale relațiilor internaționale* [*Prognosys and Prejudice. The Methodological Dilemas of the International Relations*], Bucharest, ISPRI Publishing House, 2012, p. 57.

Among the new currents of thought emerged during the '80s and the '90s remarkable is the *Copenhagen School*, called also the *post-Cold War School* or the *New School of Security* whose main exponents – Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde – are the adepts of the enlargement of the sphere of definition for security. This school accepts main traditional realist hypotheses according to which security is an objective situation, but is inspired from the constructivist theories proposing new modalities of study for the interrelation of the domains of social life. They offer a constructivist operational method according to which security is a situation perceived and, also, they introduce sectors of analysis for security. The constructivist school affirms that the world is socially constructed, can be measured and analyzed with specific scientific means and thus it socially constructs the issue of security[7].

Ole Waever defines security as a *speech act*: "... the very affirmation constitutes the act ... pronouncing "security", a representative of the state shifts the case from particular toward a specific area that, claiming a special right to use all the necessary means to stops this evolution"[8]. Resuming A. Woofers' definition concerning the objective and the subjective dimension of security, the three authors insist on the fact that "securitization, as well as politicization, has to be understood as an essentially inter-subjective process"[9]. Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde define security as the "movement that leads politics beyond the pre-established rules of the game and frame the issue either as a special type of politics or above politics"[10]. Significant is the modality in which the approach of security is discursively built, through an inter-subjective process.

The contribution of B. Buzan and O. Waever to security studies is linked, especially, to the extension of the research agenda on security issues, where the state continues to be an important actor, but also to the emphasizing of and the inter-subjective character of security by the conceptualization of securitization and de-securitization. If the security threats are existential, then to "securitize" an element or a set of elements mean to move within a political space with a considerably higher probability for violent militarized interaction. *Securitization* represents the "discursive process s by which the inter-subjective understanding is built in a political community to treat a certain thing as an existential threat addressed to a valuable object of reference and to make possible the use of urgent and exceptional measures to confront that threat". The process s may be directly discursive, addressing the definition of the situation, but most often it is indirect, when an orientation change toward other problems brings back the relative attention for the issue previously secured. On the other hand, *de-securitization* represents a "process by which a political community lowers the importance of

---

[7] Olivia Toader, "Constructivismul în relațiile internaționale" ["Constructivism in International Relations"], in Andrei Miroiu, Radu S. Ungureanu (coord.), *Manual de relații internaționale* [*Handbook of International Relations*], Jassy, Polirom Publishing House, 2006, pp. 155-163.

[8] B. Buzan, O. Wæver, J. De Wilde, *Securitatea: Un nou cadru de analiză* [*Security: A New Analysis Frame*], Cluj Napoca, CA Publishing, 2011, p. 26.

[9] *Ibidem*, p. 30.

[10] *Idem.*

a thing or stops treating a certain thing as an existential threat addressed to a valuable object of reference, and reduces or stops taking urgent and exceptional measures to confront the threat"[11].

Security is defined in relation to the perception of the threat addressed to the existence of an object of reference which is strongly valued, from the non-state actors, abstract principles and up to nature itself. The source of the threat can be identified in aggressive states, negative social tendencies or in cultural diversity. As a consequence, in the views of the Copenhagen School, the threats can manifest in a variety of political contexts or domains of the social life (economic, cultural, demographic, ecologic, etc.). The same specialists draw a "map" of the contemporary security issues, each issue being identified in relation to four variables: the spatial characteristic (local, regional, global), the sector localization (military, political, economic, cultural, and ecologic), the identity of the main actor (states, societal actors, and international organizations) and the nature of the object of reference (states, nations, principles, the environment).

