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ABSTRACT

This study makes a contribution to the distinction between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft models of society at the regional level by investigating the understanding of the Romanian governmental elites with respect to the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar. The findings of the study suggest that the conscious recognition of common culture and common values help distinguish between system and society at the regional level because they imply adherence to a common political identity. It is widely agreed in the ES that an international system develops an international society and when states engage in mutual recognition of “sovereign equality” an international society exists. The case of Romania shows that the EU is a pluralistic international society divided in decision-making between the core and the periphery in which political criteria serves for mutual recognition. Political criteria defined by the application of the rule of law and anti-corruption measures as well as by the common understanding of Western democratic culture and Western political values seem to hinder Romania from acquiring a distinctive voice in EU decision-making. Political instability continues to be a perennial concern for Romania despite EU membership. This study highlights that political instability results from an inadequate understanding of EU common political values underpinning the principles of western style democracy. The findings also indicate that before 2007 Romanians described the connection with the EU in sentimental, common historical ties in contrast to after 2007, when Romania’s Accession Treaty and the Treaty of Lisbon were increasingly invoked in context of equal recognition status hence highlighting contractual ties with the EU.

The study is framed by the international society and uses an interpretive methodology associated with international society to highlight that at the regional level culture and values give meaning to society and help the common understanding of members of international society to pursue common interests. Adherence to common EU political culture and values are imperative for political stability in Romania and for harmonizing Romanian elites’ mentalities in political and security practices with those of other EU members. A useful recommendation emerging from the findings is that international society should be examined further in context of power and prudence in order to understand how the existence of common interests, rules, norms, and values of the Union members influence the distinction between the international system and international society.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Scholars of international relations gave considerable attention, after the Cold War, to the English School (ES) tradition of studying international relations from the perspective of history and societal relations among states. The ES claims theoretical and methodological distinction in thinking of the states-system as an international society, an international system and a world society. Although there is substantive research completed in the area of international society, questions pertaining to the definition, system/society distinction and the importance of social structures, rules and norms of international society continue to need empirical investigation.

The relationship between Romania and the EU is an ideal case to focus on and make a contribution to the ES knowledge of international society because Romania has, in its historical experience, previously connected with Europe in the 1860s through a dynastic relationship, abandoned the principles of western democracy in the early 1940s and attempted to re-connect with Europe after the Cold War through EU membership. Geographical location is also an instrument with which Romania strategically joined various Western institutions including NATO and the EU. Historians (Hitchins 1994; Boia 2001a; 2001) argue that Romania’s geostrategic location played a significant role in Romania’s connection with Europe but assess the degree of Romania’s connection with Europe beyond the geographical location more in terms of a distant cousin rather than a brother or sister. Romanian political class is one of the most cited reason for which the Romanian political project (such as Romania’s EU integration) could not advance beyond the geopolitical membership. The lack of creating the proper Romanian forms to accommodate the western substance is alluded to also by Teodor Baconschi for
example, when he argues that a significant reason behind the lack of influence in the EU decision-making is due to the incapacity of the Romanian political elites to experience, with genuine desires, to connect the western substance with the Romanian forms. The findings of this study highlight that geopolitical location may be an instrument to achieve a purpose however, the value of the instrument lays in the propensity of dialoguing with EU common political values in order to connect the western substance with the Romanian forms.

Romania’s historical record shows greater political instability before and after experiencing political restraint under a communist regime. The EU is known as a regional model of peace and stabilization in which states neighboring Romania continue to aspire to membership. For Romania, the entry into the EU presupposed commitment to socio-political change and institutional modernization. At this time it is known that Romania is part of the EU family of nations but it is not known for how long or what Romania’s perception about this family is. One of the main ES critical assumptions is that in many periods of history states coexist in an international society of shared rules and norms that restrain their behavior towards order and cooperation.

This study highlights that states located at the Eastern periphery of the EU respectively, international society experience difficulty in internalizing international society’s political culture and values which differentiate between the core and periphery model of society. This study is framed by the international society of the ES and examines the degree of understanding or the meaning in which Romanian governmental elites describe their participation and action in the EU and EU’s Second Pillar. The society category of explanation advanced by the ES focuses on

---

2 Teodor Baconschi, 20 January 2010. ‘Interviews: I am an admirer of Russian culture and the European dimension of the soul of Russia,’ available on personal Blog.
the existence of common norms, rules and values among members of the international society. In the ES, international society is treated as a concept when describing international relations as a set of social relations and as a method when it measures the self-conceptions of the statesmen who are participating in the process that constitutes an international society (Navari et al., 2009:12).

When using the international society approach the ES distinguishes itself from other theoretical traditions by allowing the researcher to look at more than one thing at once. In this sense, the study primarily investigates how Romanian governmental elites understand the EU in context of the categories describing or defining an international society and subsequently how the EU is an international society through the elites’ description. There is an accepted theoretical assumption in the ES that the EU is an international society reflecting common norms, rules, and institutions (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009; Diez & Manners 2010; Stivachtis 2002, 2011).

Although there are a wealth of studies on international society, what comprises the idea of society at the regional level, or what meanings the society’s interests, values, rules and institutions acquire in context of this society from the perspective of its members or when international society’s norms matter for member states continue to need further investigation. The aim of this study is to investigate the meaning of “society” at the regional level by identifying the context in which Romanian elites conceptualize the EU as a regional international society. The focus on the interaction between Romania and the EU will provide valuable insights to the ES because the case of Romania can show how the meaning of “society” changed from before and after membership in the EU as well as the conditions in which international society’s norms matter. Scholarly literature on Romania’s Europeanization characterizes Romanian political elites as being “morally void,” “unethical with the public good,” “disillusioned with
democracy,” “unwilling to comply with the EU’s requirements and inattentive to advice offered by the EU’s most senior representatives in Romania because Romania had ‘crossed the bridge’” (Gallagher 2005, 2009: 348; Pusca 2008; Pridham 2006, 2007; Stan 2005, 2007, 2008; and Mungiu-Pippidi 2004, 2005). While the Socialist Democratic Party (PSD), responsible for negotiating the entry of Romania into the EU, is known by scholars for maintaining historical ties with the communist era, the Democratic National Liberal coalition is known to reenter the scene of political life as “a brand new government” with ambitions to meaningfully reconnect Romania to European principles of democracy. How well the elites associated with this coalition understand the strategic interest of the EU and what the EU means for these Romanian elites will be answered in this study.

The significance of this study is its contribution to the ongoing debate regarding international society enhancing the ES approach with an examination of international society from the perspective of those who experience and act within the international society. The findings provide an insight into the idea of society at the regional level pointing to the types of social structures emerging from the relationship between Romania and the EU. This will help the ES community to corroborate/advance the discussion on international society by showing how the EU is an international society from the perspective of other EU members. The findings provide an insight into when norms of international society matter for governmental elites and how the norm of common security interest is shared as a value and an instrument. Copeland (2003) concurs with Bull (1977) for instance that “the degree to which a system exhibits elements of ‘society’ must ultimately be measured by elite perceptions of this society of rules and norms” using an interpretative methodology (Copeland 2003: 431). Roy Jones (1981) also pointed to the difficulties in measuring the extent and intensities of an international society.
Martha Finnemore (2001) inquired into how we know an international society, or an international system or a world society when we see one (Finnemore 2001: 509). The findings of this study are insightful for the ES and its critics as well as for Romania and the EU officials to identify ways in which to teach and involve EU citizens in supporting the model of solidarity they have created.

As the results of the study emphasize, the EU is at crossroads, and the involvement of the EU population is crucial to strengthening the values of the common project. The value added of the study is not only theoretical, but practical. The practicality is underscored by those who claim to live at the periphery of the Union that “consciousness” is cultivated and elites’ project of peaceful coexistence is not sustainable in the absence of what appears catalogued as a primary institution of the EU, the EU population. With respect to Romania, the results of the study may help raise the consciousness of the governmental elites on the importance of cultivating “the European spirit” and bringing into completion the meaningful translation of EU political culture and values to Romanian society.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In the ES there is still an ongoing debate over what constitutes an international society, how the concept of ‘society’ can be transferred from the individuals to states, conditions under which norms of international society will or will not have an effect on states behavior, and whether or not state leaders are aware of international societal norms and take them into account when they act (Finnemore 2001; Grader 1988; Jones 1981; Copeland 2003). Dale Copeland for example insists that “No true test of the School’s approach can be achieved without exposing the beliefs and actions that elites held prior to their actions” (Copeland 2003: 432). In lieu of the questions
raised by the ES critics in ES literature, this study aims to make a contribution to the understanding of international society and implicit international relations theory by inquiring into what an international society looks like from the perspective and experiences of the statesmen (or governmental elites) since what constitutes an international society continues to remain a concern among ES critics and ES theorists. A critical assumption in the ES is that the character of international society is dictated by ideas that members of the society embrace (Wight 1977). How the EU is an international society thorough the meanings, beliefs and actions of the Romanian governmental elites within the EU and how the understanding of the relationship between Romania and the EU through the idea of international society enhances our thinking about world politics will be explored in this study in context of Romanian governmental elites, the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar.

Although the ES is praised for methodological pluralism and the use of international society to describe international relations, only a few scholars allow the story of international society to be told from the ‘inside’ of international society by those who experience it (Zhang 1998; Wheeler 2000; Roberson 1998; and Little 2007). With the exception of Ayoob (1999), Diez and Whitman (2002), Stivachtis (2002), Czaputowicz (2003) and Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez (2009) only a few scholars look at the regional manifestation of international society structure as well. This study seeks to make a significant contribution in this sense and describe the EU as an international society by giving voice to the statements and actions of those who experience living in the EU, conceptualized by the aforementioned scholars, as a regional international society. The study investigates how Romanian governmental elites conceptualize the EU as a regional international society in context of Bull’s (1977; 1984), Wight’s (1977) and Watson’s (1984; 1992) perspectives of international society. To conform to the ES methodological approach in
understanding how a phenomenon is an international society it is necessary, before identifying aspects describing the EU as an international society, to review the historical emergence and expansion of the European international society in order to understand how the idea of “society” was previously created and how values and cultural norms were shared. After establishing a frame describing the nature of society emerging in context of European international society the first research question asked is:

*In what context of “common interests,” “common values,” and “common culture” do Romanian governmental elites understand the EU as an international society?*

In this context, data may help distinguish between a *Gesellschaft* (functional) and a *Gemeinschaft* (community/emotional) type of society as well as the character of the relationship between Romania and the EU. This may also provide insights on the distinction between the system (interaction based on calculation) and society (conscious coexistence of common norms, interests, rules and values). The distinction between society and system continues to remain problematic in the ES. As the system explains and predicts states international behavior, the society describes the character of their relationships therefore underscoring the ‘meanings’ that states hold with respect to their instruments of order and interaction. After identifying the context in which the EU is conceptualized as an international society, the second research question derived from the first measures the extent to which the norm of common interest: “integration” matters for Romanians.

*Under what conditions does the norm of EU integration matter for Romanian governmental elites?*

In an international society states are regarded as being united by common interests. The idea advanced by the ES is that international societies are predictable frames and international societies of shared rules and norms play a significant role in socializing and pushing states
towards greater cooperation. Copeland (2003) for instance questions “when and under what conditions international societal norms will or will not have an effect on state behavior” (Copeland 2003: 428). “Integration” is a norm of common interest shared between Romania and the EU for less than a decade, “common security” on the other hand is a norm shared in context of “common values” for more than a decade. In the ES sense “a society may or may not be constructed around a system of common values” (Buzan 1993: 337). Security is a value on which Romanians based most of Romania’s interests in Western memberships. The third research question inquires as to:

*How do Romanian governmental elites understand security as a “common interest” in the EU’s Second Pillar?*

The findings on this question will serve as an indicator distinguishing between a pluralistic and a solidaristic international society. The findings will also reveal insights into the realm of “security” as a value of common interest shared between Romanians and the EU and “security” as an instrument used by Romanians to calculate their entry into the EU based on geopolitical specificity. The findings of these research questions culminate into describing “what type” of society characterizes the EU in the context in which Bull (1977) described historical societies in a functionalist sense and Wight (1977) as organically grown entities. In context of this study, the character of international society is informed by the elites’ interaction and their participation in decision-making which in return is dictated by adherence to common culture and common political values. It is underscored in the ES approach that “the ultimate test of a society is evidence that the agents feel that they are members of such a society and that they feel they are obligated by social rules” (Navari et al., 2009: 46).
1.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study is framed by the ES perspective on international society. The ES approach uses international society in two ways: as an empirical phenomenon and as a theoretical approach. Empirically, the ES claims that there is a ‘society of states’ or an international society constituted by the meanings diplomats and state leaders give to their actions. Based on my observation, contemporary ES scholars claim that the EU is an international society but no other study shows how the EU is an international society constituted by the meanings and actions of governmental elites. In the ES sense ‘conscious engagement of the diplomatic community produces an international society’ and distinguishes among types of international societies.

The ES approach also claims that a ‘society’ is intentionally produced by inside forces and a ‘society’ does not exist without rules and institutions. Critics of the ES argue that the interaction of states cannot be perceived in societal terms because ‘what individuals experience is different from what states actually experience’ (Jones 1981: 1). “States are ideas” Wight (1978: 107) suggests by which individuals define themselves in relation to others. In the international realm Navari (et al., 2009: 50) argues that ideas become communal and institutionalized as states tend to prioritize certain ideas constituting the environment in which they interact. The idea of state for instance or the idea of territoriality became institutionalized common understandings after 1648.

The attachment of the English School to the idea of international society defined as ‘an association of political authorities based on the conscious understanding of common values, rules and institutions’ opened a great debate over (a) what is an international society?; (b) how do we know an international society when we see one?; (c) how do we measure international society,
and so on (Finnemore 2001; Copeland 2003). The answers provided by the ES are that 1. International society is a diplomatic community that coexists peacefully and has a duty to abide by a legal order (Butterfield & Wight 1966: 96); 2. International society is a set of ideas in the minds of statesmen (Manning 1962: 318); 3. International society is a society of states composed by “a group of states conscious of certain common interests and common values; states form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions” (Bull 1977: 13).

Empirically for the Classical ES theorists, international society constituted in many periods of history the same thing but was represented under various forms ranging from a social construction, to an arena, an ideal type of order, an idea, or a form of social structure which produced great confusion.

Theoretically, international society remains, as R.J. Barry Jones (1998) notes, a contested and problematic concept, seen by some as unnecessary and by others as the only one capable of explaining the real world (Roberson et al., 1998: 232). Richard Little (2000:410) for example argues that “by comprehending the nature of previous international societies, we can develop a more profound understanding of our own. [Sovereignty], the balance of power, diplomacy and international law are all seen to be products of international society that came to fruition in the European international society.”

The emergence and evolution of European international society at the regional and global levels guides the research of the dissertation from the perspective of its evolution, enlargement, coexistence, the meaning of common interests and the society character. The confusion with which many ES critics are faced is based mainly on the use of various definitions and different empirical, normative and metaphysical interpretations of international society. Sheila Grader
(1988:30) for instance called international society a nebulous incoherence that lacks conceptual and philosophical precision. Notwithstanding its criticism Buzan (2004:7) contends that as a concept, international society “is quite well developed and relatively clear.”

The concept of ‘society’ however, is insufficiently developed at the world level which is one of the reasons that prompted Buzan to distinguish between normative and empirical theory and international and world society. In a study about International Society and the Middle East, Buzan (2009) calls international society at a regional level “a more developed form of international system in which there are rules and institutions that mediate the interaction” (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009, 25). In contrast to the Middle East as a regional international society, it is relevant to identify what type of regional international society the EU is and whether the EU is a society or a system in the Romanians view.

Overall, whether international society is an empirical phenomenon, a consciously constructed arrangement, or a politically constructed ‘social’ facet of a wider, politically constructed international order, as Robert Jackson (1998) suggested, theoretically international society claims to describe, via the ‘society’ concept, reality in a way that other alternatively used concepts cannot. ES theorists claim that international society is able to capture how actors understand their actions and give some indications about how they may act in the future (Dunne 1998; Navari et al., 2009). Little (2000) cautions however, “that getting the ‘inside view’ is not quite as straightforward as it might seem” (Little 2000: see footnote 18 on pg. 418). This may be one of the reasons that scholars are inclined to examine international society from the perspective of the system rather than society because to examine a society from the inside requires a specific methodology to get to the intent, meanings and perceptions of political actors (Little 2000: 408-11). The method that Little (2000:409) refers to is “the interpretive methodology that
acknowledges the centrality of language used by the statesmen when they are engaged in the practices that define a given international society” which requires a depth commitment to exploration. Jackson (1998) argues that as a theoretical approach international society is able to provide insights about elements of cooperation, shared expectations and understandings of the political elites which in return offer insights about states behaviors since states are, in Jackson’s (1998) view, “social constructs with boundaries decided by human beings” (Roberson et al., 1998, 157). The framework of international society was purposefully selected to accompany this study because it is able to capture the meaning of common interests and the character of the relationship between Romania and the EU. For the ES, international society represents “the institutionalization of shared interest and identity among states reflected by the consensus over core values and the growing importance of norms” (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009, 25).

**What Type of Society?**

The ES claims that there are many types of international societies (Grotian, Hobbesian and Kantian) with each emphasizing a different idea of society. Martin Wight for instance, called them analytical devices to analyze the state of world affairs. Wight (1977) claimed that the three traditions: realist, rationalist, and revolutionist associated with Hobbesian, Grotian and Kantian perspectives respectively

> [Are] not like three railroad tracks running parallel into infinity. They are not philosophically constant and pure like three stately, tranquil and independent streams...They are streams, with eddies and cross-currents, sometimes interlacing and never for long confined to their own river bed...They both influence and cross-fertilize one another, and they change without, I think, losing their inner identity (Wight 1991: 260).

Wight was a British historian preoccupied mostly with understanding the world before engaging in changing the world. He held the assumption that international theory is the political philosophy of international relations and hoped that his infamous piece *Why is there no International Theory* would stimulate a debate about the nature of theory and show others how a
historical interpretive approach may compliment the theory with its rich international experience. With his three ‘Traditions’ Wight (1991) aimed to divert the focus from the state to the concept of society and argue that the study of international relations cannot be confined to only one theoretical framework. Instead, there are multiple frameworks or traditions in which history played an essential role. Realism for example rejects the idea that there is an international society.

Realism which is associated with Machiavelli and Hobbes, takes a pessimistic view of human nature. It assumes anarchy, self-interest and power. It asserts that international relations are regulated by war. The only political society that exists is one where the state is a rational actor obligated to no other state, only to its citizens. There are no international obligations between states, and no international society exists. In contrast, Wight (1991) acknowledges that international anarchy is a condition in which states cooperate. They are socialized by a sense of common interest to help make, facilitate, communicate, administer, interpret, legitimize and enforce rules of cooperation. History and methodological approaches distinguish, in Wight’s view, the three traditions. Realists are inclined to view history as cyclical and repetitive and hence a reliable source of lessons for the guidance of astute policy makers; in contrast, revolutionists are prone to see history as linear, moving upwards towards an apocalyptic denouement…whereas rationalists are “cautious and agnostic” about any pattern or ultimate meaning in history, aware of the unpredictable and contingent and manifesting no confidence in the permanence of any progress in political institutions (Wight & Porter 2005: xxi).

In one of his lectures Wight further clarified the distinction among the “three traditions,” claiming that

Realists are prone to make sociological statements on the basis of an empirical analysis of history. For example: Machiavelli’s “armed prophets [Moses, Hitler] conquer; unarmed prophets [Savonarola, Trotsky] are destroyed” and Carr’s “international order…will always be the slogan of those who feel strong enough to impose it on others;” Revolutionists are attracted to imperative prescriptions, whether the church doctrine, the Rights of Man, the proletariat, or another cause, such as ‘Workers in the world, unite’, in the Communist manifesto and Rationalists tend to make ontological, or a priori, assertions about the nature and purpose of international obligations, such as the preamble to the United Nations Charter (Wight & Porter 2005: xxii).
By “three traditions” Wight (1991) meant parallels to understand principles of morality beyond the political purpose and the accumulation of power. As he simply stated in one of his lectures “if you are apt to think the moral problems of international politics are simple, you are an instinctive Kantian; if you think they are non-existent, bogus or delusory, you are a natural Machiavellian; and if you are apt to think them infinitely complex, bewildering and perplexing, you are probably a natural Grotian” (Wight & Porter 2005: 33). In Wight’s (1992) view, a proper way to study world politics was to integrate the ideas offered by the “three traditions,” because they correspond to a way of looking at international relations. “If we speak of each of these three types of international theory as patterns of thought we approach them from a philosophical standpoint […] if we speak of them as traditions of thought we consider them historically embodied in and handed down by writers and statesmen” (Wight 1987: 153).

The three traditions of international theory can be roughly distinguished by reference to these three interdependent conditions of international relations. The Realists are those who emphasize and concentrate upon the element of international anarchy, The Rationalists are those who emphasize and concentrate on the element of international intercourse, and the Revolutionists are those who emphasize and concentrate upon the element of the society of states, or international society (Wight & Porter 1992: 7).

Wight’s focus on analyzing the nature and structure of the international society that has existed since the age of Machiavelli led him to conclude that the way theoretical frameworks were set “neither realism nor idealism was able to capture the experience of state practice” (Dunne 1998: 96). The problem in Wight’s (1991) view was rooted in a dismissal of the meaning of the states’ instruments of interaction.

Machiavelli is the analyst of how a balance of power collapses, and shows little understanding of how it is maintained…Machiavelli describes a policy of divide and rule, though not under that name, as one of the arts of peace whereby a faction-ridden state may be brought voluntarily to submit. He also mentions it as a means of breaking up a hostile coalition. He discusses the related issue of the problem of a neutral’s policy in a neighbor’s war, and gives equivocal advice: usually it is better to side against the stronger Power, but in times of necessity to side with him may pay off. He assumes that states are normally on the offensive (Wight & Porter 2005: xxx).
According to Wight (1991), Machiavelli’s lack of understanding of the original meaning of the balance of power as a condition of equilibrium, or a description of a state of affair, a policy, or a form of control “could not have anticipated the wars of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation or the bipolar balance of power between France and the Habsburgs from the late fifteenth century into the seventeenth century” (Wight & Porter 2005: xxx). Furthermore, rationalism (Grotian) complements realism by assuming progress, a world of diplomatic and economic interaction through trade and right to self-determination. States are legal persons connected by international law and civility. War is a breakdown of the custom, a failure of reason, and a matter of the ancien regime.

Wight (1991) credits Grotius for bringing the word “system” into the vocabulary of world politics and calls the Grotian way of thinking of international politics as the middle or reconciliatory way in which state practices are influenced by the law of nations and the moral principles internalized by the individual citizens. Grotius claimed that the individual citizen’s conscience sets the moral tone of society through the show of expediency: individual action versus popular vote. The Grotian doctrine of moral individual responsibility is that the good man is prior to the good state made possible by individual decision could benefit the whole community (Wight & Porter 2005: 54-55). Thus, in Wight’s view the Grotian way may be the ideal approach to study the world since the Grotian society is bound by legal rights and obligation of human action on grounds of expediency; “if there is an international society at all, then its members have duties and the duties are enforceable” (Wight & Porter 2005: xxxiii). Wight (1978) argued that the idea of international society in Grotius thinking emphasized sociability and social obligations that rested upon custom as well as moral and legal obligations.

There is no state so powerful that it may not some time need the help of others outside itself, either for purposes of trade, or even to ward off the forces of many foreign nations against it said Grotius. In consequence, we see that even the most powerful peoples and sovereigns seek
alliances. He was arguing that the essential sociability of human nature shows itself in the connections formed even by states and princes, and moreover that all these connections are governed by universal law (Wight 1978: 123).

In contrast to the Machiavellian conception that international society is an international anarchy, the Grotian international society is in Wight’s view “a society less governed by force than by custom. It is a society governed by a social contract with a system of law that is crude and not centrally enforced but still through law, a society without government but regulated by certain special institutions such as diplomacy, the balance of power, alliances” (Wight 1987: 146).

Moreover, the third tradition of revolutionism (Kantianism) emphasizes in contrast to the realism and rationalism the concept of a world society of states or family of nations consisting of every human being in which states are subject to moral obligations. Whereas the realist perspective denies the existence of international moral and legal obligations based on natural law, the Grotian perspective holds the view that an international society exists rooted in natural law and morality discernible by reason, and lastly revolutionists hold that there is a world society of “messianic fulfillment” conceived in religious, economic or political terms (Wight & Porter 2005: xxi).

In retrospect, Wight (1991) argued in his lectures published in *International Theory: The Three Traditions* that one cannot confine studying international politics to only a single tradition, because the three traditions are logically interdependent. Therefore, in investigating how Romanians understand the EU as an international society the study takes a via media approach and draws on the international society perspective informed by Bull (1977) and Wight (1977) who study the concept from the perspective of structure and process respectively. Being “faithful to historical evidence” was another important factor in Wight’s analysis of world politics. In Wight’s view, “the traditions are not straitjackets, but organizing frameworks used to group closely related and often interdependent ideas together” (Wight & Porter 2005: xxv). To
illustrate the interdependence of “the three traditions,” Wight (1987) suggested that if one were to ask “What is international society?” a possible realist answer would be that is a fiction or an illusion. Secondly, an idealist response of “What is the state of nature” would be that sovereign states in their mutual relations are in a pre-contractual condition. Therefore, by corroborating the empirical evidence with the realist assumption one cannot give the same answer that “the state of nature” is the war of all against all because states are in a pre-contractual condition as admitted by idealists. Along the same line of thought, a prospective revolutionist answer would be that “international society is nothing until there is a world state.”

Thus, a potential avenue to study international relations would be, in Wight’s view, to take a *via media* approach and retain objectivity against what kind of “state of nature” one identifies international relations. If one accepts that the state of nature is the state of enmity and mutual destruction, or of war of all against all then the interpretation of international affairs would follow the realist pattern. If one rejects this pattern of thought, underscoring that the state of nature emphasizes international relations conceived as a habitual intercourse between sovereign states, institutions, diplomacy and law would then be the output upon which international relations form a society that “do not exist in a political or cultural vacuum, but in continuous political relations with one another; it is a society which must be understood on its own terms and not by comparison with domestic society” (Wight 1987: 147).

A relevant question concerning this project is against what kind of state of nature I identify international relations between Romania and the EU to set a methodological basis for the analysis. I agree with Wight (1987) and his middle way. The idealist (Grotian) or rationalist perspective is the way that helps identify if the relationship between Romania and the EU constitutes a society. He cautions however, to study this society as distinct from domestic
society. I argue that after 9/11 the border between international and domestic society is blurred thus making it difficult to follow Wight’s recommendation. This study will draw on the political coexistence inside the Romanian political system and implicit the Romanian political coalition to get insightful information on how Romanian elites understand their actions domestically and perceive their coexistence inside the EU. To what extent ES methodology applied to this study will produce reliable results remains to be established in the concluding chapter.

Another way of conceiving international society suggested by Wight (1987) is to identify how international relations are perceived with respect to the element of moral solidarity. Wight (1987:148) argued that “States are not persons, they have no wills but the wills of the individuals who manage their affairs, and behind the legal façade of the fictitious Society of Nations is the true international society composed of men.” The value-added of the international society approach rests in Wight’s (1987) view on the capacity to go beyond interpreting the world into changing the world.

The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it; Very well then: change it how? By bringing out its essential nature, by making explicit what is implicit, by eradicating evil and making it virtuous, by clearing away the irrelevant historical clutter of states and forms to produce the regularity, uniformity, and homogeneity of virtue. That is by redrawing the map (Wight 1987: 150).

Making explicit what is implicit in the relations between Romania and the EU may help the two actors reconsider its relationship Wight (1987) seems to suggest. The uniformity to which Wight (1987:151) refers is taken in context of two possible alternatives: the first suggests to reduce all members of international society to uniformity through the “assimilation of all existing states, members of international society to a pattern of conformity which alone confers legitimacy, and to eradicate inconsistencies,” while the second, is to conceive all mankind into a Cosmopolis as a universal temporal community capable of requiring a World Federation or the World State.” A “federative union” or a “great society” whose majority vote can override individual non-
conformist nations are the two potential solutions set forward by Wight (1987) for a progressive world. Nevertheless, Wight (1987:154) acknowledged that distinguishing meanings of relationships may be too hopeful because to distinguish between the politics of sensation (Hobbes), of reason (Rousseau) and of understanding (S. T. Coleridge and Woodrow Wilson) is challenging due to the fact that individual psychologies are hard to scrutinize. I, myself, he notes “speak of this as a temptation; I only feel capable of analyzing political ideas-not psychologies-and when I scrutinize my own psyche I seem to find all these three ways of thought within me.”

Overall, regarding the concept of international society, in Wight’s (1966) view, the idea of international society could be imagined as a society held together by a common culture or civilization. Conceptually it can be studied as a via media between realism and idealism, placing the concept into an historical and comparative study of culture, religion and philosophies across time and space. “The middle way” alternative represented as Vigezzi (2005: 159) provided an escape for Wight from “being trapped in the straits of a rigid realism, and, on the other failing into the illusion of a rapid, overwhelming change in the basis of international life.”

On the theoretical level, Wight (1978) agreed with Manning (1962) that international society and the history of international society can be reduced to a “certain coherent pattern of ideas that can be found with a certain frequency” (Vigezzi 2005: 167). He argued that international society was a heterogeneous society of states, composed of immortal states. Moreover, states were the immediate members of international society and men were its ultimate members. In Wight’s (1966:107) view, “states do die or disappear from time to time, but for the most part they far outlive the span of human life.” To a certain extent for Wight, as Robert Jackson noted, both the state and the society of states were ideas, they served the medium by which “we define ourselves and our relations with others.” As indicated, each of the traditions or
patterns embodied a description of the nature of international politics and a series of prescriptions as to how men should conduct themselves in the realm of international politics (Wight & Porter 1992: xi). Additionally, as important was the question of morality in the sense of moral rules distinguished among the three patterns of thought.

Unlike the Machiavellian or the Kantian traditions, the Grotian pattern of thought was the most appealing to Wight (1992), because it was the most suitable to accommodate the sense of common interest of Western international society in which “states formed a society—a society that was no fiction, and whose workings could be observed in institutions such as diplomacy, international law, the balance of power and the concert of great powers” (Wight & Porter 1992, xii). According to Wight (1966), there were those who claimed that “there is no such thing as international society: that international relations constitute an anarchy whose social elements are negligible” and those who believe that “the society of states is the unreal thing—a complex of legal fictions and an obsolescent diplomatic forms which conceals, obstructs and oppresses the real society of individual men and women, the civitas maxima” (Butterfield & Wight 1966: 93). Nevertheless, Wight (1966) asserted that

between the belief that the society of states is non-existent or at best a polite fiction, and the belief that it is the chrysalis for the community of mankind, lies a more complex conception of international society. It does not derogate from the moral claims of states, conceding that they are, in Suarez’s phrase, communitates perfectae (exercising valid political authority); but it sees them as relatively, not absolutely perfect, and as parts of a greater whole. It does not see international society as ready to supersede domestic society; but it notes that international society actually exercises restraints upon its members. Such a conception lacks intellectual consciousness and emotional appeal (Butterfield & Wight 1966: 95).

Bull (1977) was among the leading figures in the ES to identify two conceptions of international society: the pluralist and solidarist. Both conceptions concur that the state system is a society of states which includes commonly agreed upon values, rules, and institutions. However, they both disagree over the normative content of this society, the place of war, law and the status of the individual. In a pluralist society states are self-centered actors using rules and norms to advance
their own interests while in a solidarist society they share a sense of community and coexistence as well as the meaning of common values. Bull (1966:53) argues that if the private force is considered in relations among states then international society does not exist or it exists under a different form than that formed by the individual men. Furthermore, both pluralist and solidarist international societies disagree about distributive justice and moral standards.

For pluralists, international society is a plurality that lacks moral agency and agreement on redistributive justice whereas for solidarists, international society constitutes a society that privileges morality and displays solidarity in developing and enforcing international law. How and what kind of society is formed without a central authority, stirred in the ES an important debate in which some but not exclusively Nicholas J. Wheeler (1992), Ole Waever (1999), Timothy Dunne (1995), and Buzan (2002) are engaged in. Using the realist conception of ‘units’ Buzan (2002:3) notes that states are “sentient and how they perceive each other is a major determinant of how they interact. If the units share a common identity (a religion, a system of governance, a language), or even just a common set of rules or norms (about how to determine relative status and how to conduct diplomacy), then these subjective understandings not only condition their behavior, but also define the boundaries of a social system.”

Notwithstanding that there are numerous studies completed empirically in this sense there are insufficient studies that show the interplay between pluralism and solidarism as well as what constitutes the boundary between solidarist and pluralist international society at the sub-global level or what role the value of security plays in the pluralist/solidarist debate. At this juncture, the study will be able to distinguish between a Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft model of society. Buzan (2002:18) notes that “the existing ES literature touches on collective security as one form of possible solidarist project, but devotes most of its energy to human rights.” How the
pursuit of joint gain distinguishes between pluralist and solidarist international societies remains an aspect overlooked in the ES (Buzan 2002). This project provides clues on the pursuit of ‘joint gain’ in the EU’s Second Pillar.

A Type of Regional Society

Mohammed Ayoob (1999:247) suggests that ‘regional society’ “is a necessary stepping stone towards the building of orderly and peaceful regional communities.” Ayoob suggests with respect to ‘regional society’ that in assessing whether or not states establish a regional society it is necessary to investigate:

- the consciousness of common interests and values, which is essential for the formulation of common rules and the creation of common institutions; The concept of regional society, in order to be meaningful, must go further than the notion of international society whose requirements, in terms of Bull’s neo-Grotian definition are relatively minimal in character (Ayoob 1999: 248).

In this sense Ayoob appears to send the inquirer to look and uncover the genuine aspect or the ‘cognitive regionalism’ present in the minds of the state elites and of what constitutes cooperation for security and other purposes. According to Ayoob a regional society constituted as a ‘society’ must have the following satisfying conditions: “community like aspirations, acknowledgement of interdependence, a minimum degree of shared regional identity, defined and assigned roles to play within the region, physical proximity for interaction, a complimenting way to assess each other’s efforts toward the same end, and legitimately recognized managerial aspirations.” Although the EU is a claimed prototype of regional society in the ES, based on my observation, there are no studies to show how member states of the society conceptualize EU as an international society. Regional institutions such as The Common Foreign Security Policy (CFSP) and The Common Security Defense Policy (CSDP), as Thomas Diez and Richard G. Whitman (2002:2) suggest “have become increasingly important as providers of security.” How the participation of Romania in these EU institutions informs Romania’s understanding of the
EU will be identified in the empirical chapters. Buzan (1993; 2004; 2009), Diez and Whitman (2002) contend that the field of the English School remained underdeveloped at the regional level mainly because of “the fixation on the global scale” and the expansion of international society.

There is lack of empirical cases looking at the interplay between constitutive units at the regional level. Although there is the claim “that the current global international society developed from a regional one, the European system of nation-states of the 19th century” there is less attention given to the ‘societal component’ of regional international society. The interplay between constitutive units at the regional level signals another gap in ES literature. By taking the solidarist/pluralist debate away from the issue of human rights in the court of ‘joint gains,’ or common security the understanding and practices of the Romanian political elites, may provide an insight into (a) the nature of the relationship between Romania and the EU’s Second Pillar and show (b) how a solidarist society is being formed when the notion of security is being considered; what values of security and norms are shared between the Second Pillar and Romania, how and why they are shared.

1.4 LIMITATIONS

Limitations in this study may arise from the availability of data and methodology. “The distinction between explanation, and interpretation or understanding is an epistemological one,” (Little 2000: footnote 2; pg. 416). “Getting the inside view” as Little (2000) suggested may be problematic for a novice researcher especially when a clear distinction between epistemology and ontology is not definitively debated (Navari et al., 2009: 93-4). International relations are complex and acknowledging the centrality of language is critical in coming to terms with
intersubjectivity (Epp 1988: 55). Some variables outside the control of the researcher could impact the “consciousness” engagement of Romanian governmental elites to refuse to interact on the same basis with Union members. One being the language since the level of English proficiency in the case of some elites is low. In more than two instances the researcher spotted that some Romanian elites continue to have difficulties understanding English.

Although the instances were isolated from the study, four sets of problems can arise from the proper use of language. The complexity of language understanding is first. In Romania there is a cultural complex that the command of language distinguishes those who attend college. In context of the EU, Romanians have to engage their counterparts in either English or French and knowing how much emphasis Romanians place on eloquence, grammar and rhetoric some may intentionally avoid participating in decision-making debates precluding therefore the input of their voice in the Union and feeling that their voice inside the Union does not matter. For reasons that are nothing personal, Union members just avoid them because of time constraints.

Cultural and linguistic misunderstanding when elites converse are highly likely to occur (consider for example the following question and answer provided; Q: “Do you feel that Romania’s national security is threatened by the fact that most educated Romanians leave the country after the state invested money in their education leaving therefore your country with a lack of experts?” A: “I feel that it is not enough, more need to leave, all of them and I do not like because I see that the Union discriminates against them.” Fourth, the language impediment prevents elites from truly expressing their feelings and emotions inside the Union. Despite the fact that the researcher is fluent in Romanian and English, in at least three instances no alternative translation was found to the expression “rima jumuleste cucosul” or “the earthworm plucks the rooster,” “nu vom sta ca rimele in UE,” “we are not going to lay like earthworms in
the EU” used by some governmental elites to describe the irony in the relationship between Romania and France, and in context of finding Romania’s voice in the EU respectively. The earthworm described in both instances Romania, first as a weak and incapable partner to engage France and second as lazy Romanians expecting the EU to provide them with a voice. One of the major findings of the study is that Romanians cannot adjust their candidate status mentality of taking orders in order to participate as an equal partner with a similar mindset in the creation of rules and institutions, because they lack a common understanding of the EU political culture.

1.5 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study is presented in nine chapters. *Chapter One* covers the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, definition of terms, theoretical framework and the limitation of the study. *Chapter Two* encompasses the interpretivist/hermeneutic methodology associated with international society used for this study. *Chapter Three* introduces the idea of international society in context of the ES and reviews the underlying assumptions between the North American and the ES approaches to international relations underscoring that the ES approach is informed by history, philosophy and law, understands international relations as an international society and enquires into the ideas and meanings of international relations, the nature of the international state system, diplomacy, war and ethics. The system/society distinction and the pluralist and solidarist types of society are reviewed to illustrate in the latter chapters the character of society in context of the EU. *Chapter Four* focuses on the emergence, evolution and expansion of international society at the regional and global levels necessary to identify the nature of society in the European international society and frame how the EU can resemble an international society at the regional level. The idea of
society is reviewed from the perspectives of Hedley Bull (1977), Martin Wight (1977) and Adam Watson (1992) to underscore how the notion of “society” emerged from states practices of coexistence. Coexistence provides clues with respect to rules, norms and institutions that derive from states sharing process and in context of the EU it constitutes a frame of reference on the coexistence between Romania and the EU.

The system/society distinction in the enlargement of European international society reveals that members of European international society functioned in a framework of community with common interests, valuing their interests to preserving their independence in Europe but overseas they functioned in a system that competed for power and interests. War was used overseas to adjust the balance of power at home. European international society was restricted to the European continent but functioned abroad in an international system until it managed to transform into an international society in the late nineteenth century. Common culture influenced the proper translation of the meanings of values, rules and institutions exported by Europeans.

Chapter Five reviews the idea of regional international society and theorizes how the EU can be conceptualized as an international society in the ES sense. A regional international society is distinguished by a sense of shared unity, conscious recognition of common interests and values a regional culture and identity, primary and secondary institutions. Commitment to the union versus interactions based on calculations distinguishes the EU as an international society from the EU as an international system. The coexistence aspect distinguishes between EU as a regional international society from the European international society based on the fact that EU member states engage in cooperation in pursuit of joint gains in contrast to pursuing competition abroad to enhance status in Europe or preserve the balance of power. Membership in the EU as an international society is based on a degree of self-identification with EU common rules, laws
and institutions versus membership in the European international society granted on the European standard of civilization. In contrast to European international society, the EU is rooted on solidarity reflected by common symbols, the EU flag, the EU anthem, European day, a single economic market, functionality of the three pillars, existence of a European Monetary Union, the rotating Presidency, the foreign policy minister and the increased desire of Balkan and Eastern European states to join the EU. The society aspect (informed by consciousness of common interests and values) is rooted in preserving peace through integration and respect of common solidarity.

*Chapter Six* reviews the Romanian political system in context of political coexistence of the Democratic Liberal coalition. The chapter highlights aspects related to political instability characterizing Romanian democracy and reflected in the meaning of political accountability, political solidarity, ethical responsibility, and respect for the rule of law. The mentality that a “snap election is more preferable than cohabitating with non-loyal or non-sincere partners” discloses that political elites associate snap elections with an excess of democracy rather than political instability. *Chapter Seven* presents the study’s findings identifying first the meaning that Romanian governmental elites attach to the EU, common interests, common values, and common culture. The second part of the chapter focuses on the norm of integration and underscores when EU norms and institutions matter for Romanian elites answering thus, to Copeland (2003). The concluding part distinguishes between EU pluralistic and solidaristic society. *Chapter Eight* reviews Romanian governmental elites’ understandings and actions in context of common security interest within the Second Pillar. This chapter underscores that historical preferences play a role in how Romania constructs its foreign policy (the case of Kosovo) and exposure to international security practices positively impacted the confidence of
Romanian defense elites (the Althea mission) in contrast to how other elites felt in context of EU practices of decision-making. Chapter Nine provides a summary of the entire study, discussion of the findings, implications of the findings for theory and practice, recommendation for future research and conclusions.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the chapter is to describe the methodology used to identify how Romanian governmental elites conceptualize the EU as a regional international society. The chapter unfolds in two sections. The first section describes the methodological approach used to collect and interpret data, while the second section overviews the sample selection of the participants in the study and the reliability and validity of findings.

1.1 INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FROM AN INTERPRETIVE/HERMENEUTIC PERSPECTIVE

Richard Little (1995, 2000) assesses, that the ES methodology, as in all international relations approaches, is underdeveloped and the ES scholars have been “methodologically unselfconscious” when it comes to interpretivism/hermeneutic. Among contemporary scholars who provide preliminary insights of how to use interpretivism/hermeneutic as a method of investigation is Epp (1998), Shapcott (1994), Keene (2009), Jackson (2009) and Little (2009). In the ES, an international society is investigated primarily using a comparative historical approach, positing the contemporary idea of international society in a comparative framework with other international societies. The emergence and evolution of the European international society is considered the ideal type against which contemporary international societies are measured. The comparative method is aimed at understanding the meaning or the significance of concrete historical events and patterns in which actors were involved. As Keene (2009) argues, “the ideal
type is a tool with which to develop a better historical interpretation of what happens in the world by constructing relationships which our imagination accepts as plausibly motivated” (Navari et al., 2009: 106). European international society is considered in the ES as the ideal type that will tell us something about the significance of the EU as an international society. In the ES, the ideal type is constructed in a similar historical framework yet the evolution is explained from different perspectives by Wight (1977), Bull (1977) and Watson (1992). Whereas Wight (1977) examines the ideal type as a process, Bull (1977) portrays it from the perspective of structure and Watson (1992) as a process of interaction between the structure and the process focusing on aspects related to culture and principles of coexistence. In the context of “society,” an analysis relating events to values will determine a set of values embedded in the culture at particular times in history and their meaning will lay the foundation in this study for understanding states interactions in terms of their motives.

In the ES there is an increased tendency, as Copeland (2003) points, to engagement in grand theorizing and overlooking empirical work. Little for example, argues that “attention on the diplomatic archives, in particular, provide a way to open up the international society from the inside and at the same time reveal a way of linking the international society to the international system and to world society” (Navari et al., 2009: 100). In many respects this is the significance of the undertaken empirical study to identify the meanings that Romanians attach to the EU as an international society. This study enhances the understanding of international society at the regional level. Becoming immersed in the archival data and newspapers is tedious but understanding international society in context of its referents (categories describing an international society) from members who consciously engage in creating it is relevant for the ES in the context in which it may identify a relevant aspect capable of explaining the EU in the
event that the EU may cease to be a form of international society. In context of international society, the classical approach defended by Bull (1966), recommends two methodological directions: hermeneutics in which the researcher identifies the particularistic features of any situation and the philosophical approach focused on generalized propositions (chapter two touches on the positions taken by Manning, Wight and Bull; also the ES uses interpretivism and hermeneutics interchangeably). The ES distinguishes itself from other theoretical approaches by taking a societal perspective when studying international relations and focusing on three categories of explanation, each associated with a particular methodology and level of analysis.

While the international system and the world society are studied using a positivist and a critical approach respectively, the study of international society uses history, and interpretivism/hermeneutics. Little (1995:15) suggests that “the ES gives methodological rather than ontological priority to the separation of these elements.” An international society is considered in the ES as both a superstructure consciously created to mitigate the mechanical conditions of the system and a process of states interaction (Bull 1977; Watson 1992). Yet, scholars suggest that explanations about an international society are found at the level of state and process rather than the structure. A critical ES assumption is that an international system can encompass an international society and an international society coexists with an international system.

Fitting into levels of analysis in the ES is not clear cut as the emergence of international society was identified first by Wight (1977) as a process at the level of world society where individual princes were held together by a common culture. As Little (1995: 17) maintains, both Bull (1977) and Wight (1977) argued that historical record was important to validate the existence of an international society subsequently, a world society (the individual level of
analysis) “accompanies the existence of an international society.” In other words, it is not only
the process but the interaction between the individual, the state and the systemic forces of
anarchy that provide explanation about international society. Little (1995:17) argues that “it has
become something of an academic sport to identify where members of ES fit with respect to
ontological priority.” He acknowledges that systemic interactions influence relations at a societal
level as clearly demonstrated by the political struggle between the Ottoman Empire and the
European states during the 15th century when their relationship was tied at the systemic level
while the Ottomans started to develop common interests with European states at the state level

As maintained by Cornelia Navari, the commitment of the ES to methodological
pluralism indicates the focus on three levels of analysis and the capacity to tell a story from the
inside as well as from the outside on all three levels of analysis. Critics of the ES however, argue
that this is one of the ES’s main weaknesses since the tradition lacks a coherent point of
departure as well as a consistent point of view when acting as an interlocutor between opposing
positions resulting in more inconsistency and incoherent ideas. Wight (1977) and Little
(2000:398) argue that an ES perspective aimed at a comprehensive understanding of
international relations must embrace all three traditions relying thus on positivist assumptions to
study the system, interpretivist to study international society and critical assumptions to study the
world society.

The objective of this research is to capture the meanings and show how Romanian
political elites conceptualize the EU as an international society which by definition constitutes a
group of states that coexist together in a framework of common institutions who consciously
share common interests and common values. In the context of international society, the ES
recommends that, “we cannot think but historically” to compare international society with other international societies. Therefore, the first step of departure taken in this research project is to review the historical emergence, evolution and expansion of European international society in order to account for a comparative approach and capture the aspects of society, culture and values most likely shared. Wight (1977), Bull (1977) and Watson (1992) spent a lengthy amount of time examining the emergence and expansion of European international society in many periods of history therefore, this study uses their major findings to contextualize the aspect of society and how the EU is an international society from the perspective of contemporary human understanding.

Like the ES classical theorists, Navari (et al., 2009:50) underscore for example that historical international societies emerged and operated on particular ideas. Sharing knowledge and common interests with each other in terms of what ideas? Security, territorial integrity, sovereignty, unity, or borders is significant. When properly identified, these ideas have the potential to substantiate the terms on which the institutionalized understanding of the community was concluded upon. For example Navari (2009), argues that “some of these understandings have become instantiated in institutions and such institutionalized understandings will be conditions creating an environment that inclines actors in a certain direction,” a Gemeinschaft or a Gesellschaft community of states for example.

The second step in this study is to engage the idea of international society and the historical evolution of the EU in context of the five enlargement phases. In this context will be reviewed the main theoretical assumptions held about the EU as an international society and theorize how the EU emerges as a contemporary model of regional peaceful coexistence solidified by the recent financial crises. The next step gives consideration to the domestic aspect
of Romanian politics to create a necessary foundation for showing how domestic political forces of coexistence influence international structures and how the “international” is dissolving in the globalized international society at the regional level. The penultimate and last steps of the inquiry identify and examine the meanings of Romanian governmental elites about the EU using the interpretivism/hermeneutic method associated with the study of international society. Little (2000: 409) posits that hermeneutic/interpretivism method makes it possible to acknowledge the significance of language and,

"Make me your herald, Father, and I will be responsible for the safety of all divine property, and never tell lies though I cannot promise always to tell the whole truth” Hermes, the son of the mythical Greek god Zeus and the root of hermeneutics, responded to his father (Graves 1960: 65). The researcher playing the role of Hermes in this study compares what has been told and heard before and after Romania became part of the EU in context of international society’s referents. The focus of the dissertation is to provide an understanding of how the EU is an international society through the interpretation of the meanings Romanian governmental elites
attach to the EU and EU’s Second Pillar. While describing the hermeneutic interpretation, Gadamer (1993: 269) argued that:

This kind of sensitivity involves neither neutrality with respect to content nor the extinction of one’s self, but the foregrounding and appropriation of one’s bias, so that the text can present itself in all its otherness and thus assert its own truth against one’s own fore meanings.

The idea of allowing “the text to present itself” is visible in this research as a substantial amount of quotations are provided as evidence to support the elites’ understanding. The quest of understanding and interpreting began with defining political elites analogous with the definition employed by ES as “those involved in international decision-making processes including political leaders, diplomats and ministers of foreign affairs” (Navari et al., 2009: 47). In the case of Romania those involved in international decision-making processes associated with the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar are known as “governmental political elites.” For reasons of simplification, governmental elites, political elites, or political officials are used interchangeably. A sample of governmental elites associated with the Democratic Liberal coalition (LDP) (2004-2009 and 2009-2010) is identified based on the elites’ degree of association, involvement and decision-making in the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar.

1.2 DATA COLLECTION

The study will examine textual data: written political statements, speeches and interviews provided by the governmental elites with respect to the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar from the time they were invested in office, December 2004 to December 2010, coinciding with the fifth Cabinet of Emil Boc and with two years before and three years after EU membership respectively. Written political statements will be collected systematically employing the criteria per year and per individual from the Romanian Government database (Presidency, Government,
European Integration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defense). The criteria for data admission is based on the definition of international society ‘word categories’ reflecting content and meaning associated with the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar. Public speeches and interviews will be selected systematically per year and per individual from Romanian and international media news reports via Internet searches using Factiva and Google.

In the case of one Foreign Affairs Minister, his interviews, political statements and press releases will be systematically taken from a book *Intotdeauna Loial: Note Diplomatice pentru o Romanie Moderna 2004-2007* [Always Loyal: Diplomatic Notes for Modern Romania 2004-2007] published in chronological order as a reflection of the elite’s activity as Minister of Foreign Affairs. The most representative data collected will appear in the study as selected quotes or as an analysis in summary form to substitute for the quantity of quotes. The study included 18 participants from whom 17 were male and one female; 1 was the president, 2 were prime ministers, 5 were foreign affairs ministers, 1 was state secretary for European Affairs; 4 were associated with European integration, 2 of whom served as ministers of European Integration; and 5 were Defense Ministers. A balance between interviews, official documents and newspapers will be respected. To extract the meaning from texts the interpretivist/hermeneutic method associated with international society will be used.

The interpretivist/hermeneutic method allows the researcher to observe, discern, diagnose, interpret and explain the meanings of “EU,” “common interests,” “common values,” and “common culture” that Romanian governmental elites attach to the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar. The first step in textual analysis will focus on identifying the “meanings” behind the language of saying while the second step focused on connecting the meanings with “actions” behind the language of doing. This approach is discussed by Jackson in (Navari et al., 2009: 36).
To answer how Romanian governmental elites conceptualize the EU as a regional international society three sub-research questions will be used.

Q1. In what context of “common interests,” “common values,” and “common culture” do Romanian governmental elites understand the EU as an international society?

Q2. Under what conditions does the norm of EU integration matter for Romanian governmental elites?

Q3. How do Romanian governmental elites understand security as a “common interest” in the EU’s Second Pillar?

Questions one and two will be answered from the corroboration of data obtained from political statements, public interviews and speeches made by Romanian governmental elites from December 2004 to December 2010. To determine how Romanian governmental elites understand the EU as an international society, each elite data will be categorized according to the terms describing an international society: “common interests,” “common values,” “common culture” and the “EU.” To determine when rules and norms of international society matter for governmental elites’ data will be organized into subsets to describe the norm of “EU Integration.” Question three will be answered with data collected from political statements, public interviews and speeches made by Romanian governmental elites (including defense elites) with respect to ‘security,” the EU’s Second Pillar and “common security.” Data collected on the Althea operation and Kosovo will reflect the actions or practices of Romanian governmental elites within the Second Pillar.

The subject of the study is meanings describing an international society. Theoretically, an international society is created through ‘conscious engagement’ which can be identified in the expressions, actions and practices of political elites. By ‘conscious engagement’ I mean identifying the ‘consciousness of others’, the feel that political elites are acting as obligated by social rules. One of the premises in the study is that the EU is described as a ‘society’ by the
meanings and understandings elites give to their actions. Furthermore, it is assumed that political
elites who participate in the EU are interested in ‘common interests’, ‘values’ and ‘collectivity’.
Navari (2009) suggests (1) the demonstration of a self-conscious understanding on the part of
diplomats and state leaders, of a social relationship existing between them and that (2) a set of
reciprocally understood rules of conduct are revealed by discourses of self-justification. It is
within these discourses Navari (2009:12) notes “that the analyst will isolate most easily the
prevalent norms that constitute international society.” The first step in surveying data pertaining
to elite sample and the established period is to ask “what is the EU for Romanians?” and follow
in the language the meanings of actions and practices of the elites or the human engagement in
understanding of the EU. From this test a pattern of ‘consensus’ among documents will reappear
asserting its authority in answer.

For instance, Michael Quinn Patton (2002:50) suggested, with respect to wording
categories, to “track them down in text and examine emergent themes.” The identified concepts,
according to Patton (2002), serve as key inventory. Examining the concepts and the given
meaning in a particular setting among a particular group of people provides a sense of reference
and direction with to which to look further. Drawing on the elites’ language will enable the
researcher to understand the significance of the interests, values and rules important to
Romanians. Gadamer (1975) suggests that documenting something from behind the scenes is
challenging yet it is important to remember that getting the inside story and understanding what a
person says is to come to an understanding about the subject matter and not to get inside another
person and relive his experiences. Furthermore, according to Gadamer (1975:39), the
researcher’s task is to translate the meaning into the context in which the other speaker lives.
1.3 METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The study employs the interpretive/hermeneutic method associated with the English School and the study of the international society. “What it means to understand is dialogical in character” and here this involves interrogating documents (Gadamer 1975). This method involves participant observation to observe, discern, diagnose, interpret and explain the language that lies behind rules, interests and values that constitute any society. According to Wight (1977:55), “the idea of international society, or the ‘international social consciousness’ is manifested in the solidarities of language.” The ES suggests that in order to understand the ‘meanings’, one has to focus first on the practical language. This attempt is a dialogical activity according to Jackson (2009) because language facilitates communication, interaction and exchange between people and other important international players” (Navari et al., 2009: 36). Official documents identify the language of diplomacy and actions speak about the association between understanding and doing.

1.4 PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

The sample is purposively selected involving criteria for association with the party coalition, visibility and position in influencing decision making in the EU and EU’s Second Pillar. The Romanian government has fifteen ministries from which three focus on European Affairs (Minister of European Integration, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Defense). The Ministry of European Integration was established in January 2001 and after Romania’s accession to the EU it became the Ministry of Regional Development. An important question relevant to the study is whether the meanings found in qualitative data through the tactics outlined in the

---
3 A profile of the study participants is provided in the Appendix.
previous section are valid and the results can be generalized or replicated. Validity refers to the
degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure and reliability refers to
the consistency of measuring what it is intended to measure. Measuring the extent of Romanian
governmental elites understanding about the EU through the identification of meanings they
attach to the EU has the potential to produce biased results first because “meanings” are a matter
of interpretation and secondly when the focus is only on official data. This study will mitigate for
this bias by balancing official documents with interviews given by the elites with various
occasions in national and international media. Conducting an elite interview with members
selected in the sample will be able to triangulate data across sources and methods as well as
highlight consensus and contrast of data. Testing the study findings in another periphery country
confronted by political instability will enhance the generalizability of the findings.

“Qualitative analysis” as Miles & Huberman (1984:230) suggest “can be evocative, illumi
nating, masterful, and downright wrong.” Data will be collected and analyzed
systematically for themes or patterns to isolate a meaning to the extent that no additional data
that may subsequently appear for the years in question will influence the study’s findings. The
research project follows the guidelines of interpretive analysis of the ES as well as the general
research tradition and distinguishes between “what elites think” and “what they do” by
scrutinizing their declarations in context of the EU or, other EU members with whom they are
interacting. A potential shortcoming of this project is the elite bias defined by Miles &
Huberman (1984: 230) as: “overweighting data from articulate, well-informed, usually high-
status informants and underrepresenting data from intractable, less articulate, lower status ones.”
The size of the participants sample in this study is small (N=18). This sample is purposefully
selected as representative of the government coalition who affect decision-making in the EU and
the potential source of error encountered with respect to size is overreliance on accessible elites rather than other elites or people. There is also the possibility that the surveyed data show lack of meaningful evidence reflecting the views of some of the elites due to a short time spent in office or other reasons. In Romania, the President is responsible for foreign policy aided by the Foreign Affairs Minister and his diplomatic office.

Consequently, this research may suffer from data bias since “data sometimes” as Leedy (1997: 191) suggests may “lie buried deep within the minds or the attitudes, feelings, or reactions of men and women.” To control this potential bias the researcher will continue to monitor in the Romanian and international media the interviews given by the elites who were dismissed or changed office in order to identify changes in the perceptions they continue to have about the EU. Researcher bias may be another source of concern in the study although the researcher learned from casual conversations with people not directly involved in the focus of the study that the EU may be perceived by some of the political elites and regular Romanians as an actor “incapable” of disciplining the Romanian political class in battling corruption and reforming the justice system to the extent that it will resemble the competency and efficiency of the Union’s core. In this project the researcher’s objective will be to think “conceptually” and translate elites’ interpersonal thoughts and sentimental feelings into a theoretical description that will help convey a narrative about how the EU is understood as an international society by those who were and are currently connected with the EU.
CHAPTER THREE

THE IDEA OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the idea of international society to show how the theory of international society informs the research question of how and whether Romanian governmental elites associated with the National Liberal and Democratic coalition understand and conceptualize the European Union (EU) as an international society. Meaning is not self-contained, instead it comes to realization only in and through the “happening” of understanding (Bernstein 1983: 134). The scope of this dissertation is to understand through the examination of multiple textual sources the meaning that Romanian elites attach to the EU and then interpret how, in their own view, the EU is an international society.