The most significant contribution to the transformation of the concept of security is brought by the neorealist researcher Barry Buzan who proposes the formulation of issues that envision: the widening of the field, to adequately answer to the question *Security against what*?; the repositioning of the landmarks, to establish more precisely *Security for whom*?; the introduction of the idea of securitization, to establish *the manner in which is security instituted*; the development of the methodological infrastructure, to surprise more exactly the levels, the sectors, the referential entities, the relevance thresholds, etc.[12]

B. Buzan proposes the widening of the semiotic sphere of the term security through the introduction of five main sectors, as many objects of reference and the multiplication of the levels of the analysis of security. The author has identified five main sectors of analysis for the national security, in relation to the nature of the threats: military and political (traditional sector), economic, societal and ecologic (non traditional sector). According to Buzan, *the military security* "concerns the double interaction of the offensive and defensive armed state capacities and the perception of the states, each of the other's intentions," and as threats the use of force toward the opponent, the blockade, the bombardments or the total war. *The political security* "refers to the organizational stability of the states, of the government systems and of the ideologies legitimating them". As political threats we mention the threats directed toward the internal legitimacy of the state, or toward the external one, the ideological cleavages, and the political institutions with controversial legitimacy, pressures which the authorities cannot face anymore. *The economic security* "concerns the access to resources, finances and markets necessary to sustain an acceptable level of welfare and state power" (economic threats: economic-financial crises). *The societal security* "is preoccupied

---

[11] B. Buzan, Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 356 and p. 489.
[12] I. N. Sava (2005), *op. cit*., p. 28.

with the support capacity, within the limits of acceptable evolution conditions, of the traditional elements of language, culture, identity and cultural and religious customs". The threats in this sector refer to what can affect the identity of certain community, in the sense of jeopardizing the existence of community as social group, as migration, horizontal (cultural) competition, vertical competition (exercising a pressure), depopulation. *The environment security* "refers to maintaining the local and planetary biosphere, as essential support of which depend all human actions". The threats which can affect the security of the environment are: pollution, the natural or provoked catastrophes, etc.[13]

From the perspective of the Copenhagen School these sectors do not operate in insulation one from another, but each defines a central point within the issue of security and as a manner of ordering priorities.

According to Buzan, "the security represents the capacity of the states and societies to maintain identity independence and the functional identity"[14]. Being a product of the political, military, economic, societal and cultural capacities that the states, societies and groups engage to the end of maintaining their identity and integrity, security presents as a function of conservation of societies, so it is a tendency of preservation of identity and integrity in a domestic and international environment characterized as anarchic.

Another important element introduced by B. Buzan in security analysis, when approaching the international system, there is the division between *weak states* and *strong states*, in relation to the degree of socio-political cohesion, which signifies the traditional distinction among states in correlation to their military and economic capacity in relations with one another[15]. The character of the states determines the stable or unstable character of regional and international security. Strong states can absorb the shock of globalization, while the weak states prove to be unstable in front of this exam[16].

Globalization and Regionalization

The structure of the international system can be observed from three perspectives: *the structure of the states* that the realist school considers heterogeneous and anarchic and, after 1991, single-pole; *the structure of the society of the states* with tendencies of transformation in an international global society that the liberal school considers interdependent in general and integrated in particular (with different degrees of integration as it is in the case of the EU); *the structure type network*, in course of globalization, with centres and peripheries, which the sociological school considers ploughed by global and regional organizations, transnational societies etc.[17]

---

[13] B. Buzan (2000), *op. cit.,* p. 31, see and pp. 124-141.
[14] *Ibidem*, p. 18.
[15] *Ibidem*, pp. 105-119.
[16] See I. N. Sava (2005), *op. cit*., p. 134.
[17] *Ibidem*, pp. 130-132.

Globalization generates political fragmentation, which is a source of instability and insecurity. The process that attenuates the impact of globalization is called *regionalization*. Regionalization can be defined through the mediation of the term *frontier*[18]. The region gains identity in relation with a geopolitical border (a space of influence). By globalization, the states begin to have supplementary external responsibilities under the circumstances where a part of their domestic attributes are diminished.

On the one hand, political fragmentation increases the number of states and entities that are going to be states; on the other hand, the globalization increases the interdependency among the states, that is, the number and intensity of the relations among them. The answer of the international system to these changes is visible by the increase of the number of international regimes and by the crystallization at the regional level of certain security complexes. To the new challenges, the international system reacts by the strengthening of the security regimes and by the regionalization of security[19].

Along with the decolonization, the level of regional security started to become autonomous and to impose itself in international relations. Then, disappearing the rivalry between the two superpowers (the USA and the USSR), which used to intervene obsessively in all the regions, the local powers had the possibility of imposing their own policies[20]. The fall of the two geopolitical blocks opened the way toward a gradual emergence of the multipolarity, and the regions gained relevance in the international security. Regional security constitutes, thus, a model of security of the international relations[21] that interposes itself between the security of the system of states and the international security, determining the contour of a distinct domain of study.