The idea of international society was first introduced by the members of the British Committee, symbolically referred as the English School (ES) in the mid-1950s, to demonstrate that in the context of history international relations can take the shape of an international society in many different forms. To the discipline of International Relations, the concept of international society was introduced at the end of the first debate waged between realists and idealists, which coincided with the onset of the behaviorist revolution in the social sciences of the 1960s. While realists and idealists debated the roles, procedures and practices of international institutions in suppressing war in the international system, theorists belonging to the behaviorist movement, including David Singer and Morton Kaplan, became engaged in refining systematic disciplinary methods of studying international relations discipline. The search for new methods of international relations led to the English School. This was facilitated by the American realist
scholar Kenneth Thompson, who benefited from assistance given by the Rockefeller Foundation. Thompson wanted to give a voice to the British interpretation of international relations. Since the beginning, members of the ES claimed that the state itself had received too much attention in contrast to the society of states. They proposed instead to focus on the diplomatic community and the state system as the larger context of an international society in order to establish a new analytical tradition for international theory. Among the founding fathers of the ES were, but not exclusively, Herbert Butterfield, Martin Wight, Hedley Bull and Adam Watson who, from the beginning of their journey, were preoccupied not only with “the nature of International Relations but, with the possibilities of establishing order given the condition of international anarchy” (Dunne et al., 2010: 137).

In context in which realist scholars claimed that the international system is anarchic and “fixed,” members of the ES advanced the idea that amidst anarchy states form a ‘society. Statesmen pursue their own interests within an international society in which they consider each other’s mutual interests. Additionally, they claimed that an international society is different from an international system, because it expresses a set of values and common interests that occur in the absence of state calculations. And, in contrast to an anarchic system, international society is constituted by sovereign and politically independent states that coexist in a framework of common rules, interests and institutions.

The initiation of the idea of international society is debated within the English School and outside the English School’s circles being attributed to various actors including E. H. Carr (1939), C.A.W. Manning (1962) and Martin Wight (1966). Those who credit Carr (1939) suggest that the idea of international society arose from Carr’s (1939) arguments in *The Twenty Years’ Crisis* in which he provoked the founding fathers of the English School to engage in a discussion
about the relationship between realism and idealism, particularism and universalism, power and morality (Dunne 2000: 230). Those who credit Manning (1962) for the idea of international society argue that he drew attention to “the uniqueness of international society as a formally anarchical but substantively orderly social environment,” but neither the English School nor the constructivists gave him enough credit (Suganami 2001: 92 & 2002: 4). The others, who favor Wight (1966), argue that Wight was preoccupied with writing about “international society” long before the British Committee started (Dunne 2000: 232).

Notwithstanding the debate over who coined the idea of international society, Carr (1939) suggested that a harmonious international society obliged to follow moral and ethical principles was too idealistic because of the inequality of power in the international system generated by the Great Powers and their ability to intrude in the politics of the smaller states. Consequently, Carr (1939) argued that construing international relations as an international society is utopian due to the fact that international morality and the harmony of states interests cannot be reconciled. Rather they must be viewed apart from each other. Furthermore, according to Carr’s (1939) interpretation of the international system, all that nation-states could achieve in the international system was a “society of states” rather than an international society, claiming therefore that the idea of international society was, at best, fictitious.

In Carr’s view, both the EU and NATO cannot exist as international societies if the idea of ‘foreigner’ persists in human consciousness and there is no recognition by all nation states of the principles underlying the international society. The EU is known in the ES as describing a society of states shaped by ideas, values, identities and norms. To what extent Romanians understand the EU as an international society is subject to investigation in the empirical chapters. Carr’s involvement in the British Committee was temporary and he was excluded from the
Committee on the pretext that he did not have anything specific to contribute (Dunne 1998: 93).

In a letter to Stanley Hoffman in 1977 quoted by Dunne, Carr mentions however, that he was aware of this initiation for the concept, reiterating to Hoffman that the international society does not exist:

> Whatever my share in starting this business, I do not know that I am particularly proud of it. I suspect that we tried to conjure into existence an international society and a science of international relations. We failed. No international society exists, but an open club without substantive rules (quoted in Dunne 1998: 35).

In a letter from Martin Wight to Herbert Butterfield dated December 30, 1958, Wight mentioned, about the potential inclusion of Carr in the British Committee, that

> I hesitate about E. H. Carr. On personal grounds I should welcome his being invited, but he is himself so much a Great Power in this region that I should have misgivings lest he might deflect our discussions into channels opened up by his own work. For the same reason again, I should prefer not to coopt any St. Anthony’s people before we have established our own line of inquiry (Letter available in Vigezzi 2005: 356).

Whether or not Carr’s initial assertions influenced the research program of the ES is less relevant than is Carr’s initial claim that international society was not a given. It had to be created, which prompted the fathers of the ES to examine the practices of states and the values of civilization in more depth, so that they could capture the element of “society” as it was reflected by international relations. It is the larger goal of this dissertation to capture the elements of international society reflected in the relationship between Romania and the EU. In contrast to American scholars preoccupied with theories of international relations based upon the scientific method, the ES took a different approach informed by history, philosophy and law, an approach justified by Butterfield in a letter to Wight as essential to inquire into the “fundamentals” that underlie international life.

The point of the committee was not to study diplomatic history in the usual sense of the word or to discuss current affairs as such, but to enquire into the fundamental ideas behind diplomacy, the reasons why countries have a foreign policy, the ethics of international conflict, the degree to
which the study of foreign affairs might be amenable to scientific treatment (quoted in Vigezzi 2005: 16).

Therefore, in the quest for the existence of an international society or a society of states, members of the ES asked essential questions about the nature of the international states-system, diplomacy, war and ethics. These questions include “is it possible to tolerate those with whom we cannot communicate?” “Does an international society exist?” “What is international society?” These questions led subsequently to a great debate in 1961-1962 about the nature of international society. The Italian scholar Brunello Vigezzi (2005:155) includes among the papers, notes and correspondence of the members of the British Committee the Introductory Talk on International Society and Anarchy by Hedley Bull. At the beginning of the research process, Bull was concerned with three major questions related to international order.

1. Whether or not international relations are in a condition of anarchy
2. Whether or not the condition of anarchy can be replaced, or brought to an end
3. Whether or not such a condition is one which needs to be replaced

According to Vigezzi (2005: 149), Bull’s first take on the topic of international society was that international society was a single “society of states,” a very special society which had institutions-diplomacy, alliances, the balance of power, war itself-that obviated the need for a “world government,” avoided anarchy and guarded international order [...] essential to ensuring coexistence between individuals and between states.”

It is important to mention here that the ES establishment was concerned from the beginning with the study of international relations from an international society perspective. For them various conceptualizations of international society were needed because international society was not a static phenomenon. It evolved conceptually and empirically. The process of studying the evolution of the international society stirred confusion outside the ES circle, leading to various criticism about “conceptual and philosophical imprecision” in international society
concepts coming from Finnemore (2001), Grader (1988) and Jones (1981). Vigezzi’s (2005:150) genealogy of the ES research project suggests international society was imprecise, “for different people [...] the term meant different things.” The claim of “conceptual imprecision” or terminological confusion continues to be conversed by the new generation of ES thinkers such as Timothy Dunne, Robert Jackson, Barry Buzan and Richard Little, who argue that the cacophony of voices in conceptualizing international society, can be attributed to the categories of fields in which international society was engaged: politics, ethics, history, law and philosophy as well as the evolution of the concept in context of the new changes in world affairs. For instance, Martin Wight positioned the idea of international society in the field of comparative world history since Machiavelli. In Wight’s (1966) view, international society
can be properly described only in historical and sociological depth. It is the habitual intercourse of independent communities, beginning in the Christendom of Western Europe and gradually extending throughout the world. It is manifest in the diplomatic system; in the conscious maintenance of the balance of power to preserve the independence of the member communities; in the regular operations of international law, whose binding force is accepted over a wide though politically unimportant range of subjects; in economic, social and technical interdependence and the functional international institutions established latterly to regulate it. All these presuppose an international social consciousness, a world-wide community sentiment. (Butterfield & Wight 1966: 96).

One of the major tasks of the dissertation is to identify how the history of relations between Romania and the EU supports the concept of international society. Since all the ES members, despite the different interpretations of international society, agree that there is an international society or a diplomatic community in which states coexist peacefully and have a duty for a legal order. As noted, members of the ES explored the evolution and nature of the concept of international society from various angles of different disciplines. Manning (1962) for example embedded the concept of international society in law and literature, contextualizing the evolution of international society in reference to the concept of sovereignty and the character of the family of nations during the Cold War. Manning (1962:ix) assessed that international society was a
“notional society,” or a society constructed and composed by sovereign states as a mental concept, a social construction shaped by language in the minds of statesmen and diplomats. In his quest “to tell the world about the world” engaged with the sovereignty concept in international law perspective arguing that an international society existed as a set of ideas in the minds of state leaders.

By taking a philosophical approach Manning (1962) demonstrated how the history of ideas could help conceptualize the existence and evolution of an international society. The philosophical perspective helped Manning (1962) contextualize the meaning of sovereignty and the place of law within that sovereignty. The legal perspective prompted Manning (1962) to inquire into the rules, memberships and the place for law in the international society. The outcome of Manning’s (1962) exploration revealed that an international society can be conceived as a diplomatic political club whose members were sovereign states. According to David Long (2008:2-5), Manning’s referring to “society” occurred in three different ways: as an organization, a political club, and as an elite organization formed by statesmen and diplomats. This vision opened new avenues of thinking about society in terms of society’s four characteristics: communication, culture, cooperation and organization.

It is in the larger scope of this dissertation to identify (1) the type of society emerging from the interaction between Romania and the EU and (2) the type of society emerging from the meaning of the EU as a society of states. Like Manning, this dissertation is also based on a combination of history and interpretive hermeneutics to identify the ways Romanian governmental elites refer to the EU as a society of states. Studying international relations from an international society perspective can be a daunting and laborious task. Wight (1966), as Dunne (1998) and Vigezzi (2005) underscore, was working on the concept of international society long
before he came to the British Committee, but because of his perfectionist style of dealing with texts his work was not published quickly. Therefore, this postponement prevented others from engaging and refining the theory of international society. Wight (1977:33) expanded on Manning’s idea of international society by studying the idea of international society in historical context and argued that historically state-systems came into being accompanied by a “degree of cultural unity among its members.” Wight (1977) based his claim on two examples, classical Greece and early modern Europe, in which international societies developed in subsystems whose units shared significant elements of culture, religion and language.

The idea of international society in Wight’s view conferred a sense of belonging to states as an association rooted in European Christendom or the European balance of power. Hence, states felt connected with a sense of belonging to community. Furthermore, Wight (1966) defined international society in terms of participation in a common culture and civilization. He asserted that international relations are a branch of human relations that can be theorized using the three rival traditions of realism, rationalism and revolutionism. In his view, each of these traditions has the capability to provide distinctive insights about human relations. It is noteworthy here to mention that Wight (1977) thought of people rather than states as participants in international relations.

THE SYSTEM/SOCIETY DISTINCTION

Hedley Bull, another prominent member of the British Committee took Wight’s idea of international society one step further in an attempt to create a coherent overview of international relations in Hobbesian, Grotian and Kantian terms of anarchy, society and community. Bull agreed with Wight that there is an international society that can be traced using comparative
history to the earlier formation of states-system. Nevertheless, if for Wight, international society was an assimilation of a restricted number of states to a pattern of conformity of belonging, for Bull (1977) international society was functional, an ideal form of order, a type of society that has a history, continuity and a number of institutions. As Vigezzi (2005:161) captured, “Wight’s idea of society held together by a common culture differed from Bull’s idea of society arising naturally from the intercourse of independent communities.”

In an attempt to identify patterns of behavior, Bull (1977) saw an imperative to distinguish between the international society and international system. In Bull’s (1977) view, an international society involves mutual obligations between states. It exists when a group of states conscious of certain common interests and values form a society that functions in a framework of rules, norms and shared understanding whereas a system of states resumes state contacts only to interactions based on careful calculations. Wight’s premise was that anarchy was a condition of international relations shaped mainly, but not exclusively, by the nature of sovereign states. Bull’s premise was that an international system coexists with international society within a complex reality. The coexistence is assured by the product of international society as reflected in common interests, institutions, rules and values. In 1977, Bull published The Anarchical Society, to articulate the concept of ‘order’ and how international society assured order. He defined international society as

A society of states (or international society) exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions (Bull 1977: 13).

An international society in Bull’s view presupposes the existence of an international system. Bull (1977) claimed that international relations can be understood as existing beyond the Hobbesian state of war and anarchy. Thinking from the international society perspective, international
relations can be conceived in terms of societal order even though “thinking in terms of society does not in any way imply that relations among states are necessarily peaceful, stable or harmonious” (Alderson & Hurrell 2000: 4). For Bull (1977) international society was a political society capable of assuring order by observing the workings of common social institutions of the Great Powers, the Balance of Power, Diplomacy, International Law and War. In contrast to Manning (1962) who saw international society as a construction of ideas, Bull (1977) imagined international society as an association bound by legal and moral obligations. Bull (1977), as Vigezzi (2005:156) portrayed his passion for the existence of international society, viewed international society as a system of governance “indispensable if we are to avoid general ruin.”

For Bull (1977), an international society came into effect when two conditions were present: two states were present and there was a minimum degree of interaction between states. This coincides very closely with Bull’s definition of a system. This assertion basically opened the door to the idea that there are various types of international society, and some of them can never be completely understood. As noted in the case of Wight, the idea of international society represented a homogeneity that incorporated all existing members who accepted a pattern of conformity.

Whether it was the Kantian conformity assuming that “the constitution of each state should be republican,” or the cosmopolitan unity of seeking a common interest in the limitations of war, international society was possible in Wight’s view only through a society of states in which the word ‘society’ describes a society and a system. Bull (1977:41) also argued that “the element of society has always been present, and remains present, in the modern international system, although only as one of the elements in it, whose survival is sometimes precarious.” Bull’s (1977) view of society was communitarian as it was pluralistic or functional. He
maintained that throughout history, there were various types of international societies united by a common culture built on either religion or language. Language in addition to a common literary or artistic tradition described, for example, ancient international society whereas a diplomatic culture and an international political culture described the European international society during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Bull (1977:305) also saw that international society has important roots in international practice. Modern international society was founded and held together by “some common languages, principally English, a common scientific understanding of the world and certain common notions and techniques.” The Anarchical Society helped Bull advance his analysis on the solidarist and pluralist conceptions of international society. He concluded that in “the Grotian tradition, states are limited in their conflicts with one another by common rules and institutions” (Bull 1977: 25). States interact with each other while observing the rules and institutions of the society they form. If in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Bull (1977) described the idea of international society rooted in Christian values and culture, by the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries he notes that international society was a European association of sovereign states that satisfied political status criteria of sovereignty and upheld standards of civilization with respect to cooperative institutions such as international law, diplomacy, the balance of power and war.

At the time he wrote the Anarchical Society Bull (1977) acknowledged that international society exists, but he was aware that international society was in decline due to the cultural division between the West and the Third World. Nevertheless, his distinction between the system and society introduced the idea of pluralist versus solidarist conceptions of international society that furthered the debate over what is the ideal type of international society. For Bull (1977),
international society took various forms from an idea which is part of a tradition of thought to an ideal type of society that has a history and continuity, to an ‘institution’ that implied order or a ‘mean’ of maintaining order in world politics. Bull (1977) saw an imperative to distinguish between the international society and international system in order to identify patterns of behavior. In his view, international society exists when a group of states conscious of certain common interests and values form a society that functions in a framework of rules, norms and shared understanding whereas

A system of states (or international system) is formed when two or more states have sufficient contact between them, and have sufficient impact on one another’s decisions, to cause them to behave—at least in some measure—as parts of a whole (Bull 1977: 9).

Bull’s (1977) attempt to create a boundary between international society and international system raised important questions about the nature of international society: what constitutes an international society, what is an international system, what are the theoretical and political limits of international society, what role does legitimacy play in international society, and what kind of relationship exists between international society and any one of its institutions in particular. As Bull (1977) argued there were many types of international societies and international societies can exist in the presence or in the absence of any common culture, although in the absence of culture the notion of society is in decline and this is what I suspect to find in the relationship between Romania and the EU on the one hand and on the other hand I may find a new reemerging community culture.

The role of culture in international society as empirically demonstrated by Yannis Stivachtis (1998) is not a precondition for an international society to come into being. Using the case of Greece, Stivachtis (1998) contended that culture was not a determinant factor in enlarging international society as it was the condition of anarchy. Culture determined only the
degree of states integration into international society rather than acknowledged the distinction between system and society. In Stivachtis’s (1998:188) view “a formal acknowledgment” from the members of the international society with respect to new members has the potential to better distinguish between system and society than does culture. Furthermore, as Stivachtis (1998) demonstrates the expansion of European international society was possible without a common culture. It was made following the logic of anarchy and by the accepting of civilized practices of law, rights and diplomacy.

For the study of the international society, the distinction between system and society is important, because it unravels the aspect of the “community of sharing” reflected in the society by common rules, values, practices and institutions. It shows how states behave in an international society according to mutual obligations in contrast to how states interact in an international system based on calculated interests. Thus, the boundary between the system and society discloses the “conscious engagement” in the sense of international society and the “interaction” based on calculation in the sense of international system. The international system and international society distinction was further elucidated by Bull and Watson (1984), and when the definition of international society was refined into

a group of states (or, more generally, a group of independent political communities) which not merely form a system, in the sense that the behavior of each is a necessary factor in the calculations of the others, but also have established by dialogue and consent common rules and institutions for the conduct of their relations, and recognize their common interest in maintaining these arrangements (Bull & Watson 1984: 1).

The definition establishes that the system and society are distinct categories and the boundary line is dictated by the consensus between members around dialogue, mutual expectations and understandings. However, I argue that Bull’s (1977) definition including common values and culture has more relevance than previously thought for society in identifying the elements
describing international society at the regional level as this study will later demonstrate. Bull’s approach to the concept of “society” however, came under scrutiny of various critics including Roy E. Jones (1981) who argued that the term society makes sense in the case of individuals not states. Internationally, Jones (1981) asserted that states cannot be viewed as being the same because they have different interests. Nevertheless, scholars continue to put forward various illustrative cases to refute Jones’s assertions with respect to society and states.

**THE PLURALIST VERSUS SOLIDARIST TYPES OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY**

The ES claims that there are many types of international societies. Bull (1977), for example, distinguishes between the two conceptions of international society: the pluralist and the solidarist. Both conceptions agree that the state system is a society of states which rests upon commonly agreed values, rules, and institutions. They disagree however, over the normative content of this society, the place of war, law and the status of the individual. Bull (1966:53) argues that if the private force is considered in relations among states then international society does not exist or it exists under a different form than that formed by the individual men. Furthermore, both pluralist and solidarist societies are divergent on distributive justice and moral standards.

For pluralists, international society is a plurality that lacks moral agency and agreement on redistributive justice whereas for solidarists, international society constitutes a society that privileges morality and displays solidarity in developing and enforcing international law. How and what kind of society is formed without a central authority, stirred an important debate for the ES in which some, but not exclusively, participated Nicholas J. Wheeler (1992), Ole Waever (1998), Timothy Dunne (1995), and Barry Buzan (2002). One of the main weaknesses suggested
to Bull (1977) by his critics outside of the School is the failure to clearly distinguish between types of international society and to show how in different international societies the various elements of “society” relate to each other and contribute to the maintenance of order. Members of the ES seem to agree on the point that the pluralist society is “built around the goal of coexistence and on ethnic difference” and that the solidarist society is built on solidarity and consensus on issues of human rights and nuclear destruction (Roberson et al., 1998: 26). Buzan (1993:333) argues for example that the classical sociological distinction of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* helps distinguish between two types of international societies. Whereas a *Gemeinschaft* society is a society organically constructed involving bonds of common sentiment, experience and identity, a *Gesellschaft* society is a rational, contractual and functional society constructed in the absence of sentiment and tradition.

Identity as Buzan (1993) contends is central to the concept of society considered as a precondition for association by *Gemeinschaft* societies and as an insignificant factor for *Gesellschaft* societies built on the Waltzian logic that anarchy generates like units or the assumption that anarchy can generate a system of unlike units that accept a set of rules and functions as legitimate. It is important to note that although both types of societies operate on different principles of anarchy and hierarchy they both coexist within an international system.

The character of international society is reflected by the consensus over core values, the growing importance of norms, the perception of how states tolerate each other’s differences, and how they perceive the transfer of power to markets and other civil society actors. Why is the distinction between a solidarist type of international society and a pluralist type important or necessary? Scholars including Bull (1977), Buzan (2004), Dunne and Wheeler (1998) seem to suggest that solidarism emphasizes a society of consensus and coexistence based on shared
norms, rules and institutions. Solidarism provides insights about “the extent and degree of institutionalization of shared interests and values in systems of agreed rules of conduct, it is about collective enforcement of rules” (Buzan 2004: 61). In contrast pluralism emphasizes a society in which the influence of norms, laws and institutions are secondary. The tension between the pluralist and solidarist types of international society brings into attention the question of whether or not the development of world society threatens international society because as Jacek Czaputowicz (2003:42) underscores “pluralism emphasizes separateness while solidarism integration.”

Additionally, the two conceptions of international society can be distinguished by the principles that define international society identified at three levels: “sovereignty, coexistence and principles of regulating cooperation such as treaties and regimes” (Czaputowicz 2003: 19-20). According to Czaputowicz (2003:20), in the pluralist approach, international society fulfills an instrumental role “to counterbalance between chaos and disorder” whereas in the solidarist approach international society “is a moral political society” that consists of states that cooperate and mutually agree to respect international law and pledges to intervene in other states affairs in matters related to humanitarian issues. Norms, laws and institutions play a secondary role in a pluralist international society in contrast to a solidarist society that is defined by the consensus over norms, laws, and institutions.

Scholars including Buzan (2004) and Czaputowicz (2003) argue that the “thickness” of a solidarist international society is reflected by the adherence to common values and the pursuit of joint gains. Notably what distinguishes pluralist and solidarist types of international society are the interpretation of sovereignty and the use of international law (whether the right to decide on international law and human rights is attributed to the state or the individual). The case of
Kosovo will provide interesting insights with respect to the interpretation of sovereignty and international law. The debate between solidarist/pluralist societies relates to how states should behave within international society. A pluralist conception, as Buzan (2004:46) contends “makes the scope for international society pretty minimal, restricted to shared concerns about the degree of international order under anarchy necessary for coexistence.”

According to Buzan (2004:59), pluralism describes “thin societies” where the shared values are few and the prime focus is on devising rules of coexistence within a framework of sovereignty and non-intervention.” Buzan (2004:46) argues that pluralists tend to lean toward the realist perspective on international relations “state centric, international law is only made by states, states are the dominant unit of human society, and that state sovereignty means practical legal and political primacy.” In contrast, solidarists are about “thick” societies that lean towards Kantianism, including in addition to states non-states actors who view international society as a force that generates order or watches for human rights.

Although there are numerous empirical studies, there are insufficient studies that show the interplay between pluralism and solidarism as well as what constitutes the boundary between solidarist and pluralist international society at the sub-global level or what role the value of common security interest plays in the pluralist/solidarist debate. Chapter eight of the dissertation inquires into the role of security as a common interest conceptualized by Romanians in context of the Second Pillar. Buzan (2002:18) notes that “the existing English School literature touches on collective security as one form of possible solidarist project, but devotes most of its energy to human rights.” The EU is considered by the English School as a type of regional international society that has a solidarist component of understanding collective security. Yet, the ES focuses, as Buzan (2002:19) contends, more on “the aspirational side of solidarism-a campaign for
collective self-improvement of the human condition […] ignoring the most spectacular: the pursuit of joint gain and the pursuit of knowledge” areas that remain in addition to the economic aspect completely overlooked in the ES. In viewing the EU as an international society, one of the interpretive categories that the project focuses upon is the pursuit of “common security.”

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The ES theorists underscore in international relations literature that international society is not a given and it has to be created. It is an evolving concept with various shapes and sizes that originate from states’ international practices. Historically, international society was held together by common participation in a civilization, a common diplomatic culture or a common understanding of the world. The Machiavellian interpretation of international society is that of the international system in which states compete for status, interests and power. The Grotian interpretation of international society is that of coexistence rooted in natural law and morality discernable by reason. The Grotian society is a social construction of state practices influenced by the law of nations and the moral principles of individual citizens. The Kantian conception of international society regards international society as a family of nations consisting of every human being.

Existentially, international society coexists with international system and state behavior provides clues about the boundary between “society and system.” In an international society, states coexist and act according to the principles of community. An international society is constructed in the absence of force. The two types of international society: pluralist and solidarist provide insights regarding the character of international society and states behavior. In the pluralist sense international society is instrumental. Its role is to assure a framework of
coexistence to “counterbalance between chaos and disorder.” In the solidarist sense, international society is a product created by the states to share norms, rules and common institutions. A pluralist international society is a “thin” society in which only few values, norms and institutions are shared and accepted. A solidarist international society is a “thick” society in which the coexistence of common interests and values is purposefully created to assure progress and change. Contemporary global international society is multicultural in character with origins in both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft encompassing a range of “thin” and “thick” regional or subglobal international societies that rest on common identities, norms, rules and interests. What kind of regional international society the EU is and what impact this society’s character has for global international society will be discussed in chapter five.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE EMERGENCE AND EXPANSION OF EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY
AT THE REGIONAL AND GLOBAL LEVELS

The purpose of this chapter is to review how European international society came into existence, evolved and expanded worldwide into a global international society in order to trace the idea of society historically and create a frame of reference for the European Union as a regional international society. The chapter is divided into two sections focusing first on how European international society emerged and subsequently on its expansion.

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL

In the ES European international society is considered the ideal type against which contemporary international societies are measured and the idea of society refers to the institutionalization of shared rules, norms, interests, and identities serving thus as a framework of order for states behavior. Members of the ES agree that European international society originated in Europe, was created by Europeans and evolved according to states interests into different shapes and sizes. Geoffrey Stern (2000); Adam Watson (1984); Barry Buzan (2004) and Qin Yaqing (2010:134) acknowledge, for instance, that “modern international society appeared first in Europe, evolving from the Medieval European system, to the Italian city-state system to the Westphalian system, and then perhaps towards a world society.” Wight (1977) and Bull (1977) however, disagree over when and how European international society came into existence. The point of contention is rooted, according to Ian Hall (2006), in the different premises considered when beginning
analyze international relations. Hall (2006: 111) argues for example that framing “Wight’s understanding of “international society” is no easy task, even if one sets aside the issue of whether he approved the idea or its workings in practice.” Wight (1977) acknowledged that international society was shaped by states behavior and, anarchy (no central government), was a condition of international relations in contrast to Bull (1977) who claimed that it is the anarchy which creates the possibility for the formation of international society. In Bull’s conception international society is formed and sustained by states’ cooperation to mitigate the condition of anarchy. It is essential, Buzan and Little (2009) argue, to trace back in time the notion of international society in order to understand “our present international society” (Watson 2009: xxi).

In context of international society Buzan (2009) also calls for reflection on two more features of international society, pluralism and solidarism both defining interstate societies with a relatively low degree of shared norms, rules and institutions among states versus a relatively high degree of sharing respectively. This identifies whether or not the notion of “society” served as a framework for orderly coexistence or as a site for cooperation in pursuing joint gains (Buzan & Gonzales-Pelaez 2009: 26). Additionally, at the regional level (confined area rather than global) Buzan (2009) suggests that “one can identify quite a few regional international societies in tune with the institutions at the global level” signifying the relationship between community and society with thick and thin versions of shared culture, norm and identity pointing toward compatibilities and differences in character, values and institutions (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 34).
THE BULLIAN PERSPECTIVE

The idea of society in the perspective of Bull (1977) is functional and “consciously” created by states to sustain common goals or common interests. Bull (1977) contends that the Europeans did not form a society until the late nineteenth century when the Christian ideas were replaced by secular ideas, international law replaced the natural law and states recognized the principle of sovereignty as an attribute to all states. What existed before the nineteenth century, in Bull’s (1977) view, was a system not a society.

Bull (1977:12) traces the notion of “states system” back to the Napoleonic period and A. H. L. Heeren, a theorist whose term currency is attributed and highlights that “at a time when the growth of French power threatened to destroy the states system and transform it into a universal empire Gentz, Ancillon and Heeren sought to draw attention to the existence of the system, and also to show why it was worth preserving.” The ambiguous distinction between system and society is something that preoccupied the ES scholars for a while. Bull (1977), for example, argues that based on how classical theorists described the “states system” they spoke about an international society. Since system refers to states calculations and society to states coexistence the distinction between the two is crucial for understanding international relations because the former describes the order resulting from the calculation of states interaction and the latter describes the character of states interaction as a norm based sharing created order.

The state system, as Bull (1977:12) saw it described by Heeren, was “the union of several contiguous states, resembling each other in their manners, religion and degrees of social improvement, and cemented together by a reciprocity of interests.” Leading Bull (1977:13) to conclude based on states-system evidence of common interests, common values and a sense of
civilization that “an international society presupposes an international system, but an
international system may exist that is not an international society.” Suggesting therefore that
states, can be members of an international system, before they can be members of an
international society. Turkey is one of the most used examples by ES theorists to illustrate how
the country was part of the European-dominated international system in the sixteenth century but
not part of the European international society until the Crimean War was concluded in 1856. Bull
(1977) claims that European society did not recognize Turkey as a full member until the Treaty
of Lausanne in 1923.

The scope and the geographical size of the European international society describe, in
Bull’s (1977) view, the creation and purpose of an international society. Bull (1977) argued that
an international society is consciously created by states to mitigate the conditions of anarchy and
requires evidence of a factual disposition of states to sustain certain goals and that disposition
and this should not stand in contrast to European historical experience. Bull (1977) reviews the
history of the modern states system, the writings of European philosophers and publicists as well
as the state leaders’ speech records to identify how states produced an international society with
common rules and institutions.

The EU as an international society is contextualized in the writings of Bull (1977), Wight
(1977) and Watson (1984; 1992) as well as on Romania’s leaders’ speech records to identify
how the EU is an international society produced by elites’ meanings and actions attached to the
EU. In context of European international society Bull (1977) enumerates four essential goals for
modern international society or other international societies to exist and inquired into whether or
not they conform to the European reality. Bull (1977) insists that these goals are not exclusive.
“The goal of preservation of the system and society of states itself; the goal of maintaining the
independence or external sovereignty of individual states; the goal of preserving peace among members of international society; and lastly the goal of limitation of violence” (Bull 1977: 16-18). Corroborated with the historical evidence Bull (1977) identified that European international society did not emerge in Europe until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. In his view, what existed in Europe before the eighteenth and nineteenth century was a Christian club slash international society prioritizing Christian values and principles and bound by divine or natural law exhibited by religious oaths in the signing of treaties. It is true, Bull (1977) acknowledged, that the Christian club imagined it to be different from other clubs, especially in relation to the Ottomans whom they considered a real threat to the Christian foundation but it is the inherent foundation and the membership of the club that prevented the Christian association from being called an international society.

In Bull’s (1977) view the Christian club encompassed European Christian princes coexisting with each other according to principles of international law but also groupings of men everywhere accepting the doctrine of natural law. Due to the size and scope, the Christian club reflected, in Bull’s (1977:28) view, the idea of society made up by princes, duchies, kingdoms and principalities, and all political organizations that existed before the states took shape. European international society in Bull’s (1977) view began to articulate in the eighteenth and nineteenth century when the European Christian club assumed a different form. Bull (1977) bases his claim on the primacy of natural law which treated the individual rather than the state as the ultimate bearers of rights and duties. Furthermore, Bull (1977) asserts that the idea of international society that existed in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth century in Europe was based on universal assumptions and was solidarist in upholding the rules and principles of pacta sunt servanda rather than being based on the conception of sovereignty or the exchange of
the recognition of sovereignty in the realm of coexistence. As a principle, sovereignty developed in 1576 Bull (1977) notes and it can be traced back to the Suarez’s notion of ‘perfect community’ or to the time when the Roman law notion of ‘dominion’ was used however, what is lacking in Bull’s (1977:30) view, “is a conception that makes independence of outside authority in the control of territory and population the inherent right of all states.”

In Bull’s (1977) view, the idea of international society existing in Europe before the establishment and consolidation of European international society in the nineteenth century was a society of Christian groupings of princes and communities who coexisted within a framework of divine law. It was a natural law society with no clear guidance for membership other than following the law of God; it was a pluralist society inchoate and overlaid with the assumptions of a universal society with no clear institutions derived from cooperation. Bull (1977:30) argues that “the existing ‘international’ or ‘supranational’ institutions were those of a decadent Empire and Papacy, and did not derive from the cooperation or the consent of states…[the] tradition of cooperation which states were developing was not yet perceived as taking the place of these institutions.”

The only institution that Bull (1977:30) credits as being developed in this period is the institution of diplomacy which in his view, “originated in Italy in the fifteenth century, became generalized in the north of the Alps in the sixteenth century and spread to Russia in the time of Peter the Great.” In contrast to Wight (1977), Bull (1977:31) argues that the institution of diplomacy manifested through resident ambassadors was, in this period, in the incipient phase and did not include summit conferences or congresses to suggest that “a society of states existed.” Furthermore, Bull (1977) notes that the conception of this international society lacked the conscious attempt to create a balance of power to prevent the preponderance of a state from
accumulating power to lay down the rules to others. As Bull (1977) contends, it was not until after the peace of Westphalia during the struggle against the French King Louis XIV (1638-1715) that the balance of power was recognized as an institution of international society. Overall, as Bull (1977) claimed, the period of fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the time of “the great society of all mankind,” to which allusions were made by exponents of natural law. It was a notional society that existed in the sight of God or in the principles of natural law: no actual political system corresponding to it.

European international society emerged according to Bull (1977:31) with Westphalia and articulate in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the vestiges of Western Christendom were fading away from the theory and practice of international politics and when the state came to be fully articulated in its national or popular phase and when a modern inter-state practice began to accumulate. Bull (1977) equates the emergence of European international society with the development of the international law. In the view of size and scope Bull (1977) argues that the international society of this period substituted Christian values and Christian law with European standards of law and civilization.

Unlike the previous international society, European international society was a society of states rather than a society of Christian princes and communities functioning according to ‘law of nature’; this society encompassed politically recognized “states” satisfying the criteria for membership; it was a society guided by international law rooted in the ‘law of nations’. Members of the society coexisted in a framework in which the principle of sovereignty was recognized as an attribute of all states. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the cooperation of European international society enabled the emergence and consolidation of institutions.
International law was recognized to be a distinct body of rules, arising from the cooperation of modern states; the diplomatic institution was recognized by the Congress of Vienna, whose Final Act regularized it and brought it into conformity with the doctrine of sovereign equality of states; the preservation of the balance of power was elevated to the status of an objective consciously pursued by international society as a whole; war was lawful to maintain a balance of power” (Bull 1977: 35).

European international society adopted in Bull’s (1977) view, the hierarchical arrangement describing the status of hereditary princes for states with relative power (the Concert of Europe) consented by the members of international society. Two important aspects according to Bull (1977) distinguished European international society from previous international society: references to Christendom or divine law declined or disappeared in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from international treaties and the development of a distinct code of conduct was encapsulated in the standard of civilization. As Bull (1977) eloquently stated,

By the nineteenth century the orthodox doctrine of the positivist international lawyers was that international society was a European association, to which non-European states could be admitted only if and when they met a standard of civilization laid down by Europeans—the test which Turkey was the first to pass under Article VIII of the Treaty of Paris of 1856 she was admitted to ‘the public law and concert of Europe’ (Bull 1977: 32).

Overall, Bull (1977) came to the conclusion that European international society came into existence when a group of European states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, formed a society in the sense that they conceived themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another—international law—and share in the working of common institutions—diplomacy, international law, the balance of power, and war. In the Foreword section of Gerrit Gong’s (1984) book The Standard of Civilization in International Society, Bull concretely summarized the evolution of European international society to incorporate a clear sense for admission.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as religious influences on international politics gave place to secular ones, the belief that international society was distinctively Christian went into decline, but was replaced by the belief that it was a society confined to states of European culture or civilization, including not only the original members of what Burke called ‘the diplomatic Republic of Europe’ but also Europe’s offshoots in north and south America, as they became
politically independent. In the course of the nineteenth century, as the European impact upon Asia and Africa gathered in force, and the latter were brought within the compass of the expanding European-centered international system, European states had to define the conditions under which they would or would not admit non-European political communities to membership of the international society they formed among themselves (Bull 1984: vii).

In retrospect, Bull (1977) focused on international society as a form of order consciously produced by states common interests to mitigate the conditions of anarchy. It is important to note that Bull (1977) reached this conclusion from the standpoint of the approach taken to describe international relations. For Bull (1977) European international society came into being within a matrix of diplomatic culture, a framework of rules and institutions consciously formulated by the members of the society in the nineteenth century while for Wight (1977) international society came into existence with a degree of cultural unity, moral compass and divine law in the fifteenth century.

THE WIGHTIAN PERSPECTIVE

The idea of society in the perspective of Wight (1977) is that of a process created by adherence and states interactions or the equivalent of a “succession of hegemonies” operating on a balance of power. According to Wight (1977), European international society existed in Europe in the fifteenth century in a system of common culture and common values. Wight (1977) makes reference to Christendom to underscore that the idea of unity in diversity among the Christian princes and the sense of belonging to the same community were the common dominators transferred to the European society. One of the most contentious points attributed to Wight’s (1977) analysis of international society is Wight’s (1977) conflation of international system with international society. As Little (1998) underscores “Wight does not distinguish between the ideas of international society and international system nor does he make a reference to world society; instead he tends to conflate all three terms in the concept of a states-system” (Roberson et al.,
In the Systems of States analogously De Systematibus Civitatum Wight (1977) focuses comparatively on three regional systems, the modern or Western states system that originated in Europe in the fifteenth century and is now extended worldwide; the Greco-Roman or Hellenic-Hellenistic system and the Chinese states-system of the ancient period of Warring States to identify how elements of modern or Western states-system can be found similarly in other parts of the world as well as in other periods of history.

Wight (1977) defined a state system as a connection of several states into a single body or unit in which members retain their sovereignty and hoped to distinguish norms and values that animated the system as well as the institutions in which they were expressed (Wight 1977: 21). In context of the Western states-system which arose in Europe in the fifteenth century Wight (1977) was able to establish that it encompassed the presence of sovereign states, mutual recognition, great powers, a means of regular communication, international law and defense of common interests through the maintenance of the balance of power. A similarity derived from comparing the Western states-system to the Classical Greek city-state system and the Chinese states-system was that “a states-system presupposes a common culture; the three states-systems arose within a single culture” (Wight 1977: 17).

Cultural unity and the nature of relationships between the units in the system distinguished between the system and the empire. Regarding European international society, Wight (1977) was able to identify that it came into being in the mid-fifteenth century in a framework of common culture or civilization and was consolidated into the Westphalian international society. Wight (1977) cautioned that using the world “international” in medieval politics creates potentials for distortion because the term “international” is normally used to distinguish between national and international affairs and gets to be better articulated with
Westphalian events. Capturing the complexities of medieval Europe is challenging, Little (2005:57) argues, because “Medieval Europe covers a very long period of time and embraces some very different changes from feudal empires (650-950) to feudal anarchy (950-1150) and a feudal state-system (1150-1450).”

The notion of a “common culture” or a cultural unity raised by Wight (1977) in context of European international society remained a mystified concept. Bull (1977) mentions that “Wight raises but does not answer the question whether the cultural unity that is a necessary presupposition of states-systems consists simply in a common morality and code, leading to agreement about the basic rules of coexistence among states, or whether it requires common assumptions of a deeper kind-religious or ideological” (Wight 1977: 18). One can infer that cultural unity served as the foundation for the existence of a society. Focusing on the Christian international society of Christian princes Wight (1977) shows that there was a tendency of cultural differentiation among the members of the systems however, how and when culture became common or what consisted of remained a matter of interpretation.

European international society, in Wight’s (1977) view had taken shape in Christian Europe within a framework of “common culture and civilization” that created the idea of “belonging to international society.” More specifically Wight (1977:114) argues that European international society is a continuation of the society of Christian princes that coexisted together based on reciprocal will. European international society developed from regional international societies connected with the world society by a common interest and different versions of divine law. It was a diplomatic community that emerged in the middle of the fifteenth century and evolved to take many forms such as the medieval international society of 1494 was different than international society after 1648. The distinction between societies in his view is marked by
secularized politics, recognition of sovereignty and the balance of power which started to become the norm of conflict prevention. In the creation of European international society natural law, tolerance and a sense of common culture and values speak about the uniqueness of the European society. Wight (1977) argues that the European states-system can be imagined as a duality reflecting on one side the Christian society and on the other side different people and nations united in a political and moral sense. With respect to Christian society or *respublica Christiana*, Wight (1977: 125) mentions that:

> Everybody knew what this was; though its legal unity was broken by the Reformation, it was a historical and cultural unity with religious wars practiced as internal wars; Poland-Lithuania belonged to it but Muscovy did not. It was appealed to the Treaty of Vervins; it did not appear, perhaps significantly, in the Treaties of Westphalia; it last appeared in the Treaty of Utrecht;”

In this sense, Wight (1977) regards *respublica Christiana* as a “single undivided *societas christiana*” or a regional community standing as a “perfect community” with no political superior. But was this society a solidaristic or a pluralistic society? Using Grotius conception of international society Wight (1977:126) asserts that the common interest connecting regional international societies with world or universal society was rooted in “the human race and a law of nature that binds it.” Within human society Wight (1977:126) contended that “there is a particular bond uniting Christian states.

All Christians are members of one body, who are bidden to bear each other’s sufferings and sorrows. Just as this principle applies to individuals, so it applies to peoples *qua* peoples, and to kings *qua* kings.” Grotius, Wight (1977) argues, conceptualized international society as a set of concentric circles embracing on the outer side all human kind under natural law and on the inner side the Christian society bound by the law of Christ. Wight (1977) acknowledges that there were versions of divine law and versions or regional variants of international society connected by at least one common purpose. “There is one nation in particular to whom God has given his
laws, the Jews; and there is the law of Christ, the last of three sets of law given by God to the Human race” to underscore that “Christianity has a special status and Christians have the benefit of the doubt in their relations with the infidels” (Wight 1977: 127). In Wight’s (1977) view European international society originated in Christendom with a geographical core and a periphery of powers or regions that changed throughout its evolutionary period. In the evolution of European international society Wight (1977:42) identifies four phases:

- To 1500 core, Italy; periphery, Transalpine Europe
- 1500-1763 core, Western Europe; periphery Eastern Europe
- 1763-1941 core, Europe; periphery, the Americas and the traditional states of Asia
- Since 1941 core, roughly the states which helped to found or were members of the League of Nations; periphery, the ex-colonial states, especially in Africa

Regarding the transition from the medieval to modern international society Wight (1977) notes that

Westphalia was believed to mark the transition from religious to secular politics, from ‘Christendom’ to ‘Europe’, the exclusion of the Holy Sea, the effective end of the Holy Roman Empire by the virtual recognition of the sovereignty of its members, the formal admission of the United Provinces and the Swiss Confederation to the family of independent nations, and the beginning of the system of the balance of power (Wight 1977: 113).

According to Wight (1977), the articulation of European international society within the states-system began in Western Europe with the establishment of sovereign states, mutual recognition, society accepted hierarchy, the creation of means of regular communication, western understanding of law and the creation of means to defend their interests. The idea of society in the Middle Ages, in Wight’s (1977:143) view was provided by the Church who acted in the pre-medieval era as the STATE with the Council of Constance serving as the General Council institution. “The Church was the ubiquitous international organization of the Christian society, and its conciliar machinery provided the model for the states-system.” Wight (1977:131) mentions that “the modern secular sovereign states-system arose from the ruins of the medieval international papal monarchy and the dividing line between the two is clearly marked by the
Council of Constance, which is as far back as one needs to go in the search for the origins of the
states-system.” As far as the subjective awareness of an international anarchy Wight (1977:133)
notes that it dates back to 1454, the year of the Peace of Lodi and after the Conciliar Movement
to heal the Great Schism was concluded.

With respect to the idea of sovereignty, Wight (1977) finds that the feudal society of
sovereign states had reciprocal recognition of sovereignty. It would be impossible to have a
society of sovereign states Wight (1977:135) notes “unless each state, while claiming
sovereignty for itself, recognized that every other state had the right to claim and enjoy its own
sovereignty as well.” It is interesting in context of the EU to note that sharing or “pooling
sovereignty” describes the idea of society. Wight (1977:135) identifies that feudal society was
hierarchical “from the fourteenth to the eighteenth centuries when Western Christendom fell into
a hierarchy and the society of princes, though each claimed to acknowledge no superior likewise
‘observed degree, priority, and place, office and custom, in all line of order.”

Reciprocal recognition of sovereignty marked, in Wight’s (1977) view, the transition
from a hierarchical to an egalitarian societal system. The equality of all crowned heads was
furthered by the confirmation of sovereign powers for the estates of the Holy Roman Empire at
Westphalia when the ancient customs of hierarchy were removed and the international
community was leveled in that “all states recognize the right of all other states to equal treatment
in law and in ceremony” (Wight 1977: 136). Another conscious attempt to prevent conflict is
evidenced in Wight’s (1977) view by the Treaty of Westphalia which leveled the international
community yet great powers maintained their managerial functions “to serve not to rule” in order
to prevent the emerging conflict among each other. Bull notes in this respect that “the super-
powers contributed to international order in two main ways: by managing the balance of power
between each other, and by exploiting their preponderance in relation to the rest of the world” (cited by Wight 1977: 139). With respect to the “conscious” creation of the balance of power Wight (1977) notes that by 1518 an illustration of great powers management is when the five nominal powers of the day: the Pope, the Emperor, the three kings of France, Spain and England met to negotiate the multilateral Treaty of London in 1518. Furthermore, the rise of the diplomatic system in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is another illustration, in his view, of the reciprocity and common interest to maintain regular communication between sovereign states. Wight (1977:142) also argues that these diplomatic exchanges or the “summit meetings” evolved and acquired a new quality, of international political conference, in the fifteenth century mainly “because of the growing sense that great issues of state power might depend on them.”

Whereas in the Middle Ages these gatherings were populated mainly by the emperors, and kings with their vassals they were transformed into congresses by the 1500s attended by the European powers’ ambassadors. International congresses developed out of councils of the Church and served as institutions of international society. Moreover, Wight (1977) contends that European international society originated at the end of the fifteenth century, marked by the French invasion of Italy and the break-down of the old constitution of the Respublica Christiana. It was in the fifteenth century Wight (1977) notes when:

The papacy is transformed from an ecumenical theocracy into an Italian great power. The assertion of sovereignty by the secular powers, growing since the thirteenth century, becomes normal. The first lamentations about international anarchy are heard. To mitigate the anarchy, the first attempts at collective security are made. To assist them, the new invention of reciprocal resident embassies becomes general (Wight 1977: 151; emphasis added).

In Wight’s view, at the Peace of Westphalia, European international society was consolidated when, “the states system does not come into existence: it comes of age” (Wight 1977: 152). Wight (1977:154) argues that post Westphalian society was based on the dynastic principle of legitimacy rooted in custom in the form of a hereditary monarchy inherited from medieval feudal
society and based on the idea of international law. Dynasticism, as Wight (1977:154) assessed, was itself an international society or a “system” encompassing a collectivity of European dynasties. It served also as a principle of legitimacy and order “territorial aggrandizement was justified by dynastic claims; foreign revolutions were fomented by cultivating dynastic pretenders.” Dynastic legitimacy, Wight (1977:156) notes, was limited to Christendom and lasted only in conditions in which, through marriage, the infidel was converted to Christianity.

International law was the second principle exerted by European international society being at first incorporated in the assumptions of dynasticism and then in the principles of prescription which according to Wight (1977:158) evolved into “a system of rules and principles that has been distilled chiefly from the practice of states, with a view to regulating their relations and moderating their conflicts.” Therefore, European international society evolved from a combination of certain regional societies or “sub-systems” with defined geographical and linguistic limits, such as that of Italy in the fifteenth century, or Germany in the nineteenth century, and have functioned under temporary and privileged conditions as closed systems” (Wight 1977: 175).

Wight (1977:43) also observed in the examination of Western, Greek and ancient Chinese systems that each system arose within a single culture of community presupposing a common morality and a common political interest as well as a common code of conduct to agree or disagree about religious practices and warfare. He notes that most states-systems ended or were incorporated into a universal empire. In his view, the establishment of a world empire is the result of decline of the balance of power at the expense of the monopoly of power. In retrospect, Wight’s (1977) approach to states-system revealed that European international society originated in medieval Christendom and began to contour as a political organization with the society of
Christian princes in the fifteenth century evolving thereafter to take many forms. In contrast to Bull (1977), for Wight (1977) international society was not formed and sustained by states’ cooperation to mitigate the condition of anarchy but rather came into existence only when statesmen and people became motivated by a sense of ethics or moral obligations to act in concordance with natural law. As Hall (2006:132) emphasizes, for Wight international society was a “mysterious community, a partnership for pursuing the ultimate ends of man.” In Wight’s view, the shift from Church to state and from God to Caesar occurred much earlier than Bull (1977) thought it did; the exchange happened in the fourteenth century and was consolidated in the fifteenth coinciding with the transition between the medieval to the modern state system.

Wight (1977) finds in the comparative examination of states-system that international society as a political entity was sustained by the presence and meaning of the principle of sovereignty, mutual recognition, states’ accepted notion of hierarchy, their regular means of communication, their framework of law and states means of defending their common interests. With respect to international society’s institutions Wight (1977) found in a states-system examination the prospects and manifestations of four institutions: messengers, conferences and congresses, a diplomatic language and trade.

THE WATSONIAN PERSPECTIVE

Adam Watson (1992) approaches the idea of society in context of European international society as an interaction between the structure and the process. He finds that the idea of society is distinguished by “conscious understanding” and “feelings” from the idea of the system. Watson (1992) examines comparatively how the European society of states evolved in context of organizational principles, institutions and practices and how the European society changed or
remained similar in contrast to ancient medieval societies. Sequentially, Watson (1992) reviews the states-system history in order to identify the extent to which practices of states have changed from one era to another. He contends that an international society is generated only when rules and institutions are “consciously based on shared assumptions and theories and not every system is a society” (Watson 1992: 121).

After comparatively tracing the notion of “society” to the ancient Greek societies and Roman societal organizations, Watson (1992:47) concludes that the formation and development of European international society was influenced by ancient Greek practices and by the Roman perception of the state, international law, and authority. Additionally, Watson (1992:123) identified, in the history of the ancient systems that the system stood for order in mitigating the interests and pressures of the members of the system and a system became a society within the compass of a common or dominant culture when members of that society wanted to develop into a community free of constraints. As both Bull (1977) and Wight (1977) observed in their analyses of war, Watson (1992:125) found that in the ancient world, war was not reprehensible because it was the hallmark of independence for a king or a corporation. Moreover, interestingly Watson (1992) underscores that in the ancient world relations between members of a community and the relations between communities were determined partially by the practical realities and partially by how community members proclaimed or believed relations should be to the extent that members of the community legitimized the structure and the management of the system according to the reality in which they perceived to be operating. Watson (1992) also finds in the ancient world the existence of a cultural framework shaping the position of communities in the system to the extent that states respected and adopted elements of other communities’ cultures. Analogous to Wight (1977), Watson (1992:252)
learned that “systems are in fact societies of multiple independences moderated and managed by hegemony” although the “conscious” assumptions distinguished in his view between systems and societies. Additionally, Watson (1992) learned that what constituted “society” in the ancient world was the distinctiveness of the communities’ anti-hegemonial character and the solidarity in decision-making, the union of populations around culture, religions and the preservation of civilization.

The nature of “consciousness” in the ancient context was determined by how members of the community or society felt about their community or society in contrast to others who were not part of the community. With respect to European international society Watson (1992) establishes that this constitutes an adaptation of classical models of societies experienced by the Greek, Roman and Macedonian models originated within the cultural matrix of Latin Christendom. In Watson’s (1992) view, European international society is anchored in multiple independences changed and expanded through four centuries of history from horizontal organization in medieval Christendom to vertical integrated organizations in the sixteenth century of the Italian stato.

A society or community of coexistence is what Watson (1992) describes as the European international society of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth century formed by Christian princes and Christian principles of coexistence held together by Christian values and divine law. This society evolved concomitant to medieval transformations taking part at the regional European level such as was the development of the stato. This subsequently led to the concentration of power in the hands of a ruler, the development of hegemonial practices of a ruler to impose greater constraints on the subjects and the Westphalian settlement when European princes wanted to liberate themselves from the hegemony of an empire and transform
into multiple independences. The “conscious” development of the balance of power “to protect the weak against the strong” by the European society of sovereign princes was an important feature in the evolution and transformation of European international society. The conscious attempt to create a society that functioned within an anti-hegemonial framework preoccupied members of European international society since Westphalia. However, the rise to power of various French Kings gave way to various reactions and practices by the European states therefore shaping the size and the development of European international society.

The EU resembles in this sense a society emerging from the balance of power system. It claimed distinctiveness first in the economic status and thereafter in the security and political status to accommodate the post Cold War reality. Watson (1992) notes that the Italian ideas of Renaissance statecraft, the Reformation and the growth of national consciousness, the fear of anarchy, the fear of Turks and the desire of the sixteenth century statesmen to establish peace and order brought Europe to a new reality. In Watson’s (1992:180) view, had the Habsburg vision succeeded in restoring the unity of Christendom in Europe, “Europe might have become a suzerain system something like those existing in Asia at the time, rather than a patchwork quilt of independent and juridically equal states.” Instead, a consciously anti-hegemonial international society emerged with the Westphalian settlement marking the failure of the Habsburg concept of hegemony and the triumph of the stato in its own affairs.

The Thirty Years War motivated by religious conflict and a contest for political control in Europe was concluded when the European powers gathered in 1648 in Westphalia (what is today northwestern Germany) to make peace and establish the existence of sovereign states with their own laws and institutions and to reject the idea that a pope or emperor had universal authority to lay down the law to others. The new state system replaced religion as the determining principle
of alliances between European princes with *raison d'état* or state national interest. Notably, “recognition” or the acceptance by the international community of a state’s sovereignty over its territory indicates that the independent states did not possess equal power in this society. Watson (1992:187) notes that some were universally recognized as independent, both *de jure* and *de facto*, while others were independent in practice but not juridically equal. Romania for instance obtained its official independence recognition in 1878 but was not recognized as an equal member state until 1891 when members started to conduct diplomatic treaties. Additionally, with respect to Westphalian settlement, Watson (1992:188) asserted that it reflected the view of its architects, France, Sweden and Holland or that of the protestant powers pursuing a Protestant policy.

Although the growth of national consciousness of the new or post Westphalian international society was anti-hegemonial in character it continued to be influenced by the principle of dynastic union and the competing ideas of order between the French and the UK. Watson (1992) notes, for example, that the post Westphalian settlement brought new rules and institutions into the states practices of dealing with each other to the extent that in the sixteenth century a new concept of international law based on a combination of ethical and regulatory principles was developed as well as new arrangements and practices based on the ‘Expediency’ principle began to emerge. The new French order imposed on Europe by Louis XIV was less oppressive and more systematic. French culture, ideas and practices of civilization, war and government became the model to adopt for most of Europe until the Englishmen put forward their ideas of order in Europe free of hegemony and based on the balance of power rather than a victorious coalition. The idea of society in the eighteenth century was informed by conscious arrangements of the balance of power and the creation of special institutions. The balance of
power was the main formative element of eighteenth-century European international society according to Watson (1992). It was a mechanism directed “against hegemony from any quarter seeking to protect the independence of the weak against the strong and acted as a policy of great wisdom and justice” (Watson 1992: 210). The balance of power first included France and Austria and was then joined by Britain, Prussia and Russia; the new arrangement was aimed therefore to prevent the accumulation of power by a single state. As Watson (1992:201) stressed it, in reminiscence of the previous century, “dominant power in the system was unacceptable, no matter how legitimately it might occur.”

To prevent the potential of a hegemonial power from controlling the system Watson (1992:202) argues that “the commonwealth of European states managed their international society by four constituent institutions: international law—the rules of the game and the codes of conduct derived from a common culture; legitimacy—dynastic but modified by treaties; diplomatic dialogue—conducted through embassies and limited war—as an ultimate mean of adjusting the balance.” Additionally, Watson (1992) argues that despite juridical equality and the maintenance of a mobile balance of power, order was hard to achieve without rules and since rules were not to be laid down by a hegemonial power they had to be established by contract by members of the society. In this sense, Watson (1992) mentioned that anti-hegemonial princes realized that flexible rules were necessary in the interaction of the commonwealth members.

Their function was to make international life more orderly and more predictable, safer and more civilized, and also to induce a greater conformity in the practices of states and persuade them to modify their behavior. The sovereign members of the commonwealth of states must bind themselves by rules which they would negotiate together and which would codify and standardize their actual practices. For example, the practice to keep three miles from all the shore was codified into the three-mile limit of sovereignty, beyond which lay the open see free for all to navigate (Watson 1992: 203).

Stivachtis (1998:70) suggests with respect to “the birth of the European international society” that the Westphalian settlement was the decisive feature of the establishment of European society
since the Treaty transformed wartime diplomatic practices into rules aimed at regulating the affairs of the European states thus, legitimizing a society of sovereign states organized on anti-hegemonial principles. Furthermore, the new European international society abandoned the idea of unity of Christendom in favor of the exclusive control or sovereignty of states over their affairs. As Stivachtis (1998) argues the role of the common European culture was no longer necessary to maintain the union of the society but rather culture and common values now contributed to the creation and working of international institutions.

In context of the EU however, culture and common values continue to play a significant role in the process of Romania’s integration in the EU because they help facilitate the common understanding between Romania and the EU. As this study will demonstrate, for a country located at the periphery of the EU, the understanding of common political values plays a significant role in political recognition inside the Union as well as helping to strengthen the idea of the Union. Therefore, it is important to underscore that the post-Westphalian European international society emerged as a site of diplomatic cooperation in which states were tied together by commonly agreed contracts or commonly created rules.

After Westphalia, European states recognized that the anti-hegemonial principle was in the interest of everyone thus progress was rooted in the ability to manage power by balancing with other power rather than resort to war to destroying it. The first desire for a balance of power came after Thirty Years of religious wars to oppose the Habsburg hegemonial design of Europe and justify cooperation with the Ottomans. Watson (1992) notes that the principle of the balance of power led states to be vigilant to other states affairs, to the creation of alliances and counter alliances while promoting a general feeling of respect for independence.
The eighteenth-century European commonwealth was a sovereigns’ club, and international law was the rule book of the club’s independent and juridically equal member states...Statesmen agreed, privately if not publicly, that human societies were not natural or God-given, but as Polybius had said emerged as response to chaos. They were held to be social contracts to protect the individual interests of the consenting members. The rules of the European commonwealth were therefore not immutable ethical commandments; they could be modified by negotiation to keep pace with changing practice. Their function was to make international life more orderly and more predictable, safer and more civilized, and also to induce greater conformity in the practices of states and persuade them to modify their behavior. The actual rules were reinforced by custom and by codes of conduct (Watson 1992: 203).

In retrospect, unlike the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when the European international society was rooted in Christian values and culture, influenced by natural law, with no clear number of institutions and members, the seventeenth century European international society evolved with clearly defined institutions of legitimacy to recognize sovereign members, diplomacy to maintain exchanges, international law to comprise the rules of the commonwealth and the balance of power to prevent hegemonial orders.

War, Watson (1992:206) notes, became an isolated activity since it bore a considerable cost to the state; “it damaged your army so [...] it was better and cheaper for a state to use its armed strength as a demonstration of its power, without having to prove it by fighting.” It was a gain Watson (1992:211) acknowledged that “war had become professionalized, and a demonstration of power rather than an orgy of destruction.” From Utrecht to the French Revolution war was disagreeable and destructive yet minor wars were perceived as mechanisms to adjust the balance of power. The character of the European society was circumscribed in states common interests for freedom over their internal affairs, mutual recognition of independence and common interests to protect the weak against the strong by maintaining the principle of the balance of power and by subscribing to common practices of vigilance, recognition and respect for independence. Therefore, the post Westphalian international society signified a union of European nations operating on common interests, common values, and commonly created rules
or practices for interactions. Watson (1992:211) contends that eighteenth century European international society prioritized the equilibrium of Europe over the consent of the governed and assured only the independence of its members rather than their territorial integrity that inclined, in the long term, the balance of power in favor of the most powerful states undermining the fundamental value of the balance. The reassignment of territory was therefore among the factors contributing to the failure of the League of Nations to maintain peace. The European international society of the eighteenth century was based on conscious cooperation; was a society that valued independence, freedom and order. It was a society that made and observed rules.

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FROM THE BALANCE OF POWER TO THE CONCERT OF EUROPE

The evolution of the European international society from an anti-hegemonial practice regulated by the balance of power to a collective hegemony tempered by the balance of power marked another era in maturing the European society to preserve order and peace. Watson (1984) argues that the period of the nineteenth century was decisive in both the organization of European society and its relation with the rest of the world.

In Europe itself the leading states dismayed by the willful domination of Napoleon and the dangers of unbridled sovereignty, agreed that their society should no longer be left to the mechanistic adjustments of the balance of power, but should be directed by a diffused and balanced hegemony of the five great powers who would act in concert to manage order and change (Watson 1984: 27).

The failure of European society to recognize the effects of territory reassignment on the balance of power impeded Kant’s proposal for *Perpetual Peace*. The growth of states coalitions in Europe first through the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs and then through the Bourbon-Habsburg and the king of France perpetuated the rise of a hegemonial power in Europe, the
Napoleonic Empire that managed to transform every aspect of states warfare and sovereignty. Guided by the Machiavellian principles, Napoleon managed to install in France an autocratic regime and bring a greater part of Europe into an imperial super-stato aimed at achieving “general peace.” Although Napoleon’s order lasted only briefly, the changes introduced by him impacted European affairs to a greater extent and for a longer time. The French Revolution changed the Westphalian design of European international society of similar states legitimized by the sovereign princes into a framework of balance of power by introducing the legitimation of the state by the nation.

In sum, Napoleon’s changes managed to introduce, for a while, the European society of states to the hegemony of a single dominant power, France. The idea of hereditary monarchy established by Napoleon brought the European states to a system of royal marriages legitimized by the hegemonial tradition. By 1813 however, European states including Britain and Russia joined by Austria, Prussia and other smaller states formed an anti-hegemonial front against the Napoleonic imperial design of Europe. The unity of the European international society was assured by great powers conscious cooperation and their concerted actions rather than imposed by the structure of an empire.

The nineteenth-century European international society was a “collective hegemony” of independent states united in a common interest to oppose the domination of Europe by a single power. Equilibrium and peace in Europe was achieved at the expense of re-establishing Austria and Prussia as pylons of independent great powers, restoring Bourbon France and cooperating toward the collapse of a common enemy, Napoleon. Watson (1992) notes that the anti-hegemonial allies reverted to the eighteenth century pattern of five great powers that checked and
balanced each other aware of the advantages of order and tranquility brought on by an empire.

The switch to a new design of

five powers which did not trust each other to intervene unilaterally in order to deal with threats to peace and security; but where they agreed to act together, or were at least acquiescent in action after consultation, they could collectively exercise a **diffused hegemony** which none would agree to exercise alone. They could lay down the law: and since future adjustments were presumed to be necessary, they could also amend it. Harmony between them would orchestrate a **Concert of Europe** (Watson 1992: 240).

Watson (1992) mentions, regarding the revised and evolving European international Society that the close similarity of purposes marking the post Westphalian society faded. This meant that although the interests of the five powers remained somewhat compatible in reaching territorial arrangements compromised in the framework of the Vienna settlement, they diverged outside the **grande republique** of Europe. The revised rules and codes of conduct of the European international society introduced the concepts of “acquiescence and acceptance” in the diplomatic dialogue enabling a great power to judicially abstain from certain decisions and enforcements encouraging the partnership in the concert. Watson (1992) contends that

The history of the European states system in the nineteenth century is largely concerned with efforts of these five powers to mediate their relations with their yoke fellows and with the forces of nationalism and democracy in such a way that divergences of interest and principle did not damage the advantages which all five derived from maintaining an orderly international society…the anti-hegemonial principle had been an implicit premise of European international society since Westphalia and an explicit one since Utrecht, and it was the proclaimed purpose of the allied struggle against Napoleon (Watson 1992: 241).

Watson (1992) describes the new restrictive society of European states based on diffused hegemonial authority functioning in a concert balance of power. Notably, he underscores that “the five powers made up some three-quarters of the population of the European society of states (and the same was true of the four powers if Russia was left out of the equation); and they held more than three quarters of the effective power, especially when the resources of Britain and Russia outside of Europe were taken into account” (Watson 1992: 242). The restrictive society of
states operating in concert in the early nineteenth century encompassed the five great powers as well as smaller states however; smaller states were only allowed to participate in the logistic operation of the concert without giving their consent or having a voice in decision-making while Britain and Russia were the most influential. During the first phase of the Concert of Europe or the first three decades from the Declaration of Aachen in 1818 to the year of revolution in 1848, European international society functioned as a collective of hegemonies balanced on two extremes by Britain and Russia. Watson (1992:243) notes that “at the Vienna settlement and during the following decades Britain and Russia acted in Europe like a pair of book-ends, pushing against each other and holding the whole system in place, while outside Europe they extended their influence and their empires in parallels across Asia from the Ottoman Empire to the Pacific.”

Collectively the great powers maintained a dominion over the fragmented quarter of Europe; they were solidary in purpose to the use of armed force and the maintenance of the status quo until the middle of the 1800s when the powers “were prepared to use armed forces to a limited extent against one another” and the last half of the century when the powers used armed forces in colonial operations outside of Europe and in the Franco-Prussian war to adjust the balance of power and settle differences. The second period, from 1848 to 1871 was known in Europe as a period of “revolution and adjustment” when many European communities notably in France, German and Italian lands challenged “the legitimacy of the European states, and of their society, the sovereign’s club” (Watson 1992: 244). The evolution of Europeans from subjects to citizens “came to see their monarchical states as the constitutional and political expression of their nations, rather than as merely the institutionalized status of a princely family” (Watson 1992: 245). Nationalism, democracy and popular interest in external affairs pushed European
international society into a new phase of transformation in which force became a legitimate form of revolutions to support nationalist movements. The right to self-determination gave rise to new states in Central and Eastern Europe thus, transforming once again the design of sovereign’s club into a family of independent nations.

As the nineteenth century ended, Watson (1992) captures changes to the established order in the rise of pan-Germanism in the second half of the century under the guidance of Bismarck who strengthened the concert of Europe into a conglomerate of alliances among the three east European powers. The new changes brought by the ideas of nationalism and captured by Watson (1992:247) were that “the effect of these changes was to loosen the system and to make its member states less conscious of raison de system […] there simply was not room in Europe for the national aspirations of all its peoples; most statesmen remained aware of the dangers of irresponsible willfulness.”

In retrospect, as Watson (1992) underscored the Concert of Europe “combined the advantages of hegemony and the balance of power,” it was a creative improvement of the eighteenth century sovereign’s club but it did not sustain its linear efficiency in practice. In the first phase of the nineteenth-century Concert of Europe, Watson’s (1992) view is that the “collective hegemony” had adequate functioning to maintain legitimacy and preserve peace and order advent that was however, weakened in the second phase by the forces of change, new nationalist desires for independence and the minor wars occurring between the five members of the concert. In the last three decades or the third phase, Watson (1992: 255) contends that the Concert worked more efficiently however, under the personal orchestration of Bismarck. What Watson (1992) illustrates is basically the idea that the concept of international society is not static but changes according to states interests in context of new innovations and developments.
The “society” concept appears able to reveal what consciously unites or divides a community. In the European case, “society” describes consciously created orderly practices of anti-hegemonial coalitions and desires of the great powers to maintain in Europe a design of independent and juridically equal states. The concept of “society” as Watson (1992) described evolved from an independent cluster of city states organized horizontally with hegemonial institutions and common interests united by culture and religion to a new society of vertically integrated states within a common cultural framework to a multiple of independences. What has changed and what had remained the same is an essential question in the evolution of the European international society.

Initially, changes are observed in the evolution of society’s design, relations and conscious practices. European international society evolved from horizontal to hierarchical associations of city-states to states respectively. The ancient societies had a limited scope in their relations to settle disputes over water, land and trade versus medieval societies who aimed at spreading their cultural, material and religious traditions to others. The development of the idea of the state and the ability to learn how to contain power transformed medieval societies even further in working toward maintaining peace and order in the absence of a hegemonial power. Notably, the post Westphalian society clearly illustrates how states consciously engaged in creating new rules and codified practices in dealing with each other.

Order appears to be the element that preoccupied and united societies since the ancient time. The concept of sovereignty understood in terms of non-interference in the Sumer case or limited only to the corporations of Greek citizens order stood for mitigation and freedom from constraints. European international society evolved from societies united by a common culture and religion in Christendom to societies consciously creating anti-hegemonial fronts to prevent
the rise of a single hegemon. One of the most interesting aspects emerging from the evolutionary process of European international society is the demonstration that an international society is created by inside forces according to states interests. Additionally, it is evident that one of the goals of European international society was aimed at improving states behavior by aligning states practices into a greater conformity. As mentioned, at the regional level European international society was a fluid construction or a commonwealth of nations constructed by states according to their interests which most of the time was related to preserving the most advantageous design of the grande republique of Europe.

THE EXPANSION OF CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

The expansion of Christian international society is considered the precursor of the expansion of European international society since the ES claims that European international society evolved and expanded concomitantly. The expansion of the European international society to a global or universal international society occurred in stages with each stage illustrating a particular type of international society structure exporting specific norms and values. Buzan (2008) contends that the expansion of European international society was accomplished “on unequal terms in two ways: by the imperial absorption of much of the non-West into European empires, and by the phased admission of a few non-colonized states into international society once they were deemed ‘civilized’ (Buzan & Little 2008: 8).

The expansion of Christian international society is assessed by Bull (1984) in terms of a domineering and imperious society that “had no foundation in the will or consent of the political communities throughout the world” (Bull & Watson 1984: 120). Bull (1984) argued that the Christian international society cannot be considered to coexist universally and peacefully with
non-Christian people because European Christians asserted their values unilaterally forcing non-European people to participate in commercial and diplomatic trade against their will but, it can constitute, in the restrictive sense of membership a regional international society. Bull (1984) problematizes the concept of society based on coexistence, shared rules norms and institutions of Christian international society due to “the assumption of universal rights to trade and diplomacy conferred by nature was menacing to those whose consent to such rights had not been given” (Bull & Watson 1984: 120). He cites two relevant occurrences when war was justified by Spain and the UK’s invasions to open trade in the Indies and China in the sixteenth and nineteenth century respectively.

In the ES conception when European expansion began in the 1500s “the world was composed of a number of regional international systems, each rooted in a particular cultural tradition: one of them Christian and European, three Islamic or at least dominated by Muslims, and one centered upon China” (Bull & Watson 1984: 425). At first, minimal contacts between Europeans and these regions were relegated to trade, war and religion and were conducted according to regional and European customs. Bull & Watson (1984:425) mention that contacts were conducted “according to the elementary precepts for human intercourse which members of different, developed civilizations have been able to utilize, define and regulate.”

One of the attributes of Christian international society was unity in its desire to bring Christianity and civilization to the rest of the world. From the fifteenth century onward Medieval Latin Christendom, as Watson (1984) mentions spread in three main directions. In the south and west to recover from the Islamic occupation territories part of Latin Christendom; in the Christian lands of south east in the Holy Land of Palestine and in the non-Christian area round the south and east of the Baltic in Scandinavia, Germany and Latinized Poland. The Christian
expansion, as Watson (1984) suggests, was motivated by the crusading spirit to restore the true faith and to liberate a mission “proclaimed by the Pope, preached by the Church, open to volunteers from all Christendom and justified by reference to the interests of the whole” (Bull & Watson 1984: 14). The Christian jihad as Watson (1984) names it was fought for God, against the enemies of God and directed against the heretics, especially the Turks who became a real threat to Christendom. In Watson’s (1984) view, the fracture in the states-system induced by the religious wars produced “a society of states in competition” especially in the arts of war and peace. As Renaissance and the Reformation changed the locus of power and authority from the king to a territorial state and from the universal church to a plurality of independent churches, European princes and merchants took their ambitions to accumulate wealth and power overseas thus adding commerce, in addition to religion, to the Christian European expansionary missions.

Conversely, the resolution of medieval Christendom into new independent states cumulated with the growth of resources and ambitions of princes to produce a society in which “wariness and an eye for economic and military threats from outside were important for survival and necessary for success. Europe, as Latin Christendom came to be called, did not have room enough for the power of all its active thrusting communities” (Watson 1984: 16). It is in this sense Watson (1984) argues that the medieval expansion of Europe was related to the material advantage of trade, booty and land and was by no means all military or confined only to crusading. In Watson’s (1984:15) view, “it was the Latins who sought trade outside the bonds of Christendom, and their merchants who conducted it.” Furthermore, the spread of religious and commercial ideas practiced by Latin Christendom continue to have contemporary manifestation in religious missions and the spread of democratic and economic ideas of freedom. In context of the expansionary process Watson (1984) also suggests that the expansion of European
international society was neither uniform nor systematic; it occurred over several centuries and assumed many forms. Chronologically, Watson (1984) synthesizes the expansion onto four phases.

First came the medieval crusades into Iberia and round the Baltic. The second phase covered three centuries of competitive exploration and expansion and the parallel evolution of a European international society. Thirdly in the nineteenth century the industrial revolution enabled the European Concert to encompass the entire globe and to administer most of it. Lastly in our own century the tide of European domination ebbed and was replaced by a world society based on the European model but in which Europeans now play a modest role (Bull & Watson 1984: 32).

It is important to note that while Christian European powers expanded overseas, international society was developing successfully on the European continent. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a state system in the modern form began to articulate in Italy “while the medieval reconquest of Iberia and the Scandinavian-German expansion around the Baltic were still in process of achievement” (Bull & Watson 1984: 16). Watson (1984) finds evidence that in the century and a half from the French invasion of Italy in 1494 to the Westphalian settlement of 1648 the five maritime colonial powers: Portugal, Spain, France, England and the Netherlands managed to economically unite in their expansion of Western Europe with the Mediterranean system and the German Holy Roman empire with the Ottoman Sultanate who intensified interaction in the southern system.

The logic of Latin Christendom expansion was based on the rationale of advancing Christian principles and, as Bull (1984) acknowledges, it was not always peaceful. Bull (1984) argues that in context of defending the rights of Amerindians against the Spanish conquerors European Christians believed that they prevented the forceful entries of Amerindians into slavery without consciously realizing however, that their attempts at de-subjugation were committing Amerindians to European coercion and domination. Furthermore, Bull (1984) asserts that before the nineteenth century the interaction between the Europeans and the population with whom they
came into contact with was not always violent but rather resumed regionally to trade, conversion to Christianity and in some cases joining military alliances. Bull (1984) cites the contact between Europeans and the Amerindian, African kings and chiefs, Muslim sultans, khans and emirs, Hindu princes, and the empires of China and Japan to suggest that Europeans “did not seek always to subjugate or colonize non-Europeans because they were not capable of doing that on a general scale before they nineteenth century but rather they wanted to enter into relations of a peaceful and permanent nature with particular non-European powers” (Bull & Watson 1984: 117).

For example, Bull (1984) refers to the Ottoman relationship with the European Christian powers to suggest that the Ottomans were viewed by Europeans as partners in an economic and military system before the system came to be thought of as European despite the fact that they were perceived as an “external menace to Christendom or Europe as a whole” (Bull & Watson 1984: 117). A similar example in Bull’s (1984) view can be offered by the East Indian states which enacted military and commercial agreements with the Europeans from the seventeenth century (Bull & Watson 1984: 117).

From the coexistence perspective, Bull (1984) underscores that, in states interactions, neither the Europeans nor the non-Europeans consciously came to the realization that they were moved in relation with one another by common interests or by common and agreed rules to maintain an enduring structure of coexistence and cooperation. According to Bull (1984) Europeans and non-Europeans came to conceive international relations among each other as an international society only in the nineteenth century when they began interacting with each other on a secular basis and according to principles of equality and reciprocity rather than on dividing principles of Christians and infidels or suzerain kings and vassals. Furthermore, Bull (1984)
argues that the abandonment of indigenous conceptions of cultural and intellectual inferiority did not occur until the nineteenth century when the demand for equality of status with European powers presupposed a membership into a common international society. In his view, what did exist prior to the nineteenth century or the emergence of universal international society was basic contact between Europeans and non-Europeans based on the idea of natural law advanced by Latin Christendom that proclaimed rights and duties to human beings. The criterion for membership in the Christian international society was fulfilled by adherence to natural law and its universal symbol, the cross. Adherence to Christian society subsequently produced, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, political rights to suppressed people. According to Bull (1984) this society “was global in extent, even though it recognized an inner circle of Christian and European states among which relations were more intimate” (Bull & Watson 1984: 123).

In the view of ES classics, the Christian international society was united in the union of God and theoretically knew no geographical limitations. Bull (1984) acknowledged that the universal international society “had no foundation in the will or consent of political communities throughout the world and if it had, its influence on European or Western practice was limited” (Bull & Watson 1984: 120). Bull (1984) insists that adherence to natural law provided the rationale for forcing non-Europeans into commercial and diplomatic practices against their will. Since the sixteenth century, wars were justified Bull (1984) suggests, on the rationale of opening trade such as the British against China or the US coercion against Japan. “Like the assumption of a right to spread the Christian message and so realize the community of all men in Christ, or the latter assumption of a right to spread civilization and to bring into being a secular universal community of the civilized, the assumption of universal rights to trade and diplomacy conferred by nature was menacing to those whose consent to such rights had not been given” (Bull &
Watson 1984: 120). Entering into relationships on the basis of reciprocity enjoying full rights as members of international society was prevented, according to Bull (1984), by the non-European states domestic developments and social reforms because they narrowed the differences between political communities in the west and other states.

In Bull’s (1984) view Christian international society was universal in mission and assured coexistence on the basis of Latin and Christian culture from which its rules and institutions were derived but there was no real consensus of coexistence because “the society” presupposed only a European or Western cultural base. The values that international society exported were Christian as were the social bonds and principles of coexistence between Christians and others. Bull (1977:29) also notes that “Christian societies at this time had a strong sense of differentiation from outside powers” and attempted to formulate basic rules of war to “be fought only by those with proper authority, for a just cause and by just means.” The decadent Empire and Papacy served as international institutions of Christian international society yet Bull (1977) argues that cooperation among Christian states and others did not derive from the consent of states but rather from the institutions of natural law.

THE EXPANSION OF EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

The first westward expansion of European international society was Iberian and followed the traditions of two Iberian powers Portugal and Spain who managed to occupy without competition a large part of South America and introduce the inhabitants to their ideas of government, military techniques and equipment, law, language and customs (Bull & Watson 1984). Interestingly, unlike the situation experienced by European crusaders in Palestine and Syria where they encountered the popular support of the Muslim rule equipped with similar
techniques of military and war, in South America the Iberian powers found “imperial structures with an advanced civilization based on stone age technology and governed by a small ruling race whose subject peoples accepted their dominion without loyalty and in the Aztec case only after a long period of warfare” (Bull & Watson 1984: 18).

With respect to values and European practices of interaction exported Watson (1984) mentioned that the Spaniard power treated the colonized population of Mexico and Peru similar to how they were used to treating the population of the lands reconquered from the Muslim in Spain. Likewise did the Portuguese who treated the Asian authorities, in particular the Hindu ones, on the same terms as the European rulers. Asian powers Watson (1984) notes, “recognized the Portuguese on the same basis as the Arab and Chinese merchants; as members of their system without seriously modifying their concepts and their practices to suit the newcomers” (Bull & Watson 1984: 19).

Although Europeans shared more than they adopted from the colonized spaces Watson (1984) argues that the interaction with the “Chinese culture made a profound impression on the educated eighteenth century Europeans, who were attracted by the exquisite rococo works of art which the Chinese exported” (Bull & Watson 1984: 20). European intellectuals the author specifies “pictured China as a civilization which had achieved what they advocated, such as government open to talent on the basis of examinations, and no revealed dogma in religion” (Bull & Watson 1984: 23). A similar impression was made by Japan as well only in this case the author notes that Europeans had to respect the law of the Japanese government in 1638 to refrain from exploring Japan further. By the middle of the seventeenth century European international society began exporting the two Westphalian principles of juridical equality and absolute sovereignty into the colonies of the Americas. The situation among members of the European
international society was peaceful abroad, Watson (1984) notes, until the Dutch interests in the Indian Ocean and Brazil clashed with those of Portugal. Apparently, the Dutch secession from the Habsburg instilled in them the principle of freedom which they now wanted to apply to the sea trade managing, in this sense, to reorganize the entire web of relationships in the Indian Ocean. Watson (1984) contends that

The Dutch played a major part in shaping the international society which was evolving in Europe in the seventeenth century, particularly its anti-hegemonial assumptions and its emphasis on international law. They were also responsible for carrying this outlook and the new European rules with them beyond Europe to the East and Americas, and for breaking up the older Iberian approach based on Papal authority, hemispheres of influence, and avoidance of conflict and competition” (Bull & Watson 1984: 20).

According to (Buzan & Little 2008: 15), Europeans found a well-developed international society in place when they moved into the East Indies arguing in this sense that in the Indian Ocean the high sea principle constituted a precedent at the arrival of Europeans basically confirming Bull and Watson’s findings that European international society expanded over other regional international societies. Watson (1984) insists that the English and French powers followed the maritime pattern pioneered by the Dutch and the Portuguese and increased their comparative advantage against the Dutch abroad in commerce with goods, labor and other commodities. By the seventeenth century, both the English and French managed to intensify commerce in the Indian Ocean and in adjacent regions.

Asian rulers, Watson (1984) notes, progressively involved the European powers not only in their diplomacy and alliances but in their economic and administrative quarrels to the extent that by the eighteenth century European powers managed to bring the Asian subcontinent and the Indian Ocean marginally into the European states system (Bull & Watson 1984: 23). Watson (1984) argues that politically, members of the European international society of juridically equal states did not disregard the great differences of power among themselves but focused on the four institutions as techniques to manage order and change due to expansion. In Watson’s (1984)
view, statesmen of the European international society used the overseas involvement to calculate the balance of power on a global basis. The anti-hegemonial character of the balance of power served as a mechanism to maintain equilibrium between powers in Europe. War was viewed by the European international society as a mechanism to balance power and was not permissible in Europe.

Watson (1984) argues that members of the European international society valued the independence of the member states more than they valued peace and while in Europe they were members of a community with common interests overseas, in the Americas and Asia they were engaging in competition against one another due to different rules and institutions they found overseas. “Neither dynastic right, nor religious affinity, nor any other loyalty should stand in the way of preserving the independence of the member states, and if a judicious use of force was necessary to uphold the balance, than independence was more important than peace” (Bull & Watson 1984: 24).

With respect to international society/system distinction the competition between European states abroad indicates that European international society was restricted to the European continent and functioned abroad in a context of an international system until it managed to transform it in the late nineteenth century. International law was another institution of European international society that codified practices of the system into a set of regulatory rules of war and peace that members of the European society were obliged to obey in Europe and overseas. Watson (1984) mentions that “international law ensured that in most cases the conduct of the independent states was predictable, in place of the uncertainty and chaos which had prevailed” (Bull & Watson 1984: 24). Congresses were also part of the European international society’s institutions. They were usually attended by Christian European sovereign members and
served as a medium in which agreements were enacted and wars were concluded. With non-European members especially with countries from Levant, Asia and Africa, Gong (1984) mentions that European powers used ‘unequal treaty’, ‘capitulations’ and ‘protectorate’ regimes as derivatives of congresses. Diplomacy remains one of the oldest institutions of European international society meant to control the balance of power and the application of international law through diplomatic channels and embassies. As indicated, the expansion of European international society can be envisioned as a process with concomitant developments in Europe and abroad. For example while in Europe, developments of a distinctive European society of states based on mutual acceptance of states and the preservation of a balance of power were evolving while abroad, universal rights to trade and diplomacy conferred by nature were being replaced with secular ones.

In context of the post Westphalian period Buzan (2009), for example, mentions that European diplomatic, political and legal norms were spread across the world and internalized to a certain degree by the global society (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 3). With respect to coexistence and cooperation, Bull (1984) elaborates on the European expansionary process suggesting that the exchange of diplomatic representatives on a permanent basis leading to the establishment of resident missions and the adoption of common protocol and procedure was the first step in the process followed by the adoption of common forms of international law in the making and observance of treaties and subsequently by the representation of states at periodic multilateral conferences (Bull & Watson 1984: 121). Nevertheless, all these developments in Bull’s (1984) view could not have been made possible without a degree of cultural understanding and familiarity between the parties although he argues that “there is, moreover, an element of absurdity in the claim that states such as China, Egypt, or Persia, which existed thousands of
years before states came into being in Europe, achieved rights to full independence only when they came to pass a test devised by nineteenth-century Europeans” (Bull & Watson 1984: 123). The role of Europeans in shaping an international society of worldwide dimension cannot be denied, Bull (1984) argues, if one considers that the idea of juridical equally sovereign states conception was European and not Asian or African. Until the late nineteenth century, the role that non-European states played in shaping the foundation of global society was minimal, in Bull’s (1984) view, because Europeans had their own special interests expressed first in the expansion and not the other way around. As the global international society evolved naturally the non-European states have sought to modify the international society to reflect their interests as well but it should not be overlooked, Bull (1984) underscores, that those who sought a place in this society conscribed to the society’s rules and institutions and sometimes they did this against their own will when incorporated by force into the international system.

Europeans, as Bull (1984) argues, did not face the outside world in unity as Latin crusaders or Hellenizing Greeks had done but rather they faced the non-European world in competition against each other as they came to conceive themselves in the nineteenth century “as forming an exclusive club enjoying rights superior to those of other political communities” (Bull & Watson 1984: 426). The standard of civilization laid down by the Europeans for non-European states expressed first by religion and culture and then by adherence to international law implied that the presence of newcomers to the European club had an understanding of the club structure, rules and culture therefore, preventing any basic challenge to the rules of the club. It is Bull’s (1984) claim that only by the nineteenth century did states come to view each other as equal in the international community with the possibility to recognize each other’s reciprocal interests in sovereign rights and diplomatic missions. In Bull’s (1984:121) view, the first element that glued
diverse political entities together in a single international society was their common understanding and view of each other as states and this occurred only in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth centuries between Europeans and Asian and African states. As indicated by ES members when European expansion began the “world was organized into several regional international systems each with its own distinctive rules and institutions, reflecting a dominant regional culture” (Bull & Watson 1984: 1). Among the regional international systems were the Arab Islamic stretching from Spain to Persia; the international system of the Indian subcontinent; the Mongol-Tartar dominion of the Eurasian steppes and the Chinese international systems (Bull & Watson 1984: 2).

While the regional systems functioned like single political entities with individual religion, culture, governments, law and commerce there were areas outside the systems with underdeveloped cultures and political systems in the Sub-Saharan Africa, the Americas and Australasia. Buzan (2009) argues that tracing the impact of European international society’s norms, values and practices on world regions has the potential to reveal whether or not distinct international social structure exist at the regional level. Buzan (2009) investigated this in the Middle East region and learned that regions exhibit international social structures of various kinds that are connected with global society.

Watson (1984) asserts that “in the eighteenth century Europe came to be regarded as a single diplomatic commonwealth made up of a number of independent states ‘resembling each other in their manners, religion and degree of social improvement’, or similarly operating within a framework of a common culture” (Bull & Watson 1984: 25). Although the expansion of European society produced some changes overseas the expansionary process was unsuccessful in exporting the meanings of rules and institutions of the eighteenth century European society
meaning that international society could not reach and transform the entire international system into a global international society with the same principles, rules and institutions as it happened in Europe. Watson (1984:25) notes that “particularly in the eighteenth century, Dutch and other European statesmen tended increasingly to see how far the rules and the experience of their society could be applied beyond its limits.” The second phase of European international society expansion in the seventeenth and eighteenth century was focused on commercial, military and diplomatic relations and criteria for access to membership was assured by diplomatic and treaty relations.

Watson (1984) argues that the second expansion of European international society was consolidated in the second part of the eighteenth century when European powers assumed that economic and territorial gains abroad would enhance their state in the struggle for power and independence in Europe. “The expansion of European society now consisted of a number of parallel and competitive enterprises by European states and trading companies in which the main enemy was not an oversea power but a European rival” (Watson 1984: 26).

The imperialistic expansion for individual conquest of European international society originated from the enhancement of power status in Europe meaning that members of the European society took the competitive battle for economic advantage and territory abroad. In this period European expansion had been concerned mainly with European settlement, trade and the balance of power. “Each European state wanted the advantage of trade, bases and settlements to be exclusive extensions of its own domain; the language, religion, law and culture which the European states spread were their own particular versions” (Watson 1984: 26). The complex mosaic of states interested in power in the West Indies were Spain, England, France, the Netherlands (Dutch and Danish), and Portugal. Non-European states especially the Asian and
African powers entered into relationships on a reciprocal basis with Europeans according to Bull & Watson (1984) and Gong (1984) when they met the criteria for membership reflecting aspects of Christian religion and the European standard of civilization. The criteria for admission, as the authors acknowledge, were often discriminatory because rights to others were denied for the benefit of Europeans to acquire special privileges for themselves or Europeans “required others to meet standards of behavior they failed to observe themselves” (Bull & Watson 1984: 125).

The third phase in the expansion of European international society occurred in the nineteenth century marking another change in the European society of states both in its organization and in its relation to the rest of the world. Leading European states exchanged the mechanistic adjustment of the balance of power with a diffused and balanced hegemony of the Concert of Europe composed of five powers who engaged in acting in concert to manage order and change in Europe.

The third attempt taken at expansion by Britain, Russia and France was still competitive in character and motivated by order and security rooted in the standard of civilization and morality that Europeans claim to possess as well as by their interest to act in concert and spread civilization to others around the world. Watson (1984:27) notes that “in the nineteenth century the Europeans, and particularly the three colonizing great powers of the day, Britain, Russia and France, became involved in imposing their administration and civilization on almost all of Asia and Africa.” Notably, the society’s rules, institutions and codes of conduct were made by the leading European powers. Watson (1984:28) suggests that even though the European settler states of the Americas were admitted as sovereign and juridical equal members of the society, Europeans regarded them all including the United States as separate entities from the decision-making process of international society. Although members of the European international society
dealt frequently with overseas powers on their own terms with the Ottoman Empire they took a semi equal partnership approach by progressively obligating the Ottomans to conform to European rules and standards of civilization. Watson (1992:62; 217) argues that “the Turks and the Europeans formed an international society of a looser kind;” the Turks were not Christians and they did not adhere to European international law; they were also not included in the settlements of Westphalia, Utrecht or Vienna. Progressively under the jurisdiction of European international society were brought Persia (under British and Russian system of governance); India, Indonesia (Dutch); Indo-China (France); parts of China; and Africa. Buzan (2009) emphasizes in the story of the European/Western international society becoming global that “the triumph of European power meant that Western norms and values and institutions dominated the whole system. The mixture of coercion and copying and persuasion runs in his view parallel to Waltz’s (1979) idea that anarchy generates ‘like units’ through process of socialization and competition” (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 35).

Watson (1984) underscores that the partition of Africa occurred in Europe under the watch of the Concert of Europe and “was achieved in an atmosphere of rivalry between European states” but it closely resembled the process with the partition of South America accomplished by Spain and Portugal under the blessings of the Pope (Bull & Watson 1984: 29-30). The rise of the regional powers of the United States and Japan indicates, according to the author, that by “the end of the nineteenth century the management of international society was no longer limited to European states” (Bull & Watson 1984: 30). By the nineteenth century, most of Asia, Africa and Oceania were included under European administration. Therefore, it can be asserted that the emergence of the global international society was the product of a complex process of the expansion of European international society. Bull (1984) admits that the transition
from a European to a global international society was not always peaceful yet it was transformative and progressive, crediting Europeans for their experiments in managing the international system by a concert of great powers, the advancement of diplomatic regulations and protocols, the professionalization of international law, advances in communication, transportation, international economy and international organizations which subsequently gave rise to new ideas about disarmaments, peaceful settlements of international disputes and human rights. Bull (1984) argues that “it was the Europeans (and Americans) who were at the forefront of all these developments” (Bull & Watson 1984: 125).

Although Bull (1977) and Wight (1977) dispute the chronology and size of European international society they seem to converge on the fifteenth century European expansion that continued until the middle of the nineteenth century when international system managed to integrate regional systems and proclaim its universality. Bull (1984) warns however, that a universal international society shaped by the Europeans with common interests and institutions did not emerge until the First World War when European states and various international political communities came to the realization that they had common interests in a structure of coexistence and cooperation. In Bull’s (1984) view, contemporary universal society is a product of ancient policies and history.

The universal international society was consolidated with the creation of the colonial system although one should be aware that before the European expansion the Amerindian, Asian, African and Oceanian political communities “had the same rights of independence that European states had” (Bull & Watson 1984: 124). As Bull (1984) contends, universal international society was shaped by European international society in its image through various kinds of dominations. Additionally, he claims that universal international society first encompassed states recognized
by the European powers in “gradations of independence” from the status of a colony to that of equally sovereign states. Bull (1984) argues that from the emergence of universal society of states around the First World War to the installation of the Cold War, universal “society of states” was transformed into a “society of people.” Bull (1984) cites among the movements that eventually shook the structure of European domination, the Japanese campaign (1880-1890) against extraterritorial jurisdiction; the nationalist movements in China and India in the 1920s and the effects of the Bolshevik Revolution in the East.

An actual international society worldwide in its dimensions, as opposed to the merely theoretical one of the natural lawyers, emerged only as European states and the various independent political communities with which they were involved in a common international system came to perceive common interests in a structure of coexistence and cooperation, and tacitly or explicitly to consent to common rules and institutions (Bull & Watson 1984: 120).

The global framework in which European international society functioned contained some practices and arrangements similar to Europeans yet they were different in compelling Europeans to deal with overseas powers on their terms. Bull (1984) argues that the expansion of Europe from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries gradually incorporated various regional systems into what became an international system “which by the middle of the nineteenth century was nearly universal” (Bull & Watson 1984: 117).

According to Bull (1984) “this did not mean that there yet existed a universal international society” because the regions were not united “by a perception of common interests, or by a structure of generally agreed rules setting out rights and duties in relation to one another, nor did they cooperate in the working of common international institutions” (Bull & Watson 1984: 117). The basis for universal international society emerged in Bull’s (1984) view in the presence of European elements as well as regional elements that were present in regions before Europeans arrived. Overall, European international society came into existence “as a fragile structure prey to contradictory impulses and tendencies” of history and managed to expand itself
into several regional international societies, “each with its own distinctive rules and institutions, reflecting a dominant regional culture” (Vigezzi 2005: 92; Bull & Watson 1984: 1). European international society evolved into a society based on a “diplomatic culture” in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which many non-European states viewed as an attractive organization functioning on common values, interests, rules and institutions.

Shogo Suzuki (2004:121) points out that in the nineteenth century relations between European international society and non-European states did not share the fundamental goals of “society” that governed relations between European states. He argues that ES scholars continue to remain dedicated to solving the contradiction of past imperialist realities and the assumed progressive role of international society to bring stability and order. A possible explanation for the uneven distribution of “society” may rest, according to Vigezzi (2005), on the degree of development of non-European countries to meet the Europeans standard of expectations.

For example, Bull & Watson (1984:1) acknowledge that “Europe imposed a global international society on a previously existing “system” of several regional international societies each with its own distinctive rules and institutions reflecting a dominant regional culture” and Vigezzi (2005) questions whether or not in the fifteenth century, regional international societies of European, Islamic, Hindu, Mongol or Chinese regions were able to guarantee successful coexistence on an international scale between the peoples and states that belonged to them due to an unequal degree of development and modernization (Vigezzi 2005: 106). In Vigezzi’s (2005) view, the relationship between Europeans and non-Europeans at the regional level remains a “gap never bridged” because it is, with few exceptions, understudied. Concurring with Bull & Watson (1984) is Gong (1984:4), who argues that prior to the nineteenth century countries of the world did not behave as related parts of a single international system possibly due to divergent
values, rules and institutions which might have impeded them from functioning like members of a global international society. For example, Gong (1984:7) illustrates how Muslims dealt with the “infidel” world according to their own standard of civilization as did large sectors of Africa or other non-European civilizations. He notes that until the nineteenth century, “barbarians” and “infidels” dominated the scene of relations between Europeans and non-Europeans in context in which for Europeans, Japan and the Ottomans were considered for example “backward” and “uncivilized,” whereas for the Ottomans, Europeans were perceived as “barbarians” and “infidels.” Gong (1984:4), Bull (1977) and Suzuki (2004:121) credit the expansion of the international system that originated in Europe for frequent and sustained contact with non-European countries.

During the nineteenth century European international society set forward the standard of civilization principle (to protect life, liberty and property) as a criterion for entry into European international society. The standard of civilization, as Gong (1984:4) contends, “became a catalyst for change both in the European international society and in the non-European countries which sought to enter it.” Both European and non-European states engaged according to Gong (1984), Stivachtis (1998), Suzuki (2004), and Zhang (2010) in transforming their cultures, civilizations and patterns of interaction to evolve or conform to a “civilized” status and qualify for membership. The incorporation of non-European states into European international society meant the adoption of the European standard of civilization. The pressure for conformity to Western values and practices led to the alteration of regional cultures to some extent that they resembled those portrayed by the liberal European civilization especially in how non-Europeans learned to perceive the world and what to value or not to value within the world. The alteration as Gong (1984) notes left an ongoing legacy of problems for the legitimacy of international law.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

European international society originated in Christendom from a Gemeinschaft type of society evidenced by common interests, institutions, rules and values. Bull (1977) considers that the European character of international society was functional. It began to contour in the eighteenth century and is evidenced specifically by international law. In Bull’s (1977) view, European international society is a “natural” product of anarchy and a reflection of change arising from the interaction of independent Westphalian communities. For Bull (1977) Christian society lacked clear identifiable institutions and rules for membership as well as the conscious attempt to create a balance of power to prevent a hegemonic power from laying down the rules. In contrast Wight (1977) finds the conscious aspect present in feudal societies as well as norms of conflict prevention. He argues that European international society evolved as a process to consciously oppose the condition of anarchy and is a society differentiated by status.

In Wight’s (1977:24) view, European international society began in terms of participation in a common culture or civilization signified first by European Christendom. He insists that medieval Christendom can be conceptualized in terms of a state with the specification that “they were too imperfectly organized to assert their political independence in the absolute terms of the modern sovereign state.” Christendom, as Wight (1978) asserts functioned as a state with external relations of trade and war with powers across the Mediterranean (Islamic) and across the Ionic Sea (the Byzantine Empire). Wight (1977) also maintained that all historical states-systems have presupposed a common culture, this is refuted to some extent by Watson (1992: xxix) who contended that “international societies can form in the absence of a common culture” when political communities evolve to consciously create rules and institutions based on “shared assumptions and theories.” As it is anticipated that this study will reveal, international
societies founded in the absence of common values and culture describe societies lacking cohesion and common vision and may be prone to conflict and disintegration. To Watson (1992), European international society emerged when a group of states “consciously” established rules and institutions based on their “shared assumptions and theories.”

In Watson’s (1992) view European international society emerged in the fifteenth century and matured to consciously develop anti-hegemonial practices in the seventeenth centuries. European medieval society as conveyed by Wight (1977:26) was a much more moral society grounded in a deep sense of religion and social unity signified in a hierarchy “where everyone in theory had his place, from the Pope and the Emperor down to the meanest feudal baron” than was the modern society where the sense of unity and agreement on moral standards had to be divided by a multitude of semi-equal powers.

European international society was rooted, in Wight’s (1978) view, in traditional Christian values and practices and developed to incorporate institutions according to the contextual nature of common interest. By the seventeenth century, Wight (1978:106) argues that Europe was divided into two independent systems and grew its members from “a European core” to incorporate in 1899 twenty European states and another twenty in the separate American system. While in the medieval society membership was granted to non-European and non-Christian states based on their acceptance of the elements of the culture and civilization of the medieval Christian society. In modern European international society membership was granted to “states who possess international personality” and who acted on behalf of international law (Wight 1978: 108). With respect to the idea of coexistence from the perspective of rules and institutions developed by the European international society and shared with non-Europeans classical theorists claim that in the nineteenth century the European international society was a
society that promoted peace, toleration and mutual respect on the one side and on the other side coerced the non-Europeans to subscribe to the “civilized” laws, practices and ideas. In retrospect, the framework of emergence and development of European international society illustrated by ES theorists reveals that European international society emerged in a sense of familiarity and cultural unity to consciously recognize and adapt its purpose according to natural context. From Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft perspectives, European international society reflects more elements of a Gemeinschaft type society. Little (2005:58) argues for example that Christianity helped set the basis for a common culture and a Gemeinschaft international society evidenced by common interests, institutions, rules and values. It is in Christendom where the first sense of cultural and human unity was provided; when the Christendom disintegrated European states found in Westphalia the triumph of a new kind of unity in the political recognition of the independent juridical equal states followed subsequently by the standard of civilization.

For Bull (1977) however, in the initial phase European international society fulfilled the pluralistic mission of “practical association” concerned with order, mutual recognition of sovereignty and non-interference that moved in a solidarist direction to take actions to prevent human rights violations. Conversely, for Wight (1977) and Watson (1992) European international society represents an evolution or progress of past international societies. It is a civilized force evolving from a basis of solidarist moral and religious culture which stressed the dignity of the individual to help preserve order between sovereign states. The cultural unity was a formative element for a society of states, in the Wightian sense, signifying a thick feature of moral community. Is there a more clearly illustrated distinction between Bull and Wight’s approaches of structure and process respectively? The context of this chapter reveals that structures are created in the process of conscious attempts to prevent conflict. As a premise for
the next chapter, the society idea reflected by the EU resembles the European international society in its engagement to promote peace, toleration and mutual respect first among the Europeans and thereafter at the global level. The exportation of distinctive diplomatic, political and legal norms continues to intensify at the periphery of Europe and countries manage to subscribe into the EU’s practices, rules and institutions as candidates. States claim equal political status within the Union however, the degree of understanding of the EU’s standards of values, rules and institutions, may prevent them in critical circumstances from being recognized as “equal.”

In contrast to the imperialistic character of European international society forcing non-Europeans into commercial and diplomatic practices against their will, European states gravitate willingly toward the EU for economic, political and security benefits. EU members differentiate from non EU members through various common interests, practices and adherence to common codes of conduct. The EU is anti-hegemonial in character and continues to restrict membership to the European continent. Coexistence inside the EU is based on compromise and persuasion, common interests and observance of rules, laws and common institutions. European elements of civilization (to protect life, liberty and property) associated with the European international society is present as well in the EU. The Westphalian institutions of coexistence: sovereignty and the principle of territorial integrity seem to take a secondary place to strategic partnerships, diplomacy, international law and human rights. How regional international societies are constructed and maintained is the subject to be examined in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE EUROPEAN UNION AS AN INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

The purpose of this chapter is to review the idea of regional international society and theorize how the European Union (EU) can be conceptualized as an international society using the ES perspective. The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section provides a theoretical overview of regional international society focusing on how the EU is theoretically portrayed as a regional international society while the second section identifies the empirical traits and characteristics that make the EU a regional international society.

REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The idea of regional international society remains understudied according to Buzan (2009), Diez & Whitman (2002) and Vigezzi (2005) who argue that the notion of international society is better studied at the global level and insufficiently conceptualized at the regional level thus ignoring not only the kinds of social structures formed at the regional level but the interplay between regional international society and global society. The neglect of studying the regional level of social structure is a reflection, in Buzan's (2009) view, of scholars’ fear of damaging the idea of international society at the global level (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 27-8). Buzan (2009) suggests that at the regional level there are quite a few regional international societies, some pluralist in character who hold onto the sovereignty principle, others solidarist who agree to share sovereignty and the establishment of justice, some serving the core of the global system centered on a single hegemonic state (US, UK) others serving as the periphery of the system.
One of the most interesting aspects reflecting regional international societies and pointed out by Buzan (2009) is that regional international societies are in competition with each other, “some with a quasi-imperial character such is the US and others who want to impose their values and institutions onto the rest of the world, as well as others that want to maintain their distinctiveness at the regional level, not trying to remake the global level in their own image” (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 34). Diez and Whitman (2002:8) argue however, that the prospects for regional international societies to challenge the global international society are limited “because they would eventually either crumble or take on the form of a state.” In contrast, Bull (1977) hypothesized that a regional international society has the potential to transform a region from a cluster of states into a super sovereign state that will function on shared sovereignty such as the case with the EU.

Among ES scholars preoccupied with regional international society are Ayoob (1999), Diez & Whitman (2002; 2010), Stivachtis (2002), Czaputowicz (2003) and Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez (2009). When searching for social structures at the regional level using the Middle East as a case study Buzan and Gonzalez-Pelaez (2009:43) showed how difficult is to identify them in a region using ES theoretical framework because at the regional level “there are precedents neither for how to define what constitute a regional international society nor for how to relate it to, and differentiate it from, international society at the global level.” Although a distinct theoretical framework at the regional level is a work in progress contemporary ES scholars claim to have in their repertoire a working definition of regional international society, two potential frameworks for comparison and a theoretical engagement with EU as a regional international society. For example, Ayoob (1999) and Diez & Whitman (2002) claim the region and regional international society definitions. Diez & Whitman (2002) and Buzan (2009) developed two theoretical models
for comparing regional international societies and Stivachtis (2002) made a theoretical contribution to the literature on international society by treating the EU as a regional international society with expansionary tendencies. Despite theoretical and empirical advances on regional international society to fill the existing gap in research it is necessary to show how the EU is a regional international society distinctive from European international society and global international society when governmental elites and their actions describe it; how are EU institutions distinguished from social structures of shared norms (sovereignty, rules and identities). Thomas Diez, Ian Manners and Richard G. Whitman (2010:6) argue that “every social order is characterized by norms and institutions.” How members of regional international society understand the norms and institutions or when norms and institutions matter in cooperation in regional international society will be identified in this study.

Diez (et al., 2010: 15) reflect on the EU as a regional international society focusing in particular on the changing nature of EU institutions in contrast to Bullian institutions of international society. They argue that European integration created new regional international societies which rest on global international society challenging to transform rather than preserve the global order. The authors contend that the label “multiperspectival society” should replace the term “regional international society” because European integration transformed the core of Bullian institutions (balance of power, international law, diplomacy, war and great powers) to the extent that the institutions have been modified or replaced. It is in the scope of this chapter to show first how the EU is theoretically conceptualized as a regional international society and what in particular gives meaning to “society” at the regional level. A “region” according to Ayoob (1999:249) can be delineated in terms of a distinctive area of geographical proximity, regularity and intensity between actors. A “region” defined by Diez and Whitman (2002:1) is a “cluster of
constitutive units” with economic and political purpose. When defining regional international society Ayoob (1999) argues that a regional system transforms into a regional society when elements of community of conscious recognition on the part of regional states with common interests are present. In Ayoob’s (1999:248) view, the concept of “society” at the regional level “must be informed by a consciousness of common interests and values, which is essential for the formulation of common rules and the creation of common institutions.” Diez and Whitman (2002:3) add that in a regional international society the societal component must be stronger and institutionalized and the sense of common identity must extend beyond the unit to the constitutive units of the regional international society.

It is important to note that Ayoob (1999: 248) defines regional international society analogous to Bull’s (1977) definition of international society underscoring that the construction of regional society presupposes that “states inhabiting a region by and large accept the rules of international society in their relationship with each other.” Using the idea of “community aspiration” developed by Hurrell (1995:65) Ayoob (1999: 249), underscores that in context of regional community states must exhibit, in addition to community like aspirations, a sense of “cognitive regionalism” understood in terms of a sense of […] “we-ness,” mutual sympathy, loyalty and shared identity.” Therefore, as suggested by Ayoob (1999) states in a regional “society” versus a “system” are differentiated by a minimum degree of shared regional identity, community like aspirations, implicit or explicit recognition of each other interdependence in realms of security and welfare, and a series of norms and mechanisms to mitigate and resolve conflicts. For studying regional international societies, Diez and Whitman (2002) developed a comparative framework based on five dimensions capable of providing the empirical basis for comparing regional international societies through: (1) the nature of the constitutive units, (2) the
nature of the relationships between constitutive units, (3) the degree of hierarchy, (4) the existence of a transnational society and (5) the degree of autonomy in relation to other regional international societies and the global international society. With respect to the nature of the constitutive units, Diez and Whitman (2002:5) suggest that in order to capture the nature of the unit it is important to question “whether there are any contenders to the territorial state and of which variations of statehood can be observed.”

Additionally, in regard to the nature of the relationships between the units the authors suggest that whether a regional international society is solidarist or pluralist matters to the extent that “in a solidarist international society, relationships between constitutive units are regulated by a broader scope of common values and norms” such as legitimizing human rights interventions while in a pluralist international society, relationships are resumed only to guaranteeing self-preservation, coexistence and order (Diez and Whitman 2002: 5). Another indication, in the authors’ view, of the degree of whether or not a regional international society is pluralist or solidarist in nature, is reflected in the character of norms that members of international society agree on.

“The degree of hierarchy” Diez and Whitman (2002:6) assert describes “a solidarist society that can exist without being hierarchical in an empire like structure” but in “a denser web of norms, rules and principles.” The authors call the EU a hierarchical supranational organization. With respect to the existence of a transnational international society the authors mention that there is no clear distinction between world and international society and the delimitation matters from at least two perspectives: (1) describing the interplay of their relationship and (2) distinguishing the articulation of norms, rules and principles of the individuals apart from constitutive units. With respect to the fifth dimension describing the
degree of regional international society’s autonomy in relation to other regional international societies and global international society, Diez and Whitman (2002) contend that this is dictated by the nature of regional society’s borders on whether they are clearly defined or fluid and flexible.

The general idea borrowed from sociology and advanced in the ES with respect to how regional societies might emerge and how they are maintained is that societies constitute the outcome of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft processes involving “bonds of common sentiments, experience and identity” in the former and “contractual functional model” in the latter. Within the ES the general conclusion reached today is that contemporary global international society is the product of the historical expansion of the European society of states claim based on Bull’s (1977: 36) demonstration that “in the twentieth century international society ceased to be regarded as specifically European and came to be considered global or worldwide,” corroborated by Gong (1984) who demonstrated that a truly global international society did not emerge until late in the nineteenth century. The vision of Buzan’s (1993) international society today at a global level is that the present day international society is a hybrid. In part it stems from the gemeinschaft international society that developed in modern Europe and imposed itself on most of the planet during its imperial heyday, and in part it reflects a gesellschaft process by which different cultures embedded in a system with high levels of interaction have learned to come to terms with each other (Buzan 1993: 349; emphases added).

Notably, in the emergence of global international society the cultural aspect necessary for functionality of international society as Wight (1977) previously claimed was absent as both Watson (1987) and Buzan (2009) contend, thus affecting not only how norms and institutions were shared and internalized at the global level but how rules of coexistence were developed. For instance Buzan (2009) argues that the expansion of European international society diluted the
European culture weakening in this sense the sense of identity among peoples of the EU which impeded the level of understanding and the rapid integration process in the EU. Nevertheless, an international society in Buzan’s (1993:334) view could evolve into a subsystem that shares or does not share a common culture enabling the global international society to resemble a model of functional international society representing a diversity of cultures.

Buzan (1993) argues that “International and world society may refer to the entire global system but also may refer to subsystemic phenomena (Europe, Islam, ancient Greece). It is therefore possible for more than one international or “world” society to coexist or for one part of the system to have an international society while other parts do not” (Buzan 1993: 337). Diez and Whitman (2002) for example claim that only in Europe do two regional international societies and one world society overlap thus raising the question of how international society relates to world society. Potential answers can be found in “parallel developments to universal values” but not necessarily, Buzan (1993:347) argues since “at the most basic level, the development of international society can proceed with no parallel evolution of world society.” A major distinction between international society and world society consists of the fact that international society is based on units at the level of states and on individuals at the level of world society (Buzan 1993: 338). Buzan (1993:339) also refers to Bull’s view that at the unit level international society rests on common norms, rules and identities among states and that world society rests on common norms, rules and identities among individuals. Evolutionary, from a certain level of development as Buzan (1993) underscores, the world and international society “can only develop hand in hand.”

An international society cannot develop past a fairly primitive level without being supported by the development of elements of “world” culture at the mass level, and this is true on both the subsystem and global scales. Conversely, a world society cannot emerge unless it is supported by a stable political framework, and the state system remains the only candidate for this (Buzan 1993: 340).
It is important to note that the Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft distinction is relevant in distinguishing the world from the regional international society although a regional international society as Buzan (1993) advises can have both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft elements meaning that it can vary in density of bonds, norms, rules and common interests from “thick” to “thin.” Furthermore, as Buzan (1993) acknowledged, in the first phase of development, international society favors states first requiring some minimal elements of common culture among governing elites and then favors a degree of order meaning that “political order and the balance of power become explicit foreign policy goals” for members of international society.

Moreover, Buzan’s (1993:349) framework underscores “the bottom line of the globalized international society is the mutual recognition by nearly all states of each other as legally equal sovereign entities; as by that criterion only a tiny number of states are now visible outside international society.” In Buzan’s (1993:349) view, the global international society is multicultural in character has both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft origins, a highly developed European core, and a variety and intensity of rules, norms and institutions.

Regarding the degree of commitment with which states adhere to the global international society and the overall cohesion of the global society, in Buzan’s (1993:349) view, can be imagined in terms of concentric circles. At the core would be the main generator and supporter for the global network of regimes followed by states that seek to preserve high levels of independence by accepting and rejecting norms, rules and institutions according to their interests; China and India are two interesting examples, and lastly at the outer fringes of international society would be states that accept little more than the basics of diplomatic recognition and exchange such as North Korea and Myanmar. Regional international societies,
according to Buzan (2009), range along a spectrum from pluralist to solidarist tendencies with primary and secondary institutions. Theoretical framework developed by Buzan (2009) identifies types of regional international societies functioning on four different logics, political power, coexistence, cooperative and convergence.

The first type of regional international society is based on enmity and states survival considering war as a possibility for survival; this society does not necessarily prioritize the sharing of values. The “coexistence” type presupposes a regional international society with pluralistic features of coexistence using the post Westphalian institutions of sovereignty, the balance of power, territoriality, diplomacy, great power management, war and international law as benchmarks of order. The “cooperative” type describes a regional international society that develops mechanisms for sharing values and pursuits of joint gains and lastly the “convergent” type exhibits a liberal solidarist regional international society in which states adopt political, legal and economic views based on similar values with respect to property rights, human rights and the relationship between government and citizens (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 38).

Buzan (1993) contends that international society provides the foundation for global society and world society assures the functionality and development of global society. Stivachtis (1998:89) argues that contemporary global international society includes a number of unevenly developed regional international societies; the EU being one of them, an international society that incorporates Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft elements and member states with similar culture, customs and religion, if the candidacy of Turkey is considered. Additionally, Stivachtis (1998) suggests that global international society can be distinguished from regional international society in geographic scope and the acknowledgement of state membership.
THE EU PORTRAYED AS A REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

Theoretically, contemporary ES scholars portray the EU as a regional international society intermeshed with European international society and global society. One of the major theoretical contributions to the EU as a regional international society is made by Stivachtis (2002) who argues that the EU is both a system and a society with a relatively homogenous culture encompassing rules and institutions distinct from other European states that have no membership status (Hensel 2002: 66). According to Stivachtis (2002), the EU emerged and enlarged as a regional international society in the absence of a common culture and as a result of the conditions of anarchy pressuring the international system.

Culture, as Stivachtis (2002) suggests, served as a mechanism of integration in international society not as a force of membership connection. In Stivachtis’s (2002) view, the EU is a product of conditions of anarchy in which states gravitated to advance their national interests and pursue economic and political survival. “Membership was determined by the logic of anarchy” and the desire of “the EU to create a greater economy of scale and increase its weight in world politics” (Hensel 2002: 69). In the case of European international society, Stivachtis (2002) argues that culture helped smooth the process of socialization and integration while in the case of the EU, culture helped differentiate among prospective states for membership. Turkey is a case in point whose membership continues to be undecided from fear of subduing the European culture, customs and beliefs to the Asian culture of Islam. Nevertheless, the case of Turkey may no longer be one that differentiates among prospective states as many EU members appear to understand that in order to mitigate the challenges of globalization unity in diversity is more important than disunity. Regarding the EU conceptualization as a regional international society, Stivachtis (2002) used the system/society distinction to illustrate how
European states are held together by strategic economic interests within a system and how they form a society of states based on common values. Stivachtis (2002) underscores that the EU resembles an international system, as Bull (1977) suggested, when “EU members have sufficient contact between them, and have sufficient impact on one another’s decisions, to cause them to behave as parts of a whole” and a regional international society when members of the Union show “commitment to the liberal form of government and market economy and acceptance of sharing common cultural origins of European civilization” (Hensel 2002: 64-5). Furthermore, he argues that the EU is a clear illustration of “how an international society is always an international system (since sufficient contact and impact are necessary for a society to exist) but not vice versa” (Hensel 2002: 64).

In Stivachtis’ (2002) view, the EU is a regional international society fitting the Gesellschaft mode of society that is not based on common values or culture but rather on coexistence “the Gesellschaft mode of international society would allow one to consider the EU as a regional international society that tends to expand itself outwards (enlargement) even if it has to include states, which have divergent cultures, such as Turkey” (Hensel 2002: 65). Diez and Whitman (2002) argue that the EU international society constitutes the core of European international society that originated in the seventeenth century and that the EU and the European international society are considered regional international societies intermeshed with the global international society. Additionally, Diez and Whitman (2002:9) assert that these societies are interdependent and do not have clear borders or individual standards for membership which makes their distinction difficult. “Membership of EU international society should be distinguished from formal membership of the EU” suggesting that membership in EU international society is reflected by states self-identification with EU’s common interests and
values as well as by their acceptance of EU’s rules and institutions. To distinguish between the EU as an international organization and the EU as an international society, Diez and Whitman (2002:9) argue that membership is not a sufficient criterion for distinction but rather what distinguishes it is the state’s “degree of self-identification and the acceptance of being bound by the rules and norms of the respective international society.” A potential distinction offered between the EU as an international society and European international society are norms, rules and institutions which according to the authors are deeper and more institutionalized in the former than they are in the latter.