The process of a growing regional interdependence, especially at the societal level, was called sometimes regionalism or informal integration. As a rule though, in security studies, the term of regionalism describes either the apparition of a significant number of new regional organizations in a certain period, or the favoring of the regional agreements rather than of the multilateral ones to obtain a certain result at the international level. Thus, the security complex can be seen as a result of regionalism, but also as its correlative element. The immediate advantage of this concept is that it offers non-ideological legitimacy to the regional level of analysis, introducing it as an intermediary stratum between the national state and the international system[22].

---

[18] See Ilie Bădescu, "Regiuni și frontiere" ["Regions and Frontiers"], in I. Bădescu, D. Dungaciu, *Sociologia și geopolitica frontierei* [*The Sociology and the Geopolitics of the Frontier*], vol. I, part V, Bucharest, Floare Albastră Publishing House, 1995, pp. 303-337.

[19] I. N. Sava, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

[20] B. Buzan, Ole Waever (2003), *Regions and Powers (...)*, p. 3.

[21] Patrick M. Morgan, "Regional Security Complexes and Regional Orders", in David A. Lake, Patrick M. Morgan (eds.), *Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World*, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997, p. 20.

[22] Luciana A. Ghica, "Securitatea regională. Contexte, agende, identități", in Luciana-Alexandra Ghica, Marian Zulean (coord.), *Politica de securitate națională. Concepte, instituții, procese* [*The National Security Policy. Concepts, Institutions and Processes*], Jassy, Polirom Publishing House, 2007, p. 109.

The Theory of the Regional Complex of Security

In post-Cold War era security became a complex concept[23], a relational phenomenon that presupposes the understanding of the national security of a state in concordance with the understanding of the international model of security interdependence, inclusively of the regional one. As we have shown, Buzan's researches did not limit to the investigation of the relations between states at the level of international system, and granted a special attention to the level of regional analysis. Buzan and Weaver shown that after the end of the Cold War the level of regional security became more autonomous and this autonomy of regional security constitutes a specific *pattern* of the current period.

The theory of the regional security complex – TRSC offers a new interpretation of the security structure and distinguishes between the level of interaction of the global powers (that can transcend distance) and interaction at the level of the subsystem of the small powers of whose environment is the local region. The main idea of the regional security complex is that, from the most dangerous threats and the shortest distances, the interdependence security is modeled by a group of states that form a *security complex*[24]. These are preoccupied during history to notice mainly the capabilities and the intentions of their neighbors, the processes of securitization and the degree of interdependence of security. By TRSC the creation of a conceptual model was wanted that would include a new structure of the international security, where, along the great powers, the regions could become global actors.

We are going to conduct as following a synthetic analysis of TRSC, starting from the definition of the security complex and the exposition of its main components.

In essence a neorealist concept, introduced by Karl W. Deutsch, the regional security complex affirmed itself more and more at the end of the '70s, even since the '50s and the '60s, under the form of *community security* in order to describe the framework of the relations among states from the North-Atlantic area. The model of the regional integration of Karl Deutsch sustained also the process of European integration. He accredited the idea of constructing regions politically. First of all it is about the EU as a regional entity built on the path of political intervention, and second, by NATO. Making the distinction between the *amalgamation* and *integration* he showed that "an amalgamate community has one supreme centre for decision making, but from it does not result that its opposite is simply anarchy", while an "integrated community has multiple centre corresponding to the states forming it"[25] (for instance, the EU). According to the author, community security represents "a group of states that became integrated in a community where there is a real assurance that the members of that community

---

[23] See B. Buzan, "Is international security possible?", in Ken Booth (ed.), *New Thinking about Strategy and International Security*, London, Harper Collins Academic, 1991, pp. 31-55.

[24] B. Buzan, O. Waever (2003), *Regions and Powers* (...), p. 4.

[25] K. Deutsch et. al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1957, p. 7, apud. M. Grifiths, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

will not fight one against another, but they will resolve their disputes in a different manner". In other words, those states are not "integrated" enough to resemble "an amalgamate community security", without the need to transfer sovereignty at supranational level. "The integration and amalgamation overlap, but not completely ... there can be amalgamation without integration (for instance the civil war), and integration without amalgamation (for instance the international peace)". This way, rather than attempting to impose the amalgamation at international level as the preferred path toward peace, he suggested the creation of the "pluralist security community"[26].