The EU reflects, according to Buzan (2009), a regional society with thicker elements of society developed through cultural, economic and political cooperation. In Buzan’s (2009) view, the EU can also be considered a model of a solidarist international society embedded in the global international society with a relatively high degree of shared norms, rules and institutions between states, where the focus is not only about ordering coexistence and competition but also about cooperation in pursuit of joint gains and realization of shared values.

The interplay between regional and global social structures according to the ES is that regional international society is tempted to engage in competition with other regional societies for “global status;” exhibit pluralism by “seeking rules of coexistence with each other at the global level;” maintain cultural and political difference without aims to expand to the global level and “automatically be in rivalry for global status” (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 33). Buzan (2009) argues that “there is a substantial degree of compatibility between the societal developments at the regional level and those at the global level” (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 33). Regional societies agree on sharing of global level institutions of sovereignty, territoriality, diplomacy and great power management. With respect to the original core of the
EU, the European Economic Community, Bull’s (1977) assessment was that members of the community through integration relaxed their sovereignty with the beneficial effect of economic gain. Bull (1977:255) hypothesized that by voluntarily submerging their sovereignty European states had the potential to transform the European region through integration into a single European federal state “leaving the institution of the sovereign state precisely where it was before.” A new federal state in Bull’s (1977) view could continue to exist only if the idea of sovereignty was prioritized over that of a nation state because nation states are prone to conflict and disintegration based on their reminiscent histories. Furthermore, Bull (1977:256) argued that “a state which is not a nation state can be expected to abstain from ‘power politics’ or engage it as an end and not merely as a means.”

In context of European integration, Bull (1977) argued that it is more interesting to observe not the end product of the process that probably will produce “a European super state which is simply a nation state writ large” but the process itself capturing stages in which the locus of sovereignty changes from the national government to the organs of the “community,” the tendencies and the capacity of a state to secede from the community, the human loyalties and the time when sovereignty is recognized to be irrelevant. Bull’s (1977) anticipated the emergence of a new medievalism and the creation of a United States of Europe.

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

The EU is a community of states reaction to post-World War II developments. The European model unites in the spirit of community, decentralized unitary states, centralized unitary states and federal states. In many respects it is the European compromise financed by the United States during and post-Cold War in the name of freedom, rule of law and integration. Although
considered an experiment in progress, scholars and policymakers alike claim that the EU functions like a single state bound by common interests, values and institutions (Bull 1977; Stivachtis 2002; Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009; Barroso 2010; D’Anieri 2010).

Using the latest financial crises as examples one can be compelled to argue for example that the EU coexists as an international society based on a core-periphery structure with Germany and France serving the core and the newest EU members as the periphery. Interestingly as Bull (1977) predicted and others signaled, the prospects for the EU to function as the “United States of Europe” are limited in the context in which European people have such a strong sense of nationalism and national identity (Bull 1977: 255; D’Anieri 2010: 352). In contrast to the US, attachment to nationalism can further impede integration, enlargement and progress. In many respects, the EU models the structure of a state with a joint military force, a distinct foreign policy, a “state of the union message” and a President doing live interviews on YouTube as in the case of the United States.⁴

The effort to create a single European identity first began with the initiation and consolidation of an economic structure hoping that political and social integration would follow. The first step toward cooperation was sealed in 1949 with the creation of the Council of Europe. The EU originated in the European Coal and Steel Community (ESCS) formed in 1951 to coordinate the national markets for coal and steel in Europe. Under the guidance of Robert Schumann of Germany and Jean Monnet of France, the visionaries, or the founding fathers of the ESCS signed on 25 March 1957 the Treaty of Rome attesting the desire of Western Europe [Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg] to integrate their respective

---

industries of coal and steel into a common management system. The aim of the community was to create a “common market” in which people and goods could move across border with no restrictions. The union effect of “a peaceful Europe” emerged with the first mechanism of coexistence based on economic cooperation (1945-1959) and continued to strengthen with the creation in the 1960s of a common agricultural policy, plans to enlarge and create a single currency (1970s), establish a “Single Market” (1980s), evolving into a “Europe without frontiers” (1990s) and consolidating into a single political entity with a single foreign policy propagated with a “Single Voice” in the 2000s. Chronologically, the evolution of the EU superstate is the manifestation of changes in power in the international system unfolding in the past six decades.

Whereas the first and the second phase of the EU are marked by coexistence based on economic integration when EEC members “stop charging custom duties when trading with each other and agree on joint control over food production, so that everybody had enough to eat,” the third and fourth phase strengthened economic and political power by adding new members and agreeing to joint decision making in areas related to economy and fiscal policy. The third phase of EU development 1970-1979 is marked by the first enlargement of the Union when Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom joined the EU on 1 January 1973, raising the number of EU members from six to nine, as well as by the first plan to create a single currency when EU members decided to allow their currencies to fluctuate against each other. It is noteworthy to mention that the EU evolved and enlarged in context of prominent changes in the international system, the riots of the French students in Paris against nuclearization, the Arab-Israeli war of October 1973, the overthrowing of the Salazar regime in Portugal in 1974, the death of General

Franco of Spain in 1975, and the acts of terrorism against the Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympic Games in 1972 to name a few. The fourth phase of EU development, 1980-1989 was marked by the fall of the Berlin Wall, the incorporation of Greece in 1981, Spain and Portugal in 1986 bringing membership at the end of the Cold War to 12 and the creation of a “Single Market” attested by the Single European Act of 1987. The fifth phase in EU development, 1990-1999 continued the program of “Europe without frontiers” by strengthening the European community with the reunification and joining of East Germany to the EU in 1990, the gaining of three members, Austria, Finland and Sweden bringing the EU total at the end of 1999 to 15 members, thus completing the inclusion of the entire Western Europe into the EU.

The fifth phase begins the period of consolidation of the EU by signing on 7 February 1992 the Treaty on European Union in Maastricht officially replacing the “European Community” with the name of European Union. The treaty established clear rules for EU currency, foreign and security policy and closer cooperation in justice and home affairs. In 1999 the Treaty of Amsterdam was signed laying down plans to reform EU institutions and create a “single voice” for the EU in the world. The fifth period also reflects the beginning of the process of membership negotiation with ten countries from Central and Eastern Europe: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia as well as the inclusion of two Mediterranean islands, Cyprus and Malta.

In context of the ES, the fifth period reflects the development of conscious common interest of the EU to transform post-authoritarian societies by mentoring and integrating them into the Union in a context in which in the Balkans the Yugoslavian state began to disintegrate in 1991 and the fighting of a bloody civil war erupted in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina when Serbs, Croats and Muslims demanded territorial autonomy. In lieu of these structural
transformations Stivachtis (2002) claimed the EU to be a product of the anarchy of the post-Cold War order in which EU members engaged in strengthening their community to manage conflictual change by highly institutionalizing their system of decision-making. The end of the Cold War also marked the enlargement of the security definition to include in addition to military defense notions of environmental hazard, migration flows, financial crisis and democratic change (Cini & Perez-Solórzano Borragan 2010: 2).

In the unfolding of the fifth phase the appropriation of the Western with the Eastern European culture, religion, customs and beliefs caught contour. Through the Schengen Agreement signed on 25 March 1995 the population of Belgium, Germany, Spain, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Portugal began traveling without borders by eliminating control passports at their frontiers. On 1 January 1999 the first symbol of EU’s identity, the Euro was introduced in 11 countries, Belgium, Germany, Greece, Spain, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, and Finland. The solidarity of adhering to the euro as a common currency was not complete as Denmark, Sweden, and the United Kingdom decided however, to stay out for the time being and preserve their monetary sovereignty. “United in diversity” became the EU motto signifying therefore, how Europeans came together to form a common front to work for peace and prosperity in the context in which they blended many cultures, traditions and languages.

The sixth phase in EU development from 2000 to today is marked by the integration of ten new member states in the EU, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia, and Slovakia on 1 May 2004 and Bulgaria, Romania on 1 January 2007. This decade is also influenced by the fight against international terror, international financial crisis and significant economic stagnation in the core of the international system. Among the
important developments afferent to the period of EU consolidation is the involvement of the EU as a civilian actor on 31 March 2003 in a peacekeeping operation in the Balkans as part of its foreign and security policy, the end of the division of Europe decided by the Great Powers 60 years earlier at Yalta, the establishment of a European Constitution, the creation of a European Union Foreign Minister, and the signing of the Treaty of Lisbon on 13 December 2007 by the 27 EU members signifying the EU political and legislative structure of operation. As a civilian actor the EU participated in both, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and in Bosnia-Herzegovina where it replaced NATO led operations with civilian peacekeeping actions working toward creating “an area of freedom, security and justice” for the population in the affected area. The Treaty of Lisbon was designed to overcome the crisis created by the EU Constitutional Treaty when not only enlargement but the clause of sovereignty was rejected to strengthen the EU in areas of democracy, transparency and efficiency.

Particularly, the Treaty of Lisbon aimed to improve decision-making structures by assigning voting weights to new members. It is important to mention that the Treaty of Lisbon constitutes a statement of conscious recognition of the EU with respect to formulation of common rules and the creation of common institutions. The Lisbon Treaty was enacted two years after the French and Dutch publics rejected, in a 2005 referenda, the EU Constitutional Treaty of 2004 based on the assumption that the Constitutional Treaty was a product of self-selecting anti-democratic EU elites eclectically chosen by the French President and Ministry of Foreign Affairs Valery Giscard d’Estaing “seeking to replace national and popular sovereignty by a centralized, and probably neo-liberal superstate” (Cini & Perez-Solórzano Borragan 2010: 49). The “period of reflection” following the Dutch and French rejection of the Constitutional Treaty.
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Treaty, designed to replace all the existing treaties and become the official document of the Union, was proceeded by a flood of constructive ideas of refinement and actions which emerged from Nicholas Sarkozy, Angela Merkel as well as others who intended to give the EU in 2007 a new road map for action. The German plan won the confidence of the European people to amend the Constitutional Treaty with the Treaty of Lisbon describing in seven articles how the EU should function. The Lisbon Treaty set the basis for EU governance replacing the European Community with the “Union,” providing new directions for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and underscoring that “the EU is a body based on powers conferred by the member states, enshrined in the treaties and subject to subsidiary and proportionality; and members states have rights of action, consultation, recognition, support and now secession” from the Union (Cini & Perez-Solórzano Borragan 2010: 58; emphasis added).

THE EU-A CONTEMPORARY MODEL OF REGIONAL PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The main argument of this chapter is that the EU constitutes a regional international society with specific regional social structures and constitutively created functional institutions. In context of the ES, the EU is an excellent choice to explore the evolution of regional international society and the interplay between regional international society and global society because it shows how the EU is created by inside forces, states and their actions, and how, since the 1950s, the EU evolved to become a global power being “the world’s biggest trader,” “the biggest provider of aid to developing countries” and has “taken the international lead in tackling the issue of global warming and climate change” (European Commission 2007: 25). In context of EU evolution one can understand the fluidity of international society to take many forms. For European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso the EU constitutes “a new Europe,” “a construction
of 27 national solutions” that draws strength from the union of “speaking with one voice.” In
Barroso’s view, the EU is a special construction of mankind but it is not an international
organization like NATO, OSCE, or the Council of Europe. It is an organization that can be
compared with the structures of an empire stressing the exception that member states gravitate
willingly and freely toward “this empire” and are not integrated into the Union by force.

Moreover, according to Barroso, the EU is a conscious European reflection and
recognition willingly created by Europeans to deal with issues stemming from globalization. The
National level, Barroso contends, is no longer able to deal with climate change or energy security
yet one can approach these issues only with specific degrees of solidarity at the level of
community. The EU represents the integration of states national interests, the EU is a “solution
united” as an Italian representative once said. When faced with the question about the EU as a
“super state” some seem to embrace it and argue that this is the future international order
(Fischer 2009). Barroso however, argues that the EU is not and will not become a super state
with capacities to dilute national identities because it is the Union’s strengths of diversity and
differences that give the EU unequalled attributes but, if one insists, the EU can be imagined in
terms of an empire.8

Sometimes I like to compare the European Union as a creation to the organization of empires... 
empires... and eh... because we have the dimension of empires. But there is a great difference...
The empires were usually made through force, with a center that was imposing a dictate, a will, on
the others. And now, we have what some authors call a non-imperial empire, we have by
dimension 27 countries that decided to work together and share their sovereignty (Barroso 2007:
‘European Union is Empire’; emphasis added).

7 EUX.tv, 7 September 2010. ‘Barroso: Europe’s Moment of Truth is Now-State of the Union’ Excerpts’. Available
Accessed on July 8, 2011].
8 EUX.tv, July 10, 2007. ‘Barroso: Europe Union is Empire’ Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=--
I8M1T-GgRU. [Last Day Accessed on July 8, 2011].
The EU is a society of states compared by those with extreme views with “an old Soviet model,” or with the destruction of the nation-states or an institutional creation in which free countries are united in pursuing common values, interests and cooperation. On the surface the EU appears to emulate the United States of America with the exception that the Union misses the sentimental attachment mentality of a single nation. The total population of 27 countries in the EU surpasses that of the US by 200 million people who are inclined to identify first with their nation state and then with the EU. This is problematic, in my view, for the future progress of the Union as a “union.”

The German former Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer for example, cautioned that as the EU says farewell to the welfare state, millions of losers will be created in the process that can be easily exploited to buy into the nationalist argument and prevent further integration (Fischer 2009). Nevertheless, despite the recent economic and financial struggles the EU is a “great regional success story” illustrating a model of a diplomatic community that coexists peacefully and has a duty for legal order in the region, Europe and the world in context in which Europe is the continent where two World Wars unfolded.

The EU appears to constitute a society of states united by a single will, commitment to freedom and democracy; it is an international society committed to international law, order and support for common policies or, in the face of globalization, the EU is a society of states that “can decide to swim together or sink separately” to paraphrase Barroso. In particular, the EU is defined as a regional international society by the model of peaceful coexistence built on member states common understandings and beliefs to form a society of states in which common goals and values are exchanged to mitigate the winds of globalization. In the EU, membership is satisfied by economic and political conditions including the stability of institutions guaranteeing
democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for minorities. As a regional international society the EU shows parallels with the standard of civilization developed by the European international society only in context of the EU fulfilling the acquis required satisfying economic and political conditions of market economy in addition to democracy, rule of law, human rights, and protection for minorities. These elements underscore the economic and political character of the EU as well as the EU’s nature and identity difference striving toward the formation of the United States of Europe.

Among other contrasts to the European international society, is that the EU is based on common symbols, the European flag, the European anthem, European Day contributing to increased coherence and integration, the idea of a single economic market, functionality of the three pillars, the existence of a European Monetary Union, the rotating Presidency, and the genuine desire of Eastern European people to join the EU. The recognition and acceptance of all the symbols reflects the character of the EU as a society of states built on the sense of security that people of member states perceive to have in the EU.

Based on his role, experience as Foreign Minister and interpretation of European history, Fischer identifies in the EU at least three types of Europeans. The “pragmatic Europeans” formed by the Scandinavian, Sweden, the British, and the Danish group who had a successful national history and are now reluctant to share with Brussels their sovereignty since they did not encounter problems with democracy and peace as did the other parts of Europe. The “freedom Europeans” formed by Ireland and the Mediterranean countries whose meaning of the EU is translated into freedom to end poverty and participate in the economic process and protection of the rule of law and the “Eastern Europeans” who experienced Soviet oppression, communist regimes and isolation from the rest of the world (Fischer 2009). In the ES sense the EU is a
collection of states bound by common rules brought together by the conditions of anarchy. As a society of states, in its preliminary phase of existence the EU emerged from the logic of common integration culture from the Community of six members evolving to incorporate 27 members into decision-making. As Stivachtis (2002) underscored the ‘EU’s enlargement’ can be analogously described with the ‘expansion’ process of European international society in the context in which non-European states had to adopt the rules and institutions imposed by European states and the non EU member states had to modify their rules and institutions to fit the standard of EU membership.

The only difference between practices of European international society and the EU is the absence of physical coercion and the willingness of European states to subject themselves and share their sovereignty. Another similarity shared with the European international society is the enlargement process of the EU, only at this time candidates for membership were European rather than non-European states and the expansion occurred in the name of preserving peace, European common identity, culture and security for all rather than sharing the value of Christianity and the European standard of civilization. It is in the sense of the treaties of Rome and Lisbon as well as in terms of the European Commission, the Council of the EU, the European Parliament, EU symbols-flag, anthem, Europe day and a common currency that the EU can be identified as a single coherent entity distinguished from the European international society by unity and cooperation rather than by competition.

Currently the EU incorporates 27 members with five additional countries awaiting membership and another 17 European countries including Russia and Switzerland who remain undecided for EU integration. In context of EU enlargement it is important to mention that Russia dreams of creating its own union. In October 2011, Russian Prime Minister Putin outlined
one of his ambitious goals in future foreign policy in a Russian newspaper aiming at integrating ex-Soviet states in the creation of a “Eurasian Union” that would include Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan.⁹ Leaving aside the imperialist sentiment and the fact that other former Soviet states may be inclined to join Putin’s union, the Prime Minister plan to begin the Eurasian Union with a unified economic space modeled on the EU that will unite approximately 200 million people and will counterbalance the EU at the global level. This is an indication that regional international societies can be replicated on the global international society. At the present time the EU exists in harmony with global international society and European international society, but as Buzan (2009) noted and as the ES classics feared, regional international societies may be inclined to engage in competition and conflict with each other over who is going to dominate the global level (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 242).

The ES advises that each international society emerges on a unique system of values and cultural distinctiveness. For example the EU actively promotes human rights and democracy acting as a soft power to replace artificial divisions and bring stability in the regions of ongoing conflict. In terms of population the EU is the third largest population in the world after China and India and the largest trading partner to the US after China and Russia. Buzan (2009) suggests that in order to differentiate the character of a regional international society “one should look at the regional society and its neighbors to capture in their relationship the distinctiveness of regional society as well as the ways to sustain the existing social structure” (Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez 2009: 241). From the perspective of relationships, states in the EU are bound together in a regional security complex defined by economics, finance and common defense and politics of common solidarity. EU members develop with each other “solidarity policies” or cohesion
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policies in regional, agricultural and social affairs tilted toward the “EU’s collective wealth.” The EU’s relationship with European international society states, Japan for example, is based on a Free Trade Agreement facilitating cooperation to strengthen Europe’s industry and promote transition to a green economy. According to Suzuki (2005:138), Japan entered the European international society in 1853, when the United States forced Japan to open its ports to the West, and chose to socialize with European states by adhering to international law and engaging in European style politics.

While in European society, Suzuki (2005) notes that Japan modeled the imperialist behavior of European states and engaged in pursuing coercive policies toward its Asian neighbors on the logic of spreading ‘civilization’ to the ‘uncivilized’ states. Suzuki (2004:118) also claims that the entry of China into the international society occurred during The Opium Wars in the early nineteenth century (1830s) when British merchants forced China to open its markets for the British produced opium in India. Both China and Japan are members of the enlarged European international society and global international society but it is important, as Suzuki (2004; 2005) contends, to be aware of the kinds of norms, rules and structures states are socialized in international society because they are an expression of future behavior. In his view, “Japan’s reason for embarking on the road to imperialism in the nineteenth century was a result of its attempt to emulate the nineteenth century great powers” while “China’s realpolitik behavior may be a latent expression of its socialization into nineteenth century international society” (Suzuki 2004: 118). In retrospect to the EU, with Libya for example, a member of the
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global international society, the EU tries to socialize members of global society through constructive engagement and economic incentives. The EU Commission negotiated in 2008 with Libya, a framework for collaboration in “strengthening political, social, economic, commercial and cultural relations between both parties.” Benita Ferrero-Waldner the European Commissioner for External Relations and Neighborhood Policies declared “This is a historic decision. Libya is an important player in the Mediterranean region and Africa, and so far has no framework for relations with the EU. The launching of negotiations for a new agreement is the successful result of the reciprocal dialogue and engagement started in 2004. I am confident that the agreement will create solid and long lasting relations between Libya and the EU.”

EU’s relationship with Libya resulted after ten rounds of negotiations in a program of financial and technical assistance under the European Neighborhood Policy Instrument which lasted until February 2011 when the program was suspended. The EU continues cooperation with Libya on migrations and HIV-AIDS. The relationship with states inside and outside of the Union is what makes the EU distinctive as a regional international society. In a report given by Catherine Ashton after returning from the Middle East to EU Foreign Ministers for endorsing the approaches proposed to be taken, she emphasized that “Europe should be judged by its capacity to support its neighborhood.” In her remarks she outlined the opportunity of the EU to build peace in Somalia and help develop the economy as the best strategy to deal with issues of piracy; continue to build police forces in Afghanistan; support Russia’s accession into the World Trade Organization as well as acquire the capability to “engage with Russia on the international
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scene.” 13 ES members also suggested that there are many types of international society that can be distinguished from each other through the element of consciousness. Bull (1966) for instance, argued that a solidarist international society is distinguished from a pluralist international society by the sense of solidarity in observing common values and purposes. When observed from a system level the EU appears to reflect a social structure based on core and periphery. However, the solidarist characteristics of “working together” taken by the EU weaken, in a sense, the institution of sovereignty and non-intervention for the benefit of the whole. “To save a member of society costs less than to collapse the entire union,” seems to be the solidarist characteristic generated by the 2011 euro crisis.

Euro skeptics probably expected the euro to collapse ignoring the fact that the euro is the second global currency after the US dollar, is part of the EU identity and replaced, among other things, the traditional currencies of three great powers, the French franc, the Italian lira and the German mark. In many respects what the euro crisis accomplished was to strengthen the union of the EU and shape the Union euro policy by requiring euro states to agree on a single monetary policy. It is probably no coincidence that the European Central Bank analogous to the US Federal Reserve is based in Frankfurt, Germany.

Conversely the argument that the euro crisis fragmented the Union into two tier memberships can also be made. From the sovereignty perspective, by adopting the euro as their currency the 17 members of the Eurozone agreed to cede their right to have an independent monetary policy and obliged to respect the common rules and agreements of the Euro-system. Maintaining solidarity across different cultures, languages and ethnicities is difficult as many

European scholars and policy makers attest however, returning to earlier conflicts and the
division of the continent does not constitute progress. “Why is unity so important to Europe?” a
CNN reporter asked a Cambridge Professor of international relations John Loughlin during the
euro crisis.\textsuperscript{14} The answer according to the professor “lies in the European history of long running
conflicts that pitted neighboring countries against each other and in the ‘natural unity’ of
Europeans shared by common identity and culture.”\textsuperscript{15} The idea of a united Europe goes back
centuries according to the professor and was broadly described by the French novelist and
activist Victor Hugo who saw it materialized in the “United States of Europe” and predicted in
the nineteenth century that

\begin{center}
\textbf{a day will come when the United States of America and the United States of Europe would stretch}
\textbf{out their hands across the sea… and join together to reap the well-being of all…there will be no}
\textbf{battlefields but markets opening to commerce and minds opening to ideas. A day will come when}
\textbf{the bullets and bombs are replaced by votes}.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{center}

That day has arrived many EU statesmen argue, including Fischer who suggests that Europe will
lose without the United States but by joining common interests and forces they both can
transform the world in a sustainable way (Fischer 2009). The unity test challenged by the global
financial crisis was passed with German wisdom and efficiency as well as with France’s
incredulous optimism who confirmed the strength of the union’s core argument, solidarity. In a
speech given to Christian Democrats, Angela Merkel cautioned about the gravity of the
Eurozone crisis as “if the euro fails then Europe will fail.”\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Today Europe is in one of its toughest hours; maybe the toughest hour since the Second World}
\textbf{War. It must be clear to us that we must not be discouraged by that. In 2008 we managed to}
\textbf{overcome the financial crisis with the motto that Germany would come out stronger. Now we}
\textbf{must succeed in getting Europe out of this crisis stronger than when it entered it. The euro is far}
\textbf{more than just a currency. It is the symbol of European unification and it has become the symbol}
\textbf{for half a century of peace, freedom and prosperity. It is everything but self-evident when we look}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{14} CNN, November 4, 2011. Bryony Jones: ‘Why is unity so important to Europe?’.
\textsuperscript{15} CNN, November 4, 2011. Bryony Jones: ‘Why is unity so important to Europe?’.
\textsuperscript{16} CNN, November 4, 2011. Bryony Jones: ‘Why is unity so important to Europe?’.
\textsuperscript{17} The Guardian, 14 November 2011. ‘Eurozone Crisis: Merkel says Europe faces the toughest hour since WWII’.
at developments elsewhere. That’s why I’m saying over and over again if the euro fails; Europe will fail...that’s what we’re working for because it’s a project of such historic proportions. This means that we need to further develop the European Union’s structure. This does not mean less Europe. It means more Europe. It means building Europe in a way to allow the euro to have a future. We want automatic sanction mechanisms. The possibility for effective measures if someone infringes the stability and growth pact; there must be the right to go to the European Court against such countries. It cannot be that treaty violations remain irrelevant. We must change the weaknesses of the Lisbon Treaty towards a true, common responsibility (Angela Merkel, November 14, 2011; emphases added).

In stabilizing the euro project the German Chancellor went as far as to agree to cede some fiscal national sovereignty to the EU to achieve closer economic and political ties. In contrast, David Cameron of Britain has taken a hard euro skeptic line clashing with Germany’s call over more political union in Europe. While the German Chancellor argued for a “closer political union” and tighter budget rules, the UK Prime Minister argued that “we should look skeptically at grand plans and utopian visions; we have a right to ask what the European Union should and shouldn’t do.”

In context of the ES, the clash between the UK and German visions is a classic illustration of Bull’s assertion that “thinking in terms of society does not imply that relations among states are necessarily peaceful, stable and harmonious.” However, in my view, how EU elites and statesmen members understand the purpose of the EU contributes to the future stability of the Union. The euro crisis, as Nicholas Sarkozy argued in January 2011 at the World Economic Forum in Davos, is important, in fact it “is so important that Europe will use all means to defend it.”

[...] Mrs. Merkel and I will never, never allow the euro to fail, the euro is Europe [...] those who want to bet against the euro, I say: ‘careful, we are determined to defend the euro [...] Germany and France have known three barbaric wars. Now Europe is the most stable in the world” (Sarkozy Key Note Speech, Davos 2011; emphasis added).
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19 The Sydney Morning Herald, November 16, 2011. Penny, T.: ‘Germany, Britain clash over EU’s future’.

20 The Sydney Morning Herald, November 16, 2011. Penny, T.: ‘Germany, Britain clash over EU’s future’.

It is noteworthy to mention in context of the euro crisis that the decisive element that glues the EU together at the same time divides it. Protecting the monetary symbol led EU members toward sharing more sovereignty and establishing a closer economic union, a new structure of economic governance including budgetary and tax policies, but it is important to be noted that the effort was accomplished without the consent of EU citizens. The decision of a referendum by the Greek Prime Minister to confirm the wish of the Greek population to remain in the Eurozone produced greater anxiety in Brussels capitals prompting Merkel and Sarkozy to appeal that “a political consensus be reached…we are ready to help Greece because solidarity is the cornerstone of the European construction, as is also the principle of loyalty but that implies that Greece from its part, must meet its commitments.”

“Everyone” in this context refers to the elites involved in the Eurozone.

Surprised that after 17 countries decided, unanimously in Brussels, for Greece to follow a course of action the Greek Prime Minister decided on a referendum, Sarkozy underscored that “giving a voice to the people is always legitimate but solidarity within the Eurozone countries can only resist if everyone agrees on the necessary efforts.” Since its emergence, the scope of the EU’s unity was to “speak with one voice” and prevent war through a political and economic union. In the midst of the euro crisis there are speculations that the core-periphery structure of the EU will become more visible disclosing the uneven access to decision-making. In a speech given to the University of Strasbourg on November 8, 2011 the French President emphasized that the EU can be transformed into a “two speed Europe,” with a “federal” core formed by the 17 euro members who will make economic decisions and a “confederal” layer of the 10 non-euro
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22 Nicholas Sarkozy and Angela Merkel on ‘Greek Referendum Proposal’. Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F155odTukXs [Last Accessed on November 23, 2011].

23 Sarkozy Nicholas. ‘Europe Surprised by Greek Decision’. Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U3b1vVPf5I [Last Accessed on November 23, 2011].
members who will help the EU remain important and competitive at the global level.\textsuperscript{24} Both Sarkozy and Merkel speak about the creation of a new EU more integrated but with flexible rules to adapt to new challenges.\textsuperscript{25} This however, implicates more sharing of sovereignty, political will and less state legitimacy. Based on the current EU developments it is clear, as Gerhard Schröder suggested, for the German \textit{Spiegel} that the EU lacks the “union of a political concept” and as a supporter of the federal EU with two speeding gears, Schröder underscored that both Poland and the UK will be entitled to become part of the EU core or the decision-making process when they agree to become members of the Eurozone.\textsuperscript{26} In an interview with Fareed Zakaria, the Greek Prime Minister George Papandreou underscored in context of the Eurozone crisis that

Well, I think we’re at a crossroads – and it is really the decision, the political will that is necessary to decide on whether we will move forward to a deeper union and, therefore, not only to protect the Eurozone but protect, I would say, everything we have accomplished in Europe which is peace and greater prosperity; very different cultures, languages and people living together in cooperation. We are a model of a global society which is based on democracy, human rights and these are huge accomplishments and very important, I think, now with what’s going on around our neighborhood with the Arab Spring with our neighbors to the east, also we are a model for others. We will lose this if we are not going to move into a deeper union. The crossroads is that if we do not have that political will than we will be seeing maybe a slow or a quick break up of the Eurozone (\textit{GPS}, 23 December 2011).\textsuperscript{27}

The EU in the words of the Greek Prime Minister, the German and French leaders appear to be an international society in which strong political will and trust matter for maintaining the status quo of the union. Experiencing the sharing of the institution of sovereignty in the Eurozone in times of crisis is one the best illustrations describing the idea of “society” at the regional level. What is shared? the norm of sovereignty and solidarity to peace and common union. Although the Greek Prime Minister left Brussels with a pre-established plan he acted on his interpretation

\begin{flushright}

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{The Economist}, November 10, 2011.‘The Future of the EU: Two Speed Europe, or two Europes?’.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Free Romania}, September 6, 2011. ‘Gerhard Schröder: Europe needs to wake up’ by Dobreanu C.

\end{flushright}
of sovereignty when he decided to go for a referendum at home which begs the question of whether or not EU statesmen may have different interpretations on norms and practices associated with the EU and its institutions. The story told by the EU is that it has a thicker solidarist core and a thinner varied periphery that lack sufficient experience of socialization in the EU’s norms and institutions. From the outside, sovereignty appears to be shared to the higher extent and become irrelevant within the union. It is unclear however, to determine only on Greece’s attempted defection of whether or not all EU members work in the same rhythm to assure the survival of the Eurozone.

Is the EU a coherent entity to contribute to international security, economic, political and social developments? In many respects the EU is as much a “coexistence” type of regional society transforming Westphalian institutions of sovereignty, diplomacy, and international law as it is a “cooperative” type describing how the institution of sovereignty is modified in the name of joint gains. Fischer argued recently that “European states must combine interests for common goods….states should wonder if we should abandon our sovereignty in favor of the EU or not; we are losing that sovereignty anyway! It’s just going to non-European powers in the East (like China). The world is changing dramatically and the question that Europeans must answer is what will be the place of Europe in ten years.”28 Fischer’s message to EU members is to integrate further and realize what the Union’s strategic common interest is questioning in the context in which China and India are emerging as global powers and Russia is recovering, where Europe stands. Fischer’s vision for the EU is to team up with the US in the projection of a new world order. “We Europeans are experts in sustainable regime change because the EU changed the regimes in Spain, Portugal, Greece and Eastern Europe […] the world should be transformed

through cooperation and consent and not from the top of the gun.” For a regional international society the EU is an important player in international system maintaining at the core of its mission the preservation of peace through unity. The main institutions of the EU as a regional international society are diplomacy, international law, freedom, democracy and integration. These appear to be the primary institutions of the EU identified most frequently in principles and practices of EU actors. The balance of power for example is no longer accepted as a meaningful institution to the preservation of the system of states because it produced war.

As Fischer (2009) nicely put it, European states have realized since the end of the WWII that they need a different system for their family of states, a system driven by cooperation, negotiation and integration. In the EU these institutions are derived by subscribing to the norm of “sharing sovereignty” and intensive integration based on common interests to set up a framework of common institutions. With respect to “shared sovereignty” there are very few, if any, areas left in which states function independent of the EU. Sovereignty, as Diez (et al., 2010:20) suggest, is “pooled both through international law and common understanding.”

According to the unfolding events associated with the euro crisis, the EU exhibits a regional international society hierarchically organized with a core and periphery distinguished by the Eurozone and political and social integration. International law is the framework in which the EU functions. This is one of the most developed institutions of the EU that dates back to the European international society and is shared with both European and global international societies. The German Chancellor mentioned in her speech about the EU currency that in the future, it is intended to bring EU institutions into more harmony and use the International Court

---

as an arbiter to determine whether or not states violate treaties and find law-breakers responsible for their behavior. International law in this sense makes the principles explicit in which states cooperate economically as well as are shaping international behavior. Diplomacy is also one of the most prominent and shared institutions with other international societies. The EU uses a multilateral diplomacy backed where necessary by trade and peacekeeping forces to resolve conflicts and bring international understanding. The EU learned from its past history that war can be avoided through the creation of common understandings about each other, common institutions, cooperation and consent.

Through diplomacy and economic integration the EU managed to change the face and prospects of the European continent and the EU region. Within the EU, the Union created the post of High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy assisted by a military and political staff to coordinate diplomatic missions between EU member states and other states. The EU has no standing army and focuses mostly on peacekeeping, crisis management and humanitarian missions, being one of the biggest providers of aid to developing countries. War is an experience that Europeans pledge to overcome through consensus and co-decision making.

Although the Iraq war showed a lack of political cohesion in the Union when some of the newest members went against Germany and France’s recommendations to war, the prospects for other regional wars for example, will provide more clues with respect to the cohesion in decision-making because in terms of development the EU is in the stage of consolidation and the main goal of the EU is to strengthen and preserve peace. Diez (et al., 2010) argue for example, that the role of institutions at the regional level has changed from the preservation of states to the preservation of peace and this is the core mission of the EU but one can wonder if this matches the role of institutions in other regional societies. The EU institutions are in many respects
responses to the opportunities created after the end of the Cold War. As Fischer illustrated in his lecture, “the vision of the united Europe matched the opportunities” of post-Cold War.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is suggested in this chapter that the EU is a regional international society with distinct social structures reflected by shared sovereignty, shared currency, rules, institutions and identities as well as by a diplomacy used to identify common interests among EU members. The EU functions at the regional level on distinct institutions, some that are shared (democracy, diplomacy and international law) with European international society and global society and others that are regionally distinct (integration and freedom of circulation). Integration and freedom of circulation count as distinct regional norms consciously developed by EU members to strengthen the elements of community at the regional level. Ayoob (1999:248) argues that at the regional level “society” is informed by consciousness of common interests and values, essential for the formulation of common rules and the creation of common institutions.” In context of the EU, “common interest” is rooted in preserving peace through integration and respect of common solidarity. Older EU members worked together with the newest EU members to socialize them in developing a common understanding about the world, European identity, and European political culture. The institution of sovereignty is at the core of the EU shared to the extent that it loses its original Westphalian meaning.

The euro crises identified one of the biggest challenges to the EU’s shared identity. The main lesson learned from the euro systemic crisis is that the EU needs more political will integration and economic solidarity. The need to “speak with one voice” goes beyond the Union foreign policy. The Franco-German approach appear committed to saving the future of the Union
however, how the other 25 members of the Union understand the sharing of rules and norms of the society of states and in particular when they take them in the account is critical to the stability and future of the EU. Henceforth, how EU citizens understand the “union” of Europe and their participation within the union will be reflected on the kind of Europe that is constructed. As suggested by Fischer, the EU could evolve to become a legitimated common construction visionary and capable to aid the US in shaping the global order, a future peninsula of Asia, or will fail to the other extreme and become a corrupt power in which more than 500 million Europeans will lose trust.

Is the EU a union constructed by people and for the people or it is a union of the elites for the elites? A “Union” afraid of people referendum may be condemned to fear more protests in the future. The story told by the EU is that of a society of center-periphery structure focused on harmonizing distinct political, economic and democratic structures with a high level of intrusion by the core in the periphery to achieve consensus and social political cohesion. How the newest members of the EU, in particular the Romanian governmental elites, think about the EU as an international society built on common interest and values is the subject of chapter seven. Chapter six introduces and familiarizes the reader with the Romanian political system.
CHAPTER SIX

THE ROMANIAN GOVERNMENT COALITION

This chapter provides an overview of the Romanian political system highlighting the political coexistence of the Democratic Liberal coalition. Focusing on the elites is necessary to fulfill the purpose of the dissertation to produce an understanding of how Romanian governmental elites associated with the Democratic Liberal coalition understand the EU as an international society as opposed to a regional organization. The concept of international society will emerge from the translation of meanings, beliefs and ideas resulting from the participation of governmental elites in the EU. In context of the ES, the EU is an international society intentionally created by states and their actions. ES scholars argue that it is important in an international society to be aware of the kinds of norms, rules and structures states are socialized in because they are an expression of future states behavior (Suzuki 2004: 118).

Since international societies are consciously created by state forces it is important to understand how political actors or governmental elites who, decide the state involvement in international forums, understand their participation in an international society and how their conscious engagement contributes to the creation of norms of coexistence, rules and institutions. The chapter is structured into two sections. The first section provides an overview of the Romanian political system and introduces the main political actors. The second section describes the political and diplomatic activity of Romanian governmental elites in the context of Romania’s integration in the EU. In order to probe the validity of the ES claim that, when
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30 Governmental elites, political actors, political elites are used interchangeably.
relations between two entities are conceived as an international society, the entities behavior will be influenced by international society’s norms and code of conduct.

THE ROMANIAN POLITICAL SYSTEM

Romania is a semi-presidential parliamentary republic with an executive – president (head of state), prime minister (head of government); legislative – bicameral parliament and judicial – Constitutional Court system. Romania “has a multiparty system with a better organized left and a chronically fragmented right” (Stan & Zaharia 2007: 1082). The Romanian political system has been dominated, since the fall of communism, by a half-dozen parties. The Romanian political left has been represented primarily by the two wings, the Social Democratic Party (PSD) and the reformist Democratic Party (PD) associated with the European Socialist group and the European People’s Party respectively. The political right has been primarily represented by the newly reconstituted historical parties, National Liberal Party (PNL) and Christian-Democrat Peasant Party (PNTCD). The Democratic Union of Magyars in Romania (UDMR) has been officially organized as a political union or alliance assimilating organizations representing national minorities. The Conservative Party (PC) and the National Union for the Advancement of Romania (UNPR) are two small political parties representing the political left.

Romania’s bicameral parliament (National Assembly) consists of two chambers, the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, each with 137 and 345 seats respectively elected by popular vote for four years according to a system of proportional representation with closed party lists and a national threshold of 5 percent for individual political parties, 8 percent for multiparty coalitions and 6 percent threshold for the ethnic minority parties (ethnic minority parties are guaranteed eighteen seats by the constitution, one for each recognized minority). The 1991
adopted and 2003 amended Constitution defines Romania as a “national sovereign, independent, 
unitary and indivisible state.” The President, in conformity to Article 81 of the constitution, is 
elected by direct popular vote for a maximum of two five-year terms. The role of the President 
according to the constitution is largely ceremonial until no single party gains a parliamentary 
majority and the power of the president is necessary to step in and name the head of government. 
For turnout and financial considerations, since the fall of the communist regime, parliamentary 
and presidential elections were held together.

The elections of 1990, 1992, 1996 and 2000 brought to power three post-communist 
governments led by Social Democrats and President Ion Iliescu who acted as president from 
1990 to 1996 and from 2000 to 2004. The 1996 elections fractured the post communist 
ascendancy to power when two opposition parties from the right, PNTCD and PNL united as the 
Democratic Convention to form a government with UDMR and PD under the presidency of Emil 
Constantinescu. As Lavinia Stan and Razvan Zaharia (2007) identified, dissension within the 
Convention and between governmental partners, perpetuated to power three different premiers 
returned to power in 2000 and formed a government with UDMR and PUR.

In Romanian politics, the 2004 elections are considered historical because the Romanian 
electorate managed to break ties with the past and elect to power a president and a government 
that had less apparent connections with the politics of communism. The perspectives of the 
newly elected elites of the EU before they came to power and while in power will be interesting 
to contrast. After a second run off in presidential elections Traian Basescu (PD) defeated Social
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31 Romanian Chamber of Deputies: ‘Constitution of Romania’. Available at: 
Democrat Adrian Nastase by 51.23 percent and formed with PNL, UDMR and PUR a government under which Romania was integrated in the structures of the EU. The following section reviews the political alliance formed by the two main opposition parties, the Democratic Party led by Traian Basescu and the Liberal Party led by Teodor Stolojan assessed by comparative politics scholars “as a step ahead in the coalescence of the center-right and the beginning of a rebalanced political spectrum” (Mungiu-Pippidi 2004: 8).

THE DEMOCRAT LIBERAL COALITION

The Liberal Party or the National Liberal Party (PNL) is one of the historical parties that emerged in 1868, was dismembered in the 1940s and resurrected in the early 1990s. Historically, the Liberal Party is associated with Ion C. Bratianu, a liberal moderate and the founder of the party as well as with the establishment of a constitutional monarchy in Romania. The Liberal Party doctrine claims at its core individual freedoms, separation of powers in state and a competitive economy. On the evolutionary scale of party politics, from 1990 onward PNL was marked by numerous splits and was impacted by three types of political transformations. 1990-1998 was a period of party splitting and reunification. 1998-2003 was the period of party consolidation. During 2003-2011 the party transformed and ascended into a larger party.

It is important to mention that historically, Romania is known for a weak political class and Romanian political parties for defections, factionalism and continuous reinvention under different associations or alliances to attain political power necessary to climb up the ladder of social class. Romania is a classic case in which politicians change party affiliation in midcourse; they lack a common vision of the public good and prioritize personal pride in favor of political

principles. The comparative politics scholars Alina Mungiu-Pippidi (2004) and Lavinia Stan (2005:10) who write extensively on Romanian politics capture how “Romanian politicians have shown a dangerous propensity to migrate between parties, irrespective of ideology and policy preferences.” The first split within PNL occurred shortly after the 1990 elections from dissatisfaction of young liberals including Calin Popescu Tariceanu, the future 2004 Prime Minister, with how the party was led to elections, resulting in 1993, to the formation of PNL-Young Wing (Aripa Tanara). The second split occurred in 1992 at the level of coalition between PNL and Democratic Convention of Romania (CDR). With CDR, PNL formed a political alliance of united opposition to counterbalance the hegemony of FSN (National Salvation Front) led by neocommunists who transformed it in PSD. In the 1992 elections, the leader of PNL, Radu Campeanu decided to run not as a coalition but as a single party. This decision prompted many party members to leave PNL and create a new political wing, PNL-CD, a liberal formation led by a new leader, Mircea Ionescu Quintus.

The third splintering of PNL was marked by Campeanu leaving the party and creating a new wing, the National Liberal Party-Campeanu (PNL-C), a political cleavage in which most elderly liberals found affiliation. The year of 1998 marked the “greater liberal union” when PNL absorbed PNL-C and other small factions under the leadership of Mircea Ionescu-Quintus.33 From 1998 onward PNL began to play a significant role in Romanian politics and the Democratic Convention. The strategic move made by PNL in the 2000 elections to participate in the absence of CDR on the general elections paid off in gaining political visibility and attracting and fusing with other similar political wings. During 2001-2003, under the leadership of Theodor Stolojan, PNL incorporated the Alliance for Romania (APR); Right Union Force (UFD); and

PNL-C fusion leading to the creation of the Truth and Justice Alliance (DA) in August 2003. Through the unification process PNL became an authentic modern party of the right on the political spectrum. After the 2004 elections PNL, led by Calin Popescu Tariceanu, became the governing party.

*The Democratic Party* (PD) emerged in April 1992 from a faction of the National Salvation Front (FSN), the reinvented Communist Party led by Ion Iliescu. The party was founded by Petre Roman, the first post-communist prime minister to reject the course of action in democratic reform taken by President Iliescu. Roman was removed from power in 1992 after objecting to how Iliescu used the Valea Jiului miners to repress public dissent protesting privatization of national industries (Stan 2005: 5). Under the founding form the party lasted until 2000 when, after the disappointing election results against the incumbent Social Democrats, it split. From 2000 onward Roman engaged in “setting up his own political organization, Democratic Force, while Traian Basescu took over the Democratic Party’s chair” (Stan 2005: 5). In 2000 Basescu was elected mayor of Bucharest.

In 2003 both leaders of the opposition parties Basescu and Stolojan synchronize Romanian opposition into a new wing, the Justice and Truth Alliance (DA), formed by the fusion between PNL and PD. The electoral bloc was led jointly by the two party leaders Stolojan representing the liberals and Basescu representing the democrats; a situation in which both leaders led their parties and co-chaired the DA Alliance. In 2004, PD and the National Liberal Party ran together as the DA Alliance and defeated in the presidential elections, Prime Minister Adrian Nastase of the governing Social Democratic Party. Before 2004 November presidential elections, Basescu ran and defeated, in mayoral election for Bucharest, Mircea Geoana the Social Democrat candidate. The victory of Basescu for the position of mayor was replicated in other
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Romanian municipalities in which candidates affiliated with the DA Alliance were elected.\textsuperscript{35} The 2004 elections united the political left and right into a center spectrum. The fall of communism in 1989 marked the ascendance to power of the Social Democratic Party (PSD), a party with deep roots in the Soviet-era Communist Party. After more than two decades of democracy, Romanian political life continued to be characterized by fragmentation of political parties in the scope of obtaining the necessary number of votes for sending representatives to govern at the local and national level. For example PSD evolved from the schisms and defections in 1992 of the National Salvation Front (FSN) into the Social Democratic Party, Democratic Party and Alliance for Romania in 1997. The short interruption in 1996-2000 of the presidency of Emil Constantinescu representing the Democratic Convention of Romania (CDR) gave PSD a moment of respite and reinvention to recapture the Romanian Presidency for four more years, until 2004 when “a brand new government” entered the scene of Romanian political life.

Fulfilling the political criteria for EU membership remained inconclusive in the European Commission Reports until 1998 when the Commission recognized that Romania satisfied political criteria set out by the Copenhagen Council. “The improvement now under way since the new government came to power suggests that Romania is on the way to meeting the political conditions laid down by the Copenhagen European Council.”\textsuperscript{36} Romania’s struggle to satisfy the Copenhagen criteria raised important questions about the democratization process in Romania, the commitment of Romania’s ruling elites to European integration and the capacity of the EU to influence reform in and promote the ‘Europeanization’ of Romania. Dimitris Papadimitriou and David Phinnemore (2008:65) observed that “the receptiveness of the Romanian body politic to


the influences and pressures emanating from the EU has only increased over time, and even then has often been mediated by domestic political instability, and the inertia of a politicized bureaucracy.” Tom Gallagher (2009:261) claims, with respect to Romania’s elites, that “they have no appetite for reforms in vital policy sectors […] the main entities of the EU allowed themselves to be misled and disarmed by a calculating local elite well versed in simulating change. Values seen as central to the EU project, such as political accountability, clean government and active citizenship, failed to acquire much meaning in the Romanian context.” If the numerous returns to power of Social Democratic elites (1990-1992; 1992-1996; 2000-2004) was perceived as “delinquent and the public manifestation of a cohesive oligarchy” the entry of the Democratic Liberal Party and National Liberal Party coalition under the guidance of Traian Basescu was perceived by Romanians and westerners with hope.

What distinguishes the PDL coalition and makes it worthy to study in contrast to other political coalitions is its ideological strand of center-right liberalism, a new political class, a liberal tradition disbanded by communists in 1947, a commitment to European Union integration and enthusiasm for political and economic change. It is expected from the genuine desire (if it indeed existed) of the PDL coalition to reform the Romanian political class and integrate Romania in the structures of EU norms, values and institutions to show concrete attempts to change and an intimate understanding of what the EU stands for or represent for elites.

For instance, the coalition government led by Basescu was associated by scholars and policymakers both in Romania and abroad with “a generation of young, pro-European democrats seeking to break from the semi-authoritarian, anachronistic rule of its post-communists predecessors” (Tismaneanu & Gross 2005: 146). Scholars anticipated that the new governing coalition would consolidate in Romania a democratic political culture and modernize the state.
As Tismaneanu & Gross (2005:151) depicted, the PNL-PD governing coalition was a young and vibrant team, the average age of ministers was 44, and with two exceptions, they had no history of serving in previous governments; educated in the West or at western-style institutions the group “appeared to possess the liberal instincts that its predecessors so decidedly lacked.” In similar words this was a pro-Western democratic government capable of freeing the Romanian political system from the legacy of communism. How much and what kind of understanding the elites associated with PNL-PD coalition had about the EU and EU’s common interests is the quest of the next chapter.

**FORMING A COALITION GOVERNMENT**

In November 2004 the turnout for parliamentary and presidential election was 58.38 percent. In the parliamentary elections, the results showed that the former coalition between Social Democrats and Humanist Party (PUR) held tight, winning 37 percent of the seats while the Justice and Truth Alliance 32 percent and Greater Romania Party (PRM) 15 percent. The Senate scores were 41.6 percent for the PSD+PUR Union, 35.76 percent for the Alliance, 15.32 percent for PRM and 7.29 percent for the Democrat Union of Hungarians in Romania (UDMR). The results for the PSD coalition prompted Nastase to declare prematurely to the media that “we already have a majority and I hope Basescu will take this into account.” Social Democrats hoped to win a majority of seats in parliament by forging an alliance with PUR and UDMR however, Basescu countered the Social Democrats plan on the basis that the Alliance between Social Democrats and the Humanist Party (PUR) had not been registered at the local court.
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According to Article 103 of the constitution, when a clear majority in Parliament does not exist the president designates the prime minister. The President appoints the prime minister but does not have the authority to dismiss them. Article 89 of the constitution also stipulates that “The President can dissolve Parliament if the latter rejects the cabinet within sixty days of its formation but no earlier than rejecting it twice.” Apparently Basescu favored a parliamentary majority in which the Justice and Truth Alliance was the main partner rejecting the coalition of PSD+PUR (Stan 2005: 12). With separate seats counted for PSD, PUR and UDMR, the Justice and Truth Alliance had won a plurality and should form the government while the Social Democrat Party and Great Romania People’s Party should form a coalition of the parliamentary opposition.40

On 22 December 2004, according to the union protocol of DA, Basescu appointed the prime minister from the Liberal Party. Calin Popescu Tariceanu was one of the leaders and founding members of the resurrected PNL. Prime Minister Tariceanu formed a government including, as a majority, two former socialist allies, UDMR and PUR. The ruling coalition comprised four parties, PNL+PD+UDMR+PUR or the Liberals, the Democrats, the Democratic Union and the Humanists. The parliamentary opposition consisted of two parties, PSD and PRM (the Social Democrats and the People’s Party with a nationalist ideology). The Popescu-Tariceanu cabinet was composed by twenty-four ministers nominated by each of the governing partners. The new government was approved by the Parliament by 265 votes to 200 on 28 December 2004. As Stan (2005:13); Tismaneanu & Gross (2005) and Mungiu-Pippidi (2005) agree “the young ministers had an impeccable reputation for not being involved in corruption scandals…but little administrative experience in the domains they now supervised.” One of the
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biggest contributors to a “clean cabinet” was The Coalition for a Clean Parliament (CCP), a Romanian civil society organization with a set of six pre-established criteria on corruption, tax evasion, communist ties, migration between parties to gain personal profit, discrepancy between assets and income; and conflict of interests involving one’s public position to determine whether or not candidates were “morally fit” to hold public office (Mungiu-Pippidi 2005: 154-5).

The “liberal in nature” governing programme was adopted on 28 December 2004 aiming at modernizing the state by strengthening the rule of law and democracy, individual freedoms, restitution of confiscated properties, economic and social cohesion in concordance with fulfilling the commitments Romania had undertaken to integrate in 2007 in the EU (European Commission 2007). Important portfolios in foreign affairs, national defense and European integration were entrusted to young politicians like Mihai Razvan Ungureanu (foreign affairs), Anca Boagiu (European Integration), Sorin Frunzaverde (national defense), and Monica Macovei (justice) to mention a few (Stan 2005: 13).

From the perspective of political ideology, on 28 December 2004, the ruling coalition united two extremes, center right liberalism vs. center left social democracy on the one side and on the other a right wing conservative view on nationalism vs. a centrist ethnic Hungarian minority party. A rift in the coalition of two electoral blocs (the Justice and Truth Alliance and the Democratic Union of Magyars) was anticipated according to Stan (2005:13-4) because of equal “similarities and differences” between the blocs, the clash of personalities between the Prime Minister and the President and the lack of expertise to begin the second modernization process of the Romanian state. The Democrat Union of Hungarians in Romania Party (UDMR) was formed as a political alliance on 25 December 1989 at the onset of democracy in Romania seeking to protect the interests of 6.6 percent of Magyars. Marko Bela, the Vice
President of Romanian Parliament, led the Party or the minorities’ alliance until 2010 when Hunor Kelemen took leadership. Ideologically, the Party stands at the center of the political spectrum encouraging better distribution of wealth, regionalism and political administrative decentralization in Romania. At the EU level UDMR is a member of the European People’s Party (EEP). Since its emergence, UDMR has supported Romania’s integration in the European structures, decentralization of administration and consolidation of the market economy.

Although UDMR is not officially registered as a party but as a political union, UDMR influenced Romanian politics from both aisles of ruling in a positive sense to the extent that some have wondered why there is no equivalent of UDMR in the political system of the Republic of Moldavia (Ungureanu 2008). It is important to note that in the first seven years of post-communism, UDMR was part of the opposition and in 1996 joined the Democratic Convention government to power. Until 2008, UDMR was part of all Romania’s governing coalitions.

*The Romanian Humanist Party (PUR)* was founded in late 1991 by Dan Voiculescu, “a former economic spy” who, according to Stan (2005:5), started his career during the communist regime on foreign trade monopolies and was accused by the media, after the collapse of the regime, of embezzling the former dictator’s Swiss accounts. The Party claims to emerge in a time of political and doctrinal confusion experienced by the Romanian political system. Ideologically, PUR claims heritage of the former historical Romanian Conservative Party (the Peasant Party) that disappeared from the scene of Romanian politics after the agrarian and electoral reforms were implemented in 1919. The newly reinvented PUR, the Conservative Party, born after May 2005 Congress, is also “known for its chameleon-like readiness to make or
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break alliances for short term advantages” (Stan 2005: 13). Politically, the Party claims to be a center Party leaning toward the right on the political spectrum that stands for social liberalism of protecting human and family values, social solutions, economic development, and the middle class.\(^{42}\) PUR entered into a governing coalition with Social Democrats in 2000 that lasted until 2002 when it abandoned the coalition in favor of preserving the party’s identity and showing electorate accountability. In 2004, PUR received 6% of the electoral vote, negotiated alliances first with Social Democrats and then entered into a governing coalition with a right wing parties only after Basescu nominated his Prime Minister. PUR claims to become part of the governing coalition only “for preserving political stability in the country and at the insistences of Basescu.”\(^{43}\)

The Conservative Party claims doctrinaire affinities with European conservatism and argues that the change of the name of the party from PUR to Conservative Party occurred in context of the European integration. In 2006, the Conservative Party abandoned the governing coalition and entered into the opposition on grounds of loss of support from governing coalition partners in passing laws through Parliament. President Basescu, at his inaugural speech declared, with respect to bridging the political right with the political left that,

> I am ready to work elbow to elbow with the Prime Minister for accomplishing all objectives and in no circumstances will I be a President confounded with the government… I want to thank Prime Minister Tariceanu for putting together in a short amount of time a majority that succeeded in passing the Parliamentary vote of investiture. I want to assure the Prime Minister that in addition to prerogatives of the Constitutions, regarding the responsibility of a President to be a representative of the people in the face of state institutions that I am ready to collaborate within limits of the institution of the Presidency with the Government to accomplish its objectives” ([Romanian President], 29 December 2004).\(^{44}\)
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THE POPESCU-TARICEANU GOVERNMENT

A study focusing on semi-presidential systems and institutional blockade in context of the conflict between Basescu and Popescu-Tariceanu found that “semi-presidential systems of democratic governance risk ending up in a stalemate when it is not clear which of the two “heads”- head of State or head of Government – shall take the lead” (Muller, 2006: 1). According to Romania’s Constitution the President is elected through popular vote and appoints the Prime Minister who is confirmed by Parliament with a vote of confidence. Nevertheless, in a diverse multiparty system, as Romania has, the personalities of two political actors or “heads” appear to matter as much as forming majority government coalitions.

As Muller (2006) argues, competing dual authority between the President and Prime Minister to make and implement collectively binding decisions and cohabitation are situations in which the powers and responsibilities of both the Prime Minister and the President conflate. In Muller’s (2006:128) view, “semi-presidential systems exhibit a dual or “flexible authority” with – quite literally – two executive “heads” and the supremacy goes to the head that controls the parliamentary majority. If the party of the president holds or somehow controls the majority, then the president prevails.” Muller’s (2006) assertion is clearly visible in the cohabitation between Popescu-Tariceanu and Basescu.

Basescu won the elections of 2004 on the motto of “player president” and decided to act on the “supremacy” role because PNL-PD controlled the majority governing coalition. It is important to note that according to the Constitution, after winning presidential elections, Basescu resigned theoretically from the Democratic Party yet practically he remained very much involved in the political process of the party. From the onset, it is important to note that the cohabitation between Popescu-Tariceanu and Basescu started on personality dissimilarities. Popescu-
Tariceanu was a “relatively unknown and inexperienced prime minister;” he was viewed as calm and collected in contrast to Basescu who served as Mayor of Bucharest, was skilled in the art of politics, and perceived as “strong, popular and charismatic” wearing his heart on the sleeve and speaking his mind (Stan 2005: 13). Basescu acknowledged in the first interview given as president that he appears to challenge and demand more from the Tariceanu Government mainly because of the inertia he acquired during the electoral campaign. Energy that he wanted to transform in reality however, he was aware that his responsibilities as president lay around monitoring how the government governs; “I cannot forget that the DA Alliance is now the Government or is governing because as a candidate I pledged to be an active president and do what the government needs to do to fulfill all the campaign objectives.”

I pledge to be the president of all Romanians, a strong, impartial and active president engaged to eradicate corruption which now threatens Romanian national security […] a fundamental priority of my mandate will be to depoliticize state institutions […] we need a strong Parliament that would not be a simple annex of the Executive but a powerful force to make positive social, political, economic and cultural changes. We need an active Parliament reflective to the signals of citizens […] Romania needs to become a modern state […] a European Romania (Presidential Discourse 21 December 2004).

In his inaugural speech Basescu pledged to de-politicize state institutions, reopen the energy and competition chapters negotiated with the EU and strengthen Romania’s ties with London and Washington. He made clear that one of his objectives as President was to integrate Romania in the EU in 2007 and hoped that the new government would become involved to explain to the Romanian people the costs of EU integration. “When we speak about EU integration we speak first about the integration of the Romanian people and the Romanian economy because there is no government that seeks integration alone, in the absence of the Romanian people.” Aligned with Basescu’s message was similar to Popescu-Tariceanu who pledged to be the liberal Prime
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Minister who would govern the country irrespective of political calculations aimed at modernizing Romanian state and European integration.