The theory of complex security was approached by Barry Buzan for the first time in a paper published in 1983[27]. A first definition provided by B. Buzan for the regional complex of security was the following: "a group of states whose security preoccupations link them together closely enough that their national securities cannot be considered realistically separately from one another"[28]. Afterwards, the issue of regional security was completed by the same author and approached by other researchers within the Copenhagen School. The most used definition of a regional complex of security is the 2003 one, given by B. Buzan and O. Weaver, who completed the first definition like this: "a set of units whose major securitization, de-securitization processes are interdependent to such an extent interdependent that the security issues of the component units cannot be reasonably analyzed or resolute separately from one another"[29]. This approach succeeds, despite the criticism brought, to be an important step forward and an argument for the analysis of security as a social sciences concept that is a state of flux. Although in the analysis of the security complexes researchers start from the assumption that the state is the object of reference of security, by the accentuation of the threats of a societal type one may consider that these categories of issues permit that next to the states are analyzed also other objects of reference of security, such as societies.

Unlike the *regional subsystem* and the *subordinate system*, which are modalities to treat together on the basis of only one criterion certain states found in geographical proximity, the security complex brings to the fore the matter of a significant interdependence among the participants. The model proposed by the representatives of the Copenhagen School starts from the ascertainment of the interdependence of security and the perception of insecurity that is accentuated in correlation with the geographical proximity.

In order to be able to identify the security complexes we should investigate also the manner in which a certain region is delimited. This was defined as "a coherent territory from the point of view of space, composed by two or more states". Also we find that "The sub-region is a part of such a region and it may include several states (but less than the total number of the states in the region)

---

[26] *Idem.*
[27] B. Buzan, *People, States and Fear. The National Security Problem in International Relations*, Wheatsheaf Books, London, 1983, pp. 106-115.
[28] B. Buzan (2000), *Popoarele, statele şi teama (...)*, p. 196.
[29] B. Buzan, Ole Waever (2003), *Regions and Powers (...)*, p. 44.

or it may have a transnational composition (an assembly of states, parts of certain states or both). The micro-regions refer to the sub unitary level within the borders of a state"[30]. According to B. Buzan, in terms of security, region means that a distinct and significant subsystem of security is formed by a group of states that were meant to be in geographical proximity ones against the others[31].

If in the case of the regions, their proximity and identification within a well-defined territory are important instruments in order to differentiate and separate the regions from other spaces, in what concerns the complexes, Barry Buzan underlines the existence of two main factors defining the structure of regional security: the local/regional power balance (the power relations) that show how many actors there are within the complex and the existence of the amity/enmity relations. As we can notice, in the analysis of the regional security complex B. Buzan and O. Weaver are using as well classical variables (geographical proximity, power relations, external elements, interdependence of security), as also one of constructivist inspiration, the social construction of the relations among states/units, that is, the amity-enmity model[32].

To justify the need to direct the study of security issues toward the regional level, the two authors underline the importance of the precise definition of the types of power that we are encountering. To classify the power relations and identify their characteristics, the authors are using elements from classical realism. Most of the states are not organized anymore nowadays, unlike during the Cold War period, around two superpowers, because the international system begins to be formed out of a different type of actors, which can be considered rather great powers or regional powers (as are nowadays the EU and Russia in Europe). The local balance of power influences to a great extent the amity-enmity model at a regional level. By *amity* are understood the relations that range from simple friendship to the claims of protection and help. *Enmity* refers to the relations established on the basis of suspicion and fear. In what concerns the classification amity-enmity, we can encounter three great types of categories: the complex type conflict, characterized by enmity relations, with an increased possibility of conflict; the complexes where we find links with a low degree of enmity, specific for security regimes; and, thirdly, those based on amity, which are forming a community of security[33].

As we have shown, the identification of a security complex involves the analysis of the force of interdependence among different states. The interdependencies might be positive (when among the states there is cooperation and/or neutrality) or negative (when there is rivalry among the states). The interdependence concerns two aspects: on the one hand the existence of interstate relations seen through the rapport of amity-enmity, and on the other hand, the existence of common threats and interests of security. Within the same context, is developed as well the idea that these interdependencies are not exclusively military, diplomatic or

---

[30] B. Buzan, O. Waever, Jaap de Wilde (2011), *Securitatea. Un nou cadru (...)*, p. 36.
[31] B. Buzan (2000), *Popoarele, statele (...)*, p. 194.
[32] B. Buzan, O. Weaver (2003), *Regions and Powers (...)*, p. 52.
[33] B. Buzan (2000), *Popoarele, statele (...)*, pp. 196-199.

political, as they can manifest also at societal level, at economic level or in matters of the security of environment. The identification of the regional complexes of security is accomplished through the analysis of the dynamics of security within these dimensions. The economic factor may influence two aspects which are important for the definition of a regional complex of security: the process of regional integration, and on the other hand it motivates the interest of the external actors on the regional complex.

According to B. Buzan the factors that stay at the basis of the apparition and the evolution of the regional security complexes are: the local factors, the common interests and values, an elevated level of the threat/fear or an elevated level of trust and friendship, the socio-political and economic factors[34].

B. Buzan and O. Weaver approach descriptively the levels of analysis and the interactions among these[35] within the theory of the regional security complex that can empirically explain the regional security. The four levels are: the domestic level in states and regions generating the vulnerabilities; the relations of one state with another state that generate the region itself; the interaction of the region with the neighboring regions; the role of the global powers in the region that determine the interaction between the structures of the global and regional security. These four levels, together, constitute a *security constellation*[36].

The essence of the theory of security complexes stays in that, as the political and military threats cross easier the shorter distances than the long ones, security is in general associated with proximity. Security complexes generate regionalization within the international system, as its characteristics. The regions which the security complexes draw have an objective character, in the sense that they have an ontological status in theory, as they are identified by the researcher on the basis of the already existing security relations. At the same time, security complexes are theoretical constructions that the analyst is using to describe and explain reality. The importance of the theory of the regional security complex is provided by its main assumptions that focus on several main elements such as: the regions represent the most appropriate level of analysis in security studies; the regions confer those studies a viable organization of the structure in empirical analyses; they offer analytical scenarios for the testing of the possible future developments within the international system[37].

In relation to the structure and the evolution of the regional security complexes, B. Buzan and O. Weaver identify different types of regional security complexes that determine the development of regional security and the reinterpretation of the concept of security, on which we are not going to insist now, but we stop at the *centered* security complex which can transform in different manners, from the accent placed on one power to an integrated structures through

---

[33] B. Buzan (2000), *Popoarele, statele (...)*, pp. 196-199.
[34] *Ibidem*, pp. 199-208.
[35] See B. Buzan, O. Weaver, chapter "Descriptive RSCT: a matrix for area studies", in *Regions and Powers (...)*, pp. 51-53.
[36] B. Buzan, O. Weaver, J. De Wilde, *Securitatea: un nou cadru (...)*, p. 201.
[37] B. Buzan, O. Weaver (2003), *Regions and Povers (...)*, p. 45.

institutions. Such an example is the European Union, which represents a sophisticate security community based on norms, institutions and principles, and that intends to become an actor at global level[38].

The Delimitation of the Security Complex of the European Union

In what concerns the historic past of Europe, we ascertain the numerous attempts of several forms of region (*centered, fragmented, covered*) and, even more, it experimented processes of amalgamation and re-differentiation within many more security complexes. The release of the two World Wars showed Europe that it was going through a crisis of its own security complex, a crisis that continued also throughout the Cold War, when Europe was *covered* for approximately 50 years of the Soviet and American super-complexes. During the Cold War period, Europe knew times of *insecurity* during 1940-1959, *security* in the '60s and *de-securitization* during 1970-1980, and around the '90s was noticed a *re-securitization*[39].

Initially, Europe saw the integration as a way to overcome the rivalry that provoked the two World Wars and also the economic havoc that followed these wars by an action of cooperation. The European integration was generated by three essential objectives: finding a solution to the German question, to the desire to make the wealthy members even more influential in the world as partners, more than they could be in separate states[40], as well as to the insecurity hovering over Europe, entertained by the Soviet threat. The interdependence among the European states led to the formation of a compact European security complex meant to face the danger coming from the East, and the unification of Germany from 1990, offered a new drive to the European integration[41].