The Government I shall lead will be based on the liberal values and the following pillars: (1) the Alliance Truth and Justice PNL-PD – as a political nucleus; (2) an exceptional collaboration with the President of the country. We count on Traian Basescu, as President of Romania and defender of the Constitution to get involved in the fight against corruption, contribute to the legal functioning of state institutions and be a partner of the Government I shall lead; (3) re-launching of Parliament into a source for viable governance and (4) foster an independent judiciary branch (Popescu-Tariceanu Investiture Speech; 28 December 2004).

In context of the “nucleus of government,” PNL-PD, Tariceanu underscored in the same speech that the Alliance had obtained the highest number of MPs and they co-opted UDMR in governance because of its proven record “to be a stability source and a support factor for European accession” and PUR for its approach to market economy and values to support “small and medium size enterprises and successful economic development.” Weeks after the investiture Basescu appeared regretful for bringing PUR into the governing alliance, crediting the Prime Minister for his difficult job in maintaining intact a frail governing coalition and explaining to the electorate and governing partners that PUR is indeed a loyal ally in the government.

“It is very difficult for the Prime Minister to have in the structures of the government a political party that was very loyal to Social Democrats during the election campaign and now claims county prefectures as well as to justify to the electorate how it is possible to nominate county prefects from a political party that was very hostile during elections and whose loyalty continue to lie with Nicolae Vacaroiu and Adrian Nastase.” In Basescu’s view, PUR was an “immoral solution” but a necessary political solution negotiated in conjecture of forming a government and preventing snap elections. In an interview to Special Edition, Basescu underscored that in anticipation, DA had prepared governing solutions ready to deal with animosities within the DA but not for the entire governing coalition. In his view, PUR was only
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theoretically part of the governing coalition because practically it was an ally loyal to PSD. Although at first reticent, Basescu was an ardent supporter of the snap elections which in his view represented an instrument of consolidation of democracy rather than an instrument of political instability; “it is preferable to have early elections than non loyal or non sincere governing partners.”\textsuperscript{48}

With respect to the cohabitation with PM Tariceanu, Basescu appeared dissatisfied with his leadership two months into the governing process, especially with the PM’s approach to fiscal stability and introduction of legislation to reduce the budget deficit and criminalize tax evasion. Three months into cohabitation, Basescu acknowledged the fragility of the majority coalition and assured the Romanian people that he has weekly consultations with the PM in which he informs the PM on foreign policy, reforming the intelligence service, Romania’s EU relations as well as about other sectors affiliated with the presidency.\textsuperscript{49} Under auspices of Romania’s EU integration the Romanian PM was influenced from one side by a fragile coalition and from the other by motion of censure filed by the opposition.

Only six months after the election, 110 members of the Romanian Parliament signed a motion of censure against Tariceanu’s government. Tariceanu classified the PSD motion as a “censure motion against Romania’s EU accession and not against the Government” and asked if PSD knew the difference between a statesman and a politician who opposes everything (\textit{Government of Romania}, 22 June 2005; emphasis in original). In his reply to motion signatories Tariceanu asked whether or not “the correct title of the motion that we are debating today is “PSD boycotts Romania’s EU integration?” an anti-Europe motion is not a reaction to the


assumption of the Government’s responsibility” (Government of Romania, 22 June 2005). After Romania had been criticized in Brussels for the lack of progress toward integration and an outdated and corrupt judiciary system, on 7 July 2005 Tariceanu announced that he and his cabinet would resign in order to trigger early elections. The resignation was made on grounds that “I do not want to take part in the process wherewith the Romanian people, my people are doomed to corruption, poverty and isolation” (Government of Romania, 13 July 2005).

On 19 July 2005 Tariceanu revised his decision under circumstances in which severe floods affected many parts of Romania. Tariceanu’s dissatisfaction with the President and the opposition continued to be captured in debating other motions of censure filed by PSD. “Mr. President, Senators and Deputies, today I witnessed a lamentable spectacle in the Parliament of Romania. It is not enough that the Parliament is, in the public perception, one of the institutions which enjoy the lowest confidence, due to this system you practice. You make the Parliament a jumble; you turn it into a stadium” (Government of Romania, 21 February 2006).

On 29 June 2006, Tariceanu officially announced that the National Liberal Party supported the withdrawal of Romanian troops involved in battleships abroad. This may be classified as an act of solidarity with some EU members however; it may be classified as an attempt to embarrass Basescu. The announcement contrasted Basescu’s support for Romanian troops to participate in wars with allies and coincided with Basescu’s visit to the United States. Politically, the year 2007 started for the Tariceanu government, as Stan & Zaharia (2008) assess it, much better than it ended. On a positive note Romania became a member of the EU on 1 January 2007 but on the negative aspect, the animosities between the President and the Prime Minister, deepened ending up in a public scandal over the interpretation of a written note sent by Tariceanu to Basescu supposedly asking him to help Patriciu, a former Liberal Party leader,
personal friend of Tariceanu and the wealthiest Romanian (the head of oil company Petromedia) by talking to the Prosecutor General to stall the investigation that began on Patriciu in 2005 (Stan & Zaharia 2008: 115-7). Basescu interpreted the note as asking a personal favor stating that “The Prime Minister offered me a partnership, but unfortunately with our oligarchs” accusing Tariceanu of abusing power and forcing his resignation. Tariceanu argued that “the note I sent was meant to inform the President about a drafted report by Petromedia accompanying the note revealing possible abuses and illegalities committed by some state representatives” (Government of Romania, 17 January 2007). The scandal continued to reveal other written notes sent either by the President or the Prime Minister on various occasions with various requests to other offices.

In context of intra-governmental dissensions it is important to note that the partnership between PNL and PD culminated in 2006 when Tariceanu continued to lead the government and Basescu (PD) joined the opposition (the Liberal Democrats: PLD) assembled by Theodor Stolojan who was expelled earlier from the party and found a subsequent new party, the Liberal Democrat (PL-D) to protest the leadership of Tariceanu. Stolojan’s PL-D merged with PD to form the new PD-L. On 15 December 2007 PD changed its name to PD-L upon a merger with Stolojan’s newly created wing.

Stan and Vancea (2009:50-1) note, in this respect, that “the Alliance’s breakup led to a never-ending war of words between the prime minister and his National Liberals on one hand, and the president and his Democrats on the other.” The animosity between the Romanian President and his Prime Minister went so far as, only weeks after Romania was admitted into the EU, the President refused to accept the nomination of Adrian Cioroianu for Minister of Foreign Affairs claiming that Cioroianu did not have enough experience for the position leaving the
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Prime Minister, with the choice to act as interim Minister of Foreign Affairs until the Constitutional Court examined “the constitutionality of the president’s refusal to a nomination” (Stan & Zaharia 2008: 1119). Tariceanu’s threat of resignation prompted several political parties from the opposition and government to rally behind him to launch the procedure to impeach the president for infringing on the prime minister’s powers.

Four months after the Romanian accession to the EU, 322 deputies and senators from the Romanian Parliament voted to suspend Basescu from office for allegedly unconstitutional conduct on 19 violations. In conformity with the law, the Constitutional Court found no clear evidence of Basescu’s breach of the Constitution but the Parliament voted for impeachment of the President on 19 April 2007 with 322 votes for impeachment, 108 against it, and 8 abstentions (Government of Romania, 19 April 2007). The minimum necessary number of votes for president’s impeachment is 233 votes. The President was suspended from office from 19 April 2007 until 24 May 2007.

To minimize political instability, Basescu pledged at first to resign and then decided to wait for the results of a referendum called for 19 May under Article 95.3 of the Constitution which read that after adopting the impeachment proposal, a referendum is to be organized within 30 days, to allow an absolute majority of popular vote to decide on the impeachment vote of the Parliament. The results of the national referendum on the president’s impeachment confirmed Basescu’s return to the Presidency and coincided with the initiation of changing the electoral system from proportional representation to single member plurality (a single member district) referred to in political science as winner takes all. According to Stan & Zaharia (2008:1121), “Basescu’s return to presidency increased his resolve to strike back at those who tried to sideline him claiming that the referendum had proven that the political elite and political system were
irremediably corrupted.” While delivering before both chambers of the Parliament against a motion of censure against the Cabinet, Tariceanu underscored that:

Today, the Romanian Parliament will cast a vote on the motion and indicate the type of democracy that will characterize Romania in the future, and Parliament will have to choose between demagoguery and populism and facts and achievements. Our democratic tradition is extremely fragile, looking behind, weighing all events of the 17 years; we can say that Romania is a new democracy in the making and the consolidation of democracy here is in its infancy. Never did I want to be part of a fragile political system, of a nation where political continuity depends on the moods of the character that believes himself to be the Messiah forgetting why we were voted in to rule Romania. I came before you not to defend the Tariceanu Cabinet but to represent the interests of the Romanian people, since we have a duty towards it: namely to build a stable, secure, responsible and prosperous society (Government of Romania, 11 June 2007).

On 1 April 2007 Tariceanu dismissed the ministers of the pro-Basescu Democratic Party and formed a minority government with UDMR. The minority government passed through Parliament with the support of PSD on 3 April 2007. In his address before the joint chambers of the Parliament, Tariceanu underscored the significance of the vote:

This vote signifies the wish for securing political stability in Romania…instead of arguments and never ending conflicts between state bodies…the other constitutional procedures are due to be carried out, the swearing in of the new Ministers, and only afterwards, can we say that the Government is functioning with a new team” (Government of Romania, 3 April 2007).

The second Tariceanu Cabinet brought into the new team various PNL replacements including Adrian Cioroianu (PNL) as Foreign Minister. The year of 2007, as Stan & Zaharia (2008) assess it was the year of dissensions, political division and political stalemate. Tariceanu survived as premier with the support of the Liberals and UDMR but in the long term this hindered progress in Romanian development as Tariceanu had to reorganize his cabinet several times and his ministers were unable to conceive and implement long term programs (Stan & Zaharia 2008: 1123). The Tariceanu Government survived numerous motions of no confidence including that of the “1000 Days of Chaos-the end of the right governing” initiated by PSD in Parliament on 3 October 2007. An overall assessment of the Alliance DA that won the 2004 elections is that the Alliance governed as a whole only two years while the remaining two being assumed by the liberals with discreet support from PSD. As Basescu reflects on the cohabitation period with
Tariceanu he assesses the Tariceanu Cabinet as being sustained from the shadow by PSD and the activity of Tariceanu as a “catastrophic PM” (catastrofal) for ruining the country’s finances.\textsuperscript{51} The purpose of reviewing the cohabitation period between Basescu and Tariceanu was aimed at underscoring political instability that characterizes Romania’s democracy in context of deadlock dissensions, fragmented legislative majority, uneasy cohabitation and threats to the cabinet’s survival.

All of the aforementioned episodes unfolded in Romania’s political system while Romania was engaged in “consciously” pursuing EU accession. Political stability was a criterion that Romania had to meet before the EU accession. The continuation of political instability can impact the progress of the EU if the Romanian political elites continue to underscore their interests over those of Romania and the Union. The first Romanian Parliament elected on the basis of a single vote system was selected in December 2008. On 22 December 2008, in the aftermath of legislative elections Democratic Liberal Party (PD-L) and the Social Democratic Party (PSD) obtained similar scores and decided to join forces in a grand coalition government of “PC Alliance” under a PD-L Prime Minister, Emil Boc.

\textbf{THE BOC I & II & III CABINETS}

The first Boc Cabinet was sworn in on 22 December 2008 and lasted less than a year, until 1 October 2009 when all PSD Ministers resigned from the Cabinet protesting the removal from office of Dan Nica (PSD), the Minister of Administration and Interior. Due to significant

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{B/TV}, 2 August 2011. ‘Interview with Basescu’ Available at: http://wn.com/Traian_Basescu_la_B1_tv_USL_interzis_la_guvernare_nici_dac%C4%83_ob%C5%A3ine_peste_50 [Last Accessed December 21, 2011].
changes in the political composition of the Cabinet and the subsequent motion of no confidence backed by the PSD and PNL coalition the second Boc Cabinet was dismissed Tuesday 11 October 2009 with 258 votes in favor and 176 against. The dismissal of Boc Cabinet II marked the time when a Romanian government was dismissed from office in the last twenty years because it could not survive a motion of censure. “We lost a battle not the war” Boc replied, and “it is an honor for a government to fall when promoting real laws of reforming the pension program [...] PNL-PSD adopted the censure motion to assure that the parliamentarians of the two parties would not lose their privileges.” According to the Constitution, a Boc Cabinet could act as an interim Cabinet for 45 days.

Boc Cabinet III was an interim Cabinet acting as such from 13 October 2009 to 23 December 2009. The Cabinet had been constituted after the Parliament rejected Basescu’s choices at the PM position. During the 45 day interim period the opposition parties, PNL, PSD and UDMR, having an absolute majority in both Chambers of the Parliament, favored the mayor of Sibiu, Klaus Iohannis for the position of Prime Minister. Contrary to their wishes, the President nominated consecutively two new members backed by the PD-L to the Prime Minister position, Lucian Croitoru (Independent) on 23 October 2009 who was voted down by Parliament on 4 November 2009 and Liviu Negoita (PD-L) who managed to produce a political deadlock causing Romania to lose a consistent financial package from the IMF.

The political deadlock created by Negoita lasted until the November presidential elections. Because, PD-L had no parliamentary majority and the time limit for the Parliament to conduct Negoita’s hearings expired, Boc was allowed to lead the interim Cabinet until the presidential elections. After winning the presidency mandate against the PSD candidate Mircea Geoana, Basescu re-nominated Negoita who again failed the vote of the Parliament. On 23

---

52 Romania Libera, 13 October 2009. ‘Boc II Government was dismissed’.
December 2009 Boc was reinstated as Prime Minister after he received the confidence vote from Parliament.

Without a backing majority, and a stable Government, it is hard to have a state budget law. Now, the first condition has been fulfilled. We have a government validated by Parliament. Reconfirmation with a confidence vote on the part of Parliament, means that this Cabinet should further do what is right for Romania […] I stated from the very beginning that I have not taken this mandate to become more popular, but to do what is right. It is hard to be popular in times of crisis; you can be popular only if you are irresponsible. I believe the government validated today by Parliament knows what it should do, and enter directly in activity without any break” (Government of Romania, 29 December 2009).

This is part of the declaration of Romanian Prime Minister Boc after the investiture vote by the new Executive was won in Parliament. Boc also stressed in his declaration that the confidence vote of the new Cabinet signified a new partnership between the Executive and Parliament.

Regarding the mass resignation of PSD members from Government, Boc argued that

The Social Democrat Party has decided to place electoral campaign and party related interests above the country’s interests. The Social Democratic Party had the occasion to prove that it can be instrumental for the country in a difficult year but it preferred to leave. The country’s government cannot wait, it has to carry on its activity, it will be difficult but we should prevail (Government of Romania, 1 October 2009).

Five independent Ministers were incorporated into Boc’s Cabinet IV including Minister of Foreign Affairs, Theodor Baconschi. In his response to the joint Chambers of the Parliament, Boc stressed that he wanted to bring “political normality” in Romania underscoring to the Romanian people and the PSD that “all decisions we made in 2009, were made with you at the same table. I can give you an example, the Agreement with IMF was decided with you at the table, and all measures we implemented and are about to implement were decided together. No measure was added or wiped out” (Government of Romania, 29 December 2009). Initially, the PD-L + PSD + Conservative Party coalition produced a government with central orientation aimed at good governance seeking to preserve Romania’s political stability
THE BOC CABINET IV & V

The fourth Boc Cabinet was voted in by the Parliament on 23 December 2009. The Government formed was a coalition government between PD-L and UDMR. On 2 September 2010, PM Boc submitted to the President a new Government reshuffle replacing six Ministers (Government of Romania, 2 September 2010). It is important to note however, that by the end of 2010 the Boc Cabinet survived a few more votes of no confidence filed by PSD, PC, and PNL on the grounds that the Boc Government “is a government of incompetents, a government which promoted ministers who have nothing to do with their supposed area of expertise.”

Basescu however, declared with respect to nominating the Minister for Defense that he had taken into consideration the gravity of the person who was supposed to be skilled and versatile because, “this person will deal directly with Condoleezza Rice and Collin Powel.” Stan & Zaharia (2009: 1092-7) contend however, that Defense Ministers Teodor Melescanu “was a former communist ambassador” and Mihai Stanisoara “had been accused of traffic of influence and abuse.”

In contrast to the Tariceanu Government characterized as “two heads,” the Boc Government is known to cohabitate in more civility with the President although the media and the opposition, Mircea Geoana (PSD), appreciate Boc as “the trumpet of the President.” When asked about whether or not PSD and PD-L can persuade the Liberals to accept certain amendments Boc replied that “it does not fall to the PM’s responsibility to intervene in the parliamentary mechanism; parliament is sovereign in its decisions and I shall observe

---

53 Nine O’Clock, 15 October 2010. ‘PSD to file no-confidence motion on Monday’.
54 Rompres, 21 April 2005. ‘Interview with President Traian Basescu’.
55 Ziare.com, 15 November 2008. ‘Geoana: Boc e o trompeta de serviciu’. ['Geoana: Boc is a service trumpet'].
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Parliament’s decisions” (Government of Romania, 23 February 2009). The President’s characterization of Boc after his Cabinet was initially dismissed by the Parliament was:

Boc was a responsible premier with courage to assume reforms for which Romania will no longer continue to be tributary in the areas of minimum wage law, new codes for justice, education reforms and pension law […] with respect to the political aspect of the motion, it was a matter of calculation aimed at presidential elections. In my view, the political calculation was erroneously made because it did not consider Romanian interest.\(^{56}\)

In a casual interview, when asked to elaborate on the character of the “player President,” Boc underscored that

Basescu is, through his structure, a man of facts, a man of reason and responsibility. I do not say that he stays put, I say that he is doing the right thing in partnership with the Government […] Romania could not resist all these years of crises if it was not for the partnership with Basescu; perhaps the key to Romania’s success lies in the fact that the President of Romania assumed important measures in partnership with the Government.\(^{57}\)

Boc dismissed the “speaking tube” or (portavoce) allegation suggesting that in order to eliminate conflicts between the President and the Premier and maintain a good and effective cooperative relationship in the interest of the state the key to success is “partnership.” Additionally, what appears to determine an effective cohabitation between the president and the premier lies in the personality or style of the individuals noting that, in the governing process, leaders may be subject to international and domestic constraints. With respect to the current presidential administration, Premier Boc claims that Basescu and the Boc Government do not function on populist measures because this would lead the country to economic collapse. While debating a motion of censure within the joint Chambers of the Parliament Boc underscored that Romania is at crossroads and governmental officials have two choices, one is to fall into the populist measures of PSD and PNL and aggravate the situation and the other to cohabitate in the interest of the country (Government of Romania, 28 October 2010). In retrospect, the 2008 elections

\(^{56}\) EurActiv, 13 October 2009. ‘Boc Government was dismissed. Motion of Censure was adopted with 258 votes’.  
\(^{57}\) ProTV, Sunday 27, November 2011. ‘Interview with Emil Boc in special edition: “After 20 Years”.’
generated the governing Cabinet of Boc I formed by PSD and PD-L ministers. The first conflict emerged when PSD Ministers resigned as a sign of protest over the portfolio controlling the secret service of the Ministry of the Interior. To consolidate the position of the PSD candidate Mircea Geoana, PSD abandoned the governing coalition in September 2009. On 13 October 2009, the Government led by Boc is dismissed through a motion of censure placed by PNL and backed by PSD. Boc lead an interim government until Basescu won the presidential elections and re-nominated Boc for the premier position. The new Cabinet was sustained in Parliament by UDMR, UNPR (dissidents from PSD) minorities and independents. The current opposition is formed by PSD and PNL.

On December 2010, Ion Iliescu, the Honorary President of PSD, declared for the Romanian media that “PSD and PNL need to overcome the doctrinaire differences and collaborate against a common adversary.”

On 5 February 2011, PSD, PNL and PC formed a new political alliance, the Social Liberal Union (USL) led by PSD leader Victor Ponta and PNL leader Crin Antonescu. It is important to note that the alliance protocol between two historical political adversaries PSD and PNL is supposed to function until 2020. Leaders of USL argue that the purpose of the union is to “isolate Traian Basescu,” and “counterbalance the failure of the PD-L regime” in context in which PNL, PSD and PC’s identities will not merge but be individually preserved as it will be their electorate.

As of 2012 elections for the USL hope to obtain from the electorate enough votes to be able, not only to become part of the governing coalition, but designate the new prime minister. According to recent polls conducted by Liberals in Bucharest, between 62 to 68% of Bucharest’s population will be inclined to vote for the

---

58 Gandul, 4 December 2010. ‘Iliescu: PSD si PNL trebuie sa aiba intelepciunea pentru a scapa tara de aceasta guvernare’. ['Iliescu: PSD and PNL must have the wisdom to help the country get rid of this government'].
59 Jurnalul National, 7 February 2011. ‘USL - alianta pentru izolarea lui Basescu’. ['USL - The Alliance to isolate Basescu'].
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USL.60 Romania’s political class, as scholars rightly assess, seems to suffer from low accountability, reliability and integrity and is to some extent influenced by the Romanian proportional representation system which “allows party leaders to form clienteles by controlling inclusion on the party list. Deserving individuals have often been turned down in favor of the party’s leader’s relatives, friends and clients, who, once nominated, favor their patrons more than they champion the interests of their electoral district” (Stan & Zaharia 2008: 1123). From his posture as a diplomat and observer of other European democracies former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Teodor Baconschi assessed the art of making politics through political clienteles practiced in Romania stressing that Romania distinguishes itself from other democracies by

An art of making politics without a political doctrine, values, or ideas; in Romania, politics is made in the name of a pragmatism that often becomes mafia, promoter not only of amoral but explicit amoral practices that destroy democracy […] at this time Romania does not have a popular party, this needs to be invented […] if you want me to be imprudent of sincere, I do not consider that there is a true popular political party in Romania, this needs to be invented. Romanian democracy lacks a popular political party that is based on values and the enthusiasm of the middle class […] the abject art of making politics is a site in construction and it will take time until some courageous, crazy or lucid people will step forward and say: there is an alternative to this style of politics.61

Alina Mungiu Pippidi (2004) claims that real political change in Romania is difficult to achieve in a context in which in Romania, the idea of a single party-state, is gaining strength and there is no authentic opposition. Mungiu-Pippidi (2004:17) argues that state dependency is an important category of explanation for voting behavior especially when it comes to PSD and a peasant population who are “an easy prey for local predatory elites who control resources and therefore politics.” As for the current period, the popularity of both Basescu and Boc declined significantly, especially when they announced that the welfare state needs to be modernized and Romania must become independent of borrowing from IMF. “The state needs simplification

60Gandul, 5 February 2011. ‘PSD, PNL si PC fac astazi Uniunea Social Liberala’ [‘PSD, PNL and PC incorporate today the Social Liberal Union’].
61Realitatea TV, 3 December 2010. ‘Baconschi: In Romania, politics are made with no doctrine or values’.
from heavy costs and bureaucrats; people must find jobs in private industries.”62 With slogans such as “the state is not responsible for every citizen, that was communism;” and “Romanians must understand individual responsibility because the state does not have any longer the resources of a communist state” it is most likely that PSD, under the umbrella of USL, will claim victory again in Romanian politics.63 Basescu acknowledged that the Romanian electoral system needs revision. He is against party lists and in favor of “a clean nominal vote” that will connect voters with politicians in a context in which the current reality reflected by the Romanian Parliament is a “weak quality” of political leaders connected with the party.

The Parliament, as Basescu stresses, does not reflect the vote of the electorate but the option of the political party. In Basescu’s view approximately 40% of parliamentarians “have nothing to do” or no expertise to be in the parliament. Eugene Bejinariu, PSD deputy of Suceava, argues that Romania is divided in two, a Romania that belongs to political elites dominated by power struggles and personal interests and another Romania in which ordinary Romanian citizens try to make a living.64 Seen from outside, Romania can be easily perceived as an “unpredictable state” lacking real expertise in the civility of making politics even after five years of EU integration. Uncovering the nature and function of international societies has been one of the ES’s preoccupations and this study illustrates in the next chapter how the EU is an international society from the perspective of those who make it, the elites.

---

62 B1TV, 2 August 2011. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu’.
64 Monitorul de Suceava, 22 October 2010. ‘Bejinariu: Romania este o tara bogata, dar nu atat de bogata incat sa fie condusa de PD-L’. [‘Bejinariu: Romania is a rich country but not rich enough to be run by PD-L’].
CHAPTER SEVEN

ROMANIAN GOVERNMENT PERCEPTION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

The purpose of this chapter is to identify in context of the categories describing an international society how and whether or not Romanian governmental or political elites conceptualize the EU as an international society. An international society according to Bull (1977)

exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the workings of common institutions (Bull 1977:13).

The definition of international society suggests that common interests and values, common rules and institutions shared among states are elements that describe or tie together an international society. Bull refined the definition of international society several years later reducing it only to recognition, dialogue and consent.

By an international society we mean a group of states (or, more generally, a group of independent political communities) which not merely form a system, in the sense that the behavior of each is a necessary factor in the calculations of others, but also have established by dialogue and consent common rules and institutions for the conduct of their relations, and recognize their common interest in maintaining these arrangements (Bull & Watson 1984: 1).

In every society, common culture, as a Romanian elite underscored, is critical for common understanding, and maintaining of unity otherwise tensions among society’s groups and fragmentation are prone to ensue (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 18 February 2011). As findings of the chapter will show “common culture” and “common values” play a significant role in how Romanian government elites appear to perceive and understand the EU. Both proponents and critics of the ES agree that “the degree to which a system exhibits elements of a ‘society’ must ultimately be measured by elites’ perceptions of this society of rules and norms (Finnemore 2001: 509-510; Copeland 2003: 431). Before identifying the type of ‘society’ Romanians have
with the EU it is necessary to identify the meanings Romanian elites attach to the EU in a framework of an international society. In the ES sense, an empirical international society is created through states cooperation to fulfill a specific purpose such as trade or mutual defense. Europeans, for example, claim that the EU is a society of states created by Europeans from common desires to strengthen European identity, preserve peace and enhance prosperity. In the international system, the EU symbolizes a model of political and economic consolidation.

The ensuing section provides systematically collected evidence conveying that the EU is an international society constructed by the elites in the interest of their respective states and population. In the view of Romanians from the outside, the EU resembles a solidaristic society created by common interests while from the inside it is a society in competition in which states compete for power of decision-making and special interests. “We have special channels through which we make political lobby for the treatment applied to us and the Bulgarians to be correct” a Romanian elite underscored with respect to the Schengen issue reflecting the current situation inside the EU (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 18 February 2011; emphasis added).

Data provide evidence that inside the EU states seem to interact with each other on the principles of equality and reciprocity but sometimes, only bigger and older states voices matter in decision making. The extent to which the voice of newer EU members matters in the EU decision making process is as a matter of investigation from the perspective of EU governmental elites in further research.
EUROPEAN UNION - A UNION OF STATESMEN OR A UNION OF NATIONS

From the plethora of documents encompassing public and political speeches made by Romanian political elites from 2005 to 2010 emerges the idea that the EU is an international society of peace and prosperity built by government elites to advance these values. The EU is a product of anarchy mitigated by elites’ conscious commitment to peace and is also a process that requires, in the initial phase, an active political and diplomatic engagement of the elites followed by subsequent support of civic involvement of the population to properly integrate the state in the structures of international society. In Romania, the role of the president in foreign policy is to transmit political messages in which he sustains or not a point of view suggested by the foreign affairs minister and his collaborators. Corroborated data on the political speeches and interviews given by Romanian President Basescu with respect to the EU seem to suggest that Romania’s struggle to become part of the EU started with the elites and continued with the involvement of shared responsibility between the elites and the general population in the fight for Romania’s EU integration.

We began recently to understand that if the entry into the EU is first and foremost a problem of government and political class, EU integration is our problem, of each of 22 million Romanians since no government can produce changes in attitudes and mentalities of each person if we refuse to be integrated in the new reality” (Discourse of Romanian President, 19 June 2006).

The comments of the Prime Minister underscore also that the EU is a construction of the elites or a product of political diplomatic effort.

Currently, I can say that I am satisfied that I can hold my head up high when I come to Brussels. As compared to the situation one year ago, when I took over the mandate and I had huge concerns on Romania’s capacity to fulfill its obligations and on the possibility to join the EU on January 1st 2007. Today, I can tell you that due to efforts made together with the Cabinet colleagues, administration and all Romanians, we have achieved progress which can be seen, and appreciated accordingly. I am waiting for the May 17th Report of the Commission with much optimism (Government of Romania, 23 March 2006).

65 The question was first coined by Charles de Gaulle and was mentioned by Ungureanu (2008:140) in context of two Europe(s).
We face a critical moment in the evolution of Romania knowing that on January 1st 2007 Romania will become a member of European Union. Although with few obstacles, our political diplomatic effort does not end here. We are expected to embark onto a new journey with its own challenges, opportunities, successes and failures. In this journey we must remodel our identity as politicians, diplomats as well the identity of our nation. In this identity it is imperative to harmonize with clarity our national interest with the interests of the EU (Ungureanu 2008: 106).

“Remodel our identity as politicians, diplomats and the identity of our nation” signifies in the ES sense a Gemeinschaft society in which states conceive themselves to be bound by common rules, interests, sentiments and identity. The idea that the EU is a project put together by the elites to ensure the peace and prosperity of the whole is highlighted also by Jonathan Scheele, the Head of the European Commission Delegation in Romania who underscored at the ceremony of oath taken by the Romanian prefects that EU officials worked together with Romanian officials toward preparing Romania for EU membership. Messages such as this substantiate the fact that the EU is a construction by the elites and modern state institutions are among criteria of admission in the participation of the construction project.

Today, it is a great honor for me, as a foreigner to attend this important event together with you. The event is important for the European Commission despite the fact that the accession does not depend on the fact that the prefects of Romania are politically appointed or they are high ranking civil servants. There is no EU Acquis for establishing the standards necessary to governance system or national public administrators. That is why, we might say that Romania’s EU Accession does not depend on its administrative structure. But the success of this accession, Romania’s modernization cannot occur without the public administration reform. That’s why; I worked with the Ministry, the administration, the Romanian authorities and you in order to prepare this important change. That’s why, the public administration of Romania should adopt the general principles of good governance and to comply with the administrative standards defined and used by EU member states: trust and predictability, openness and transparency, accountability and efficiency, efficiency and effectiveness (Message by Jonathan Scheele, 4 January 2006; emphasis added).66

Romanian President underscored the fact that the Western political class failed to familiarize their population with the ambitions of the economic and political union that eventually lead to union apathy. The same thing can be stressed about the work accomplished by the Romanian elites since a EUROBAROMETRU poll commissioned by the EU to test Romanian public opinion revealed that in the early 2000s, 95% of Romanians favored integration in NATO versus

35% integration in the EU (Motoc & Cioculescu et al., 2010: 51). The 1992 Danish referendum on the Maastricht Treaty also revealed that the Danish people were against EU expansion while public opinion polls showed that “Danes and other Europeans were increasingly wary of decisions made by unknown “Eurocrats” in Brussels on matters ranging from the size of apples to the elimination of national currencies” (Cusimano Love 2011: 64).

[...] If we succeed at home we can join without hesitation those who share the vision for a powerful Union, prosper and present on the global scene; a union that attracts and inspires, a union that is respected and listened to, a model of democracy, economic prosperity, security, good neighborhoods in which every citizen and member state matters [...] We need functional and performing institutions in which our citizens feel represented and trust in. We must be competitive to overcome differences in standards of living between the EU and us and must offer Romanian citizens equal choices to standards of living. We need a coherent post accession strategy with a clear vision on Romania’s modernization. Our European vocation must be illustrated in the results of post EU accession that will contour Romania’s identity. We enter a Europe with eurosceptic citizens who feel that a European project does not reflect their interest. Those politicians from the EU who did not engage with their citizens paid an important political price. It is time to learn from their failure, to not be indifferent and deaf to the concerns of citizens and familiarize our citizens with European institutions as well as involve them in European topics of interest (Discourse of Romanian President, 20 December 2006).

According to Basescu,

One of the most important things for states pursuing EU membership is not the time of entry into the Union as it is preparing the new European citizens for living in an enlarged Europe. To us Europe is a culture and a space that although they do not appear foreign to us, they seemed to be very far away. We even developed a complex against an institutional structure –the European Union-who expects us to come yet it is up to us to get to and open the door (Discourse of Romanian President, 19 June 2006).

Q: What are the expectations of your government and your people as regards EU accession?

First of all, I would say Romanians no longer see the European Union as a Santa Claus figure. I think Romanians are more Euro-realists than used to be the case. Now, the Euro-optimism and trust in the European Union has decreased to 64-68 percent from 80 percent a few years ago, but the Euro-realism has increased. Also, one should stress that Romanian are more eager to find information concerning the effects of EU accession on their daily lives. As for the government, I think everybody is aware that the EU accession is a challenge. Firstly, Romania has to implement EU policies in a timely and complete manner. Secondly, there is the challenge to actively and promptly participate in the decision-making process at community level. The third challenge is ensuring a high absorption rate of EU funds. Fourthly, there is communicating with Romanian citizens, companies, and all the stake holders with regard to the changes entailed by implementing the acquis. But I am optimistic that the government, public authorities, citizens and companies will be able to make the most of Romania’s accession to the EU, to fully reap its benefits.67

Note in the middle fragment how one of the elites underscores the idea of international society advanced by Wight (1977) with respect to “culture and space” and how unfamiliar, culturally, the EU appeared for Romanians before 2007. Notably in the latter fragment “communicating with Romanian citizens” with respect to the EU’s accession was the fourth challenge stated and “the government” was listed first in light of reaping the benefits of EU accession.

The fragments of the political statements seem to imply that at its base the EU is a genuine construction of the elites requiring support from genuine European states and a genuine European citizenry. As noted, EU citizens are necessary to fructify and sustain elites’ political developments in reforming and integrating states within the Union. The failure of the referenda on the European Constitutional Treaty (seeking to modernize EU institutions) by French and the Netherlands citizens a few years later attest to the psychological impact the enlargement of the Union had for EU citizens and the level of involvement in the decision making process. The result of the referenda visibly illustrates the citizenry’s reluctance to proceed with enlargement and successful re-launch of the European project.

The rejection of the Treaty signifies how important the population becomes in the successful continuation of the European model and the shape of its character. The emotions created in Brussels when the Greek referendum was called in 2010, speak also about the fact that in decision-making, citizens voices are important and often come after the common aspirations of the elites. It is important to note however, that the statements indicating the EU as a project of the elites supersede statements showing the involvement of the Romanian population in the European project. The examined data seeking to identify meanings and beliefs that Romanian elites attach to the EU show a pattern in which elites highlight their urgency to familiarize the Romanian population and the population of the EU with respect to EU institutions, common
interests and prospects of cooperation thus supporting the claim that elites are those who negotiate the process or set the basis of an international society and the population serve as pillars for sustainability and the character international society acquires. “How well prepared is Romania to absorb the psychological, social and financial costs of EU membership” became one of the classical questions confronting Romanian elites before EU membership. Most of the elites’ replies included the phrase that “I think Romania is relatively well prepared, but it will rest with us, politicians to explain to Romanians the need to mobilize and modernize our country.”  

Most interview excerpts substantiate also the claim that the support of Romanian citizens became critical during the integration process and from the moment Romania was granted membership it became the responsibility of the governmental elites to educate the general population about the EU and its institutions. Data also show that membership into an international society can help ease the process of state reform.

In the case of Romania, EU membership legitimized the undertaken actions of Romanian elites to reform the state and its institutions. The rejection of the Constitutional Treaty by the French and Netherlands citizens was assessed by Romanian elites as a signal sent by citizens with respect to the EU’s future and the fact that the EU became more bureaucratic and inefficient. Shifting the message that the EU is based on a Brusselian elitist vision to the idea that the EU is a union created by the citizens of 27 democracies is challenging, and as Basescu underscored

Probing through referendum the approval of EU citizens with respect to enlargement is a salutary solution that consolidates democracy. Ultimately, the EU is not a construction of political elites but of citizens. They must decide what type of Union they want. We want to be good Europeans although nobody needs to make illusions that Romania will not play its own role within the Union.

---

68 Radio Free Europe, 26 September 2006. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu, President of Romania’.
Our voice will be heard; we want a powerful cohesive Europe searching to resolve common problems such as the energy policy. ^69

Romania signed, with the EU, the Accession Treaty on 25 April 2005. The Treaty provided Romania with terms and conditions based on which Romania was allowed to join the European family of nations. Before a common set date, (in the case of Romania 1st January 2007), each EU member state had to ratify Romania’s Accession Treaty in their Parliaments recommending therefore, based on how Romania fulfilled the undertaking commitments, admission or request more evidence of progress. The French President, Jacques Chirac (read an elite) for example, supported Romania’s membership in the Union but the French population was against it prompting the French Parliament to wait until the final Monitoring Report was released in May 2006 to show Romania’s progress to the French population.

France preferred to await first the Monitoring Report, which is the only objective instrument for the evaluation of the progress achieved by a country; they await the Report in order to have the necessary support base before the public opinion (Government of Romania, 24 March 2006).

The voice of the public opinion especially western voices seems to matter but not as much as the voice of their governmental elites. In 2006 there is evidence that Romanian Foreign Affairs Minister Ungureanu argued that the EU is a construction made by the people and for the people and it is

Not the evidence of the goodwill of some hypothetical technocrats from Brussels or some lenient governments of the member states. I can assure you that such people don’t exist when it comes to politics and economics. Rather the EU is an accomplishment at the end of a road that Romania and the EU went through together to ensure that the enlarged Europe is more powerful, democratic and competitive” (Ungureanu 2008: 74-5).

It is important to note however, that his scenario about the EU was presented at London School of Economics (LSE) on 30 October 2006 after two politically resounding ‘no’ votes obtained in 2005 from France and the Netherlands. In the Union, EU citizens, as Romanian President

^69 EurActiv, 27 December 2006. ‘Basescu in European Media: We will make our voice heard’.
underscored upon his return from Berlin, have not received prominence above the state until the 2007 Berlin Declaration. After signing the Berlin Declaration attesting 50 years in the European Community, Romanian President emphasized to the media upon returning from Berlin that

the Declaration sends a political message first and foremost to European citizens making an appeal to them and political elites to put trust in the European construction […] it is for the first time in the history of the EU when priority is given to citizens rather than the states (President Speech, 25 March 2007).

For centuries Europe has been an idea, holding out hope of peace and understanding. That hope has been fulfilled. European unification has made peace and prosperity possible. It has brought about a sense of community to overcome differences. Each Member State has helped to unite Europe and to strengthen democracy and the rule of law. Thanks to the yearning for freedom of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe the unnatural division of Europe is now consigned to the past. European integration shows that we have learned the painful lessons of a history marked by bloody conflict. Today we live together as was never possible before. We, the citizens of the European Union, have united for the better. In the European Union, we are turning our common ideals into reality: for us, the individual is paramount (European Council: ‘The Berlin Declaration’, 25 March 2007).

Examined in the absence of a political compromise the Berlin Declaration emphasizes the individual, as the highest institution of the Union in the name of whom common interests and values, common rules and institutions are created. If the international society, (read EU) is determined by mechanical factors of the anarchy reflected by the political configuration of the system then common interests, norms, values and institutions are the task of members of international society to be created and adapted to animate the system.

The EU as an international society appears constituted as a reflection of a social contract of the state elites to further certain shared principles and values to make the world more predictable “For centuries Europe has been an idea” resulting in a common construction of Europeans through common will and solidarity of political, economic and social forces. “An idea of peace” linked to security, prosperity and stabilization summing up former historical ideas of sovereignty, unity, borders and territories resonating thus with the ES institutionalization of common understanding. Tom Gallagher (2009:65) posed the question of “What motives did PSD
have for wanting to take Romania in the EU?” to a leading member of the EU Delegation negotiating Romania’s entry in the EU and was replied that “It was a desire for respectability on the part of the PSD combined with not wanting to be left out of a process that was gathering momentum everywhere in the region, except in former Yugoslavia.” In Gallagher’s (2009:67) view, while Brussels was busy with accession challenges PSD was busy lobbying and building political alliances with the European social democratic family in order to join the EU without complying with many entry requirements. As for the EU, Romanian Foreign Affairs Ministers mentioned since 2006 that the EU as a union is at a crossroads of what it is going to become.

The union is in flux and can become a democratic union of nations or a union of state elites. Apparently the EU confronts a deficit of communication not only between elites and their population but among elites themselves. Vasile Puscas (2007: 116), a former EU negotiator and EU parliamentarian argues for example, that at times, “EU political elites tend to withdraw near the original base of its constituencies leaving the European scene in fog.” Ungureanu (2008) acknowledge that citizens’ vociferation with respect to how EU treaties are enacted without their prior consult is legitimate and in his view, this is one of the fundamental flaws of the Union, the failing to involve its constituents.

From my own recent experience, the truth of the matter is that EU Foreign Affairs Ministers complain of the same thing, failure of communication. Who reads the Constitutional Treaty? The Treaty is 600 pages long, does not have pictures, the font is very small and it is not a sexy text. How do you present the Treaty? In what adapted form can the Treaty be transformed to make the object of social interest…Europe toward which we are going to has two alternatives, a Europe of homelands as Charles de Gaulle had mentioned or a Europe of nations. Do not ask me to choose: unfortunately I am on the boat and the wave leads the boat to a destination that cannot be decided only by myself…we are at crossroads between a federal Europe and a unitary Europe…the Constitutional Treaty was not ratified but only by half of the member states who proposed it (Ungureanu 2008: 140).

A “Europe of nations” or a “Europe of states,” the fragment underscores the democratic deficit of the Union and the critical support of the European population. To the ES, this is important since
it describes the character of the society at the regional level. Regional international societies seem to move beyond the civilized states to request civilized and involved nations.

THE MEANING OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

The meaning of the EU reflects in the view of Romanian elites ideas of “peace and prosperity,” a model of unity and diversity, a model of cooperation, a legal framework in which Romanians can be monitored and guided to function like a proper democracy, a family living ‘the occident life’ from which Romania was torn against its will 60 years ago, modernization and reforms, a European project to make peace. The meanings can be continued with solidarity, the common denominator of the Union, emphasizing common ideals of peace, liberty, tolerance, pluralism, respect for rule of law, unity in diversity, economic prosperity and social cohesion. Romanians expect from the EU more solidarity, political will, a powerful voice some call “Brussels is a bureaucracy expecting foreign affairs ministers to come with their own portfolio of community issues. Brussels now learns that Europe does not mean only Mediterranean, Adriatic or North Sea” but Eastern Europe and the Balkans (Ungureanu 2008: 141). The most representative elites’ statements conveying the meaning of the EU before membership are provided below.

The EU is a both a territory and a civilization in which differences coexist and are harmonized […] imagine that the EU is like a circle of friends. In danger action is taken together; if you want to show that you are members of the same group you adopt the same values and in danger you have a response similar to the group. One of Brussels expectation is to see you taking the same positions as it does in foreign policy. This indicates loyalty towards the same goal (Ungureanu 2008: 141).

Romania needs this chance […] The EU monitoring is necessary. It is a help to assure government credibility because in the last fifteen years people lost confidence in government.70

The EU is a project meant to assure the best living standards to its citizens. If we, the Romanians really want to join this project, it is necessary for us to become Europeans and to turn Romania into a European country. In fact, EU accession represents Romania’s modernization in a more accelerated way. And the effort should be made not only by the administration, political segment but by the entire society (The Office of Prime Minister, 13 April 2005).

The EU means the entry of Romania in the occidental life from where Romania was torn against its will 60 years ago; if the entry in NATO meant placing a powerful anchor of security, the entry in the EU means placing Romania in the prosperity anchor. It depends on us, Romanian citizens and our solidarity toward our objectives to succeed (Discourse of the President, 19 June 2006).

The EU is an experiment with imaginary frontiers symbolizing the guarantee of a political European contract. Europe is everywhere on the continent. A United Europe composed of several Europes of which we are all a part (Ungureanu 2008: 139).

Almost one year ago, you invested me with the position of Prime Minister. The mandate you entrusted me with stands under the sign of European integration. I want to show you where Romania stands now at the end of one year of governance…my political project is to transform Romania into a European country and us to become European citizens on the 1st of January 2007…PSD barons pushed us into the European Union with no real plans to fight against corruption…It was an elegant way by which the European leaders told the former Government: “We have opened the door for you, but you seem unable to enter!”…in 2005 we achieved three major successes toward EU accession: regain credibility, begin the modernization process and become active players within EU structures (Government of Romania, 20 December 2005).

The EU can be described in a single word: performance; performance of state institutions, social-economic performance, individual performance and performance of groups of people (Discourse of Romanian President, 19 June 2006).

The EU means modernization and reform […] credibility in front of European partners bridging the gaps between Romani and other EU states (Government of Romania, 17 May 2006).

Romanians have seen in the EU a model of cooperation who managed to facilitate the fulfillment of each European citizen’s potential (President’s Speech, 31 January 2007).

I have the ambition that Romania becomes a stronger and respected voice in Europe, not only in terms of population, but also in terms of economic potential, and its contribution to the European project promotion. A strong European Union, capable of political and social solidarity, competitive is in Romania’s interest (Government of Romania, 1 April 2007).

The EU is a solidary and unique project in the world through its scope and success (Government of Romania, 9 May 2007).

The EU is an innovative project just as desired by Robert Schuman to create a strong entity, competitive, influent, a space of prosperity and security for all EU citizens […] EU’s success is built on solid values and European Day will always be a moment to reflect on values and principles underlying the EU: peace, reconciliation, tolerance, liberty, solidarity, respect for democracy and diversity (President Speech, 8 May 2009).

The EU is an instrument using soft power to transform totalitarian regimes in functional democracies with vibrant market economies […] the EU can accomplish many things regarding common policies. There is a very thin line between what the EU can and can’t do and this was never clearly explained to EU citizens. The EU is not a perfect social union. It is a functional
union that offers solutions for a high number of issues raised but contributing the most to the abolition of barriers between states whether they are of commercial, security or mutual understanding nature (Ungureanu 2008: 80).

The EU means modernizing Romania at the current standards of any European country. This would mean a Romania, in which all citizens feel equal before the law, the removal of all privileges and discriminations [...] a medium that enables the citizen to be treated equally, respectfully by all public authorities, and the authorities to spend public money to serve national interest” (Government of Romania, 25 January 2010).

Solidarity is the common denominator of EU that needs to guide us forward. Economic and financial crises test the capacity of EU member states to be solidary to integrate in their own political conduct principles of the Union founding fathers. Allow me to remind you of the words of Jean Monnet suggesting that nothing is possible without the involvement of people nothing has a durable future in the absence of the institutions (President Speech, 7 May 2010).

The EU means a special communion with a system of values, identical gestures, mentalities, aspirations and common political projects. The EU means citizenship equality, it means that one should not be surprised of what he or she sees in London from what he or she sees in Madrid... Europe means first of all civilization, economic prosperity, a moral contract that connects communities into an indestructible force of community. Why is togetherness necessary? Because of economic prosperity; in a close circle prosperity generates unity, unity generates prosperity. Togetherness is necessary to identify a threat and gather the entire community to combat it. The idea of community cannot be held together in the absence of a project. No community exists without scope or guidance. The moral character of the current economic order is what strengthens the EU community. When all believe in the same values, and know they have to respect the same laws and venerate the same gods, after understanding the good and bad of morality and ethical responsibility, the strengthening bind is togetherness (Ungureanu 2008: 137-8).

The EU means changes in behavior of the state and the population, it means civilization. “What does EU mean for the Romanian peasant once they become EU citizens?” was an interesting question for Orban to answer.

Transformation or fundamental transformations in mentality, agriculture and farming including food safety and animal rights; Some simple rules which for occidentals they are as given while we need to learn to internalize them...the slaughter of the pig ritual for example; [we] must understand that we enter in an organization, a home with specific rules. We must respect them. Why? Because respecting the rules of the game leads to benefits. It helps you to live well but the rules of the game must be respected whether we like it or not.”

[Occidentals] or the EU members reached this point of civilization not by chance but through a common understanding of the community acquis. Of course there are traditions and histories but rules need to be respected. EU integration is a process in which we must teach people the rules of the game. Those who would respect the rules of the game will benefit the most.”

---
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The meaning of the EU extracted from the aforementioned statements conveys the EU as an international society portrayed by the ES classics as a process or adherence to a common set of values, rules and interests in which solidarity is not visible only at the level of the Union but at the level of the state to achieve pre-established objectives to become a political equally recognized member of the Union. “Transformation” is the key word describing the Gemeinschaft community. “Why does Romania wish to become an EU member state? The Bulgarian Prime Minister Stanishev has recently said that the EU membership for Bulgaria will serve as ‘a financial compensation for the hardship during the transition from communism to democracy’. Do you share this point of view?” was a question posed to the Minister of European Integration, Anca Boagiu.

Becoming an EU member state is rediscovering our identity, regaining our natural status. We have been listening to the orchestra for so long, but only recently preparing to be part of it. The European integration is a chance for Romania to modernize its institutions, its mentalities. Already the changes brought up by the integration process are becoming part of our ordinary lives. We have new institutions, new regulations, new opportunities and new challenges we have to face. It is a complex process that touches every layer. What we are going through is what we have assumed, not something we have imposed. [Sentimentally,] it is true indeed. But I think that neither the Romanian nor Bulgaria should be naïve to believe that EU integration is an automatic process because of our recent history. And it is in my honest belief that both Romania and Bulgaria have undergone all the necessary steps for the European integration only in the light of the Copenhagen criteria...In other words, Romania and Bulgaria were neither mistreated nor favored by our European partners.”

EU entry is an investment in peace and stability.

Romanians must drop the idea that the EU means milk and honey all over the place. Wanting to be an EU country is something, understanding the process is something completely different...the large share of Romanians supporting EU integration proves that they want to be where they belong, as soon as possible, but the most significant issue is that they do not know what the process means. It is easy to claim we want to join the EU and, on the other hand, not to accept the measures the Government needs to take for Romania to be able to perform well economically and socially.

73 Europe Gateway, 6 July 2006. ‘Romanian Minister of European Integration Ms. Anca Boagiu in an interview for Portal Europe’.
72 BBC Monitoring European, 9 May 2006. ‘EU aspirant and fringe countries: President Basescu speaking in Vilnius on 4 May’.
75 Rompres, 28 February 2005. ‘President Basescu draws attention to costs incurred by EU accession process’.
Chronologically in the elites’ political statements and interviews the EU is conceptualized as a family in which every citizen can secure its own good. The EU is a model of common construction based on solidarity and political will reflected by European institutions, European Commission and Parliament, the two main pillars that helped Romania’s EU accession process (Discourse of Romanian President, 20 December 2006).

The EU is a community in which Romanian citizens can prosper through the modernization of Romanian state institutions. For example, Basescu argues that the EU has the framework of governance to guide and socialize Romania within EU institutions by inviting Romania to observe the union’s rules and norms. The process in which Romania’s institutions were reformed, to a certain extent, to make them compatible with EU institutions is part of “socialization.” Fulfilling the criteria for membership and the periodic evaluations of the European Commission since 2005 to determine whether or not Romania was compatible with EU standards reflects the Union efforts to raise Romania to membership status as well as Romania’s efforts to fulfill EU standards. The removal of Romania from the mediocrity of its state institutions in the name of entry in the EU goes beyond the political aspect seeking vitalization and efficiency.

The EU socialized Romania in Brussels and offered a consistent amount of financial assistance in grants through PHARE, ISPA and SAPARD to bring Romania to EU standards however, the EU missed the opportunity to anticipate two of Romania’s closet problems that impeded real economic development and paralyzed the institutions of democracy: the culture of corruption, and the inefficiency of the judicial system. The allocation of irredeemable 31 billion euros for 2007-2013 from the EU budget designated to improve transport infrastructure, regional development, human resources and economic competitiveness sought to modernize Romania by
bringing it to a developing stage compatible to some of the EU’s standards. Basescu stressed, “We are obligated to prepare Romanian institutions to be capable to absorb structural funds sent to Romania and achieve by 2015 a modern Romanian state capable to assure Romanians a decent life” (Discourse of Romanian President, 19 June 2006). It is important to note however, that despite membership the EU continues to check Romania’s progress in areas of justice, home affairs and Schengen but as the current US Ambassador to Romania suggested recently, “Romanians must want to eliminate their corruption more than the occidentals want.” In an interview three months before Romania became a member of the EU, Basescu was asked whether or not Romania would become a second class member in the EU compared to countries that obtained EU membership on 1 May 2004. Basescu underscored that:

Romania would not have accepted it as a way of tackling [the membership] negotiations being discriminated against other members. The reality is that Europe is now more skeptical. Europe is now experiencing a crisis of self-confidence-a crisis caused by the fact that there is no clear view of future solutions. There are problems with the EU constitution, with the future of EU expansion, with the functionality of European structures, which have become extremely bureaucratic. Amid such problems, it is only normal that enthusiasm toward new members should diminish, and even the new members themselves seem to suffer from a lack of enthusiasm. But, if we think that once we have been admitted, there is nothing more to do, failure is guaranteed. That’s why I am aware of the fact that after 1 January 2007, we will have to complete the integration process. Admission is one thing; integration is something different.76

What the Romanian President, PM and Foreign Affairs Ministers try to convey in this section is that from the outside the EU is perceived as a Union in which differences are negotiated and not discriminated. Romanians at least imagine that once Romania is granted membership Romania will have an equal voice in decision making. As it will be illustrated in the following sections, the reality inside the Union is different from what Romanian elites expected from the outside in the sense that inside the Union states are faced with choices to either join in the development of the model of the stronger voices or lag behind in integration, corruption and traps of domestic

76 Radio Free Europe, 26 September 2006. ‘Romania: President Traian Basescu Speaks with RFE/RL’.
politics. As it will be shown the EU is a medium of intensive interaction in which states can disagree over certain positions based on their national interests such is the case of Kosovo in Romania’s instance but at the same time the EU is a regional framework of cooperation in which new members have to work harder to win the trust of the core or older member states and escape the stereotype of the past. The Schengen case is illustrative showing that Romania had not won the trust of Netherlands to become part of the Schengen program despite the fact that Romania made its entry case in the EU as being the country that will protect the Eastern frontier of the EU. Therefore, it seems that an equal voice within the Union is correlated with living by the standard of the stronger voices within the Union meaning less corruption, more political stability and greater predictability.

“COMMON INTERESTS”

An international society is described by common interests and values, rules and institutions shared among states. There is no question that Romania shares common interests with the EU therefore the quest in this section is to dive into the meanings of conscious recognition of certain common interests and common values essential for the creation of common rules and common institutions. Ayoob argues for example, that a regional system transforms into a regional society when elements of community of conscious recognition on the part of regional states are present. In Ayoob’s (1999:248) view, the concept of “society” at the regional level is informed by a consciousness of common interests and values which are essential for the formulation of common rules and the creation of common institutions. Security is the common denominator underpinning Romanian common interests with the EU. Whether it is shared security in the Black Sea region, market economy, energy or the Eastern European Border, Romanian
governmental elites convinced the EU to proceed with Eastern enlargement in the name of security. Analogous is the security reason with how Wight (1966) conceptualized the enlargement of the European international society.

International society is the habitual intercourse of independent communities, beginning in the Christendom of Western Europe and gradually extending throughout the world. It is manifest in the diplomatic system; in the conscious maintenance of the balance of power to preserve the independence of the member communities; in the regular operations of international law whose binding force is accepted over a wide though politically unimportant range of subjects; in economic, social and technological interdependence and the functional international institutions established latterly to regulate it. All these presuppose an international social consciousness, a world wide community sentiment (Wight 1966: 96; emphasis added).

Common solutions to common problems in the Black Sea related to frozen conflicts, arms, drugs and human trafficking is the approach suggested by Romania to the EU to be decided together. Basescu argues that the Black Sea region constitutes an area where Romania’s and the EU’s common interests converge.

Well, the new reality will most likely influence EU policy as a whole. Until now, the responsibility for what was happening in the Black Sea region rested on Russia and Turkey, mainly while Romania as a NATO member and a prospective EU member was trying to stir the EU’s interest for the region. From the moment Romania becomes an EU member, it is clear that the European Union itself will have a border with the Black Sea and its problems, which are not few: frozen conflicts, massive human trafficking from the former Soviet Republics to Europe, arms trafficking, drugs trafficking which have as a final destination EU member state, including Romania.77

From the common interests of internationalization of the Black Sea region steam energy interests:

These problems will become EU problems, especially since Europe gets more than 50 percent of its energy from this region. And, paradoxically, as if by God’s grace, the most viable alternative solutions are also in the Black Sea region—I mean the oil reserves from the Caspian. The main problem is how we will bring these resources of oil and gas from the Caspian toward Europe without using the current distribution system; in other words, how can we establish an alternative to the current domination of Russian state controlled energy giant-Gazprom.78

We want a strong, robust Europe that should seek common solutions to problems. The energy policy is an example of common interests and common solutions. Frozen conflicts at the frontier of NATO and the EU can erupt any moment and threaten the stability of Europe. A common political will of EU, US, Russia and Turkey can help to remediate the problem. The EU is the only

77 Radio Free Europe, 26 September 2006. ‘Romania: President Traian Basescu Speaks with RFE/RL’.
78 Radio Free Europe, 26 September 2006. ‘Romania: President Traian Basescu Speaks with RFE/RL’.
institution capable of guaranteeing the democracy Romanians obtained in 1989; to Romania EU offers development with a capital D.\textsuperscript{79}

Romania is an important market for the EU. We want to find our place in Europe, the place that we had until the Second World War, in the era in which Bucharest was called “little Paris.” Romania brings to the EU a value added of security because we are at the crossroads between Europe and frozen conflicts from Transnistria, Nagorno Karabah, and Ossetia; Romania is rich in culture and history and educated people, just think how many young Romanians work for Microsoft in Europe.\textsuperscript{80}

Nabucco project is financed by the EU with 200 million EUR and by each member country in the project including Turkey, Bulgaria, Hungary and Austria (\textsl{Press Release by Prime Minister}, 14 July 2009).

Nabucco is an important project because of energy security and economic viability [...] the project ensures Romania’s energy security [...] Romania is interested in all project dimensions aimed at consolidating energy security: diversification of routes and sources; consolidation of the EU internal market for energy and gas as well as reduction of consumption through renewable energy. Our goal is to ensure the security of energy supply as a basis for sustainable economic development. Promoting energy security in the Black Sea region, a strategic area at the cross of Europe, Caucasus and the Caspian Region is one of Romania’s main objectives [...] Romania is also one of the initiators next to Austria of the EU Strategy for the Danube region. The promotion of a Strategy at the EU level demonstrates our capacity, as a responsible EU member state to contribute effectively to EU development (\textsl{Speech by Prime Minister}, 13 November 2009).

During the summer of 2005, Dinga signaled that the EU was challenged by the lack of an area of common interest able to overcome conjectural interests.

Solidarity as a European tenet has been humiliated at the summer session of the EU Council, although we can also mention that, when discussing the sixth variant of the financial perspective, it was just the new (smaller and poorer) member states that were ready to give up some support, but an agreement could be reached, and an EU pattern reconfiguration was required.\textsuperscript{81}

The end of the bipolar world order transformed the concept of security into a commonly constructed concept guided by diplomacy to include in addition to collective state security (territory and sovereignty), societal security (cultural identity, civilization and ideology) and individual security (survival of the individual and the economic prosperity) (Ungureanu 2008: 167-9). Romanian Foreign Affairs Ministers including Cioroianu, Comanescu and Baconschi argue that as a member of EU, Romania must learn how to escape the mentality of a “candidate

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{EurActiv}, 27 September 2006. ‘Basescu in European Media: We will make our voice be heard’.

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Forward} (Belgian Publication), 4 April 2005. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu’ available on the presidency.ro

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{BBC Monitoring European}, 21 June 2005. ‘Romanian integration minister views major challenges facing EU’.
status” and begin harmonizing Romania’s interests with those of the EU. In the view of Comanescu, “Brussels means among other things Romania but is it equally important for Bucharest to make an effort to look like Brussels.”82 In this way, in the opinion of Comanescu Romania will make an effort to meaningfully contribute to the EU. A potential deficiency pointed at unison by Foreign Affairs Ministers is that Romanian political elites do not know how to harmonize Romania’s interests with those of the EU. Romania lacks a genuine political class familiar with the European political process. Baconschi for example credits the absence of an innovative collective mentality to the lack of practical institutional success inside the EU.

In a historical context this is related to our collective memory. We have not until now been part but only of forms without substance - that is the truth! We have not internalized the European reflux, the feeling that we are part of a dynamic organization in which every member state reciprocally influences each other. There is a deficit of European attitude in Romanian society and in the Romanian media.83

Comanescu also urges Romanian elites need to get to know the modicum of the European political process and become acquainted with the European political issues in order to take advantage in assessing, strategizing and consolidating Romania’s interests and policies in concordance with EU policies of coexistence, minorities and financial budgeting. Further, Comanescu points out that Romania has great chances to become a leader or an important actor in one of the neighborhood policies at the south or eastern part of Romania. EU in his view, is what member states wanted to be, if member states take leading actions over leadership positions and division of labor. Based on Comanescu’s take, the EU constitutes a unit with parts performing specialized tasks yet Romania has to identify its niche. Both Comanescu and Basescu seem to conceptualize the EU as a political and economic space in which the Romanian


population should feel at home. “Romania in the EU is at home” and needs to be treated as such; political elites underscore this in both various interviews and political statements. Although theoretically since January 2007 this is true practically, the challenge in the social integration of the Roma population and of other types of Romanians seeking employment in the Union worsened the Romanian public image in the EU. Dealing with either the Roma or Gypsy population or with employment issues is part of the “common interest” problems the government elites argue. In one voice Romanian governmental elites argue that the Roma issue needs a European solution because they are now European citizens. Romanians seem to expect from members of the EU guidance on how to better include and integrate into the structures of EU society a nomadic population such as Roma. They expect a sense of solidarity in coexisting peacefully while observing common purposes.

On this note Basescu, Comanescu and Baconschi warn that they do not want to transfer the Roma problem from the national level to the international level or from Romania to the EU but as EU members they want an EU common approach that can solve the problem due to the fact that EU members have the obligation to respect the free movement of people.\footnote{Ziare.com, July 1, 2010. ‘Lazar Comanescu: Problema Romilor ar trebui tratata din perspectiva Europeana’; ‘Lazar Comanescu: Rroma issue should be treated from a European perspective’.} Europe, in Baconschi’s view, appears to be a union based on “openness, inclusion and community” which are the opposite of “fear, hatred and poverty.” According to Baconschi, Romania takes the EU membership very seriously and finds the creation of “artificial dividing lines in Europe” such as “new Europe” versus “old Europe” counterproductive.

We don’t really need such things […] if we really want to correctly implement the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty, if we want to have a fruitful perspective of the EU as a global player, so I think it’s a pity to put at risk any of our achievements—that’s why we need transparent rules, real equity
between member states and political debate on a democratic basis if we really want to build up the EU in the 21st century in a completely transformed global environment.\footnote{The Financial Times Europe, 16 January 2011. ‘Interview Transcript: Teodor Baconschi foreign minister’. Interview by Chris Bryant in Vienna. 16 January 2011.}

Prioritizing the idea of intergovernmental Europe over that of the community would be a great failure. An apocalyptic scenario because all the positive experiences accumulated in building the European construction in the last 50 years or so would be lost […] everyone is interested in preserving what has been built without affecting the European idea.\footnote{Baconschi Blog, 16 January 2011. ‘Interview with Teodor Baconschi at talk show: “Romanian Politics” transmitted by Reality TV’. The interview is available at http://baconschi.ro/la-emisiunea-romania-politica-realitatea-tv/ [Last Accessed on January 2, 2012].}

Increasingly, since Romanians have become part of the Union, they express their concern of preserving the Union’s funding principles. In the ES Bull (1977) and Wight (1977) speak about an international system becoming an international society excluding the possibility of an international society to decline in the sense of community and transform into an international system. The society concept describes what consciously unites or divides a community and the idea of society in Bull & Watson’s (1984: 120) view is dictated by will or consent to adopt the values and practices of international society. Finding a voice or competing for a voice inside the Union seems to suggest that members of the Union compete for trust, attention and power inside the Union sometimes using the community instruments in self interests.

The principles on which the Union was founded are very important in the memory of the 500 million Europeans who became dedicated after the Second World War in this great European adventure built on certain values and sacred principles. If the sacredness of these principles is negotiated on a case to case basis according to electoral jocularity of a member state we run the risk to weaken this great construction and to get back to every state for itself. With the risk of becoming only a declarative repetitive statement, I believe that assuming the Union principles is critical for EU members in order to prevent a snowball effect (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11 February 2010).

\textit{Q: Apropos of countries outside the EU, Europe is going to have a Foreign Affairs Ministry with people who will work in the service of EU diplomacy. Do you hope to see a Romanian ambassador among them?}

At this time the result is disappointing. Practically only a Hungarian and a Lithuanian managed to place themselves on the list. The principle that one third of the component service comes from national diplomacy must be respected otherwise the geographic equilibrium would not be
respected as it will be the legitimation of this instrument with which the EU aims to project itself as a global actor. At this time the new members are penalized. The process is in progress. There are promises that some relevant positions in Brussels, in the executive center will ensue for us (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11 February 2010).

This is an indication that inside the Union, older members not only have more political influence but compete with new states for power and their states interests.

Q: Why are those from Central and Eastern Europe penalized?

Obviously, the big ones take their greater share. Hence, on the one hand the commissioners who know each other are promoting themselves, on the other hand the big member states that have a great political weight are inclined to award themselves, of course through less transparent negotiations, the most relevant positions from the diplomatic service. If we want the service to represent the interests of 27 members and to isolate some consensual themes of Pan European foreign policy we need the representation of all new members. Because they appear to exclude at least at this point not only Romania and Bulgaria, the new members, but other countries from the “new Europe.” We hope Europe will be only one and its diplomatic service to serve the interests of the 500 million of European citizens (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11 February 2010).

Aurescu for example underscored similar points:

Romania is a strong supporter of an increased role for the EU on the international scene, as well as for a more effective external action of the Union […] It is our view that the impact of the Lisbon Treaty on the institutional architecture of the CFSP should lead to more coherence, efficiency and transparency in the overall EU external action. There is a need for more structure and coherence in an area where already there’s a considerable amount of substance but not a particularly high level of convergence and pragmatism (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 28 June 2011).

Compromise and the capacity to maintain potential tensions under control is important for the Union (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 10 December 2010).

Furthermore, regarding Romania’s common interests with the EU, Basescu assured the President of the European Commission Jose Manuel Barroso that after joining the EU, Romania would not change its interests on any questions of the European interest. “The Romanians would be good Europeans” Basescu said; “we would have a good mastery of the art of negotiations and compromise and that Romania would consolidate its institutions so that it should make its contribution as important as possible to the development of the European Union.”87 It can be

87 Rompres, January 30, 2007. ‘President Traian Basescu on Tuesday assured Barroso…’
assumed from Boagiu’s interviews that in her view, the EU constituted “another world” yet a world in which Roma citizens were the most immediate European citizens of Europe. In context of Romania’s image in Europe Boagiu stressed that

we are a country that has its own values, we are a country as culturally rich as any European country […] Yes, we have a Roma population, but at the same time you can find the Roma people all over Europe, not only Romania has Roma. We could say that the Roma are the most European citizens of Europe. You can find them everywhere in all countries.\(^8\)

The French were among the first EU members to scold Romania for failing to integrate the Roma population. The French attempt at inclusion however, showed little progress as Roma continued to behave in the EU according to how they understood EU, in many respects worse than how they behaved in Romania. The French policy to repatriate Roma citizens from the periphery of the largest cities was not well received by the Romanian elites including Boc who argued that “there is also a divided European responsibility for solving the Gypsy issue; the issue of the ethnic Gypsy requires a European approach that should be complimentary to the national efforts with a view to ensuring the social inclusion.”\(^8\) In response to Boc’s message and after unsuccessful attempts to deal with the Gypsy issue the French Minister of Immigration Eric Besson stressed that France is willing to relinquish to Romania the expertise in implementing the social inclusion projects meant for the Gypsies.” Basescu’s response to the French’s approach stressed that

the Gypsy should be helped to buy trailers, a measure which will allow preserving their nomadic culture, but without resulting in their assimilation […] moving from place to place represents an important part of their culture […] we cannot force them to stay in one place because they won’t stay […] I believe that we should find a more adequate solution for the nomadic Roma or Gypsies, instead of trying to fool them with 300 euros, like the French government is doing right now-a government that used to be more generous with Gypsies before, when they bought them 15 sheep, so that Gypsies were laughing for they have never bred sheep. They sold them the next day. Maybe we can find a formula to help them buy trailers instead. I saw in Spain how this type of problem was solved.\(^9\)

\(^8\) *EurActiv*, 24October 2005. ‘Interview with Romania’s minister for European integration Anca Boagiu’.

\(^9\) *Rompres*, 10 September 2010. ‘There is also a divided European responsibility for solving Gypsies issue’.

\(^9\) *BBC Monitoring European*, 9 September 2010. ‘Romania’s president says EU was aware of Roma problem’.
According to Basescu, when Romania entered the EU, the European community was aware that among 22 million Romanians, half a million were Gypsies. “Europe knew very well about this particular community in Romania. That’s why Europe cannot come today and say: these are not European citizens, they have no rights.” In Basescu’s view the principle of solidarity in EU common interests was and continues to be tested multiple times on various issues and it is necessary that member states come together to provide a common and efficient solution. According to Basescu, “solidarity must be assumed including at the level of the ordinary citizen and of the political class, of the public administration, and of the civil society.” Minority rights concerned the EU community since the period of Romania’s accession. Boagiu stressed during a visit of the Dutch diplomacy that

We must continue the integration process of the Roma community into society. Romania’s government is implementing several programs to this end, but a change in mentality is also needed. A strategy at the European level would be welcome, having as its objective the tackling of problems specific to Roma ethnic population.

Romanian elites seem to reveal that the conscious recognition of common interests seem to converge well with those of the EU when security is conceptualized in the name of the state rather than in the name of the individual (if the failure to find a common policy to integrate Roma is considered). Romania’s reconnection with Europe was helped by states interests including France, Germany and in particular by the US interests in the Black Sea region and the Middle East. The German support for instance emphasized in Bucharest by the president of the German region of Hessen, Norbert Kartmann, whose father was born in Romania was that “We want Romania to become a full EU member state as soon as possible […] I wish Romania, from
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91 BBC Monitoring European, 9 September 2010. ‘Romania’s president says EU was aware of Roma problem’.
93 BBC Monitoring European, 3 March 2006. ‘Romania: Dutch foreign minister discusses EU accession and minority rights’.
all my heart to join the EU on 1 January 2007 because the EU’s eastern flank will be incomplete without a stable partner like Romania.”94 In the EU, Romanian political elites claim to have power to affect decision-making while pointing to issues and vociferously expressing concerns over EU’s cohesion, common vision, and peaceful governance while with other non EU members such as Republic of Moldova, Croatia, Serbia or SFOR, Romanians offer their EU integration expertise indicating a sense of responsibility as an EU member to strengthen European stabilization; whereas the interaction with non-European states stands for strengthening EU’s role as a global actor.

Diez & Whitman (2002) suggested that the EU international society and the global society are interdependent coexisting in a system of rules and institutions distinguished by the density of rules and norms. According to Ungureanu (2008:138), the EU is based on four pillars: morality, resistance against external threats, the wish for prosperity and the common project. As Ungureanu and other Romanian elites suggest currently in the EU the first two pillars are less visible than are the last two. Illustrative of Romania’s request for speaking with one voice and forming common resistance is emphasized in the claim of Baconschi that “among the excellence fields of the Romanian diplomacy is the security and defense policy as well as the external policy of the EU;” in his view,

Romania has understood the potential of the European Union as a global player, it is supporting the common sense idea that the EU stands no chance of facing the emerging giants and the geopolitical configurations if it does not speak with one voice; so we have to responsibly contribute to building consensus on the big external policy issues that the European External Action Service will advocate globally.95

It is noteworthy that Basescu underscored that among the principles underlying the functioning of the EU, Romania prioritizes most the principle of solidarity stressing that “we shall know how

94 BBC Monitoring European, 4 October 2005. ‘German region head supports Romania’s EU entry in 2007’.
95 Rompres, 8 October 2010. ‘For Minister Baconschi: it is frustrating that Romania has not received any posts in EEAS’.
to be united with the EU, with the European Commission, and with the member states as the EU has turned into ‘the big house’ where the 27th child lives too.”

Romanian elites stress that the principal of solidarity is the common denominator of the Union and they see the principle working especially in strengthening cooperation framework between EU members and prospective members on the “to do list” or “pieces of advice” considered, for example, by the Minister of European Integration critical in helping Romania and other membership seeking states to reach the EU’s objectives. “The EU will help us but they won’t spoon feed us” indicate that the EU is an arena of competition but not in terms of calculation for the good of one state but for the good of all. In contrast to the European international society, Romanian elites want to see the EU engaged and matter at the global level but not in context in which EU members will compete against each other overseas but compete as a union with other unions, something that was suggested by Buzan (2009).

“COMMON VALUES”

The Treaty of Lisbon is considered in context of the EU a reform treaty that established the fundamental rights and values to solidarity and security. With the Treaty of Lisbon the Charter of Fundamental Rights acquires legal values and six fundamental values become EU values: dignity, liberty, equality, solidarity, citizenship and justice. If in the area of “common interests” the meanings that Romanian elites attach to the term seem to have a similar understanding or practical translation with that of the EU, when it comes to values Romanian elites lack understanding of common EU values and appear to have a difficult time naming Romanian values and this is probably because Romanian values are basically obscured or corrupted by an
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96 Rompres, January 30, 2007. ‘President Traian Basescu on Tuesday assured Barroso…’
unjust judicial system. In the state of Romania values seem to get significant meaning only in regional context. Gallagher (2009:6-7) for example argues that in Romania, political accountability, clean government and active citizenship are corrupted by a cartel political elite more “cynical and amoral” than that of the Soviet satellites. In his view in Romania, “the quality of many politicians and civil servants and their knowledge of what Europeanization entails were inferior to Poland, Hungary and other Baltic states.”

In the past, as Gong (1984) demonstrated, accepting the standards and values of an international society distinguished between members and non members of the society. In an international society no country wants to be ostracized as an uncivilized country because the priorities of values speak about the character of the state. To what extent could Romanian political elites be induced to accept the standards and values of the Union if they seem to have no similar meaning or understanding for the Union values and their own values? Alina Mungiu-Pippidi for example makes an interesting observation with respect to Romania’s development and its role in the EU. She notes that although Romania is a member of the EU, Romania does not behave like one.

We act as if we were not one and even the EU does not fully accept us. We are still foreign, undigested matter. We do not seem to aspire to a postmodern foreign policy, unlike other developed EU countries such as the Netherlands, whose foreign policy is exerted using the EU’s foreign affairs mechanism as an intermediary and by creating alliances on the issues of interest. We rather seem like a country with 19th century aspirations, concerned with our own identity and our own borders, forgetting that the EU enlargement has made borders superfluous.97

According to Mungiu-Pippidi, Romanian political elites are detached from the EU’s CFSP and had chosen instead a postmodern foreign policy, a foreign policy based on “interests rather than values.” Romania’s solution for the Moldova Republic was to use ethnic principles to grant Romanian citizenship thus taking the short cut toward securing the free movement in the EU for
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97 BBC Monitoring European, 28 April 2009. ‘Commentary deplores Romanian foreign policy on Moldova’.
some citizens of the Moldova Republic rather than helping the citizens of Moldova understand the EU. A new legislative framework brought by the Treaty of Lisbon offered more prospects for democracy and efficiency.

The EU is a living space of democracy and civic values. You, the younger generation are responsible to make the fundamental values of the Treaty to come alive; we, the current political leaders propose the values (President Speech, 23 November 2007).

It is noteworthy to mention, that it is difficult to identify in collected data clearly stated values other than paying lip service to the values mentioned by the EU documents. Both Tariceanu and Mihai Razvan Ungureanu seem to share a Euro-centric philosophy on values informed by the founding fathers of the EU, Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman and probably by their international exposure and education. Once speaking before the Parliament Tariceanu asked

What type of society will we be inside the space of the EU? The European standards shape the Romanian future from the outside and the system of values Romanians chose to adopt shapes Romans future from the inside […] the great challenge for Romania is to build a system of genuine values. Communism destructed our elites and undermined our values. The Romanian society has been in search of some benchmarks for 16 years. The European project provides us a support in this respect. But if we do not undertake the fundamental values which lay at the basis of the United Europe, we have no chance to evolve within the system (Government of Romania, 17 May 2006).

How critical is observing the common rules and values for the future of an international society? The sharing of values in the EU refers to the dissemination of democratic principles. Respecting the value of each human being and human dignity, respect for the individual and its fundamental rights and freedoms, the toleration of the Gypsy in the EU speaks about the cultivation of solidarity to integrate the minority population in the system of values of the Union. Both Foreign Affairs Ministers Cioroianu and Ungureanu had to resign from office based on their responsive actions involving Romanian citizens abroad. Two Romanian citizens were held against their will in Iraq in the case of Ungureanu and one Romanian citizen died in a hunger strike in Poland in the case of Cioroianu. The demission of the two ministers based on their responsive actions
involving Romanian citizens abroad was unprecedented in Romanian political offices and speak in this context about the shared expectations in the EU and how the expectations influence the practice of Romanian elites. For example, Ungureanu mentions in his resignation note that the issue with two Romanian citizens represented a problem deemed to be resolved by the Romanian consulate in the respective country and not a problem of the competence of the Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs however, due to the fact that Romanian Prime Minister Tariceanu asked for his resignation Ungureanu was happy to conform to noting that “this should become the norm in a normal political environment, in a normal country, in a European country whenever a high senior official appointed in high positions knowingly or unknowingly violates the rules of communication or the rules of conduct that affects the high quality of their work.”

Recently, the third Foreign Affairs Minister Baconschi was asked to resign after a “violent and clueless slums” phrase appeared on his blog describing the demonstrators throwing rocks at the police while protesting in Bucharest. The description of Baconschi seems legitimate in context in which Romania is an EU country and Romanian citizens are expected to behave like citizens of the Union. The resignation of Baconschi however, may be part of a political calculation to substitute his investiture with that of former Foreign Minister Diaconescu who seems less scrupulous navigating the Brusselian channels for obtaining Romania Schengen membership. Romania, as the British conservative politician and ex-European Commissioner Chris Patten labeled it in 2004, can be viewed as an “unpredictable state” or as a “hybrid of democracies” an observation underscored by Vladimir Tismaneanu who argued once that in Romania “we have democracy Italian style, democracy Greek style and we have democracy
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Romanian style;” Tismaneanu argues that in Romania there is a lack of three T’s such as trust, tolerance and truth but political elites are engaged in a “politics of dialogue.” In relation to “common values,” Ungureanu underscored that Romania respects the same values as other EU states respect and condemn the same faults and the same vices as other EU states do. The need to re-create some genuine elites committed to respecting others, the rule of law, work, honesty and genuine values is necessary in the view of Tariceanu to modernize Romania.

I can assure you that the Government will continue to support the fight against corruption, not only because there is a careful EU monitoring in this respect, but because Romania needs a strong judiciary. The fight against corruption is a prerequisite of the rule of law. I can appreciate that nowadays, in Romania, there is a great need for justice; there is a thirst for justice at the level of the population. Although, we have a functional market economy, and we have fundamental institutions which are correctly functioning, we have to attempt to redeem the confidence in the judiciary, which should be efficient, independent, avoid excess, so that the state relies on three pillars, namely: the executive power, legislative power and the judiciary (Government of Romania, 17 February, 2006).

Unfortunately, we too often think of the respect for law and rules in terms of coercion, and the defense mechanism which automatically starts is the one to disobey law. We need to transform the respect for law into a fundamental value that regulates relations among citizens. Then, there will be order here as in any other European country, and the energy which we waste might be invested in a much more profitable way (Government of Romania, 17 May 2006; emphasis added).

In a European state, the citizen with their rights and freedoms is at the center of actions carried out by institutions. It should be the same in Romania (Government of Romania, 1 August 2007).

The general idea emerging from speeches and political statements in context of “common values” is that the task to defend EU values is transferred to the younger generation. Boc for example urged the younger generation of Poland and elsewhere in Europe to use “every day to defend democracy and our values in European Union, which may bring prosperity and freedom.” Although Romania’s fight against corruption is not uniformly translated into practice the European Commission continues to monitor performance on the judiciary reform
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and influence Romania’s ascendancy in the Schengen Access. Tariceanu’s understanding of “common values” is influenced by the value of human dignity translated by the dictum of Jean Monnet that “we do not form states coalitions, we unite people.”

I would like to add that people unite when they share joint values. For this reason, I consider it is important to speak about the values that we acquire once we honor the promise to be Europeans. They are the same values that the other members of the EU acquired too regardless of their moment of accession. If we accept to build our life upon values such as: liberty, dignity and solidarity, then we are truly Europeans. The ratification of the EU Accession Treaty is a commitment that Romania undertakes to its European partners and itself! Today, we make a promise of honor to be European! We make it in a solemn and democratic way in the Romanian Parliament” underscored Tariceanu (Government of Romania, 17 May 2005).

The quotation reveals that the commitments undertaken by Romania presupposed not only a transformation of the state but the mentality of the state population vis-à-vis the state and the EU.

“A promise of honor to be European” meant to behave like Europeans.

I want to inform Romanian citizens with respect to the future status of Romania as a member state, their future rights as EU members, and the obligations derived from it…we will start a second campaign to inform Europeans about the Romanian realities because I want that Romania is no longer perceived exclusively through the image of abandoned children, beggars who are tramping the streets of Paris and Madrid, or the thieves who scared the inhabitants of Vienna and so on (The Office of the Prime Minister, 13 April 2005).

This is a highlight of the image of Romania perpetuated in Europe during 2005.

The EU is a project meant to assure the best living standards to its citizens. If we, the Romanians, really want to join this project, it is necessary for us to become Europeans and to turn Romania into a European country. In fact, EU accession represents Romania’s modernization in a more accelerated way. And the effort should be made not only by the administration and political segment but by the entire society (The Office of the Prime Minister, 13 April 2005).

The National Anticorruption Department (DNA) was created as an independent institution in response to fight against corruption however, because of an incapable justice system to speed up the process or interpret the law objectively the work revealed by the DNA remains only at the stage of “shamed but left unpunished or corrected,” noting in this sense that people who break the law are tried while not incarcerated, sentences vary between political subjects and regular people and result most of the time in two to four year probation or between five and ten years’
incarceration for murder.\textsuperscript{103} Nevertheless, the process of initiating the DNA is promising and shows that the action of Romanian elites to combat corruption is monitored by both the EU and the United States but interestingly Romanian elites seem to react much faster when the US engages in criticism. For example after the Netherlands refusal to recommend Romania’s membership in Schengen, the Romanian President catalogued the Netherlands action as an abuse and criticized Amsterdam and Rotterdam for its inability to stop the human and drug trafficking. “It is not Romania who legalized prostitution and drugs because it could not control them” was Bucharest’s message to the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{104} No similar confronting messages were identified in reply to the US Embassy’s criticism of Romania’s corruption and rule of law problem.

It is important also to note that in the initial stage DNA was rejected by the Romanian Senate questioning whether DNA was entitled to investigate members of the Parliament because of parliamentary immunity. The Senate rejection provoked a negative reaction at the level of the mass media, public opinion and the European Commission. A representative of the US Embassy declared in a press conference that in the US elected officials do not have immunity against acts of corruption.

Democracy depends on good governance and respect for the rule of law and we consider that these are indispensable elements of human rights. For this reason we criticize parliamentary immunity in Romania. During the last parliamentary elections some candidates suggested that their scope for running for office was to avoid their imminent investigations rather than represent the interests of their community […] In the US legislators do not have immunity against acts of corruption.\textsuperscript{105}

Tariceanu addressed the Senate about anticorruption measures since 2006 underscoring that

\textsuperscript{103} Gandul, 27 February 2012. ‘Procurorii contesta condamnarea la cinci ani de inchisoare a agresorului lui Chauncey Hardi. Ionut Adrian Tanasoaia, zis Gypsy Gypsanu, a primit pedeapsa minima’. [‘Prosecutors contest The five years conviction of Chauncey Hardi’s aggressor. Ionut Adrian Tanasoaia known as Gypsy Gypsanu received the minimum sentence’].

\textsuperscript{104} Hotnews, 9 December 2011. ‘Traian Basescu, atac frontal la Olanda: Nu noi am legalizat prostitutia si drogurile pentru ca nu am putut lupta cu ele. Decizia lor de a se opune intrarii noastre in Schengen este un abuz’. [‘Traian Basescu critiques Holland: It is not us who legalized prostitution and drugs because we could not fight them. Their decision to oppose our entry in Schengen is an abuse’].

\textsuperscript{105} Gandul, 27 May 2011. ‘Adjunctul sefului misiunii SUA: Noi criticam imunitatea parlamentara din Romania’. [‘Adjunct to the US mission: We are concerned about parliamentary immunity in Romania’].
I do not want you to believe that there is any political reservation about the anticorruption measures. I do not believe that you have something to be afraid of with respect to these measures; after all DNA is not but the former National Anticorruption Prosecutor’s Office which has its headquarters within the General Prosecutor’s Office; it is not but a change in its task” (Government of Romania, 14 February 2006).

“Education reform will help train the new generation according to the European values” seem to be the general idea perpetuated by elites. It is important to suggest however, that as Jacques Chirac suggested “The European construction is an art of the possible” and there is hope that the EU in collaboration with the US may have the power to turn Romania into a genuine European country in the context in which Romania lags behind in judicial affairs and corruption continues to erode the institutions of democracy.

If selectively ignoring the rule of law brought Romania in the EU, what will compel Romanian elites to favor citizens’ interests above theirs when the law of the state is turned into optional norm? Is it possible for international society to have a positive evolution when member states are not ruled by a genuine democracy, political stability and normality or will this lead to the demise of the union and perhaps to a much greater chaos than the destruction of the Second World War? Romania is a country that continues to take advantage of an ill informed electorate and takes political conflicts to streets. As Tariceanu underscored:

Romania has a government that is permanently eroded by domestic disputes […] is a country where communist and populist behavior is preponderant […] is a country in which politicians have small dreams for Romania and great dreams for themselves (Government of Romania, 1 April 2007).

Tariceanu’s assessment of the Romanian political class was made only two years after Romania pledged to observe the same values as EU members.

I want to assure Europeans that we are equal partners, people that respect their commitments; by signing the Accession Treaty with EU we want to comply with the rigor and seriousness that characterizes European construction […] I can say that Romania is built on the same values of prosperity, freedom, democracy, equality that the European Union was built on; I want to say that Romania is a state that obeys law (Government of Romania, 25 April 2005).
THE MEANING OF A “COMMON CULTURE”

Common culture as Stivachtis (1998) suggested in the case of European international society determined the level of states integration in the society of states meaning the acceptance of civilized practices of law, rights and diplomacy. As suggested in the case of Greece, culture did not influence or did not matter in the process of states entrance in European international society because the expansion was made on the logic of anarchy. Data on Romanian elites show that in context of the EU, Romanians tried to make their case of entry based on a common culture contribution insisting that Romania shares a common identity with Europe and a common history. Shortly before Romania was granted membership Romanian elites designated Sibiu (Hermannstadt in German), a Transylvanian city to become the “ambassador who will promote the values of the cultural patrimony and the national identity.”

The idea of connecting the similarities and diversity of European culture was initiated in 1983 by Melina Mercouri, then the Greek Minister of Culture. The cultural capitals of Europe created by the European Ministers of Culture aimed to bring together different cultures to show how the intensity of the European spirit shapes European identity. Sibiu, a medieval burg and the symbol of European civilization encompasses one of the largest communities of Germans and significant number of Hungarians. Basescu underscored at the inaugural speech that

106 euROpeanul, 19 December 2006. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu: How Romanians enter in a five star restaurant’.


Romania has traditions, ties and a European culture; all our sentiments are connected with Europe. Only for the fact that for 50 years we lived outside of the capitalist world it does not mean that we are from the other continent. I already said: we will be good Europeans.
Romania entering Europe through Sibiu and culture has an important role in consolidation of regional cooperation and the identity of the united Europe because it provides a base for dialog, mutual understanding and development (President Message, 1 January 2007). The understanding that Romanian elites seem to have in context of common culture is the development of a solidary attitude toward preserving the common heritage. Each EU member is represented in the EU by its own individual heritage canvasing diversity. Protecting and conserving inherited material and immaterial creations involves a strategy of communication that Romanian President argued as

Cultural heritage is not only a treasury of identity but a factor of sustainable development; European Council is involved in proposing and directing common interest policies to preserve the diversity and the common cultural treasure we inherited (President Speech, 7 June 2007).

In context of the same event the Prime Minister emphasized that Sibiu, speaks about people’s character.

I know that there are many people who keep their word in Ardeal (Transylvania). But there are many people who do the same thing in Bucharest too. We kept our word and we allocated the financial funds necessary for this project to develop. We have the opportunity to show Europe the real values which represent Romania. Now when we become citizens of Europe, we are bound to prove to Europe what we are, we can, and we appreciate and love. Culture is above all other things dialog. I am glad that Romania has started to identify with culture, a thing which we could hardly imagine ten years ago (Government of Romania, 1 January 2007).

Sibiu, in the view of the elites offered an introspective look into a cultural manifestation of diversity of population, art and architecture. In the course of preparing Sibiu for the European festivity elites underscored that with Sibiu they hoped to engage in dialogue and change Romania’s image abroad.

I believe, that future such cultural manifestations can change substantially the perception created in the past about Romania; a perception not at all very favorable and certainly, these things will be added to the efforts that the entire country and the authorities do, in order to be truly integrated in the EU and to feel that Europeans want our accession (The Office of the Prime Minister, 25 April 2005).

European baroque begins in Occident and reaches Transylvania in two successive centuries. European gothic begins in Belgium, Flanders and north of Italy and reaches monasteries of Stefan the Great. Elements of Byzantium culture and civilization outburst in Moravia, four centuries after
the death of Justinian...all of these symbolize United Europe with no core or periphery. Europe is everywhere on the continent (Ungureanu 2008: 139).

The fundamental value of solidarity lies at the core of the Roma inclusion project as well as the European project...the issue of inclusion of Roma population is not only a social problem but one of cultural and ethnic order (Cabinet of State Minister, 12 June 2006).

The EU does not intend to create a union with one specific language or a unique culture. But otherwise, wants to respect each member's language, culture and history. Monolingual approaches impede broadening the cultural and lingual prospects for Union’s citizens so necessary in professional and business life. Learning two European languages in addition to the native language is key for functioning well inside the EU.”

Orban for example suggests that inside the EU people should preserve their language in order to preserve their home nation identity. Yet learning to communicate in more than one language in his view helps promote intercultural dialogue among EU citizens as well as spread EU values in the world. Orban considers language appropriation as a necessary instrument to adapt to globalization underscoring EU’s multilingualism and multiculturalism. Nevertheless, only English, French and German are considered “procedural languages” of the EU institutions.  

Culture makes a difference! What identity of a nation means is made primarily through its cultural pride, its cultural heritage and the way it cares for it (Government of Romania, 4 April 2012). In retrospect the cultural ties that Romanians believe they have with EU consists of European continental identity, Romania inhabits a large German and Hungarian population, architecture and common historical experience. Romanians also seem to be aware that the EU society presupposes a certain code of conduct and adherence to certain system of values. Cultural and political cohesion, as Puscas (2007) once underscored, is cultivated through synchronization of interests. In the EU the commonality of culture and values or “common culture” and “common values” seem to determine the status of membership within the Union, at the periphery or at the core of the Union.
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RULES AND NORMS - THE NORM OF EU INTEGRATION

Romania is the seventh country of the EU after Poland with respect to size and population; it is the second economy in size from Eastern Europe and the seventh of Europe. Romania requested EU membership in June 1995 and was accepted in the EU during the fifth enlargement. Basescu made EU integration the main priority of his foreign policy. In his victory speech he prioritized the Bucharest-Washington-London alliance and promised to review several chapters negotiated with the EU, including the chapter on energy (President Speech, December 13, 2004). EU Membership presupposes the observance of a common set of rules and norms agreed on in advance by both Romania and EU members.

“To become an EU member Romania must fulfill its commitments (Romanian performanta); this is all we have to do to become member of EU” (University of Bucharest, 14 June 2005). The engagement between Romania and EU was concluded in 51 Chapters of negotiation. After 1999 Romania engaged in preparing for EU accession by leaving the final decision of admission to Brussels. Periodic Reports filed by the European Commission revealed since 2004 that progress in chapters of justice and internal affairs lagged significantly behind those requested by Brussels. In the EU the institution of integration is as important as the institution of cooperation and negotiation because they describe the norm sharing of sovereignty. Diez & Whitman (2002) argue that integration and freedom of circulation count as distinct regional norms consciously developed by EU members to strengthen the elements of community at the regional level. After signing the Accession Treaty with the EU in Luxembourg on 25th April 2005 Romania was granted status of ‘observer’ in all EU institutions therefore enabling Romania to familiarize itself with EU institutions and become an active actor in the European process before obtaining final membership in 2007. The correspondence between Cioroianu, a
Romanian observer in Brussels, and Nicolae Vacaroiu, President of the Romanian Senate (2000-2008) reveals through the eyes of Cioroianu that the EU is an organization in flux, eager to adapt to new times and new mentalities but as a society of states the EU lacks coherence, future vision and true visionary leaders with capacities to strategize the future of the EU as a regional and global actor.”

For instance Cioroianu admires the clear trajectories of other powers such as the US who wants to become the military of the world ready to protect global democracy or China who aims at becoming the mega-giant of factories producing everything for everyone but it is unclear in his view what the EU wants to become in the 21st century. Barroso on the other hand underscores that the EU does not want to become the US because it is from the diversity of voices that the Union draws its strength. Furthermore, Romanian elites are aware that Romania lacks a mature political class and well prepared public servants in the field of cooperation between Romania and EU states.

As for 2011 former Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Cioroianu and Baconschi speak about Romania’s need to refurbish its nursery of EU practitioners and Romanian President for opening a school to train future politicians. They see this necessary to bridge the knowledge, custom and practice gap to improve the Union’s consistency and cohesion in the consciously evolving architecture. As one of the newcomers or one that is a most juridically challenged member, Romanian political elites point that Romanians are inclined to prioritize the principle of solidarity in times of crisis whereas other states appear skeptical to newcomers from concerns of consuming goods and services of older Europe. For example when confronted with high unemployment rates, Spain, one of the most popular countries of the Union with respective to

110 Old Dilemma, 29 September 2005, no 89. ‘A Letter that is not lost but open’.
labor and synchronizing common interests with Romania announced that beginning with 2012 it intends to rally behind other EU members who adopt a restrictive measure against the flux of immigrant labor force from newcomer states like Romania. “What is the EU saying about Romania?” became a classical question many Romanians asked Cioroianu when he returned periodically home from Brussels. He mentions that the sad answer he had to give to the majority was that “the EU did not say anything” and not because Romania does not matter for the EU but because the majority of EU member states face their own domestic problems related either to presidential campaign in France or with dealing with the second Islamic generation in the UK or awaiting the dismissal of the Foreign Minister of Germany. Indicating therefore that within EU, members are inclined to prioritize first their national interests before the interests of the Union. More integration or more Europe appears necessary to a coherent Union.

Gallagher (2009:3) argues for example that Romania joined the Union with remaining key reforms unimplemented because of lack of cohesiveness in the EU’s multi-layered system of decision making, incapable to comprehend the stark challenges of a candidate like Romania. In his view, the EU was too lenient in preparing Romania for membership. While in the EU for half of a decade Romania continues to be trapped in its historical legacy of corruption and underperforming institutions. With respect to “peaceful coexistence” Cioroianu remains skeptical that EU will have a new style other than Romania of making politics. He invites however, Europeans to take a second look at Romanians and dismiss the stereotype that all Romanians are too laid back or careless. He also points out that the difference between Romanians and the EU in terms of mentality is exponentially larger. In 2005 he disclosed to Vacaroiu that for him
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“before anything else, Europe meant highways that in Romania were absent, GPS systems and multitudes of suitcases on two wheelers.”

Marko Bela (ethnic Hungarian) considers that Romania made it to the EU but the integration process is long and tedious and many things are expected to be resolved regarding interethnic coexistence in Romania. Coexistence and integration Bela argues begins at home.

The EU as a regional political actor appears to constitute for Bela, actors with powers to normalize the Romanian political class to preserve domestic stability as well as an actor that can resolve at the national and international level minority related issues. In Bela’s view, despite the inefficient state of democracy in Romania, the EU integration means for Romania “guarantees for ethnic minority rights by the European institutions.” Noteworthy is the fact that although UDMR is an ethnic based political union UDMR was a great supporter of Romania’s EU entry. With respect to Romania’s constitutional framework Bela noted that a close introspection to the balance of power in Romania will reveal that

The balance of power does not function or does not function well in reality […] however, those who say that we should not push Romania towards EU but hold it back because of this, do not recognize that falling behind Europe and drifting in another direction would mean our end in the long term. This option would create conditions for an oppressive nation policy and forceful assimilation simply by pushing Romania into a permanent and final economic crisis. This would facilitate and give impetus to, the emigration of Hungarians.

According to Bela the EU was an efficient actor capable of influencing Romania on the minority issue:

without a European influence we do not see a solution to the problem […] we can imagine a reassuring final solution only within Euro-Atlantic and European institutions; that is to say, the

---

114 Old Dilemma, 29 September 2005, no 89. ‘A Letter that is not lost but open’.
115 Ziare.com, 14 January 2010. ‘Marko Bela: Am fost naiv cand am crezut ca Silviu Brucan era pesimist’; ['Marko Bela: I was naïve when I thought Silviu Brucan was pessimist'].
116 BBC Monitoring European, 16 January 2000. ‘Hungarian leader expects positive change from current government’.
risk concerning ethnic issues in Romania is many times higher outside these European institutions than is within them.\textsuperscript{117} Anca Boagiu who served as Minister of European integration in 2005 acknowledged in an interview that the “Romanian political class was not sufficiently prepared nor politically mature to understand the importance of the moments Romania was engaged to in the accession to the EU.”\textsuperscript{118} Boagiu also reveals that the European Commission provided Romania with a road map on what needs to be accomplished before accession and her assessment is that this was a fair and friendly approach due to the fact that as a Union, the EU has a common budget that is monitored by each member country.

As an international society, the EU is different from practices within the enlarged European international society to the extent that now states behavior is corrected through red and green flags as well as signals.\textsuperscript{119} For instance the European Commission monitoring Romania’s progress toward integration sent various warning letters to Bucharest. It is not clear however, whether Romanian officials perceived the warning letters as “a working instrument” and with great optimism.\textsuperscript{120} They understood the method of warning letters as an instrument confirming the European Commission support for Romania’s efforts toward integration. For example for the Minister of EU integration the warning letter conveyed collaboration and dialogue.

The message that the European Commission sends us is one of collaboration, of support for the Romanian government when the government considers that it needs it; it is based on the same partnership that always existed between the Romanian government and the European Commission.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{117} BBC Monitoring European, 16 January 2000. ‘Hungarian leader expects positive change from current government’.
\textsuperscript{118} Free Romania, 18 November 2005. ‘Romanian political class is not sufficiently prepared and sufficiently mature’.
\textsuperscript{119} BBC Monitoring European, 21 March 2005. ‘Romanian Premier to attend European Council meeting in Brussels on 22-23 March’.
\textsuperscript{120} BBC Monitoring European, 8 November 2005. ‘Romanian authorities see EU warning letter as “working instrument.”’
\textsuperscript{121} BBC Monitoring European, 24 November 2005. ‘EU foreign affairs committee criticizes Romanian corruption’.
For Ungureanu,

The warning letter is an inventory of issues that we have to take care of. By no means should it be considered in a catastrophic way; if you wish, it is a “memento,” an “add memoir” that helps us at the government level in our attempt to reach the standards that could certify Romania’s capability to become an EU member in 2007.122

Note that usually the warning letters requested Romanians to intensify the reform of the justice system and to continue fighting against corruption. As Commissioner Olli Rehn stressed once in front of the EU Parliament,

The problems signaled in the report must be contemplated very seriously by the two countries and they must serve as guidelines for stepping up the reforms, if Romania and Bulgaria want to accede to the EU on 1 January 2007.123

Following a warning letter received from the Commission on 9 August 2005 prompted Dinga to suggest that Romania made efforts to improve in the seven areas signaled by the EU executive including justice and home affairs however,

The European Commission continues to be waiting for high profile corruption cases, political or otherwise. We do not speak here about finalizing those cases, but about proving in a convincing manner to the EU that Romania is investigating the high-profile corruption cases and that these cases are irreversible [...]This capability of staying in the lane leading to reaching the target is applicable to the fulfillment of any commitment made by Romania. It is possible that on 1 January 2007 we will not have managed to meet all the pledges point by point and in a final manner, but if we can convincingly prove to the commission that we are already committed to a no return lane as regards meeting our pledges, then this will be sufficient.”124

The complacency with which Romanian elites approached the Commission warning letters is important from the perspective of norms and when norms matter in the EU as an international society. Boagiu speaks about the EU in context of structural funds stressing that “the EU is willing to give but the state decides when and how much it receives.”125 Boagiu claims that Romania aimed at becoming a country similar to other EU members by aligning domestic laws

---

122 BBC Monitoring European, 24 November 2005. ‘EU foreign affairs committee criticizes Romanian corruption’.
123 BBC Monitoring European, 26 October 2005. ‘EU urges Romania to continue reform, or face entry delay’.
124 BBC Monitoring European, 9 August 2005. ‘Integration minister says EU “unlikely” to postpone Romania’s entry in ’07’.
125 Free Romania, 18 November 2005. ‘Romanian political class is not sufficiently prepared and sufficiently mature’.
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with the European acquis. According to Boagiu at the beginning of the integration process there was a disconnection between EU actions and Romania the recipient. She acknowledged that the EU with its experts in various areas were helping Romania to integrate into the EU yet Romania and Romanians needed to understand that the “EU will help us, but they won’t spoon-feed us; all along this process it is clear that you have to know your responsibility as a citizen in order to benefit from a rule; and you can only be a beneficiary once you respect some rules.”

In the conception of Romanian elites “EU integration” is associated with a positive evolution of Romania, with resuming Romania’s place within the “family” of Europe to which Romania is bound by common values and principles of law. For Romanians, EU integration is the equivalent of state reform or Romanian modernization. Chronologically, the process of integration started in Romania on 1 January 2007 with Basescu’s speech underscoring that membership is not synonymous with the actual integration. Our integration must come from the capacity to generate economic growth, from efficient institutions, a credible justice, independent and able to bring justice to people, uncorrupted officials, develop infrastructure at European standards, and a clean environment; in abstract, a standard of living for Romanian citizens comparable to that of European citizens. Equally, Romania’s integration must come from our ability to become solidary or to be united with general interest of the Union as well as from our capacity to bring our contribution to the competitiveness, security and inner cohesion of the European Union (President’s Speech, 31 January 2007).

In the view of Basescu, the advancement of the EU was possible because of the will of the political elites and of support of EU citizens and Romania’s integration stands as a testament of the consistency in fulfilling promises of the Romanian people.

The EU managed to overcome the old institutional divisions between west and east. The union can be consolidated through education, familiarization and mutual understanding between east and west. The European spirit, the way of thinking and European rules will gradually install in Romanian life but Romanians must be able to distinguish that membership is not synonymous with integration and that modernization of Romania is our final objective” (President’s Speech, 31 January 2007).

---

Modernizing the Romanian state and its institutions is part of the series of commitments undertaken by Romania during EU accession. Romanian elites seem aware that they must fulfill the undertaken commitments.

Once inside the club, you take the risk of being despised if you cannot meet the demands. In a five star restaurant, one has to order as much as one can pay; Romania joins the EU in a time in which pessimism reigns in Europe.\textsuperscript{127}

Based on the date when the interview was given it seems that at least the Romanian President was aware that Romania was going to be despised if the commitments to eradicate corruption were not fulfilled. When asked about whether or not Romania will be treated equal in the Union Basescu replied that

\begin{quote}
In the EU we are not asking for special treatment but ask for the same rules applied to the last ten countries that entered into the EU is the message that we sent to the EU at NATO Summit in Riga. Romanians are not inferiors to Europeans to be treated unequal yet we cannot forget that EU is not about gifts and we must focus on the integration process to meet the commitments undertaken. As a political class we must assure optimal conditions for the integration process and fulfill the admission criteria. No one will do for us what the European Commission did for Romania until membership: monitoring all input sections negotiated in the membership agreement and support with expertise to help meet all undertaken commitments. After January 1, 2007 we will be on our own to fulfill with our will, mine, yours and that of a government of 22 million people the integration process; for this is necessary to reform the State and change the course of administration through decentralization in all sectors including education, health, agriculture and infrastructure.\textsuperscript{128}
\end{quote}

Romania wants to have a role and a voice inside the EU.

\begin{quote}
Romania is not interested in joining a family torn by squabbling, but a powerful club where even though there are small countries and big countries, small histories and big histories, small cultures and big cultures, the result is only one, namely a credible, safe and completed EU. As a new member state we strive for a solidarity that should not be based on the abstract notions of the importance of peace and security, but rather on a real solidarity that links peace with democracy and the consolidation of an economic environment able to offer each and everyone what they deserve.\textsuperscript{129}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{127} euROpeanul, 19 December 2006. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu: How Romanians enter in a five star restaurant’.
\textsuperscript{128} euROpeanul, 19 December 2006. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu: How Romanians enter in a five star restaurant’
\textsuperscript{129} BBC Monitoring European, 9 June 2005. ‘Foreign Minister confident in Romania’s EU entry in 2007’.
\end{flushright}
The EU integration will lead to Romania’s effective modernization turning the country into a real European country [...] PNL, after having been an essential factor to Romania’s historical modernization, will be the one to make it a real European country.\footnote{\textit{Rompres}, 16 December 2006. ‘PM Tariceanu: Integration process will lead to Romania’s effective modernization’} 

According to Basescu, integration in the EU should change the way Romanian parliamentarians conduct political debates and pass laws.

There are some young parliamentarians with promising potential although we must be real and acknowledge that the way laws are debated and passed today have changed since my time as parliamentarian. Now laws are debated in committees behind closed doors and exposed to the public only when they are in plenary sessions to be passed.\footnote{\textit{europeanul}, 19 December 2006. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu: How Romanians enter in a five star restaurant’}

I asked the UK and France to help the Romanian Presidency with two advisers capable to deal with fighting against corruption and EU integration. On the one hand this should convince the state institutions to wage war against corruption and on the other I personally need the expertise of an occidental council with respect to EU integration. Their opinion regarding integration could help us to better guide our actions; at this time my number one priority is to watch to assure that the current government remains integral to corruption.\footnote{\textit{Le Monde}, 4 March 2005. ‘Interview with Romanian President Traian Basescu’}

Romania practiced the foreign policy of “a good European” with Europe. Romania needs this chance. Our government is engaged in fighting a fierce battle against corruption. Is prepared to meet the enormous obligations related to membership; 40 generals of police and public servants were removed from power because of incompetence. More than 4200 companies holding debts against the state had their bank accounts blocked. The EU monitoring is necessary. It is a help to assure government credibility because in the last fifteen years people lost confidence in government.\footnote{\textit{Handelsblatt}, 21 March 2005. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu’ available onPresidency.ro}

When norms of socialization matter in an international society is a question that may find important answers in the Romanian case. The norm of integration for example seems to matter for Romanian elites during the period of EU accession when the de-politicization of the Justice Department was attempted and new laws were introduced to give independence to Justice and to include the presumption of innocence until found guilty. The Romanian President argues that the adoption of the presumption of innocence is a civilized practice that diminishes the volume of arrests until found guilty.
We adopted the civilized practice of presumption of innocence until the person is found guilty. For this reason the system gave up those arrests leading to releases after a month or two, because you cannot keep a person in preventive arrest until sentenced; trials usually take one, two, three years according to their gravity.\(^{134}\)

The interpretation of presumption of innocence in Romanian context however, continues to perpetuate the practice of ‘delayed trials’ leading to corrupt judicial decisions, los of dossiers, etc. According to a statistical report released by *HotNews.ro* 92 years, 7 months and 28 days is the total amount of delays in 27 major corruption cases monitored by *HotNews* which on average means 3 years and six months. For example, corruption cases involving major politicians such as the former Romanian Prime Minister Adrian Nastase had taken 1,645 days in “Aunt Tamara” and 1,844 days in the “Chinese Goods” cases and resulted in acquittal solutions favoring the image of the Prime Minister. For another official involved in bribery, Nicole Mischie the case lasted 2, 362 days meaning 57 terms.\(^{135}\) The revision of the Constitution to assure compatibility to the new realities of Romania as well as reforming the political system became the President’s new priority in 2009.

A new agency, The National Agency of Integrity (ANI) was created to assure minimum of integrity of states officials. A new campaign organized by the Ministry of European Integration in collaboration with Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Administration and the Interior ‘I do not bribe and I don’t take bribes’ was initiated in all Romanian ministers offices on June 21, 2006. Leaflets and brochures were distributed to public officials informing them of the consequences for accepting or bribe offering as well as a number of contacts were they could report illicit situations (*Ministry of European Integration*, June 2006). The same campaign debuted also at customs and frontier points as well as in police offices across the country. The last big scandal unfolded last year involving more than 100 agents from frontiers and customs


\(^{135}\) *HotNews*, 8 December 2011. ‘*HotNews.ro* monitoring report on major corruption cases in Romania’.
across the country demonstrates the effect messages from leaflets had for the frontier people. Important links were identified between the corrupt agents and Bucharest political officials. It is important to mention however, that the flagrant operation occurred only after Romania was refused by some EU members’ accession to the Schengen Program which substantiates the claim that Romanian elites take EU norms seriously only when they are coerced to do it. “We, occidentals, don’t have to want to fight the anticorruption battle more than you do. This initiative must come from Romania” is the latest message that US Ambassador to Romania is transmitting to Romanian elites with respect to corruption. Romania’s rejection to join the Schengen program was interpreted by Romanian elites as an attempt to block Romania’s efforts to contribute to the enhancement of the EU security and not as an attempt to cooperate with the EU to assure security. All we want, Baconschi said, “is equal treatment and a sense of fairness which is fundamental to the European construction.” According to Baconschi, Romania takes the EU membership very seriously and finds the creation of “artificial dividing lines in Europe” such as “new Europe” versus “old Europe” counterproductive.

We don’t really need such things [...] if we really want to correctly implement the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty, if we want to have a fruitful perspective of the EU as a global player, so I think it’s a pity to put at risk any of our achievements—that’s why we need transparent rules, real equity between member states and political debate on a democratic basis if we really want to build up the EU in the 21st century in a completely transformed global environment.

“Allowing Romania in Schengen is not a favor made to our country but an acknowledgement of our efforts” the current Diaconescu, the current Foreign Affairs Minister stated after Netherlands

136 *Gandul*, 25 January 2012. ‘US Ambassador: “We, occidentals must not want to fight corruption more than you do.”’
refused to give its consent twice in Romania’s attempt to join Schengen.¹³⁹ In contrast to the French and the German reactions to delay Romania’s Shengen accession based on the Monitoring Mechanism of Cooperation the Luxembourg reaction to European affairs transmitted by the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg Jean Asselborn in a meeting with Baconschi was that “the mentality that should animate the EU is that there are no privileged or underprivileged countries and in the European journey we are all on the same footing.”¹⁴⁰ Basescu’s message to the EU especially to France who accused Romania of not having a frontier treaty with the Moldova Republic was that

> Romania’s stop to adhere to Schengen will create an unacceptable precedent where powerful countries from the EU afford to make abuses against smaller countries [...] and unorthodox practices such as those to accept various contracts in exchange for a favor like occurred in previous Romanian administrations when contracts were awarded for EU or NATO favors will not be repeated."¹⁴¹

Basescu’s underscore alluded to the fact that France will probably not receive special treatment in bidding for refurbishing a Romanian nuclear plant. When Netherlands announced its reservation to vote in favor of Romania joining Schengen Basescu argued at a meeting at European Council in Brussels that “it wasn’t us who legalized prostitution and drugs because we couldn’t fight them” arguing that the Dutch decision to oppose Romania and Bulgaria’s Schengen accession was an “abuse” because both countries have complied with the law and the treaty. Furthermore, both Basescu and Orban argue that the monitoring mechanism MCV used on justice is not correctly used to monitor Romania on border security. “All EU members should be evaluated by the same standards; this mechanism is often used against Romanian interests” Orban argues. Romania is evaluated with the same mechanism for justice and fight against

¹³⁹ *Gandul*, 23 February 2012. ‘Diaconescu: Allowing Romania in Schengen is not a favor made to Romania but acknowledgement of our efforts’.
¹⁴¹ *Ziare.com*, 6 January 2011. ‘Basescu accuses France and Germany of abuse and pledges to not sit like “garden worms” in the EU’.
corruption (MCV). If MCV is applied equally to all EU members interesting data will emerge. From where did the image come that Romania and Bulgaria are the most corrupted states of EU, and have the most problems? Probably if this mechanism will be equally applied and according to data obtained Romania’s image will improve.\textsuperscript{142} The European Council raised the issue again during the March 12, 2012 reunion and because of the negative result is expected to raise the issue again in September.

EU integration means in the first place expression of the will of the Romanian people to return in democratic Europe, in civilized Europe, in Europe in which peace is the first commandment of the EU; by entering EU Romania is guaranteeing its future of peace and prosperity (\textit{Press Release}, 31 December 2006).

In 2006, Tariceanu’s assessment of 16th of May European Commission Report about Romania’s progress was promising.

We have been submitted to an extremely strict and rigorous monitoring from the European partners. There has been a much stricter monitoring than the one of the 10 countries that joined the EU on the 1st of May 2004 […] the message of the report is that Romania has achieved major progress over the last seven months in the taking over of the European standards and criteria and we have to continue in the same pace and on the same direction in order to solve the other problems too” (\textit{Government of Romania}, 16 May 2006).

Romania was left with two safeguard clauses on corruption and border security (they emerged in the October 2005 Monitoring Report). The EU left Romania to focus on reforms implementation in justice and the fight against corruption.

[...] the fact that only four of the 14 red flags which existed on different fields in the October 2005 Report remained is a proof of the progress which has been achieved (\textit{Government of Romania}, 16 May 2006).

But what kind of progress or socialization was achieved if in 2011 border security officials continued to break the law with nonchalance? Tariceanu calls the red flags left by the European Commission technical in character and not related to the lack of political will to fix them. Other

Romanians seem to attack the messenger rather than act on the message to accelerate the eradication of corruption and to improve the competence of judiciary. The judiciary system seems to have borrowed the western clothing style but not the mentality and the interpretation speed and skill. The European Commission assessed Romanian membership annually in the Monitoring Reports awarding red, yellow and green flags. Ministers were monitored by European experts until they successfully fulfilled the EU accession-related objectives. There is unison among the political elites in attaching the same meaning to the EU integration. Tariceanu argues that

EU integration will mean the transformation into a modern state. As a lot of people ask about the negative consequences of the EU accession, I want to tell you that there are no negative consequences. One thing should be known very clear: one of the main obligations is the law observance, the rule of law. As an EU member state, every Romanian citizen has to understand that he has to observe the law and the legal framework of Romania; In this framework, every citizen can build a dignified and prosperous life, through honest and fair work” (Government of Romania, 16 May 2006).

Orban suggests as well that

European integration means modernization, a process good for everyone and “pragmatic enthusiasm” is the best way to anticipate the EU integration because some would benefit more than others according to their level of academic preparation.143

EU accession will not be a hammer stroke, a shock that everybody expects, but a chance and opportunity. The integration process started before accession and will continue after the accession date. It is not a turning point to change the rules of the game.144

Romania’s EU accession involves many opportunities, but also entails observation of community exigencies and standards.145

We can speed up the reforms in order to become full members of the EU.146

With respect to EU standards, at a conference on “New Europe Leaders” Boagiu stressed that:

143 EurActiv, 11 February 2005. ‘Enuziasm, dar fiti pragmatici’ . [Enthusiasm, but with pragmatism].
144 Rompres, 10 April 2006. ‘Negativist scenarios on SMEs bankruptcy after EU accession are not justified, says Ludovic Orban’.
145 Rompres, 24 November 2005. ‘Chamber of Trade organizes seminar on sources of European information’.
146 Europe Gateway, 6 July 2006. ‘Romanian Minister of European Integration Ms. Anca Boagiu in an interview for Portal Europe’. 
Romania has chosen to apply EU standards not because it did not have a different solution or because it was imposed by Brussels but because it was willing to represent a model in the region.\textsuperscript{147}

Boagli expected Romania’s integration process to go smoothly once the “necessary political will” was focused on transforming the judiciary and fight against corruption. The creation of the National Agency for Integrity and the raising of awareness campaign of “I don’t give and I don’t take bribe” were steps taken in this sense.\textsuperscript{148}

The big fish can be caught only by a free justice and a judiciary system as independent as possible which carries out its activity in a fair manner. I consider that today Romania cannot be any longer accused of not having such a system […] started with the moment of the publication of this report, we should enter a total state of alert because it evinces exactly what it has remained to us to be done.\textsuperscript{149}

Nobody should expect “miracles” in the short term, given there are problems that had not been settled before. We cannot make Romania the wake of the accession to the EU, the mirror image of Switzerland or Germany, but, for us it is important that the reforms started to be implemented as well.\textsuperscript{150}

From the international society perspective, it is clear that the EU provides the optimal climate of political and social stability but it remains in the responsibility of the state to integrate in the institutional and mentality structures of the Union.

The integration into the European Union is a strategic priority for Romania (\textit{Government of Romania}, 27 February 2006); Integration speaks about a maturity stage “integration will be a maturity test for Romania to continue the reforms started and the assimilation of the European standards (\textit{Government of Romania}, 17 May 2006).