After the end of the Cold War, the image of the European security became distinct, in the sense that the traditional monopole of the state in security problems became attenuated or they even vanished, and the list of the challenges addressed to the European security complex enlarged, comprising all the sectors and almost all the levels. The problems of security of Europe in the new era of globalization start to be gradually better articulated, as well at regional level, as at the global level. At the European level is nowadays discussed the existence of two complexes of regional security, the security complex of the European Union which is dominant and the security complex centered on the Russian Federation.

Our approach continues with the application of the model of the regional security complex previously synthesized, the present European security complex. Starting from the two main directions of the theory of the regional security complex

---

[38] *Ibidem*, pp. 59-64.
[39] B. Buzan, O. Weaver, (2003), *Regions and Powers...*, p. 356.
[40] P. Calvocotessi, *Politica mondială după 1945 [World Politics after1945]*, 7nd edition, Bucharest, Publishing House Allfa, 2000, p. 221.
[41] H. Kissinger, *Are nevoie America de o politică externă? Către diplomația secolului XXI* [*Does America Need a Foreign Policy? Toward the Diplomacy of the 21st Century*], Bucharest, Publishing House Incitatus, 2002, p. 34.

(the type of powers involved and the relations of amity-enmity) we are going to attempt to delimit the security complex of the European Union and to emphasize the characteristics of this complex.

The new European security complex (of the EU, this time) that took shape during the beginning of the '90s, after the reunification of Germany has three defining characteristics: it is *centered*, it has the shape of *concentric circles* and it is a nucleus focalized on *institutions*[42]. As type of powers involved, we are going to notice that this security complex is a *centered* one, without a great power to its centre (although France, Germany and Great Britain have still the status of great European powers). Within the EU, the centrality is not offered by the domination of a single power pole, by through the formation of a group of states that delegate a part of their competences to the communitarian and international institutions. The Europeans started to accept more and more the idea that the structure of security is organized in a unique form that combines as well the interests of the member states as the centre policy. In matters of security the leading force belongs to all the states constituting the Union, even though sometimes it does not follow the same common foreign policy and security, (the analyst) sensing certain major differences in their approaches[43]. The centrality of the EU is given, thus, by the great legitimacy offered by the member states.

The European Union is a *centre-periphery* structure, in the sense that Central and Eastern Europe was organized as a "concentric circle"[44] around the Western nucleus. Provided that these countries are closed within a central order in the EU, the security issues in this part of the continent, it follows, partially, the same model as in Western Europe, but it determines supplementary complications, because the dependency on the West of Europe is as well an anchor of stability as a line of intrusion[45]. To operate as an institution of security, the EU must maintain its *core* intact besides the effects of the national political identities of the main European powers. This does not mean that the member states should forcefully accept a concept of the idea of Europe or that the European identity should be reduced to the national identity, but that in each European country, the terms nation, state and Europe should be carefully modeled, so that the European Union is to become a conjunction of national tradition and the *European solidarity*. Even more, EU may intervene directly at peripheries, there where the non-military factors (socio-economic, ethnic, etc.) do not act powerfully enough to avoid conflicts[46].

The essential characteristic of the EU security complex is the institutional dimension (Parliament, Commission, Council, etc.) that confers legitimacy. Thus, the EU is a region integrated through institutions and not by one power that

---

[42] O. Waever, "The Constellation of Securities", in Aydinli Ersel, Rosenau James N. (eds.). *Globalization, Security and Nation State: Paradigms in Transition*, State University of New York Press, 2005, p. 161.

[43] See Cătălin D. Rogojanu, *Teoria complexului regional de securitate: complexul de securitate european* [*The Theory of the Regional security Complex: the European Complex of Security*], Jassy, Lumen Publishing House, 2007, pp. 122-123 and 136-139.

[44] O. Waever (2005), The Constellation..., *op. cit.*, p. 161.

[45] B. Buzan, O. Weaver (2003), *Regions and Powers (...)*, p. 353.

[46] *Ibidem*, pp. 161-162.

gathers all the other states around it[47]. The institutional dimension is considered a modality of consolidation of the trust among states and of enhancement of the relations of amity within their mutual relations. Via its institutions the European Union receives the quality of global actor and from this status the privilege to ensure the coherence, before all, at institutional level.