According to Dinga,

It’s not what we say but what we do that counts…I know about the perception in Brussels […] we know what we have to do. Romania had to change how it is perceived by the EU of promising much and delivering little. There is a gap between saying ‘yes’ and doing the implementation. Twice a month we monitor everything we said we committed ourselves to doing and send the reports to Brussels […] reforming the judiciary won’t happen tomorrow […] solving the issues of

\textsuperscript{147} \textit{BBC Monitoring European}, 20 October 2005. ‘Romania’s EU integration minister says progress towards entry ‘obvious’.
\textsuperscript{148} \textit{BBC Monitoring European}, 20 July 2006. ‘Integration minister says Romania can make up for delays in EU entry process’.
\textsuperscript{149} \textit{BBC Monitoring European}, 26 October 2006. ‘EU urges Romania to continue reform, or face entry delay’.
\textsuperscript{150} \textit{BBC Monitoring European}, 24 November 2005. ‘EU foreign affairs committee criticizes Romanian corruption’.
corruption and the judiciary means dealing with organized crime, and its impact on criminality. These are so entrenched. Such behavior will change if the penalties are serious and do not discriminate.\textsuperscript{151}

European bodies are confident about Romania’s capacity to honor its pledges and follow through accession calendar, but they expect the country to do so within the deadlines established.\textsuperscript{152}

This indicates the level of trust Romania had to win inside the EU before membership.

The European Union and the European Parliament have to be convinced that both Romania and Bulgaria would carry on the execution on the undertaken obligations, as Brussels is of the opinion, which is difficult to explain, that Bulgaria and Romania would act in an emotional and risky way.\textsuperscript{153}

The norms and standards of civilization in which a state is socialized in a society of states are important because they can remain ingrained into the culture of the state. When Romania became part of the European international society Romania had to adapt and adopt certain standards of civilization pervasive today in language, to a certain degree in customs, political system, etc. however, the communist system pressed on them the standards prioritized by the communist society that are incompatible and lag far behind those of the EU. The exchange of the institutional and organizational culture is important in Romania’s modernization.

“Integration” also means modernization in the living standards, higher salaries and a better quality of life with a performing health system (\textit{Government of Romania}, 26 September 2006).

Governmental elites seem aware that:

Firstly, the status of the EU member state implies a permanent effort to observe the European norms and standards and participate in the process of the European construction, a similar view with the purpose of international society (\textit{Government of Romania}, 26 September 2006).

I have said that among the negative consequences of accession-if we can call them so-the main “constraint” will be the necessity to observe the law as a state with genuine rule of law. The EU is comprised of countries defined by the rule of law. This thing should be very well understood by all Romanian citizens. This is the most important “disadvantage” which in fact, stands only for the necessity for us to align with the European’s conduct (\textit{Government of Romania}, 26 September 2006).

\textsuperscript{151} \textit{International Herald Tribune}, 22 March 2005. ‘Romania vows to link words to deeds RECKONING FOR THE EU/A compromise and criticism’.

\textsuperscript{152} \textit{BBC Monitoring European}, 26 January 2005. ‘Romania and Bulgaria expected to join EU together, Romanian EU Minister says’.

\textsuperscript{153} \textit{BBC Monitoring European}, 16 February 2005. ‘Bulgaria and Romania coordinate EU entry efforts’.
The observance of the rule of law and international law is what basically distinguishes between an international society and an international organization. It is unclear why Tariceanu calls it a “disadvantage.” With respect to the sharing of sovereignty however, the approach seem more relaxed and in tone with the EU. If in 2005 Basescu seemed to view the concept of sovereignty in strict Westphalian terms, in 2011 he becomes an ardent proponent of the United States of Europe. Reporter: *You asked Romanians at one point to enter with arrogance in the EU.*

Basescu: Yes, why not? Although I could have found a better, politically correct word; in the last 15 years Romanians were criticized and placed under pressure by the international community that sometimes they wondered if whether or not they were led by Bucharest or from elsewhere. Remember all the vehement criticism coming from various politicians more or less charged to criticize Romania. It was a long and difficult period in which every European politician who wanted to show control of the situation chose to discredit Romanians. The media perpetuated their rhetoric with the big titles on the front pages denigrating especially the government. My take is that the negativity impacted Romanians to the extent that they actually believed that are less performing than their EU counterparts; It is my job to remind Romanians of their pride and dignity and assure them that they are not second hand Europeans.¹⁵⁴

In a joint press release with the Italian President, Giorgio Napolitano, Basescu underscored the necessity of creation of the United States of Europe as a testament of closer integration. Napolitano suggested that the

United States of Europe is a great ideal that must guide us on the road toward a closer integration which now has become a target and it is true that now is the acute time of acceleration because we have to come quickly to some decisions and put some base on the European Council decisions of 21 July that we respect and collaborate to implement.¹⁵⁵

Globalization requires union, no one single EU state can handle alone the process of globalization, be it Germany or Romania; it is the task of European political elites to convince the United States of Europe that more integration does not affect their traditions, culture and individuality. The big problem is whether or not we have at the EU level political actors capable to persuade people that this is the solution. My answer is doubtful with respect to this capability. I am not convinced that today’s political leaders have the will and power to persuade the population that achieving the

¹⁵⁵ Mediafax, 15 September 2011. ‘Basescu: I am not embarrassed to repeat the thesis of the creation of the United States of Europe’. 

233
United States of Europe does not affect the culture, tradition and personality of each nation; I am
doubtful that at the moment this generation of politicians can convince people.\textsuperscript{156}

The general conclusion about the EU that the Romanian Presidency arrived at is that of
federalization or the United States of Europe.

EU is a project made for population not for politicians. It is most likely that politicians would live
just as well in a united Europe as in an individualized Europe, in a United States of Europe or in
Europe as is today. In two-three years politicians must decide whether or not they want to move to
a complementary process of unification.\textsuperscript{157}

It is important to qualify the statement however, that the EU is made by politicians for their
citizens. The EU is a solution for peace, a negotiated model of coexistence that respects
international law and human rights and believes that a democratic process can be orchestrated in
the absence of force. Changing the mindset of Romanian population and Romanian political
elites may take time. Hope is the future that the desire for power may not corrupt everyone in the
political process.

**WHAT KIND OF SOCIETY – PLURALISTIC OR SOLIDARISTIC**

As conveyed by Romanian elites the EU is a vibrant international society molded by elites and
sustained by their states and population in which member states bring their capabilities in union
with the general interest of the Union however, as data indicate the EU lacks the mentality of a
single nation, cohesion and a clear future vision. As a society, the EU is divided between a core
and periphery. Political recognition inside the EU determines whether a state from the periphery
can move toward the core in terms of decision making. Reaching consensus in the EU over

\textsuperscript{156} Mediafax, 15 September 2011. ‘Basescu: I am not embarrassed to repeat the thesis of the creation of the United
States of Europe’.

\textsuperscript{157} Mediafax, 15 September 2011. ‘Basescu: I am not embarrassed to repeat the thesis of the creation of the United
States of Europe’.
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international issues is challenging because most of the time states interests prevail over the EU common interest. As indicated by Cioroianu for example, the EU is caught in domestic issues before it is preoccupied with international problems. Buzan (2004:22-3) for example argues that regional international societies are layered societies and what makes them interesting is how loosely or tightly they are bound together and whether or not what binds them is of Gesellschaft or Gemeinschaft nature. From Buzan’s (2004) perspective the EU is an international society with a solidarist component in understanding collective security, an issue that preoccupied Europeans for centuries and an issue around which most common interests tend to converge.

Data sustain Buzan’s (2004) claim but reveal that Romanians appear regionally concerned with other meanings of security beyond the protection of the state borders including the energy security, improving standard of living for the EU population, and strengthening peace and stability at the Black Sea. Data also indicate that Romanian political elites view the EU as a consciously created architecture of multiple communities encompassing a layer of states who tend to lead and a layer of states who are inclined to follow, Atlanticists vs. Europeanists, protectionists vs. free-traders, and so on. Additionally, Romanians indicate that currently the EU is not a competitive global actor because it does not have inner cohesion and that Romania’s vision is not taken in consideration especially in instances when EU’s common interests are established only based on influent member states requests.

What is interesting in the Romanian case is that within the EU the connection with French, German, Greek and Bulgarian communities is based on a combination of emotional, identity, and historical communalities whereas the connection between Romania and the US for example seems to be tied in rational, contractual terms for perpetuating both states interests. Romanian elites claim that when it comes to security Romania should not have to choose
between the EU and the US because the two have common Union members and common security interests. Both Basescu and Ungureanu mention that Romania relies on the US for security mainly because of the US security identity construction through NATO and because of the US’s projection of power. Basescu for example argues that the EU must move beyond “social parameters” or “social Europe” to attain global competitiveness.

I observe the fierce competition between EU, the United States, China and India, the larger global players and wonder whether or not we are capable with a social Europe to compete, to remain relevant economically with US and China’s economies; sure the most likely European answer is yes yet we must find a strategy to transform the yes in reality and not a mere political assertion (President Speech, 23 April 2010).

Ungureanu for example argues that Romania’s connection with the US helps legitimize Romanian credibility in the region and subsequently in the EU: “politically it is an amount of credibility that very few other foreign policy gestures can bring.”¹⁵⁸ What is the general interest of the Union? Romanian President alluded before Romania’s membership in the EU that the EU should not be conceptualized in materialistic terms because the EU is not about money but about peace, it is “a guarantor of peace in Europe,” a “unifier force on the continent,” an actor with global aspirations, an actor capable to provide solutions whose solidarity is often tested by the economic challenges of globalization.

In the view of Romanians the EU is a union of whatever member states wanted the EU to be, transitioning therefore from the Gemeinschaft to the Gesellschaft. The EU can consolidate into a union of democracies that jointly preserve European values of multicultural diversity or into a hierarchical union of leaders and followers. Data show that within the Union both the political elites and the general public continue to see in their interactions barriers of culture, customs and practices. It is acknowledged by Romanian Foreign Affairs Ministers: Cioroianu,

Baconschi and Comanescu that Romania currently faces a lack of political force capable to match the EU’s institutional experts as well as overall the EU lacks an innovative leadership to help strengthen EU’s global credibility. Moreover, as Puscas, an EU parliamentarian, corroborates with what the elites convey that the EU is itself at a crossroads, in impasse of ideas and true leaders who can shake up the fatigue in Brussels and across the EU.

The “spirit of community” appears to exist between Romania and the EU only when the EU is conceptualized as a mechanism of governance for sharing common objectives of regional security such as securing the Black Sea area, working with aspirant countries toward EU membership, protecting the eastern border of the EU, preventing the continuation of animosity between former enemies, and promoting European values. Furthermore, Romanian political elites conceptualize the EU as a gubernatorial medium in which member states coexists with each other as “strategic partners” engaging in providing solutions for the problems they face although it is important to note that as an international structure the EU evolved from being called in the past decade a “club with strict rules” to a conscious construction of common responsibilities, a forum of engagement or a scene from which to “speak to Europe, or in the front of Europe.” Romanians appeared satisfied before entering the EU that the EU was defined by a social European model. Once inside EU, data show that the EU functions in a framework of prudence dictated by the European Council formed by state leaders who decide on whether or not the EU enlarges, when to do it and under what circumstances. Furthermore, Romanians seem to believe that the European social model is sustainable only through competition.

Without an increased competition at the level of Union and individual states we cannot ensure sustainability of the European model...we need a new framework more efficient and courageous to consolidate European competition in the next decade [...] It is important to remember that the principle of solidarity is the main pillar of European construction. We cannot become competitive at the Union level with imbalances between north and south or east and west. Without inner
cohesion the Union cannot be competitive, with no inner cohesion the EU does not matter in
global competition…the gaps between old and new EU members should be reduced (President
Speech, 23 April 2010).

Solidarity is the common denominator of EU that needs to guide us forward. Economic and
financial crises test the capacity of EU member states to be solidary to integrate in their own
political conduct principles of the Union founding fathers. Allow me to remind you the words of
Jean Monnet suggesting that nothing is possible without the involvement of people; nothing has a
durable future in the absence of the institutions (President Speech, 7 May 2010).

In the view of Romanian elites the EU cannot survive in the absence of solidarity between people
and institutions. The EU cannot become a global actor without a vision, a sustained level of
integration and active involvement of each state and EU citizens. Romanian elites suggest that
EU citizens and member states can use in a more efficient way the new institutional framework
provided by the Lisbon Treaty to build on the real potential of the Union. A new instrument with
which to build an international identity is European Service of Internal Action capable to
constitute a European democratic cadre of diplomacy and contribute to a common and efficient
foreign policy of the Union.

Brussels is the political center where 27 members consolidate what makes us stronger globally
(President Speech, 24 July 2010).

Under the assumption that the EU is a regional international society what meaning does the
“society” concept have? In the ES sense the term society refers to coexistence, shared rules,
norms and institutions. A solidarist regional international society is distinguished from a pluralist
international society by the broader scope of sharing of common values and norms. Such as
legitimizing human rights interventions and the inclusion of Roma in the European society while
preserving their nomadic character and respecting their freedom of movement in the EU. In
context of social inclusion of Roma as well as the Romanian citizens an attempt was made by
both, Romania, France and other EU members. The Romanian President offered to send
Romanian teachers to teach the Roma minority as well as Romanian police to help the French
police identify those who break the law. Transforming in unison Romania’s state, society, rules, laws institutions and customs in such a short period of time was and continues to be challenging for Romania in the context in which Brussels continues to identify problems in the Romanian code of conduct in domestic affairs and Bucharest continues to show determination on working to fix them. As Buzan (2004:8) acknowledged, in an international society “just as human beings or individuals who live in societies which they shape and are shaped by, so also do states live in an international society in which they shape and are shaped by.”

In Romania, common EU values appear reflected mostly in areas of civic participation where Romanian citizens profess their liberty to participate in the process and choose their candidates. However, there is no similar translation of EU values in Romanian political and justice systems. There is no political accountability similar with other Union members. In the area of rule of law, the justice system continues to reform. Interestingly, the law of the Union seems to take precedence over the law of the state. As one governmental official underscored, in Romania “politicians have small dreams for Romania and great dreams for themselves” but on a positive aspect with respect to EU values Romanian elites are able to recall them when they help prospective EU candidates toward EU membership. Romanians claim to observe the same values as EU only it seems that in Romania the meanings of these values are different.

Puscas (2007: 274-5) uses his experience as negotiator to the EU to suggest that the EU has “a cultural institutional ambivalence that presupposes certain codes of conduct,” that Romanians are unfamiliar with because throughout history Romanians received various examples of codes of conduct from various societies that presupposed the adherence to various systems of values which basically appears to have confused Romanians about who they are and what they wanted to obtain in Brussels. Romania, as Puscas (2007:9) suggests needs to redefine
its political identity first at home and thereafter in the EU because in his view, taking over of the European brand is more efficient when the country brand is well defined. Shortly after the second time Holland rejected Romania’s entry into the Schengen program Romanian officials decided to oppose Serbia’s candidacy to EU membership insisting that Serbia had to improve the situation of the ethnic minority of the Vlachs. “Romania is not blocking Serbia’s EU bid, but is asking for guarantees for the respect of the Vlach’s community rights.”\footnote{Romanian Times, 29 February 2012. ‘German FM Westerwelle slams Romania’s opposition to Serbia EU bid’.}

Romania’s approach to Serbia’s candidacy reflects that inside the Union states can form alliances and compete against the interest of other states like the Netherlands, France and Germany did when Romania’s bid for Schengen was on the agenda. States can also engage into a tit for tat game like Romania did in the case of Serbia showing both Germany and Holland how serious Romania is with respect to Schengen space and minimize Holland’s efforts to help the Serbian candidacy to the EU.\footnote{Ziua, 29 February 2012. ‘EUObserver: Romania’s Decission to oppose Serbian candidacy to EU is related to Holland’s refusal to allow Romania in Schengen’.} Romania’s veto surprised EU officials who questioned Romania’s predictability inside the Union. The German Foreign Minister for instance regretted that the internal agenda of Romania had dictated its stance on Serbia’s EU bid and catalogued the action as “this is not the European spirit.”\footnote{Romanian Times, 29 February 2012. ‘German FM Westerwelle slams Romania’s opposition to Serbia EU bid’.}

Opposing the candidacy of Serbia on the Vlach minority shows that Romania is solidary with EU values however, as the results of this project shows, Romanians do not understand the EU values on the same terms.

For Romanians the EU value of minority rights can be carefully used to calculate Romania’s national interest to obtain Schengen membership. Romania’s veto action seems to indicate that inside the EU states are not solidary in observing minority rights and also it is acceptable in the EU for states to strengthen their identities on the voice of ethnic minority
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\footnote{Ziua, 29 February 2012. ‘EUObserver: Romania’s Decision to oppose Serbian candidacy to EU is related to Holland’s refusal to allow Romania in Schengen’.}
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rights. Furthermore, the explanation offered by the Romanian Foreign Affairs Minister Diaconescu in an aftermath interview was that the monitory mechanism regarding the protection of minority rights in Serbia concerns “the state’s non-interference in the Romanian minority to define their own identity and use their own language.”  

The Serbian President replied that not all Vlachs are Romanian citizens, “Vlachs are not Romanians and no one has the right to ask them to declare themselves Romanians.”

Theoretically, data collected on Romanian elites with respect to the solidarity denominator reflect that the EU is conceptualized as a solidarity international society because its model is based on integration rather than separation practically, the solidarity as Romania’s action emphasizes is at the level of individual rights rather than decision-making (if the candidacy of Serbia, the Iraq War and the pattern that Romanians are looking to have a voice in the Union are considered). Bull (1977), Wheeler (1992), Buzan (2002) and Czaputowicz (2003) concur to the idea that the battle between solidarist and pluralist forms of international society occurs at the border between international and world society.

To isolate the “individual” at a regional level will explain that Romanians conceptualize the EU as a solidarist international society in the context in which individuals are subjects not objects of international law. Whether individuals are Roma or Vlach minorities Romanians invoke principles of human rights in the reciprocal recognition of the norm of non-intervention. Solidarism according to Buzan (2004:61) is about “the extent and degree of institutionalization of shared interests and values in systems of agreed rules of conduct, it is about collective enforcement of rules.” Untangling the boundary between the solidarist side of international
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society and the pluralist side of world society is a neglected problem in the ES as Buzan (2004) claims. As concretely as this case shows, this may be one of the limitations of the ES theory because, after Romanians theoretically proclaim the EU as a “moral political society” it is unclear why they consider that inside the EU Serbian minorities will be neglected if states mutually agree to respect international law.

Morality and international law distinguish an international organization from an international society. The EU as Stivachtis (2002) argued can be both a society and a system but in context of protecting the rights of the “individual” minority as a “common interest” it cannot be a system because it is unity and cooperation that are at the basis of the Union although the argument that the EU started from the consolidation of an economic structure with the political desire to preserve peace can be made. When is then the EU a system, and a society, if states use human rights, the basic norm of solidarism to calculate their interests? Pluralism, as Czaputowicz (2003:21) suggests, defines the international society where the influence of norms, laws and institutions is insignificant; Solidarism defines international society in which the influence of norms, laws and institutions is significant.

Based on the experience of Romanian officials with the inclusion of Roma into the structures of EU society, the EU is a ‘thin’ solidarist international society because in their view, a proper solution has not yet been identified to a common problem. International law and human rights are attributed to the individual rather than state in the pursuit of the realization of common values. Diez and Whitman (2002:5) argue that in a pluralist international society, relationships are resumed to only guaranteeing self-preservation, coexistence and order and a pluralist international society is distinguished by the character of norms that members of international society agree on. The norm of integration is a norm of calculation because it guarantees
coexistence and order in the EU and Romanian elites understand through integration modernization of the Romanian state and its institutions in order to better serve the EU and Romanian citizens. Basescu for example argues that EU has the governance framework to guide, socialize and assure Romania’s functionality within EU institutions.

While in the EU Romanians committed to be “good Europeans” but as the political section underscores Romanians could not manage to keep down their domestic political disputes without EU’s monitoring. The integration of Romania in the EU was based on calculations according to the Treaty signed with EU. Additionally, Romanian elites continue to calculate their interests in the EU while they improve on justice and domestic affairs chapters. Most likely Romania’s calculation to “flex its muscle” on Serbia’s accession will produce Romania’s entry in Schengen in the fall but at the same time will create a precedent on “the solidarity of European spirit.”

Romania’s veto on Serbia confused Brussels and based on the interviews collected by media from Serbian and EU officials, Romania “took colleagues by surprise given that it had never made a big deal of protecting minorities in Serbia including in its long series of annual reports had never identified it as a serious problem.” As mentioned in this source, it is important to note that the Netherlands blocked Romania’s entry in Schengen because “Romania was too corrupt” and Romania vetoed Serbia’s EU candidacy because the Netherlands invested in Serbia’s EU preparation while Serbia handed over to The Hague International Court its top war crime fugitives. What kind of society emerges from the ideas, meanings and beliefs attached to the EU as a regional international society? The idea of society implies the understanding and sharing of common interests, norms, rules and institutions. The EU is conceptualized as a thin
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solidarist international society when Romanians share in EU individual values of minority rights. The EU is a thick international society when Romanians agree to comply with the norm of integration but at the same time it is a thick pluralist international society when Romanians comply with integration only when the EU act as watch dog and Romania does not consciously come to the realization that combating corruption and improving the efficiency of the justice system is in the interest of the Romanians before it is in the interest of the EU. The EU is a society divided between core and periphery in terms of power over decision-making. Political recognition distinguishes between the core and periphery as do a common understanding of culture and values that facilitate the understanding of common interests and increases chances of political recognition.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this chapter was to identify how and whether or not Romanian governmental elites conceptualize the EU as a regional international society. Data reflecting political and public statements (2005-2010) reveal that EU is a fluid international society molded on the elite visions to fulfill the interests of their states and population. Data underscore that in a regional international society such is the EU common culture an informed citizenry is necessary to support elites’ construction. Similarly, citizens are critical in the successful continuation of the European model of peaceful coexistence. Before entering the EU (2007) Romanian elites conceptualized the EU as an international society in which “all resemble each other,” a Gemeinschaft or a solidarity society. Elite statements underscore that EU is a product of an anarchical condition and states conscious effort to mitigate conflict which means that a regional international society is first a product of anarchy as Bull (1977) suggested and second is a
society in the process of sharing understanding to mitigate anarchy or when elites’ consciously come to the realization based on common values and interests that common approaches are necessary to mitigate the conditions of anarchy. Embarking in the EU reflected a diplomatic effort (process) in the case of Romanians and a necessity to prevent destabilization in the case of western Union members.

While embarking on the journey of the EU, Romanians understood the necessity to remodel their identities and the identity of Romania to resemble that of the EU (Ungureanu 2008: 106). While inside the EU they claimed that it is the individual (elite and EU citizen) that is the highest institution of the Union and that the EU rests now on the solidarity of the individuals (elites + citizens + EU institutions) rather than on the solidarity of elites connected with Brussels. Romanian elites recommended to EU elites to involve people to strengthen EU institutions and its social and moral character. Additionally, inside the EU Romanian elites learned that the EU is a hierarchical society and new members need to win the trust of older Union members if they want to have a voice in decision making, otherwise the role of new members will be resumed to that of identifying issues while the most experienced and trusted Union members will have the final say.

Harmonizing mentalities and integrating further into the EU structures is a matter of process. In this sense Romanians convey that the EU is an international society at crossroads tending to be divided between those who lead and are completely integrated in the Union and those who follow and continue to integrate although they also underscore that the EU lacks true visionary leaders like the Union founding fathers. The EU is built on common values, however, a state like Romania with a confused system of values illustrates that common values matter and the EU reflects at this time western European values centered on individual rights. Romanians
are able to recall in text the western values but have a difficult time implementing the real meaning of them in practice. In the ES sense the term society is measured by elites’ perceptions of rules and norms. The EU is based on a solidarist component to provide life, peace and prosperity for the individual. Who is the individual? When the individual is Roma, both Romania and EU as a whole lack the appropriate solution for a common interest, the social inclusion of Roma. Although inside the EU there is intermittent competition among states, Romanians argue that the social European model (the EU) is not sustainable in the absence of competition at the global level. Therefore, they believe that more integration will result in greater cohesion. The idea of solidarity inside the Union seems to be decided by states interests if the case of Netherlands and Serbia are considered in isolation and by Union’s interests when states do not have too much to lose.

The EU is a thin international society when Romanians share inside EU individual values. They perceive that the EU has not come together as a Union to provide a common solution for the inclusion of Roma. Romanians perceive the Vlach minority neglected in Serbia while Serbia will fulfill its candidacy membership requirements. Romanians invite EU leaders to involve EU citizens in the Union process to strengthen the Union. They argue that the EU is a model of economic, political and social solidarity but it lacks real progress on the last two pillars. The EU is a moral contract in search for common will to enforce its morality. The EU is a thick international society when Romanians agree to share common interests and understandings on the norm of integration but because Romanians act only to please the EU their actions lack real conscious meaning. Romanians seem to share mechanically the norm of integration with the EU rather than come to the realization that combating corruption and reform the judiciary would first benefit Romanian democracy before it will help strengthen the Union. Romanian elites seem to
take EU norms seriously when they are coerced to do it although they acknowledge that the EU means modernization and transformation for the Romanian state and its institutions. Overall, data show that the EU as a regional international society is in flux and at crossroads. More political will, integration, harmonizing of mentalities, practices and rules as well as involvement of EU population is necessary in the framework of institutional creation.
CHAPTER EIGHT

ROMANIAN GOVERNMENT PERCEPTION ABOUT THE EUROPEAN UNION’S SECOND PILLAR

The purpose of this chapter is to identify how Romanian governmental elites associated with the EU’s Second Pillar of Common Foreign Security Policy (CFSP) understand the institution as a consciously created force in a framework of “common interests” and “common security.” The scope of the chapter is to understand in what context of “security” Romanian elites explain Romanian participation in CFSP as a guiding indicator to distinguish between a pluralistic and solidaristic society.

OVERVIEW OF THE EUROPEAN UNION’s CFSP

CFSP is the successor of the European Political Cooperation (EPC) establishment instituted in 1970. In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty established that CFSP replaced EPC and become an instrument of diplomacy and intervention of the EU to respond to the crises confronting the European member states. As established by the Maastricht Treaty the objectives of the CFSP are to be attained through joint actions and common positions adopted unanimously in the European Council.\(^{165}\) The five objectives of CFSP are to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests, independence and integrity of the Union; strengthen the security of the Union; preserve peace and strengthen international security; promote international cooperation; develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law, and show respect for human rights and fundamental

freedoms.\footnote{Europa: ‘A Guide to the European Union’.} CFSP objectives were reaffirmed by the Treaty of Amsterdam (1996) and subsequently by the Treaty of Lisbon (2007). In 2009, when the Treaty of Lisbon entered into force the institutional structure of three “pillars” (European Community), (CFSP) and (Justice and Home Affairs-JHA) was replaced with three types of competencies: exclusive competences, shared competences and supporting competences leaving the intergovernmental method of operation for CFSP unchanged.

Simply stated, CFSP is about harmonizing EU foreign policy in areas of security, defense diplomacy and actions. CFSP is an evolving institution designed to transform the EU into a global force in areas related to political diplomacy and security. In context of CFSP, scholars identify various obstacles to a common EU foreign policy. Some fault the lack of cohesiveness in policy formulation which resulted from the dichotomy between the Council and the Commission. Robert Dover (2010) for instance argues that “the EU has been an awkward foreign and security policy actor unable to formulate a cohesive identity or the credible capabilities with which to project itself onto the world stage” (Cini & Perez-Solórzano Borragan 2010: 239).

Attempts toward harmonization and strengthening the position of the European Commission in foreign and defense policies were made in the Treaty of Amsterdam (1996) however, no significant improvement was visible in the intergovernmental framework in cooperation on a government to government basis. The Iraq war for instance identified that a “common response” inside the Union was challenged by the division between Continental and Atlanticist mentalities as well as by the different political/diplomatic statures. As Commissioner Oli Rehn stated with respect to the EU functionality, “the different visions in the EU enrich the policies created but to have a homogeneous union is neither possible nor desirable” \textit{(The Bridge,}
The Lisbon Treaty (2007) was more influential toward harmonization because it specifically defined what the EU as a Union can and cannot do as well as clarified the division of competences between the EU and member states. Initially, as Dover (2010) claims, European governments retained sovereignty over pursuing independent foreign policy through the ability to veto any policy initiative or operation conducted under CFSP. The author notes that the success of formulating a common foreign policy was also jeopardized by very little input from the decision-making structure of the European Commission and the European Parliament (Cini & Perez-Solórzano Borragan 2010: 244-246). Karen Smith (2003:3) mentions that most studies on the failures of the EU’s foreign policy point to the national governments pursuing foreign policy interests separately from the Union because the EU does not have jurisdiction over states foreign policies.

THE CASE OF KOSOVO

The Yugoslav experience shows, for example, how the EU imagined its enlarged boundaries. The delay in European action led to an American response in the region that Europeans had thereafter to protect. The Dayton Accords of 1995 ended the Yugoslavian civil war and set the basis for a potential “ethnic nation state” in the middle of Europe, a continent impacted by a nationalist history of ethnic division. Both Romania and Russia continue to maintain historical allegiances with Serbia and refuse to recognize Kosovo’s independence on grounds of international law amidst the fact that almost all EU members recognize Kosovo as a state. When speaking about Kosovo, Romanian political elites claim that they want a European
response/solution to the region.\textsuperscript{167} Former Romanian Defense Minister, Teodor Melescanu for instance insists that although Serbia lost a piece of territorial history, politically Serbia gained more strength because all people inside Serbia are loyal to Serbia. In his view, Albanian people inside Kosovo stopped being loyal to Serbia before Kosovo separated in 1999 (Motoc \textit{et al.}, 2010: 188). Both Romanian parliamentarians in the EU Parliament and Romanian governmental elites adopted a unitary position with respect to Kosovo suggesting that

\begin{quote}
We are not refusing the solidarity with other EU members and their interests but rather we act in the EU’s interest which is today the same as Romania’s national interest. It is not us who depart from the EU interest but those who believe that violating international law can serve the interests of the EU…resolving a problem of the magnitude of Kosovo outside of international law endangers the stability and security of the world and this is against the interests of Kosovo’s population.\textsuperscript{168}
\end{quote}

The case of Kosovo’s independence seems to concern Romanians from the perspective of international law, EU consensus over ethnic states issues and the fact that Kosovo situation was not unique and had the potential to create precedents. According to Frunzaverde, “the creation of a precedent was not a problem for the EU states such as Slovenia or Romania that have modern laws with respect to national minorities but for countries like Abhazia, Osetia and Transnistria.”\textsuperscript{169} The year of 2007 in Basescu’s view signified for the Western Balkans “the year of truth, when the international community must come with a viable solution for the Kosovo province […] the difficulties in the Western Balkans require an integrated solution including a European prospect.”\textsuperscript{170} In context of the EU’s unitary foreign policy Basescu advocates the advantage of the Lisbon Treaty or the new constitutional treaty that gave more power to the
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European Parliament without leading to national state dissolution. In Basescu’s view, “the dissolution of the states in favor of the gigantic power of Brussels is out of the question.” Basescu stressed that the EU should get an identity based on culture and customs: “we shall have to see to our cultural values being imparted to Europe for us to be identified according to culture and not according to the English language everybody wants to speak; culture and customs must be the elements of our identity in the future.”

In the area of “common interests” Tariceanu appears to include free circulation of goods and people and aspects related to the conformity of European rules, norms and laws. With respect to initial tensioned bilateral relations between Romania and other EU members based on the flow of migrant workers Tariceanu stressed for example in a conversation about the attitude toward Romanians in Italy that “we have many common interests which must not be endangered by isolated cases; it is our common interest to promote the European values and oppose forces that bring prejudice to this system of values.” Furthermore, Tariceanu underscored that all Romanian politicians adopt a common conduct when it comes to national interest or to Romania’s interests in the EU. Tariceanu called the creation of Kosovo an unprecedented creation incompatible with European reality and identity. “There is no ground for us to think that there is any kind of similitude with Romania, as a unitary state, and I want this to be well understood by all citizens of Romania.”

As Prime Minister, I reiterate on this occasion the idea that Romania has a consistent demeanor that all state institutions take steps in the same direction and with equal responsibility so that whatever is best for Romania and the nation be set in place as a solution to the challenges we have to go through together. Romania’s stance on Kosovo renders conclusive evidence in this respect.
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The Parliament’s adopting today of a fully convergent stance with that expressed by the President of Romania and the government clearly demonstrates that Romanian democracy, the institutions of our state, work solidly.\textsuperscript{175}

According to Tariceanu, in the EU, Romania is an actor that ensures stability and security granted being its willingness to draw closer to the EU, Serbia, Moldova, Turkey, and others. As a member of the EU and NATO in the proximity of the Balkans, Tariceanu stressed that “Romania will further take responsible action to ensure stability and security of the region and for turning its European destiny to reality.”\textsuperscript{176} Regarding Romania’s EU integration Tariceanu stressed that “Romania has started on the path to European integration after January 1, 2005 with a serious handicap with respect to both its image and the fulfillment of the pledges made.”\textsuperscript{177}

As an adherent member of the EU, Romania continued to advocate Moldova’s European accession which in Tariceanu’s view constitutes a diplomatic success on how Romania approaches its foreign policy. In his view, while “Moldova acquires a completely different statute than Romania’s eastern neighbors, Romania does its duty as a neighbor and friend state that shares a common history, a common language, common customs and interests with Moldova.”\textsuperscript{178} Interestingly when confronted with the situation such as the 25 EU members not reaching a consensus over the Union’s budget for 2007-2013, Tariceanu stressed that debates over states national interests are complicated since “the national interest often prevails over the common one, but Romania has not lost anything at present, we have a particular substantial package, which amounts to a very important sum of money.”\textsuperscript{179}
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Romania is willing and able to contribute to the process of settling the difficult issues in the Western Balkan region. In particular, we support a strong and substantial involvement in Kosovo, in the post-status period. As a future EU member state, we are ready to assume out part of the responsibility of building a secure and prosperous Kosovo, part of a secure and prosperous region.\(^\text{180}\)

In a study completed by Mircea Micu (2011) involving Kosovo’s unilateral declaration of independence and Romanian officials involved in policy decisions and actions Micu (2011: 59) learned from Romanian officials that the decision to commit Romania’s personnel to EULEX, an EU led mission to help Kosovo state building in the area related to rule of law, was made “from the desire of contributing to regional stability and the consolidation of EU’s CFSP cooperation on one hand and on the other from Romania’s obligation to defend principles of international law and vital national interests.” Furthermore, Micu (2011) notes that Romanians were concerned that by participating in EULEX would implicitly recognize Kosovo’s de facto independence, a situation calmed thereafter by the UN in June 2008 when it transferred EULEX under the umbrella of UN framework.

When asked about Romania’s position on Kosovo that differs from other EU members Ungureanu replied that “I believe one must observe international law principles which underlie the balance at the European level; that a set of international law principles includes the inviolability of borders instituted through the Treaty of Paris of 1947 but most of all, by the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.”\(^\text{181}\) Although some elites associated with UDMR saluted Kosovo’s initiative Bela argued that the EU was an efficient actor capable of influencing Romania on the minority issue:

without a European influence we do not see a solution to the problem...we can imagine a reassuring final solution only within Euro-Atlantic and European institutions; that is to say, the
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risk concerning ethnic issues in Romania is many times higher outside these European institutions than is within them.\(^{182}\)

As a political figure representing the interests of Hungarian minorities, Bela was concerned with the Hungarian public life in Transylvania as well as with regional developments. With respect to Romania’s “common interests” and role in the EU, Bela argued that the rapprochement between Romania and the EU can be possible on cultural terms.

Although politics often estrange nations culture can bring us together […] Romania can and must become together with other strategic partners a promoter of cooperation between the East and the European Union […] literature, plastic art, music, folklore, the past and recent history proves that we have in common many communication elements, which makes easier the intercultural dialogue […] a viable community cannot exist without a community memory, which entails that the past must be regained for the future.\(^{183}\)

Noteworthy is that Romania’s political elites seems to consensually share the sentiment that the EU is not only a political space for reconciliation but a space for national reunification. For instance Basescu argued that it does not matter whether or not Moldova reunites with Romania outside of the EU, since it is in the EU, where both countries will be united. The same argument is made by Bela when Hungary was granted EU membership

for us it means a great deal that Hungary will soon be a full- fledged member of the EU, since this means that in the years ahead Hungary’s political and economic influence will increase considerably and this could have a beneficial impact on the situation of the Hungarians in Romania; secondly, Hungary’s EU membership will be the first important step towards the Hungarians of Hungary and of Romania to be together without borders (emphasis added).\(^{184}\)

The vice president of the Euro parliamentarian Tokes Laszlo, Szilagyi Zsolt argued recently that “without autonomy in Transylvania the Hungarian community from Tinutul Secuiesc (Secuiesc County) could not survive due to an intensified Romanization process in the area through the

---


\(^{183}\) *Rompres*, 15 December 2006. ‘Romania must be a promoter of cooperation between the East and the EU, says Marko Bela’.

\(^{184}\) *BBC Monitoring European*, 13 April 2003. ‘Romania, Romanian Hungarians hail Hungary’s EU referendum result’.
implantations of churches.” In Zsolt’s view, without cultural autonomy the Hungarian minority from the region would have the same destiny as the German minority who fled Romania. At this time Zsolt argues that Hungarian minorities have many identities: “we are Hungarians, Transylvanian, belong to one church or another, and of course we are Europeans.” Zsolt mentions that he views the EU as a model for natural devolution and self-governing for regional, ethnic or national communities suggesting that a modern state is a decentralized state capable of governing religious, ethnic or national communities.

The new leader of UDMR Kelemen Hunor argues that the “Hungarian minority from Romania wants to preserve their identity and the easiest way toward that is through autonomy obtained on the axis Bucharest-Budapest-Brussels.” The reply to Zsolt’s comments coming from the Romanian elites was that “Romania has a constitution that needs to be respected.” Returning to the pillar structure it is important to note that the abolition of the pillars made the European Community disappear and be replaced by the “EU” who acquired juridical personality, as it was previously reserved for the former Community, to conclude treaties in the fields within its area of competence. In the current format:

The EU has competence in all fields connected with the CFSP. It defines and implements this via policy, among others, the President of the European Council and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, whose roles and status have been recognized by the Treaty of Lisbon. However, the EU may not adopt legislative acts in this field. In addition, the Court of Justice of the EU does not have competence to give judgment in this area (Europa: ‘Summaries of EU Legislation’).
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185 News Gandul, 22 July 2011. ‘Szilágyi Zsolt: Daca nu va fi autonomie in Transilvania nu va putea supravieţi comunitatea maghiara’. [‘Without autonomy the Hungarian community will not survive’].


The scope of the chapter, in context of harmonization of common interests, is to identify a shared sense of Union, of interests and aspirations in the realm of security among Romanian elites while focusing on “what constitutes security,” “what means are used to provide for security,” and whether or not there are competing narratives between security meanings and security practices.

THE IDEA OF SECURITY

CFSP concerns foreign policy of the EU for security, defense diplomacy and actions. According to Ungureanu (2006), Romania has been a contributor to CFSP since 1 February 1993, when the European Agreement was signed. Ungureanu (2006) mentions that closer interaction with the EU helped Romania become aware of the EU’s positions, joint actions and common strategies. In his view, both the European Commission and EU member states have agreed that CFSP provisions are fully harmonized and implemented therefore in the negotiation process, Romania managed to close first its foreign policy chapter (Phinnemore et al., 2006: 136).

Romanian Defense Minister (2007-2008) Teodor Melescanu argues that “security” is a multiform and multi stratified concept with different referents and meanings for a politician and a journalist. For example, if in the former case the object of security is the state, in the latter case that may be an international system or an ethnic religious group (Motoc et al., 2010: 175). The idea of security seemingly embraced by Melescanu is that based on the Copenhagen paradigm of multidimensional with multiple referents, including not only military aspects but aspects related to state, individuals and groups.

The post Cold War era allowed the affirmation of the Copenhagen paradigm…and democratic member states of NATO and the EU adopted a compatible foreign policy, also political and military elites of both institutions have been greatly influenced by the Copenhagen school (see NATO strategic concept from Rome 1991) and began to include in the realm of security aspects of low politics related to economics, social, environmental and cultural problems (Motoc et al., 2010: 177).
Interestingly when faced with the question of EU and NATO as security communities Melescanu identifies NATO as a pluralist security community and the EU as a “postmodern political organization or polity based on democracy and freedom” (Motoc et al., 2010: 183). Security for Adrian Cioroianu spurs from dialogue, trust, cooperation and political will of international community to address frozen conflicts. In his view, the international community, including the EU became increasingly involved in the Black Sea area after learning of energy resources.

The implication of the EU in the area of the Black Sea originates from specific interests yet the initiative will promote EU values of democracy, human rights and regional cooperation […] a culture of cooperation […] security is not a zero sum, it is an opportunity of cooperation” (Motoc et al., 2010: 71-2).

Security is framed by prevention, coordination and synergy for Ungureanu. It is connected with economic, democratic developments and ownership. “No state in the region has a monopoly in providing solutions. What has worked in Europe could be applied in the Black Sea. Ensuring stability in the region necessitates a new vision based on regional ownership” (Motoc et al., 2010: 74). Historical preferences (read Kosovo) sometimes play a role in how Romania constructs its foreign policy according to Melescanu. Romania’s approach on foreign policy helped Romania’s integration in the EU while in the EU Romania will attempt to offer or share with the EU from its experience, underscored Ungureanu in 2006.

Since the beginning, our dialogue with Brussels was honest and based on sincerity. This has given Romania more credibility, more than Romania ever had. In these conditions the expectations of Europe are higher. They expect from us to have a voice on foreign policy issues, to be solidary with EU opinions and to build on joint positions. We will bring issues that EU will focus on in context of our expertise. Issues related to the Black Sea and our expertise in the Balkans…We are moving from a campaign policy to a concrete policy (Ungureanu 2008: 377).

Melescanu argues that in general, national security and foreign policy live in an “organic symbiosis” or a continuous interdependence even before entering globalization. A symbiosis in

Note that this chapter on security is written in collaboration with a political scientist whose research is focused on strategic security.
which the former identifies threats and the latter creates solidary connections to overcome them and pursue national interests (Motoc et al., 2010: 181).

A good foreign policy guarantees security for the state, the individual and to the regional and international level [...] foreign policy is influenced by the neighborhood and there are good and bad neighborhoods [...] the reality suggests however, that in the short and medium term, we must accept, that international community does have a common strategy as well as the resources necessary to eliminate all weak states and remodel them into powerful states [...] the EU, NATO, OSCE have the necessary instruments and strategies to manage conflicts, situation of crisis and build nations. European states focus on diplomacy, as noted in the European Security Strategy, to overcome terrorism, proliferation of nuclear weapons, regional conflicts and organized crime. The EU managed to accomplish an efficient neighborhood policy through which states from the region became well governed, democratic, prosperous and with good intentions (Motoc et al., 2010: 189).

The dialogue between Romania and EU officials as Ungureanu underscores evolved. In the initial phase the dialogue was limited to “international issues of common interest,” and was conducted at the expert or ministerial level extending in the subsequent phase to the Head of State and Government and after to other governmental institutions (Phinnemore et al., 2006: 135). Security was the most used argument by Romania in foreign policy decisions. Protecting national sovereignty attached to territorial integrity was one of the main priorities of Romania until NATO membership was obtained in 2004.

Ungureanu (2006) argues that, in context of foreign policy, Romania’s relationship with the EU “has always been a two-way street, allowing Romania both to better understand EU positions and to offer opinions and insights into foreign policy areas of particular interest;” additionally, he observed a positive correlation between EU membership and states confidence “once a candidate joins, it gains a new confidence and assertiveness in its contribution to the CFSP” (Phinnemore et al., 2006: 136). In the case of Romania however, after five years of integration the level of confidence seems negatively correlated with EU membership. For example, Baconschi discloses that Romania continues to operate in a framework of candidate mentality and has a difficult time finding its voice within the structures of the EU.
In the European debate in addition to being present we are interested in having a voice expressing all our national interests. We are interested in the vivacity of transatlantic connection and to increase our regional profile. We start from the premise that Romania does not gain from isolation but rather through cooperation such as strategic partnerships with Poland, policies with Turkey, and a strategic partnership with France. After the President’s visit to Germany, our relations improved tremendously, therefore, we want to be part of a Europe that is dynamic in which Romania is appreciated accordingly (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 29 December 2011).

“Culture is a product of thought” a retired Romanian general once suggested and there is relevant evidence in the case of Romania that the proximity to the Eastern periphery of the EU influences the level of confidence that a member state has in the Union. This however, can be attributed to the fact that Romania is plagued by a corrupt justice system and EU officials are reticent in trusting Romania. In general, the idea of security emerging from the elites’ statements and interviews is that security is a product of prudence and cooperation comprising soft approaches of promoting dialogue, partnership and solidarity in solving conflicts and tensions in the Balkans and the Black Sea. Interlocking states interests with institutions seem to be the framework that provides security in the view of Romanian elites.

“COMMON SECURITY”

The purpose of this section is to identify the context in which Romania articulates the need for security in CFSP. Is security articulated in the statements of political elites as a normative value or as an instrumental object to achieve a purpose? The type of security Romanian elites prioritize, (states vs. individuals) will help distinguish between a pluralist versus a solidarist relationship with EU conceptualized as an international society. There is consensus among foreign affairs elites imagining Romania’s role in the EU as a peace stabilizer, an ambassador capable of using its diplomatic skills to bring stability, democracy and prosperity in neighboring countries of Moldova, Ukraine and the Black Sea area. For example, Ungureanu articulated during Romania’s candidacy to membership that Romania will bring to the EU a large
diplomatic service, an impressive number of embassies and consulates and a diplomatic service with a tradition in excellence therefore enhancing the EU’s external relations. A year earlier Ungureanu underscored, in an interview related to Romanian diplomacy, that “during peace time in general diplomacy does not produce miracles but settles successes and successes are those that get public attention” (*TVR Iasi*, 25 September 2005). Before EU membership Romanian elites placed high hopes on Romania’s geostrategic position and hoped to influence change in the region from inside the EU.

Romania will continue to plead for support for a settlement of the Transnistrian conflict, for addressing the threats to regional stability and security arising from the region, for Moldova’s prosperity, and for an increasingly closer relationship with the EU […] Romania will continue to work with others in the EU to shape democratic developments in Ukraine, to support the authorities in Kiev to bring stability, democracy and prosperity to the Ukrainian people, and to promote Ukraine’s Europeanness both internally and in the country’s relations with its neighbors (Phinnemore *et al.*, 2006: 137).

Basescu outlined Romania’s ambassadorship’s role in regional and European security as well.

EU membership will add confidence […] I want to see Romania as an important European player […] Romania’s full membership in the EU will soon place us at the junction of two almost symmetrical perspectives, each with its own set of challenges and benefits. First of all, the EU will border the Black Sea and its outlook will extend to new partners such as Georgia and Ukraine. Secondly, Romania will play a new role both as a state interested in countering regional security threats and as a promoter of European and democratic values into the extended Black Sea region and the Western Balkans […] we will not waver in our support and guidance for the Republic of Moldova on its natural path towards the EU and we will continue to uphold its economic and social stability.190

The Black Sea region, dominated by frozen conflicts, is conceptualized by Romanian elites as a pillar of stability first for Romania and subsequently for the EU if the appropriate and immediate attention is given. Romanian Defense Minister Teodor Atanasiu, for example argued that Romania considered “its duty to serve as a mediator in regional disputes. We try to internationalize the talks around the frozen conflicts of the region, like that in the case of

---

Transnistria.”

To the EU, Romanian elites advanced the case of the Black Sea as a security risk arising from four smoldering conflicts (in the Republic of Moldova over Transnistria, in Georgia over Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and in Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh) as well as a security opportunity to energetic resources. Through NATO and the EU Romanian elites hoped to internationalize the space of the Black Sea into the structures of democracy and market economy. Both Atanasiu and the Chief of General Staff of Armed Forces, Eugen Badalan agree that:

The Black Sea area is a region of strategic opportunities from the perspective of access to energetic resources. The area requires security, economic, political assistance. The approach at transforming the wider Black Sea area into a secure and stable area requires stabilizing regional factors of frozen conflicts, drug trafficking, human and weapon trafficking, transnational migration and transnational organized crime. The EU will be able to transform the area into a pillar of security and stability through EU enlargement and strategic partnerships with Turkey, Ukraine, Russia, Georgia, and Moldova (National Defense University, “Carol I” 2005, November 21).

Preponderant in elites’ interviews and political statements the Black Sea emerges as a site of potential cooperation where NATO and EU values and security standards can be shared. For example the Minister of National Defense (2006-2007) Sorin Frunzaverde argued that because of regional threats resulting from activities of organized crime and frozen conflicts “security in the Black Sea is a complex situation that requires national, regional and Euro-Atlantic efforts […] and when we draw up our strategy for this region, we have to take into account the fact that we are a member of both the EU and NATO and therefore consider that Black Sea security is part of Euro-Atlantic security” (Jane’s Defense Weekly, 7 March 2007). Additionally, Badalan underscores that new strategic models of cooperation and security are necessary in the Black Sea to enhance coalitions, integrated actions and prospects for solidarity (National Defense University, “Carol I” 2005, November 21). Geographical or geostrategic location is part of

Romania’s security challenge and identity. There is a consensus among Romanian elites that Romania’s geopolitical location is a value for both NATO and the EU and has become an area of interest for the EU because of its location, at the juncture of Europe, Central Asia and the Middle East and because of its transit position for oil and gas. Frunzaverde for example views the role of the EU in the region “focused on good governance, democracy, transport, environment, energy, and combating organized crime. The presence of the EU in the Black Sea region opens a window of fresh perspectives and opportunities for Romania and the other countries in the area” (The Bridge Magazine, 2007).

Romania’s most important strategic value is its location in the Black Sea region. On the corridor connecting Europe to Central Asia and the Middle East, Romania acts as a platform for projecting interests and policies towards the two hot spots on the security map, Iraq and Afghanistan, and is key to the opening of Caspian and Central Asian energy resources to European consumers […] stability and security of the Black Sea as well as creating alternate transport routes for energy resources are among Romania - EU interests” (Jane’s Defense Weekly, 7 March 2007).

Ungureanu’s inviting message to the EU was that the Black Sea area is an opportunity for the EU to enhance democratization, security and prosperity as well as a prospective test of cooperation between the EU and Russia while the US is involved. Furthermore, Ungureanu argues that until Romania and Bulgaria, for EU officials, the Black Sea region was in many respects terra incognita.

The Black Sea area is vital for the EU’s future energy, security, particularly as a link to the Caspian Sea and Central Asia. It is also important in terms of sea transport being linked to the heart of the European continent via the longest European waterway, the Danube. As an ecosystem, the Black Sea area has the potential to influence all of Europe […] It is precisely the wider Black Sea area where Romania sees a potential for further ESDP involvement (Phinnemore et al., 2006: 140).

European Security Defense Policy (ESDP) is the mechanism framing a common defense policy allowing EU members to develop civilian and military capabilities for crisis management and conflict prevention at the international level.192 As underscored in interviews and political

statements, Romania has been contributing to CFSP and implicitly ESDP before it became an EU member. As an observer to the EU after signing the Accession Treaty on 25 April 2005 Romania participated in various political and military forums with military defense experts exchanging knowledge and methodologies as well as contributing to the strategic planning of military environment for 2006-2030 (National Defense University, Bucharest 2007).

According to Admiral Gheorghe Marin, Chief of the General Staff, Romanian participation in the EU led missions including, but not exclusively, an EU police mission (EUMP) in Bosnia-Herzegovina (2003) with six police officers, ALTHEA in Bosnia-Herzegovina (January-October 2006) with nearly 100 military and FYROM (2003-2005) with three police officers (National Defense University, 2007: 5-13). It is important to note that EU led missions were coalition stability missions conducted in complementarity with NATO. Romania’s participation in the EU’s process of defining doctrines and strategies was limited to the level of consulting and was constrained by membership status, such as a clear position and an impact in decision, was not possible until 1st January 2007.

In intergovernmental forums, decisions are taken by consensus. States that are not member, partner or associate states do not have a final word in these matters…we offer a huge pool of expertise in the Balkans. When the EU decides to generate a common approach and officially acknowledge the Black Sea region as one of interest, Romania offers the same level of expertise on the required political and security level (National Defense University, Bucharest 2006: ‘Debates Session’).

Especially among the defense elites “common security” in context of the EU translated in professionalization of the army to meet NATO and EU security requests to combat asymmetrical threats.

Once Romania becomes an EU member, it will also participate in the activities of the European Defense Agency. Our status as a NATO and EU member opens new opportunities for our defense industry at the European and trans-Atlantic level; support for technology and production modernization by transfer of technology, licensed production, know-how, economic partnership with companies in NATO and EU nations; developing regional maintenance centers for aircraft, combat vehicles and ships, and gradual integration with the European Defense Agency (Defense News, 23 January 2006).
Beginning in January 2007, registering as a soldier in the Romanian army during peace time became voluntary. In the words of the Romanian Defense Minister (2004-2006) integration into NATO and the EU are considered “a landmark in Romania Army’s transformation process, on our attempt of adapting ourselves to the nowadays security environment, of creating and developing a culture of security and community” (National Defense University, “Carol I” 2005, November 21). Defense elites see Romania as an actor of sharing in both NATO and the EU from its experience during the reform process of the armed forces, likewise did the other elites in the previous chapter with respect to helping prospective EU candidates to avoid the mistakes Romania made during accession.

In context of ESDP, Romania has become a supplier of security assistance in Southeastern Europe through consistent regional policies. Romania acquired a distinct political strategic identity in European regional security arrangements. We arrived here through a balanced strategy of political, economic, military and social factors. Now, we need to generate an internal reality compatible with Euroatlantic standards and values […] Romania belongs to Europe, geographic, historical and civilizational […] NATO membership confers to Romania unprecedented security guarantees […] After all the sacrifices Romanians now have rights to live in a society based on a system of values of the free world – democracy, equality before law, freedom of speech, and social justice. Nobody domestically can contest this reality; nobody can refuse Romanians, in their country, the right to liberty, and a decent standard of living in a state member of NATO” (Parliamentary Debates, Sorin Frunzaverde, 26 February 2004).

Frunzaverde (2006-2007) acknowledged that NATO started reforming Romania’s military institution and EU membership shaped foreign affairs and security policies (The Bridge Magazine, 2007). Strengthening Romania’s profile within the ESDP through support in operations carried by the EU was an important goal of Romania’s foreign policy. Melescanu argued that

Romania is resolutely backing a more integrated policy: a single command at European level…it is also essential to retain close cooperation with NATO. For us, the advantage of the EU is not only to offer military means but also to be able to combine these with non-military means. This combination is essential (European Report, 23 November 2007).

With respect to buying military equipment, Melescanu highlighted in an interview that
Any weapons purchase is a political decision [...] in the case of fighter jets the political criteria will be very clear: the need to buy these fighters either from EU member countries or from NATO member countries [...] As NATO and EU members we have an obligation to show solidarity.”

The procurement choice between EU suppliers and Lockheed Martin stirred questions of solidarity, capabilities and finances. There is consensus among Romanian elites that the Black Sea area can be transformed into a pillar of security through cooperation and enlargement under the guidance of joint actions taken in the name of CFSP. Additionally, there is consensus that Romanian foreign and security policy has strong ties with the US. “NATO remains a pillar of Romania’s national security,” Ungureanu underscored on November 16, 2006 during a meeting with NATO’s Secretary General.194 “Our NATO membership is a basic pillar of Romania’s foreign and security policy” Tariceanu emphasized at the swearing in of the new Defense Minister, four months after Romania was granted EU membership (Government of Romania, 10 April 2007). NATO needs to evolve from a political and military structure to combat asymmetric risks that endanger member states, Basescu stated at the end of a meeting with NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer.195 According to Basescu, NATO can bring “value added” to energy security. As Romanian elites conceptualize it, the EU is a model of regional coexistence, whose security is indispensably based on North America and NATO’s security capabilities.

Romania would back up the EU’s involvement in solving frozen conflicts, under the aegis of the European Security and Defense Policy; we hope to change with the help of the neighboring states, the region into a model of peaceful coexistence; Romania plans to be an active contributor to the consolidation of international security. We will remain engaged in the projects promoted by the Union as part of the European Security Defense Policy; we also favor a solid trans-Atlantic partnership and a powerful cooperation between NATO and the EU; we see Europe and North America as partners with common goals and values.196

196 Rompres, 31 January 2007. ‘President Basescu : Romania is ready to fulfill EU security commitments’.
Some European countries tend to see Romania as being more Atlanticist. A reporter once stressed to Basescu, how do you see Romania’s role or place within the EU? “Our bilateral relationship with the US is essential for the Romanian national security.”\(^{197}\)

We have excellent relations with the United States. Maybe WikiLeaks will prove that-I do not know what will be in the telegrams, we’ll see! But first of all we consider that we are Europeans. Since we joined the EU on January 1, 2007, we have done nothing that would suggest we are not excellent Europeans.

On the other hand, [becoming] an EU country [led to] an extremely important change in our foreign policy; Instead of powerful diplomacy within the EU, we shifted a little bit our resources on the Caspian Area and Central Asia, trying to open this door for the European Union. We assumed large responsibilities. The fact that we succeeded in reaching agreements with Azerbaijan and Georgia for the AGRI project with the Azerbaijan and Georgia, - Romania interconnection-the possibility to move gas to Europe-is proof that we have some efficiency in the region.

At the same time we constantly ask large EU countries to be our partners in developing a foreign policy in this region. But we are extremely responsible; it’s our first responsibility, as a border country, to develop relations in this region and to focus our diplomacy in this region. And the relations that we have with Turkmenistan, with Kazakhstan, are proof that we are able to develop such policies.\(^{198}\)

Interestingly, with respect to the oil commodity Basescu stresses that it is important to remain European in contrast to the military aircraft situation when he argues against the European suppliers. “Nabucco is a European project; it’s our objective to remain European.”\(^{199}\) When asked about the relationship with the US and his approach to ignore Russia, Basescu emphasizes that “Maybe when I’m no longer President of Romania there will be another approach” but Romania’s security and the history of Romania struggling to survive forces of the Ottoman Empire in the south, the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the west and the Russian Empire in the east are sufficient factors to take a unilateral approach when it comes to security.