The European security complex succeeded to overcome the model of enmity and to transform the relations among its members by the construction of a form of economic and political organization, which is nowadays the European Union, with the merit to have ensured first of all the peace among the member states and, second, a type of economy through which a great number of citizens have had access to prosperity. The territorial disputes were a significant component of the conflicts developed in time, in Europe, but it proved that they could be overcame by the proposition of common objectives and methods identified to run its interests, which led to transparency and an increase of the mutual trust between states.

The relations between the members states of the EU based on the project of integration are built as a *meta-securitization*[48]. The project of integration, in itself, generates security, which surprises a dimensional "societal security"[49]. The most efficient securitization is accomplished by enlargement, via the export of the communitarian values in the borderline regions, for this way the stability of the Union is ensured.

The EU is nowadays the best multilaterally organized region of the world and it became the most institutionalized area of the globe, representing an important political factor, with a numerous population and it is the most important economic bloc of the world. By the integration of the national states in a supranational economic and political union, to which all the members take part equally, the European Union points the way toward other wider forms of post-national organization, beyond the narrow visions and the destructive passions of the nationalism era[50]. The manner of political organization of the EU is unique, because it neither replaces the state representation to the highest level, but it neither cancels the old order. In reality, it mixes a continuity of the sovereignty in a new organization. Even though the exact and final nature of the European construction is not established yet, however the proposed experiment led the European states toward peace, and the regional integration has drawn new limits.

Conclusions: From Security Complex to Security Community

Starting from a global tendency of increased regionalization we can notice that the European model of integration was the first to offer a coherent answer

---

[47] *Ibidem*, pp. 56-59.
[48] *Ibidem*, pp. 352-353.
[49] This is a sociological approach of security centred, not on the individual as actor and referent object, but on the *human collectives*. The organizing concept of the societal security is constituted by *identity*. Society's identity is treated as "a thing" that can be menaced and "whose values and vulnerabilities are as objective as those of the state" (see B. Buzan, O. Weaver, Jaap de Wilde, 2011, *Security. A New Framework....*, pp. 171-180).
[50] Z. Brzezinski, *Marea tablă de Şah. Geopolitica lumilor secolului XXI* [*The Great Chess Board. The Geopolitics of the Worlds of 21st Century*], Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic Publishing House, 2000, p. 70.

to the threats and challenges with which the region was confronted and which had the greatest impact in relation to different forms of regional cooperation. There are also other regions of the world (Southern and South-East Asia, for instance) which are in a quest for alternative models that overcome the state level, but which arrive at most at the inter-regional level. As shown, The European Union represents a regional complex of security, on the one hand due to the high degree of interdependence that is established among the national actors that enter in its composition, and on the other hand due to the existence of the institutions that had a determining role in easing the transformation of relations within the complex, to which we add cultural and socio-political elements of the European member states. One of the multiple functions of the EU is that to assure the security of the citizens of the member states in one or more of the domains of the social life.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, then European complex of security evolved within the context of the new threats and risks, but also, it evolved within the new concepts of security, toward a *community security*, and its legitimacy is being assigned by the member states. The UE can represent an example for the evolution of the security complexes toward a community security, provided that it fulfils the necessary conditions for the creation of a pluralist community security as presented by K. Deutsch and namely "the compatibility of the fundamental values derived from the common institutions and the common responsibility (a matter of identity, sympathy and mutual loyalty)"[51]. A security community is a concept based rather on values, than on interests, and the values are transformed in norms, in behaviour rules that structure the action of the individuals and institutions. Deutsch mentioned two types of security community that, subsequently, evolved in different directions: the European Community of Coal and Steel and NATO. The European Union, which developed from the Community of Coal and Steel, became a community security, in the sense that its institutions include certain values, transformed afterwards in norms and that, in turn, are shaping the preferences of the actors.

The most relevant form of community and security contains an active and regional securitization, only that it is not the type of a state against another state to countervail, but is a *collective securitization* across the region. For this reason, the security community that represents the EU is a special and unusual form of a security complex[52]. Although it plays a marginal role in the security policy at regional level, acquiring the aspect of a regional complex of security, the European Union attempts to create itself a particular political and security role within a more extended regional framework. And we could also include in this scenario the future integration of the states from Eastern Europe (Moldova, Ukraine) and in the Southern Caucasus (Georgia) that are part of the Russian

---

[51] Karl Deutsch, et. al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968, p. 5.
[52] See B. Buzan, O. Weaver (2003), *Regions and Power...*, pp. 437-439.

security complex, or those from the Western Balkans that represent a *sub-complex of regional security*.

In a globalized world, the regional differentiation of security represents a beneficial fact because, on the one hand, it creates the possibility of the transformation of the European Union in a regional actor and, on the other hand, through its own security complex, the Union can reach the status of global power. The perspective of the UE as organization with global economic and security value has already risen ample debates within its institutions and within the ranks of public opinion, which realization still needs common, coherent and perseverant efforts at multiple levels.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bădescu Ilie, Dungaciu Dan (coord.), *Sociologia și geopolitica frontierei* [*The Sociology and the Geopolitics of the Frontier*], vol. I-II, Bucharest, Floare Albastră Publishing House, 1995;

Brzezinski Zbigniew, *Marea tablă de Şah. Geopolitica lumilor secolului XXI* [*The Great Chess Board. The Geopolitics of the Worlds of 21st Century*], Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic Publishing House, 2000;

Buzan Barry, "Is international security possible?", in Ken Booth (ed.), *New Thinking about Strategy and International Security*, London, Harper Collins Academic, 1991;

Buzan Barry, *People, States and Fear. The National Security Problem in International Relations*, Wheatsheaf Books, London, 1983;

Buzan Barry, *Popoarele, statele și teama. O agendă pentru studii de securitate internațională în epoca de după Războiul Rece* [*Peoples, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies after Cold War Era*], 2nd edition, Chișinău, Cartier Publishing House, 2000;

Buzan Barry, Wæver Ole, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003;

Buzan Barry, Wæver Ole, De Wilde Jaap, *Securitatea: Un nou cadru de analiză* [*Security: A New Analysis Frame*], Cluj Napoca, CA Publishing, 2011;

Calvocotessi Peter, *Politica mondială după 1945* [*World Politics after 1945*], 7nd edition, Bucharest, Publishing House Allfa, 2000;

Cristea Darie, *Prognoză și prejudecată. Dilemele metodologice ale relațiilor internaționale* [*Prognosis and Prejudice. The Methodological Dilemas of the International Relations*], Bucharest, IPSIR Publishing House, 2012;

Deutsch Karl, et. al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968;

Dungaciu Dan, Cristea Darie (coord.), *Doctrine, strategii, politici. De la discursul geopolitic la operaționalizarea securității internaționale* [*Doctrines, strategies, policies. The geopolitical discourse on international security operational*], Bucharest, IPSIR Publishing House, 2012;

Ghica Alexandra-Luciana, Zulean Marian (coord.), *Politica de securitate națională. Concepte, instituții, procese* [*The National security policy. Concepts, Institutions and processes*], Jassy, Polirom Publishing House, 2007;

Martin Griffiths, *Relații internaționale. Școli, curente, gânditori* [*International Relations. Schools, Currents, Thinkers*], Bucharest, Ziua Publishing House, 2003;

Kissinger Henry, *Are nevoie America de o politică externă? Către diplomația secolului XXI* [*Does America Need a Foreign Policy? Toward the Diplomacy of the 21st Century*], Bucharest, Publishing House Incitatus, 2002;

McSweeney Bill, *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999;

Morgan Patrick M., "Regional Security Complexes and Regional Orders", in David A. Lake, Patrick M. Morgan (eds.), *Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World*, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997;

Rogojanu Cătălin-Dumitru, *Teoria complexului regional de securitate: complexul de securitate european* [*The Theory of the Regional Security Complex: the European Complex of Security*], Jassy, Lumen Publishing House, 2007;

Sava Nicu Ionel, *Studii de securitate* [*Security Studies*], Bucharest, Center for Regional Studies, 2005;

Miroiu Andrei, Ungureanu Sebastian Radu (coord.), *Manual de relații internaționale* [*Handbook of International Relations*], Jassy, Polirom Publishing House, 2006;

Wæver Ole, "Securitization and Desecuritization" in Lipschutz Ronnie D. (ed.), *On Security*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1998;

Wæaver Ole, "The Constallation of Securities", in Aydinli Ersel, Rosenau James N. (eds.). *Globalization, Security and Nation State: Paradigms in Transition*, State University of New York Press, 2005;

Wolfers Arnold, "National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol", in *Political Science Quarterly*, 67 (4), 1952.