For us security is [one of the] essential things. I have understood for some time the approach of European politicians. I’ve always said that maybe you look at security in one way when you have the borders of the Atlantic, and you are looking at your security in another way when your borders are on the Black Sea. It’s a different approach sometimes, but in this respect Romania doesn’t have to ask anybody. When we talk about security it’s our own decision and we have to look first at security. The events in Georgia prove that something can happen at any moment. We have

\(^{197}\) Rompres, 7 February 2005. ‘Early Elections Are a Necessity, says President Basescu’.
\(^{198}\) FT.com/Europe, 13 December 2010. ‘Interview Transcript: Traian Basescu, President of Romania’.
\(^{199}\) FT.com/Europe, 13 December 2010. ‘Interview Transcript: Traian Basescu, President of Romania’.
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Transnistria a few kilometers from our border; we cannot assume any risks regarding our security.\textsuperscript{200} Basescu also stressed that Romania was and remains for designing a unitary CFSP of Europe while encouraging Europe to maintain good relationships with the US. In Basescu’s view, “it will be hard to imagine a Europe without the US as it will be to see a US without Europe.”\textsuperscript{201} The triangular relationship between Romania, the EU and United States is further clarified by Ungureanu mentioning in an interview that the obvious question of, “if you imagine Romania’s national security warranted by a strong and consistent alliance with Washington, can you say that you have the same confidence in the European defense and security dimension?” was asked by EU officials. Ungureanu stresses that the Romanian answer to confidence in European security dimension was an unequivocal “yes” otherwise Romania would not want to become a member of the European Union, taking into consideration that this ‘club’ has its own strict rules.\textsuperscript{202} As Ungureanu describes it, the politics in the relationship between Romania and the EU and between Romania and the US can be analogously described as a very cold winter and strategic partnerships like coats necessary to protect one from frost bites. The more coats one has the better their chance to survive the winter intensities.

Alternatively while retired from political office Melescanu argues that “What Romania does in relationship with Russia is ignorance” advising that Romania should “take Russia seriously because Russian collective memory is powerful. They don’t forget easily and are always able to show what you said about them even two years ago.”\textsuperscript{203} An overall view of the “common security” ideas emerging from Romanian Defense elites is that soft security is

\textsuperscript{200} FT.com/Europe, 13 December 2010. ‘Interview Transcript: Traian Basescu, President of Romania’.

\textsuperscript{201} EuroNews; November 28, 2010. ‘Interview with Traian Basescu’.


\textsuperscript{203} Ziare.com, Friday 17 September 2010. ‘Teodor Melescanu: In relation with Russia, what we are doing is ignorance’.
necessary to combat asymmetrical threats. While in the EU, Romania is engaged to promoting transatlantic values and security standards in border, seashore and civil emergencies.

Romania confronts security risks that are generally nonmilitary and of a domestic nature manifested in the economic, financial, social and ecological fields... great emphasis is placed on having modern, mobile, well trained and equipped forces capable to sustain operations wherever necessary. Our priorities are to establish, train, deploy and sustain the forces for the full range of national, NATO and EU mission, regional and coalition initiatives, to develop air-transport capabilities and to increase the operational usability and capabilities of our naval units (Defense News, 23 January 2006).

Accession to the EU means, in Frunzaverde’s view, security and stability for the Romanian people in the economic field.

The European Union has contributed to the increase in economic security, foreign investments and the presence of several European and international corporations in Romania which have brought economic stability as a key role in the overall development […] EU membership has brought new challenges for Romania. As an EU border country Romania has great responsibilities and had to make efforts towards an efficient management of its frontiers to stop illegal immigration, human trafficking and criminal networks. Improved border security has been developed in cooperation with, and with the help of, the EU. While in the EU, Romania has to act responsibly towards neighboring countries, including the Republic of Moldova. The EU’s involvement in the stabilization of the Republic of Moldova, territorial integrity, democracy and border security are very important for Romania and the entire region” (The Bridge Magazine, 2007).

Frunzaverde agrees that Romania’s role in the EU’s CFSP is one of a security provider. In his view, CFSP constitutes a framework of cooperation underlying soft security.

The regional cooperation framework should be focused on issues regarding border control and soft security: environmental protection, illegal migration and the illegal traffic of drugs, small and light weapons and sensitive materials” (Jane’s Defense Weekly, 7 March 2007).

Frunzaverde seems to understand CFSP as an instrument guiding security strategies.

The EU’s CFSP and the ESDP have been important guidelines for Romania’s perspective in this field. As part of the EU, Romania receives certain benefits, but it also makes an important contribution to the development of European policies and programs. On November 23, 2007 Romania actively participated in international missions, under the aegis of NATO, EU or UN or in alliance with USA, with the following forces: 49 persons in Bosnia, under the aegis of EU (EUFOR) and 153 persons in Kosovo, under the aegis of NATO (KFOR) (The Bridge Magazine, 2007).

The accession of Romania to NATO represented the marking moment for our accession in the European Union…the presence of our military in the international missions together with their
comrades from the North Atlantic countries, in their majority being members of the European Union, was to prove that Romania wants and can be part of the Union based on the system of values of democracy and freedom and the reform of the Romanian armed forces was one of the decisive elements of domestic policy for the accession to NATO and the European Union (Minister of National Defense, 29 December 2006).

From the military point of view, Romania is integrated in the European Policy of Security and Defense and the Romanian military forces are present in the Catalogue of Forces 2007, and our country becomes the member of the European Agency of Defense” (Minister of National Defense, 29 December 2006).

During a French-Romanian seminar on “Thinking Together Over European Security and Defense Dimension” Melescanu reiterated that the EU offers Romania new means to make fresh defense commitments.

The accession to the EU offers Romania opportunities to optimize its contribution to the development of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). ESDP is a relatively recent EU initiative. It represents the EU’s response to the risks and threats of the present day security climate. The status of a European Union member means a country should take upon itself fresh commitments and responsibilities on security and defense issues. ESDP recorded spectacular developments in increased defense capabilities at the European level and in committing EU members to civil and military operations.

According to Melescanu while in the EU, Romania grew increasingly interested in a more integrated security and defense policy.

We are very attached to a common European defense policy. Even though we have just joined the EU, we want to and we have to invest in it. Our first consideration is the European Defense Agency: we want to adhere as quickly as possible to the European code of conduct on military acquisitions, and then our aim is to get involved in the agency’s different research projects, including direct financial participation…the unmanned aerial vehicle is the project that interest us most as well as others like the soldier of the future. By participating in these kind of projects, we can show solidarity for the creation of a solid basis for the European defense policy and, at the same time, resuscitating our national industry, which needs to both develop and establish relations with its European counterparts” (European Report, 23 November 2007).

It is also essential to retain close cooperation with NATO. For us, however, the advantage of the EU is not only to offer military means but also to be able to combine these with non-military means. This combination is essential…the future is in greater integration. Romania is currently engaged in several EU operations. We are present in Bosnia and have announced the participation of 120 men in the EU operation in Chad in the French battalion…The commitment to Chad is symbolic for two reasons. It is the first as a member of EU; it is also a very clear indication that

\[^{204}\text{Rompres, 29 May 2007. ‘EU member status means making fresh security and defense commitments-Defense Minister Melescanu’}.\]
Romania, like other member states, is not insensitive to the African continent" (European Report, 23 November 2007).

With respect to “common security,” it appears that Romanian political elites involved in EU political affairs tend to conceptualize “security” in terms of energy projects, peace and EU enlargement and elites involved in defense affairs as opportunities to enhance the armed forces to be able to combat asymmetric threats, cooperation and integration of armed forces within CFSP structures. For example both Atanasiu and Badalan agree on the principle that “NATO and the EU can evolve from the military point of view by complementarity […] the Romanian contribution of forces would be available not only to NATO but also to the European Union, and they should be used according to these organizations’ specific military necessity” (Ministry of National Defense, 21 March 2005). As a member of the EU, Romania offered to become a pillar of security at the Eastern border of the EU while relying on the US and NATO for security. Notably, based on its experience with the Schengen Program, Romania was perceived as a “security risk” by several leading members of the Union including France, the Netherlands and Germany. A rejection was made by EU counterparts on grounds of Romania’s weak judicial system and judiciary actions to strengthen the battle of Romanians against corruption and crime.

The CFSP constitutes an example of common institutions created by EU member states in conditions of instability to maintain a common security. “Speaking with one voice” is the motto of the CFSP institutional mechanism specially created after the end of the Cold War to appease regional conflicts in Europe and elsewhere. As stated by the EU Council, the main instrument of CFSP is “soft power” including the use of diplomacy, trade, aid and peacekeepers to bring about understanding, order and stability.205 Europe’s common security, as indicated by

Romanian elites cannot be achieved but only in complementarity to NATO and the US. CFSP is one of the EU institutions created by members of the EU to protect the European community. Based on the experiences accumulated in Kosovo and Afghanistan with respect to security, Romanian elites tend to advocate a comprehensive approach involving the international community of civil and military coordination in areas of conflict.

The world, as the Romanian State Secretary for European Affairs, Bogdan Aurescu suggested, is unpredictable and fragmented challenged by threats “which blur the distinction between defense and security, between national and European” calling for actions that move beyond the concept of territoriality and spheres of influence (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11 November 2011). Furthermore, in consequence of the emerging threats of the 21st Century the idea of “security” according to Aurescu, “cannot be reduced to its military dimension” because the new challenges of international terrorism, cyber-attacks, piracy, and disruptive events such as those from Georgia indicate that security “embraces political, economic (energy for example), social environmental, as well as defense components” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11 November 2010).

Aurescu also argues that “cyber - attacks and energy insecurity are able to paralyze a country without moving a single soldier” reasons for which Romania as a member of the Euro-Atlantic enterprise, uses “a broad concept of security, based on a tri-dimensional approach: political-military, economic/environmental and human” considering at the same time flexibility in adapting the concept according to the context (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11 November 2010). Aurescu’s speech also underscores that Romania prioritizes “cooperation among the multilateral institutions.” He concurs with other elites views that the main guarantor for Romania’s security is NATO although in his view both NATO and the EU are “natural partners
who share twenty-one common members.” He mentions that Romania’s behavior is largely influenced by the Council of Europe which acts as a complimentary force of security to NATO and OSCE through its focus on human rights and other sets of values.

THE ALTHEA OPERATION

Operation Althea is a concrete example in which Romania participated in EU led peacekeeping operations highlighting Romania’s contribution with experts in the field of police, rule of law, administration and civil protection. The Althea operation was launched by the EU on 2 December 2004 in Bosnia-Herzegovina to conduct police and monitoring missions and was officially concluded by Romania on January 6, 2006. For the Romanian armed Forces, Althea was the first mission in a theater of operation since the end of the Second World War. The Romanian Armed Forces were deployed in the operation of Althea in January 2005 with two detachments, each of 42 soldiers and four reconnaissance helicopters (Ministry of National Defense, 5 January 2006).

Additional transport and intelligence units were made available upon request. Romania’s participation in this mission was justified by the Ministry of Defense as “an action that mirrors the continuity of the Romanian Army’s efforts aimed at reconstruction, security and stability in the Balkans and the support granted to the European Union’s wider involvement in the region. The move is part of a wider Romanian participation in the European security and defense policy, both as a candidate to EU accession and a NATO member.” To the Althea operation Romania also offered the use of 196 policemen for ESDP and 13 experts for rule of law missions. Noteworthy is that Romanian forces served in the Althea mission under the Italian operational

206 Rompres, 3 January 2005. ‘Romania to send four helicopters to Bosnia Herzegovina Operation Theater’.
control as well as under the British command thus sharing an amalgam of leaders and practices 
(Ministry of National Defense, 12 December 2005). Romanian soldiers, as a retired general observed, benefited from sharing their practice with other soldiers.

[…] it is amazing that people coming from different cultures, even having different interests in that area, succeed in getting along perfectly. Taking the Romanian soldier as an example, his behavior in theaters of operation is rather better than in the training process, here, at home. I mean in the confrontation with reality and the intercommunication between cultures, he proved to be themselves…the world has no other chance but partnerships and unity to manage the emerging threats (National Defense University, 25 May 2006; General-Brigadier (ret.) dr. George Vaduva).

While reflecting on the Althea operation, Atanasiu stressed that crises create an environment for improving cooperation among various players of the EU, and crisis management operations can contribute to increasing coherence in implementation of the response to a crisis. In addition to the Black Sea area, the Balkan area is considered by Romanian elites an area of strategic importance at both political and military levels in context of stabilization and democratization. If, with France and Germany for example Romania conducts relations at other levels signing programs of strategic partnerships, with Serbia and Montenegro for example, Romania signs protocols of cooperation in education and training of military and civil personnel (Ministry of National Defense, 19 April 2005). The meaning attached to the Althea operation seems to be that of stabilization and nation building.

As a regional actor political and defense elites describe the role of Romania in the Balkans as an entrepreneur sharing not only what Romania got right in the EU integration process but also what it got wrong. Both Serbia and Moldova are two of the EU candidates mentored by Romanian elites. To show engagement with the region and EU’s institutions Romania participated not only in peacekeeping missions but in group training exercises. Atanasiu for instance signed on 21 November 2005 with Bulgaria, Greece and the Republic of Cyprus a letter of intention establishing a combat tactical group operational in 2007 and
subsequently with Italy and Turkey in May 2005 for 2010 as part of the EU practice of rapid reaction capacity. The purpose of the tactical group exercise was to serve in crisis management missions under the aegis of joint operation (Ministry of National Defense, 21 November 2005). The meaning attached to “joint operations” by defense elites translates in coordinated perspectives to create a framework of common participation in international missions. The EU Force Catalogues include Romania’s contribution to the EU missions since the pre-accession period. “The goal was to strengthen Romania’s profile within the European Security and Defense Policy through support to the operations carried out by the European Union” mentioned Defense Minister Frunzaverde.207

Among the actions of solidarity with CFSP that were being drafted “The Memorandum on joining the European Defense Agency” initiated by and referred for approval to the Romanian Supreme Defense Council at the end of 2006. “Another priority of the Romanian defense policy was the promotion of stability in the Western Balkans and the enlarged Black Sea region. In 2006, Romania - as a host state - has contributed officers and general staff.”208 For example, in The EU Force Catalogue 2006 it is stated that EU leaders are determined to support that

The European Union shall play its full role on the international stage. To that end, we intend to give the European Union the necessary means and capabilities to assume its responsibilities regarding common European policy on security and defense. […] the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and the readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises without prejudice to actions by NATO (EU Council, November 2006).

Since Romania is both a NATO and EU member Romanian elites tend to show undivided loyalties to both organizations however, their opinions seem to diverge with respect to involving the army abroad. With a Eurocentric view Tariceanu once underscored that

207 Rompres, 13 November 2006. ‘Romanian Defense Minister Sorin Frunzaverde attended on Monday the meeting of EU defense ministers held at the headquarters of EU Council in Brussels’.
208 Rompres, 13 November 2006. ‘Romanian Defense Minister Sorin Frunzaverde attended on Monday the meeting of EU defense ministers held at the headquarters of EU Council in Brussels’.
I am a supporter of the idea that a genuine military is trained in theatres of operations, on the battlefield. I have been and I am the advocate of the participation of troops in peacekeeping missions under the aegis of NATO, OSCE and other international bodies (Government of Romania, 14 March 2007).

In June 2005, Atanasiu demanded the withdrawal of Romanian troops from Iraq, an action called by Basescu irresponsible pointing out that those “who do not understand that the most important honor in the military is the honor of observing commitments, it means that they do not understand the army” stressing however, that politicizing the Army is one of the worst things that can happen in Romania. Two days before Romania officially became an EU member Frunzaverde remarked that

The missions carried out by the Romanian military in various operation theaters proved we have a professional army, capable of taking part in international missions, and at the same time, of being integrated into the EU European Security Policy […] The presence of our military side by side with their fellow soldiers in the EU countries in international missions strengthened the latter one’s trust in the Romanian capability of carrying out missions that were entrusted to them. January 2007 marks Romania’s integration into the EU security policy and the capacity to act as a member of the European Defense Agency (Rompres, 29 December 2006).

Although less visible, the contribution of the Ministry of Defense was significant in the field of ESDP[...]2006 was the peak year for the implementation of the practices in the ESDP, promotion of stability in the West Balkans and the extended area of the Black Sea[...]Romania consolidates its profile through Romanian support in the operations carried out by the EU[...]Romania participated with military forces (81 troops) in ALTHEA military operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina, deploying transport, police, small units of military intelligence as well as staff personnel (Ministry of National Defense, 2006).

Among the defense elites, Romania is called “an active actor of the European and Euro-Atlantic architecture […] As a NATO and EU members, Romania continues to be a pillar of regional and global stability, an active participant in peacekeeping mission and operations in the Balkans, Central Asia, Middle East, as well as within regional initiatives, including the Black Sea area” (National Defense University, 24 May 2007). In ESDP Romanian participation is known to contribute with forces and capabilities to building common defense capacities. As indicated by Gheorghe Marin, the Chief of the General Staff, Romania’s involvement in EU missions

---

210 Rompres, 29 December 2006. ‘Minister Sorin Frunzaverde hails Romania’s joining EU’.
included a mix of civilian and police missions (*National Defense University*, p. 11). The most important lesson which resulted from these missions was to identify cooperation possibilities and means to combat asymmetrical transnational threats. In retrospect, security is a matter of common interest between Romania and the EU. By common security Romanians refer to security of borders, democratization of the Black Sea area, nation building and resources. They speak about stability, democracy and prosperity in countries like Moldova and Ukraine however; integration in the EU goes beyond Romania’s advocacy requiring self-determination of the Moldavian population. According to Basescu

Romania wants to find support within the European Union for the Republic of Moldova to return to Europe, which it left in 1940 against its will. The populations of Romania and of the Republic of Moldova share a common history, language, culture, traditions and European desires; Romania and the Romanians definitely have a moral and political obligation to fight so that our families east of the Prut River should return home to Europe.\(^{211}\)

The year of 2007 signified for the Western Balkans, in Basescu’s view, “the year of truth, when the international community must come with a viable solution for the Kosovo Province; the difficulties in the Western Balkans require an integrated solution, including a European prospect.”\(^{212}\) Recently, Romania withdrew support of Serbian candidacy to the EU on the grounds that Serbia does not address the situation of Vlach minority (Romanian-Serbian).\(^{213}\) The development of common practical approaches and cooperation in peacekeeping operations seems to give Romanian elites new opportunities to learn and adjust to EU standards. With respect to the Black Sea, Romanians are looking to the EU for guidance and support to develop a CFSP on the area related to the Caspian Sea and Central Asia. The EU can play a positive part in this area as Basescu stressed

---

\(^{211}\) *Rompres*, 31 January 2007. ‘President Traian Basescu delivered a speech on Wednesday before the parliamentarians of the EU member countries’.

\(^{212}\) *Rompres*, 31 January 2007. ‘President Traian Basescu delivered a speech on Wednesday before the parliamentarians of the EU member countries’.

\(^{213}\) *Gandul*, February 24, 2012. ‘Romania has decided to block Serbian candidate status to EU’.
Provided that it defines its interest in the region […] the Black Sea is a highly important hub for the transit of energy resources from producing to consumer states; A European energy market is a crucial goal that requires joint strategies. The EU needs to approach the issue of energy security in a common voice otherwise we will not be successful or miss the chance to attain our major goals.214

Speaking with one voice in the EU energy policy is imperative for a common energy policy as well as challenging in a Union in which sovereignty in providing for energy is unevenly distributed in member states. As in the EU, CFSP dimension seems to require a change in mentality and attentiveness inside the framework itself.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of the chapter was to identify the idea of security, in the statements and interviews of Romanian political elites and observe differences between security meanings and actions. Data indicate a minimal difference between Defense Ministers who tend to associate security with strong states and normative values and Foreign Affairs Ministers who speak of security as a value to spread democracy and as an instrument to secure energy resources to be shared thereafter for the good of the European region.

Data also show that it is difficult to distinguish between statements where security is conceptualized as a normative value and statements in which security is an instrument to achieve a purpose, in this case, the spread of values of democracy and prosperity. Therefore, the case of Romania shows that distinguishing between a solidarist and pluralist type of society in the area of CFSP is complex if indeed there is a difference. Alex J. Bellamy and Matt McDonald (2004:307) argue that questions of order and justice are critical in distinguishing between the solidarist and pluralist international societies. However, in the Romanian case the only

distinction that order and justice can make is that Romanian elites speak of security outside the state as a value and inside the state as an instrument to secure goods for the individual. The idea of security reflects security for state borders to provide security for individuals. An attempt to track the meaning of security across time and space (before and after EU accession) shows that Romanian political elites introduced the EU to the frozen conflicts in the Black Sea underscoring that this is the area where solidarity and spreading of normative values can be cultivated. Before EU accession Romanian defense elites were not allowed to participate in the consensus of decision-making. After 2007 Romanian elites speak about security in context of economic and foreign investments to help with border security. The compulsory military service was eliminated in 2007 and the professionalization of the Romanian soldier and the military was in its second stage. Romanians now want to subscribe to the European code of conduct on military acquisitions; to become more involved in research projects and transfer of knowledge; to strengthen the security component of the Union. CFSP becomes a mechanism of security coordination and provider but only in complementarity to NATO.

The concept of “soft security” is more often used in elites’ statements. As underscored by Aurescu Romania uses a tri-dimensional approach when it comes to security. Their idea of security seems to converge around the assumption that EU enlargement will bring more access to economic opportunities in the Black Sea region and more political interaction between EU values and states confronting frozen conflicts. Another distinction made in context to the previous chapter is that in the area of security Romanian elites show, in general, more confidence and an increased ability from the part of the defense elites to articulate the values of the EU more concretely. A possible explanation is that in the region Romania managed to acquire a security provider identity through NATO and work with the EU before Romania was granted
membership. Exposure to international norms and practices of socialization seem to positively impact Romanians confidence as elites see through their actions in Althea contributions made to the EU’s CFSP before Romania became part of the EU.

Since we are NATO members, our role has been increased a lot. It is obvious that we have been the only institution in Romania working with the EU within European structures, without being members of the Union yet […] It is clear that, if Romania joins the Union in January 2007, the Romanian Army will participate in the European security just as it has done until now.\textsuperscript{215}

The idea that solidarity can be cultivated through increased integration and partnerships is predominant. Romanians understand CFSP as a medium where a closer culture of security can result from unity, cooperation and engagement.

\textsuperscript{215} Rompres, 9 May 2006. ‘Romanian Defense Minister: The Day of May 9 has multiple significations for Romanians’.
CHAPTER NINE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the preceding two chapters a summary of data collected from Romanian governmental elites official documents, interviews and public statements have been presented and organized in categories according to the definition describing an international society. In chapter eight the idea of security was examined in relationship with the Second Pillar to identify the context in which security acquires the meaning of “common interest.” The focus on the meaning of security was intended to distinguish between norms and a pluralistic and solidaristic international society.

The purpose of this chapter is to expand on the idea of international society reflected by the evidence provided in the last two chapters and state clearly the findings and the conclusions reached with respect to international society at the regional level. The chapter begins with a summary of the purpose and structure of the study followed by a discussion of the major findings related to the EU as a regional international society. Conclusions from the findings of this study are discussed in relation to the definition of international society, function and characteristics of international society as well as strengths and limitations of international society theory. The latter part of the chapter will focus on the implication of the findings for theory and practice and will make recommendations for further research.
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate how Romanian governmental elites conceptualize the EU as an international society from the perspective of elites’ meanings and practices attached to the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar. The study was framed by the international society theory of the English School, claiming that an international society exists when two or more states consciously create a society of states in which they share common interests and common values, are bound by a common set of rules and are involved in the creation of common institutions.

Bull’s (1977) definition of international society is standardly used by members of the ES to examine the three concepts of international system, international society, and world society (see Ole Waever (1998), ‘Four Meanings of International Society’). Participants in the study were Romanian governmental elites associated with the Democratic Liberal Party coalition perceived by Romanian and western comparative politics scholars (Tismaneanu & Gross 2005; Stan 2005; Mungiu-Pippidi 2005) as pro-western, seeking to break ties with old practices of political instability and aiming to integrate Romania into the structures of European institutions. Participants in the study were selected according to definition of political elites used by the ES.

The study examined textual data: written political statements, speeches and interviews provided by the governmental elites with respect to the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar from the time they were invested in office, December 2004 to December 2010, coinciding with the fifth Cabinet of Emil Boc and with two years before and three years after EU membership respectively. Written political statements were collected systematically employing the criteria per year and per individual from the Romanian Government database (Presidency, Government, European Integration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defense). The criteria for data
admission was based on the definition of international society ‘word categories’ reflecting content and meaning associated with the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar. Public speeches and interviews were selected systematically per year and per individual from Romanian and international media news reports via Internet searches using Factiva and Google.

In the case of one Foreign Affairs Minister, his interviews, political statements and press releases were systematically taken from a book [Always Loyal: Diplomatic Notes for Modern Romania 2004-2007]. The most representative data collected appear in the study as selected quotes or as an analysis in summary form to substitute for the quantity of quotes. The study included 18 participants from whom 17 were male and one female; 1 was the president, 2 were prime ministers, 5 were foreign affairs ministers, 1 was state secretary for European Affairs; 4 were associated with European integration, 2 of whom served as ministers of European Integration; and 5 were Defense Ministers. The number of documents surveyed in the study is around 600, from which, close to 450 were selected and approximately 300 are cited. From January 2008 to October 2008 data were missing from the Romanian Government website and were supplemented with media statements and interviews. A balance between interviews, official documents and newspapers was respected. To extract the meaning from texts the interpretivist/hermeneutic method associated with international society was used. In the ES sense:

These methods acknowledge that it is possible to draw on the language used in a given international society in order to identify and then understand the significance of the interests, values, rules and institutions that prevail in a particular place and at a particular point in time. It is presupposed, that these features vary considerably from one international society to another but this can be appreciated through an investigation of the language used by statesmen when they are engaged in practices that define an international society (Little 2000: 409).

The interpretivist/hermeneutic method allowed the researcher to observe, discern, diagnose, interpret and explain the meanings of “EU,” “common interests,” “common values,” and
“common culture” that Romanian governmental elites attach to the EU and the EU’s Second Pillar. The first step in the textual analysis focused on identifying the “meanings” behind the language of saying while the second step focused on connecting the meanings with “actions” behind the language of doing. This approach is discussed by Jackson in (Navari et al., 2009: 36). Wight (1966) argued that to comprehend the nature of an international society it is necessary to examine the nature of previous international societies. In this sense the emergence and expansion of European international society from the perspective of Bull (1977), Wight (1977) and Watson (1984; 1992) was examined. This study aimed to answer how Romanian governmental elites conceptualize the EU as a regional international society through the answers of three sub-research questions.

Q1. In what context of “common interests,” “common values,” and “common culture” do Romanian governmental elites understand the EU as an international society?

Q2. Under what conditions does the norm of EU integration matter for Romanian governmental elites?

Q3. How do Romanian governmental elites understand security as a “common interest” in the EU’s Second Pillar?

Questions one and two were answered from the corroboration of data obtained from political statements, public interviews and speeches made by Romanian governmental elites from December 2004 to December 2010. To determine how Romanian governmental elites understand the EU as an international society, for each elite data were categorized according to the terms describing an international society: “common interests,” “common values,” “common culture” and the “EU.” To determine when rules and norms of international society matter for governmental elites’ data were organized in subsets to describe the norm of “EU Integration.” Question three was answered with data collected from political statements, public interviews and speeches made by Romanian governmental elites (including defense elites) with respect to
‘security,” the EU’s Second Pillar and “common security.” Data collected on the Althea operation and Kosovo reflect the actions or practices of Romanian governmental elites within the Second Pillar.

**DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS**

The idea of international society at the regional level was previously examined by Bull (1977), Wight (1977), Watson (1984; 1992), Ayoob (1999), Diez & Whitman (2002; 2010), Stivachtis (2002), Czaputowicz (2003) and Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez (2004-2009). The purpose of this study was to examine international society from the perspective of those who live and act in it by identifying how Romanian governmental elites conceptualize the EU as a regional international society.

**Research Question One**

*In what context of “common interests,” “common values,” and “common culture” do Romanian governmental elites understand the EU as an international society?*

The findings obtained on this question suggest that the EU is a society of states or an international society but the idea of “union” is not subordinated to the community of people. The EU is a project enacted by the elites to support their state and population interests. When asking what the EU means for Romanian elites the results gathered under this heading indicate that the EU is a problem of government and political class, a construction of political elites, a diplomatic effort, a European model to advance peace and prosperity, a product of elites’ conscious commitment to peace, a union of solidarity, a culture and a space, an idea holding out hope of peace and understanding, a model of cooperation, a territory and a civilization in which differences coexist, a project to ensure the best standards of living to EU citizens, the occidental life, an unprecedented European experiment, a community, performance, modernization and an
innovative project. The list of adjectives positively describing the EU continues (see pg. 206-9 for specific quotes). Note that before 2007, the official date marking Romania’s entry in the EU, Romanian elites described the EU as a genuine solidarity construction by the elites requiring genuine support from its citizenry.

The elites’ description conforms to the EU reality in which three referenda testing the Danish, the French and the Netherlands support of the population for EU enlargement and Constitutional Treaty failed to show positive support for the EU project. Furthermore, according to the Romanian President, EU citizens as an institution of the EU had not received prominence above states in EU documents until the 2007 Berlin Declaration. In context of this question, data supplied evidence for the EU as an international society with common interests, values, culture, rules and institutions.

The results on the propensity of the international society terms with respect to the EU as a “Union” however, may be influenced by an infusion of wording appealing to EU officials to strengthen Romania’s entry in the EU since in one instance the Romanian President discloses in an interview that he requested from France and the UK advisors capable of helping Romania fight against corruption and EU integration.216 Two lectures given at the London School of Economics (LSE), the sanctuary of the English School are identified as well, one in 2006 and one in 2011.217 Nevertheless, the 2006 lecture highlights that the EU is a union of the elites that “has not been properly explained to European citizens,” therefore dismissing the suspicion of ES

scholars consulting for the Romanian government.” The results of this question enhance the theory of international society, that the EU is an international society created by western elites that requires the support of citizens for sustainability. The results show that Romanians associate the EU with a union model symbolizing a political and moral contract among elites to improve the life and prosperity of the EU population. New in this section emerges the EU as a framework of governance, an international society that requires members to modify their identities (become Europeans) and transform their countries into European countries. This conforms to the realist logic of anarchy and the creation of like units. The EU emerges as an actor aiming at harmonizing laws, rules and mentalities in the spirit of cooperation and the sharing of common values. The results up to 2007 on this question reveal that the EU is a model of economic integration lacking progress in the areas of political and social solidarity and once inside the Union, Romanians called for more solidarity and integration of political conducts. The results describing the meaning of the EU highlight the idea that before Romania walked into the EU as a member, Romanian elites thought that they would have an equal voice inside the Union.

When asking about the “common interests” between Romania and the EU, the results highlighting the meaning of “common interests” suggest that the EU, unlike the European international society, enlarged with a conscious attempt to preserve a regional order of peace and stability for Europeans as a whole while European international society proceeded with the enlargement in the conscious attempt to maintain the balance of power. This is interesting because it reflects Wight’s (1966) recommendation that in order to understand the character of an international society a researcher needs to compare that international society with other international societies. With respect to Romania’s common interests with the EU emerges the idea of border and energy security as well as stability through enlargement to spread EU values.

218 (See Ungureanu’s lecture on 30 October 2006).
in the area of frozen conflicts. In addition to materialistic interests emerges the idea of “social common interests” and social solidarity. Romanians expose that life inside the Union lacks common solutions for integrating Roma, the EU appears divided between old and new Europe and security is conceptualized in the name of the state rather than the individual. The results show that inside EU members do not have a common meaning of solidarity.

When asking what “common values” mean in relationship between Romanian governmental elites and the EU the results show that Romanians are able to recall EU values in context but fail to provide a common practical EU translation for political values. As practices of Romanian governmental elites suggest, such EU values of political solidarity, political accountability and clean government are not properly understood by some of the Romanian elites. Although Romanians show lack of observing the same EU political values the results show that Romanian elites send political messages to Brussels and prospective EU candidates, especially those neighboring Romania, that Romania shares the same “common values” with the EU.

However, some of the elites suggest that Romania continues to be in search of building a genuine system of values and needs to transform the respect for the rule of law into a fundamental value if Romanians want to succeed in finding a voice inside the Union. What is interesting in this section is that Romanian governmental elites use the meaning of values to appeal and highlight Brussels lack of social integration in the case of Roma, as well as veto Serbia’s candidacy to the EU. From the ES perspective, perceived from the outside, the EU, as conceptualized by Romanians, is an international society in which not all states have reached the plateau of conscious understanding of “common values.” Furthermore, because Romanians lack “common values” it is most likely to remain at the periphery of the Union rather than participate
as an equal voice in the decision-making process. Because, Romania made its case to the EU on “common interests,” “common values,” and “common culture” I expected to find an abundance of statements highlighting common values or the practice of common values shared with the EU. Data collected on this question showed little support that Romanian governmental elites share common values with the EU. When asking about the meaning of “common culture” there was also a lack of statements highlighting the sharing of common culture. On the first day of EU membership two governmental elites underscored that communism prevented Romania from acquiring an experience of identifying with culture. In context of the EU, Romanian elites underscored that culture was dialogue claiming to share with the EU cultural manifestations in the diversity of population, art, sentiment of being European and similar architecture. From an ES perspective, culture was viewed by Wight (1977) as essential in joining an international society as well as a matter of integration in international society by Stivachtis (1998).

The results on “common values” and “common culture” extend the knowledge of international society suggesting that at a regional level “common values” and “common culture” are essential for member states to acquire a voice inside an international society and that states can pursue their own values and interests while “claiming” to understand and respect the values and interests of others. In both instances Romanians claim difficulty in adjusting their mentalities to that of the Union as well as winning the trust of older Union members so that they can be perceived as respectable members of the Union. Overall, the answer to research question one is that Romanian governmental elites understand the EU in context of the elites “common interests” to secure the Eastern border of the EU, provide peace and prosperity in the area of the Black Sea, energy security and social integration. Romanian elites claim to show determination
in improving in the areas of common values by helping consolidate EU values in the Republic of Moldova and other EU prospective candidates.

Research Question Two

Under what conditions does the norm of EU integration matter for Romanian governmental elites?

The findings for research question two reveal that Romanian governmental elites take the norm of EU integration seriously only when they are coerced to do it. Copeland (2003) inquired as to when norms of socialization in international society matter. The findings of this question enhance international society literature in that norms of socialization matter for statesmen when statesmen become consciously aware of the Union’s common interests. The results in this section show that Romanian elites were aware that 2007 meant integration and integration depended on their willingness to fight against corruption and work in unison to harmonize Romania’s interests with those of the Union. Although some good practices were attempted in reforming the justice system, significant results in dealing with corruption had not been visible until Romania’s entry in the Schengen program was denied. The findings also highlight that Romania indeed saw its entrance in the EU as a reciprocal “win-win scenario” therefore relaxing from completely fulfilling the EU pledges.

Research Question Three

How do Romanian governmental elites understand security as a “common interest” in the EU’s Second Pillar?

The findings for research question three reveal that socialization in norms and security practices mattered for Romanian defense elites to the extent that they became familiarized with the EU’s CFSP as a guiding instrument to spread the values of democracy and prosperity. Data show that the idea of security for Romanians translates in security for borders, the Black Sea space, and
diversification of energy resources. Distinguishing between security as a normative value and as an instrument to achieve a purpose essential in distinguishing between a pluralist and solidarist type of society is difficult because security for the eastern border of the EU implies security for individuals inside the EU. Security in areas of frozen conflicts implies spreading the values of democracy, peace and prosperity while at the same time securing resources for the EU. Through EU enlargement and the internationalization of the Black Sea, Romanian elites hope to stabilize the region by appeasing frozen conflicts as well as cultivating solidarity within integrated actions in new strategic modes of cooperation between NATO and the EU. Although Romanians claim, in unison, that their security is based on NATO, Romanian defense elites expect to intensify in the EU’s CFSP exchange of military knowledge and methodologies in the area of strategic planning targeting mutual recognition for information sharing towards a common European security model. Romanian defense ministers argue that the Romanian military benefits from living and learning alongside NATO and respectively EU troops.

Exposure to international security practices in ALTHEA as well as in other EU and NATO led practices seem to positively impact the confidence of Romanian defense elites with respect to the meaningful participation of Romania in CFSP and respectively in the EU. The refusal to recognize Kosovo in the context in which 22 of the 27 EU states recognize it has to do with the fact that Romanians believe that by allowing ethnically homogeneous populations to claim statehood in Europe, unwanted precedents with important repercussions for Romania’s neighborhood in Transnistria, Ossetia and Abkhazia will be created.²¹⁹

²¹⁹ SETimes, 25 February 2012. ‘Agreement reached on Kosovo’s regional representation’. 
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The ES perspective to study international relations as an international society remains a puzzle even at the regional level because of issues of power and states self-interests. Studying international relations from an international society perspective implies studying the elements describing the concept of “society” revealed by states practices and interactions as well as by the interests and values they share. The attempt taken in this study to capture the EU as an international society through the Romanian meanings and actions models the ES theoretical and methodological approaches and inquires into the ideas and meanings underlying the practices of common interests and values between Romania and the EU.

An important finding of the study reveals that acting and reacting in international relations is an acquired or an appropriated behavior that models context and results from the intensity of relations (the Romanian statesmen argue that within the EU they first have to win the sympathy and trust of older members in order to be taken seriously and second, they reacted on the norm of integration in reforming the justice system and battling corruption after the refusal of Schengen membership). ES classics argue that realism rejects the idea that structure can be a consciously created concept because of states interests and that the realist approach lacks methods to identify the original meanings of the instruments of order (balance of power, the EU, etc.). By knowing the meanings of states instruments of interaction the ES suggests that it is important for helping preserve or enhance a particular order. Whereas ignoring the meanings of international relations/world politics instruments of order will continue to lead toward uncertainty and unpredictability. It is important to note however, that a purpose describes an action and meanings describe emotions behind the actions. The findings of the study suggest that on the surface common meaning of “interests,” “values,” and “culture” is something simple that
anyone can understand or agree with however, behind the “common meaning” states may have other hidden meanings or interests that justify their actions. For example the examination of elites’ interviews encountered two instances relevant to study meanings. The first was identified in a question posed in an academic setting by a scholar who enquired into the elite’s personal attitude regarding the entry of Turkey in the EU and how he saw solving the western demographic and cultural reticence with respect to Turkey. The reply of the elite was that “you put me in difficulty, please allow me to answer this question in private.” To what extent can than a researcher really get to the root of the meaning to be able to generalize and predict according to findings when the statesmen refuse to speak publicly on sensitive issues. The second instance, disclosing an important limitation to focusing on official documents and even on interviews, is the effect of pre-established common positions.

For example, another reply to a journalist who pressed: “If possible, I would like to have some sincere not protocol answers” was that “it is important to keep in mind that I am a European commissioner therefore, this title is obligating me to follow some pre-established rules, and on specific subjects we receive in advance the ‘lines to take’.” Gadamer suggested however, that it is important to place the answer or the interview in context in order to isolate the relevant meanings nevertheless, to what extent do open sources (official documents) reveal the real meanings behind an issue when elites refuse to go off script. To balance the limitation that official documents may hide I surveyed, in parallel, newspapers to get to the root of what elites attempted to say in official documents however, even when pressed some elites refused to go beyond the pre-established lines. Therefore, one of the recommendations of this study for further research is to try to identify the depth of meanings behind statesmen actions in another case
study. Data obtained from personally interviewing the participants of this study may triangulate and enhance the process of analyzing international society through common meanings.

**What type of society is the EU?** The concept of society as the classical theorists, Wight (1987) and Bull (1977) suggest is held together by a common culture or civilization and can conceptually be studied between structure and cooperation placing the concept across time and space. Culture seems to distinguish between a society created by structure and a society created by process. Common culture and common political values in the case of Romania proved to be imperative in harmonizing Romanian elites’ mentalities with those of other EU members as well as understanding how to approach decision-making in the EU political process.

Common culture in this context showed relevance in political dialogue, language and common understanding beyond religion, architectural and artistic tradition. It showed that through the meanings of Romanians, culture distinguishes between core and periphery of the union. Culture, is what Wight (1979) suggested, to be the basis on which European international society was founded and what Bull (1977) argued, that brought international society into decline. One of the recommendations of this study for EU officials is to cultivate common cultural beliefs below and beyond Brussels institutions to involve exchange among the union members population, between the population and EU officials as well as among EU officials.

The character of society between Romania and the EU is reflected in consensus over core values, importance of norms and toleration of each other. While from the outside (before official membership) Romanians described the EU as a solidarist society of states with institutions. From inside the Union (after 2007) Romanians revealed a different reality, a pluralist society built on the experiences of political division, hierarchy and political lobby to
compete for power and recognition. In retrospect, the EU is a hierarchical society of states divided between core and periphery in which states pursue their own values and interests while cooperating in a framework of institutions to create common institutions.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY AND PRACTICE**

The implication of findings for theory is that the nature of society between Romania and the EU is held together by the structure of common interests rather than by a common understanding of political values and cultural beliefs. The conscious recognition of common culture and common values helps distinguish between system and society because they imply adherence to a common political identity. Mutual recognition inside the EU as a society is made on political criteria defined by the application of the rule of law. A common understanding of culture and political values enhances political recognition of countries confronted with integration challenges.

International society has to be understood in context of power and prudence if findings of the norm of integration are considered when Romanians calculated their interests in the EU while they improved on justice and domestic affairs chapters. Romania vetoed Serbia’s EU candidacy in order to undermine the preparatory work of Holland on Serbia as well as proceeded to take a unilateral decision to refuse to recognize Kosovo’s independence in order to protect its national interest. At the regional level, for regional order, culture and common values are categories of explanation of international society. They matter in international societies in the context in which international society’s members have to understand each other’s histories, emotions and common interests. The absence of common culture and common values prevents cohesion and divides an international society between core and periphery. Language matters in an international society as a facilitator of communication to express emotions and translate the reality as one sees it. Elites
are the first members of an international society but individuals matter in a regional international society to support elites’ economic, political and social construction. The stability of states’ political systems matters in an international society in order to prevent destabilization and conflict. Political knowledge in an international society is important for building consensus. Security is thought as a value as well as an instrument in an international society to spread other values associated with democracy. The confidence of international society’s membership seems to increase with exposure to norms and practices of socialization.

The EU as an international society is a structure that has a history and institutions. Before becoming an official member, Romanians viewed the EU as a solidarity involving bonds of common sentiment and culture especially when they referred to membership. After membership the core of the EU is portrayed more as a pluralist society that refuses to accept the freedom of the Gypsy, omits to take Romania’s voice into consideration, to “speak with one voice,” or surpasses the idea of community on which the Union was founded for the practice of intergovernmental relationships. Bonds of common sentiments and culture seem apparent in relationships between the Union’s periphery in the case of Bulgaria and Romania.

Political dialogue and strategic partnerships are the mechanisms with which EU members cooperate. Romanians do not see the EU competing successfully globally because it does not have inner cohesion but a hierarchical union of leaders and followers. The nature of “society” reflected by the interaction between Romania and the EU is that of order and political distinction in which states pursue their common interests. The practical interaction between Romania and the EU reveals that Romania is aware of common interests with the EU however, at least in the period of transition before the full integration (the adoption of euro and the accession to Schengen) Romania chooses to function on its own meaning of values. The coexistence element
however, discloses that the institution of diplomacy is highly tilted in terms of decision making toward the bigger, more experienced and powerful states while the new comers like Romania, remain responsible for identifying and bringing the issues for discussion and common action inside the Union. Within the Union there is a deficit of political trust towards states with inefficient judiciary such as Romania.

As the findings of this project suggest, the lack of meaningful actions toward modernization and the efficiency and competency of the justice system to battle corruption, Romania was denied entry in Schengen. The Schengen decision was political as well as a measure to protect the security of citizens inside the Union. The implication of the findings for practice at the EU level is to cultivate cultural and political solidarity among the Union population and subordinate the Union to the population. For Romania, political instability can be corrected with a competent judiciary, building smaller claim courts to speed up the trial process and require law school attendees to complete college degrees before attending law school. A conscious or similar understanding with EU members has the potential to ensue after common values and common understanding of each other are internalized.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

The goal of the study was to investigate how Romanian governmental elites conceptualize the EU as an international society. Due to the large participant sample for a textual analysis task an extensive amount of data was overall reviewed. A missing data gap was identified from January 2008 to October 2008 from the online archive on the Government of Romania. Interviews and public statements substituted for missing data. In the case of two elites, collected data did not show meaning to the topic under investigation therefore, that data were not included in the study.
The findings of this study suggest that the aspect of common culture and values is relevant for the periphery or newer EU members to acclimatize and integrate into the geo-political culture of the EU. Another study involving a state from the periphery or core of the Union employing ES methodology and focusing on governmental elites involved in the EU decision making will shed light on the extent to which common culture and common values are important for understanding regional international society. Conducting elite interviews with the study participants will enhance the ES methodology on document analysis and will further clarify the role of common culture and common values in distinguishing between types of society as well as between system and society at the regional level.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study expanded on the idea of international society at the regional level previously examined by classical and contemporary ES theorists. This investigation revealed that culture and values give meaning to society at the regional level and the society emerges on the observance of common interests and the rule of law. As a regional international society, the EU is a type of order, or a product of elites’ conscious commitment to peace. It is a model of coexistence in which culture and values are important instruments of power decision-making. Regional international society requires social and political solidarity support among the elites and between the Union elites and individuals. Political will, integration, harmonization of mentalities, practices and rules are necessary to strengthen the idea of a union at the regional level. Romanian governmental elites showed that the EU is in search of solidarity of a common political will to share common interests and provide common solutions. The idea of solidarity
inside the Union is decided by states interests. Security as a common interest is a value and an instrument to spread the value of democracy at the borders of the Union’s periphery. Romanian defense elites showed more confidence in the instruments of the Union because of exposure to international norms and practices. They were able to articulate the values of the EU in context to practices that contrast to the other governmental elites who acted on the norm of integration only to please the EU. Overall, at the regional level, international society faces political challenges with ramifications in culture, values and common interests. The distinction between domestic and international society is minimal as is respectively between national and foreign policy. The survival at the regional level is dependent on visions, harmonization of mentalities and further integration.

As a response to the ES critics, at this time, we know an international society when we see a model of coexistence in which members meaningfully share common values, culture, interests, rules and institutions and attach special emotions to meanings and actions to their participation in the future of the model. The element of “society” thin and thick revealed by the perception of Romanian governmental elites with respect to the EU’s rules and norms indicates that the idea of “society” is thickened or thinned by the influence of culture, values and, common understanding of rules and norms. A thick “society” occurs after intensive exposure to society’s rules, norms and practices.
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APPENDIX: PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY PROFILE

**Traian Basescu (PD),** President of Romania (2004-2009) (2009-2014); president of the Democratic Party (PD) from December 2001 to 18 December 2004 and co-president of Justice and Truth Alliance (DA) from September 2003 until 18 December 2004. Basescu is a native of Dobrudja, former Captain of Romanian commercial ships, mayor of Bucharest (2000-2004) and Minister of Transportation (1991-1992 & 1996-2000) in Roman and Stolojan Governments respectively.\(^{220}\) He was elected President of Romania on 20 December 2004 on the vision to “change” the corrupted political process, modernize the social state and make Romania more prosperous by appealing to values that united Romanians, the sense of sacrifice and self-confidence. In context of the EU, Basescu argues that Romania is evolving concomitant to EU’s consolidation. In Basescu’s view, under his leadership Romania evolved to the extent that in “2009, Romania is no longer the Romania of 2004 PSD leaders, Adrian Nastase and Ion Iliescu.”\(^{221}\) As most Liberal Democrat elites do, Basescu takes pride in managing to introduce Romania to the structures of NATO and the EU, the attempts to modernize the Romanian state, and the Hague international law success when Romania’s territory was expanded in the law suit with Ukraine over Snake Island by 9,000 sq.\(^{222}\)

**Calin Popescu Tariceanu (PNL),** Prime Minister of Romania (2004-2008). Founding and acting member of the Liberal Party since 1990. Interim president of the Liberal Party and co-president of Justice and Truth Alliance (DA) from 2 October 2004 after Theodor Stolojan dropped out of the presidential race citing health problems. Tariceanu is a native of Bucharest and has a degree
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\(^{220}\) (Romanian Presidency, Biography).
\(^{221}\) Rompres, 16 November2009. ‘Achievements and failures of his mandate and future projects issues approached by Traian Basescu in Sibiu’.
\(^{222}\) Rompres, 16 November 2009. ‘Achievements and failures of his mandate and future projects issues approached by Traian Basescu in Sibiu’.
in construction engineering. He worked as engineer (1975-1980) and university lecturer until 1990. Tariceanu activated as Minister of Industry and Commerce (1996-1997) in Victor Ciorbea’s Government. From 29 December 2004 Tariceanu lead a coalition government formed by PNL+PD+UDMR+PC aiming, among other objectives, at consolidating the state of democracy in Romania and restraining the state intervention in the economy. In 2005 Tariceanu announced his resignation but reconsidered the decision in context of natural disasters confronting Romania in 2005 as well as Romania’s integration in the EU. Governing under the auspices of snap elections Tariceanu proposes withdrawal of Romanian troops from Iraq. He views the process of integration in the context in which “Romania has started on the path to European integration after January 1, 2005 with a serious handicap with respect to both its image and the fulfillment of the pledges made.”

**Emil Boc (PD),** Prime Minister from December 2008 to present, former mayor of Cluj-Napoca (one of the largest Transylvanian cities) from 2004 to 2009 and Vice President of the Committee charged with revising the Constitution in 2003. President of the Democrat Party from December 2004 to December 2007 and Democrat Liberal Party from December 2007. Licensed in law since 1996 Boc received his PhD in Political Science and Philosophy in 2000 from Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca where he taught law and political science courses until 2000. During the 1990s Boc participated as a visiting scholar in the political science departments at the University of Virginia, University of Pittsburg, Michigan State University as well as in Brussels and at Nottingham University in the UK. With respect to Romania’s integration in the EU, Boc urges Romanians to start behaving at home and abroad as EU citizens committed to democracy. He argues that in the EU Romania continues to encounter barriers in areas related to

---

223 Rompres, 12 March 2006. ‘Prime Minister Calin Popescu-Tariceanu gives an interview to Rompres’.
224 Government of Romania, PM biography.
people and culture, market and infrastructure networks. In Boc’s view, the political lines that separated Romanians from Europeans in the past are gone but the structural barriers persist and Romanians need a more creative approach.\footnote{Rompres, 25 February 2010. ‘Emil Boc at the Danube Summit: Strategy, practical skills equally needed’.

Marko Bela (UDMR), Prime Minister for Culture, Education and European Integration (2004-2009); Vice Premier Minister in the Government of Romania since 2004. Founding member and acting President of UDMR until 2010. Bela was a candidate for the Romanian presidency in 2004 where he obtained 5.1 percent of presidential votes. He served on the Senate’s Foreign Policy Committee and on the Committees of Education and Culture. Bela has a degree from Babes Bolyai University in literature with emphasis on French. His career started as a secondary teacher and continued as Editor in Chief for Literary Reviews in the Transylvanian city of Targu Mures.\footnote{Government of Romania, Marko Bela biography.} Based on Bela’s experience as partner in the coalition government with PDL he acknowledges that, above all, Romania needs political stability. Skeptical that the Social Democrats would ever resolve “the Hungarian minority problem” and after accusing them of duplicity in their relation with the governing party UDMR, Bela decided in 2000 to rally behind former Romanian President Iliescu to prevent Corneliu Vadim Tudor, a nationalist leader from winning elections.

As a political figure in the governing coalition Bela was an ardent proponent for decentralization and region reorganization necessary to create economic efficiency and new developmental regions. His message however, was hijacked on the ethnic grounds of cultural, economic and political autonomy. In context of the EU, Bela advocated greater freedom for minorities while nurturing and developing relations with the home country. Comparative politics
scholars including Mungiu-Pippidi (2004) assess UDMR as a “reliable pro-reform member of the ruling coalition” (Mungiu-Pippidi 2004: 23). Romanian President claims that “UDMR proved to be the best option of all alliances made until now by PDL. I thank UDMR for all responsibilities assumed next to PDL and the other minorities.”\textsuperscript{227} The new President of UDMR, Kelemen Hunor underscored that “UDMR had never betrayed its governing partners, we do not betray, not even when someone asks or when dissensions occur between us, we do not betray.”\textsuperscript{228}

\textit{Anca Boagiu (PD)}, Minister of European Integration (August 2005 - April 2007), former Chairperson of the Committee for European Affairs (until May 2006), member of PD and current Vice president of the Liberal Democratic Party; Minister of Transportation (2000) and (2007-present). Boagiu is a native of Constanta (Dobrudja), holds a degree from Ovidius University of Constanta in civil engineering, worked as a building site supervisor in 1995 and attended training courses in management for leaders of the Romanian Government in Crotonville, USA and a course for young politicians in the European Parliament structures in Brussels.\textsuperscript{229} Among political elites responsible with EU affairs were Ioan Talpes, PSD appointed until 2004 as Minister for coordinating activities regarding European integration. Ene Dinga appointed Minister of European Integration (2004-2005), Marko Bela, Anca Boagiu appointed in 2005 Minister of European Integration, Leonard Orban chief negotiator and Bogdan Aurescu, State Secretary for European Affairs. In an interview given as Minister of European Integration, Boagiu acknowledged that the “Romanian political class was not sufficiently prepared nor

\textsuperscript{227} \textit{Gandul}, 10 December 2010. ‘Basescu: “Statul nu este responsabil pentru fiecare cetatean. Acela este comunismul.”’ [Basescu: The State is not responsible for every citizen. That is communism].

\textsuperscript{228} \textit{Mediafax}, 17 December 2011. ‘Kelemen: UDMR had never betrayed governing partners’.

\textsuperscript{229} \textit{Romanian Government}, Anca Boagiu biography.
politically mature to understand the importance of the moments Romania was engaged to in the accession to the EU.”²³⁰

Ene Dinga (PD-L), Minister of European Integration (December 2004 - August 2005) and member PD-L since 2003; Dinga is a native of Bucharest, holds a degree in economics from the Romanian Academy of Economic Studies (ASE) Bucharest, worked as an economist in the communist state planning during the 1980s, attended public finance courses offered by the IMF in 2000 in Washington, and English for intermediate and upper level classes at Manchester Academy. He advised Traian Basescu on European economic integration and continues to advise the Cabinet of Prime Minister on post integration.²³¹ An interesting aspect regarding the exchange of norms and institutions revealed by Dinga in an interview about Romania’s readiness to be integrated in the EU was that “one of the best advantages beneficial to Romania in the EU’s adherence process is that the European institutions will have the context to discipline Romanian institutions in the sense that they will function according to European criteria and standards of operation.” According to Dinga, the integration process of Romania in the EU presupposes the support of EU members in the creation and harmonization of Romanian institutions with those of the EU. At the EU’s recommendation, Romania appeared engaged in creating frameworks of compatibility capable to model the economic, politic and social reality of Romania.

Leonard Orban (PNL) Secretary of State to the Ministry of European Integration of Romania (2004-2006). Orban is a native of Brasov (Transylvania), holds a BA in economics from ASE University of Bucharest, and a BS in mechanical engineering from the University of Brasov and has worked as an engineer at a Tractor Machine Manufacturing Technology prior to activation in

²³⁰ Romania Libera, 18 November 2005. ‘Boagiu: Romanian political class is not sufficiently prepared and sufficiently mature’.
the Romanian Government. In context of Romania’s EU integration, Orban was Chief Negotiator with the EU from December 2004 to April 2005 and is the co-signer with the President of Romania, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania’s EU Accession Treaty signed on 25 April 2005 in Luxembourg. Orban also contributed in 2002 to Romania’s NATO integration. Since April 2005, Orban has coordinated Romania’s position as active observer to the Council of the EU, headed Romania’s delegation for negotiating the accession to the European Economic Area, activated as Commissioner to the EU’s Commission for multilingualism, served as Presidential advisor on European affairs and currently acts as Minister of European Affairs in a new Minister/structure created on 20 September 2011 with the scope to optimize the efficiency of absorbing structural funds from the EU. In an interview about “what EU integration means for Romania in general and Romanians in particular,” Orban underscored that for Romania, EU integration means modernization and solidarity in embracing forces of globalization and for Romanians it means different things for different categories of people.

**Bogdan Aurescu, (Independent)** State Secretary for European Affairs (2004-2005). Beginning with September 2004-2009 Aurescu represented Romania at CIJ Hague on the case disputing the maritime delimitation of Snake Island, process finalized on 3 February 2009. Aurescu is a native of Bucharest, licensed in law and history, holds a PhD in law examining the sovereignty concept in context of international law (2003). He is a permanent member of arbitrage at the Hague Court, is a visiting professor at the University of Hamburg where he teaches law as well as a lecturer at Nicolae Titulescu University of Bucharest. In 2004 he served as secretary of state in

---


**Mihai Razvan Ungureanu (PNL)** Minister of Foreign Affairs (2004-2007). Ungureanu is a native of Iasi (Moldavia), holds a BA in History-Philosophy from Alexander Ioan Cuza of Iasi (Al. I. Cuza), an MA in Hebrew Studies from St. Cross College of Oxford University and a PhD in History examining the conversion progress of Romanian society at the beginning of the modern era from Al. I. Cuza. Prior to diplomatic office Ungureanu taught history, but not exclusively, at Al. I. Cuza University, School of Slavonic and East European Studies at the University of London (1992-1996-1998 respectively). He served as State Secretary with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1998-2001), Director General and Regional envoy of the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe (2001-2003) and as coordinator for the Southeast European Cooperation Initiative (SECI) in Vienna until 2004. He is the co-signer with Leonard Orban and the Romanian President of the Accession Treaty of Romania in the EU in Luxembourg on 25 April 2005. As Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ungureanu resigned from office on 4 February 2007 at the request of PM Tariceanu who learned from the media about two Romanian workers arrested in Iraq on spying allegations while the President was informed a few days after the arrest. Currently Ungureanu leads the Romanian Intelligence Office. As for Romania’s accession in the EU, Ungureanu credits the support of the US. In his view, Romania’s partnership with the
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233 Ministry of Foreign Affairs, About Governmental Officials.
US influenced Romania’s credibility in the region to the extent that no other foreign policy gestures could have influenced it.\(^\text{234}\)

**Adrian Cioroianu (PNL),** Minister of Foreign Affairs (2007-2008). Cioroianu is a native of Craiova (Oltenia), holds a BA in History from the University of Bucharest, an MA and PhD in History from Laval University of Quebec, Canada (2002). Prior to political office Cioroianu taught history at the University of Bucharest where he continues to teach. He joined PNL in 2002 when he became an advisor to then presidential contender Theodor Stolojan but argues that he considers himself an independent in the Liberal wing as he does not have “carnet de partid” or the equivalent of “party ID” to attest loyalties toward a political party. Moreover, Cioroianu claims to be an historian, a university professor more than a politician because he enjoys debating substantive ideas not swimming into the murky waters of politics (Firica Mihai, December 2010). Like Ungureanu, Cioroianu was asked to resign from office after a Romanian citizen died in a hunger strike over working rights in Poland. It is important to note that both resignations from the Minister of Foreign Affairs are without precedent and speak about the norms of socialization in the EU. It is most likely that both ministers would have continued to remain in office if Romania was not a member of the EU. Cioroianu claims that as Foreign Minister he did not have a personal relationship with either the President or the Prime Minister but every time Romania stumbled domestically it resonated internationally thus affecting Romania’s image abroad or impeding Romania from pursuing a coherent foreign policy.

**Lazar Comanescu (Independent),** Minister of Foreign Affairs from April 2008 to December 2008. Comanescu is an economist by profession and is originally from Valcea, a county in the historical region between Oltenia and Muntenia. He has impressive experience in the negotiation

process between Romania-NATO and Romania-EU serving as Ambassador of Romania to the EU since 2001, State Secretary for European Integration (1995-1998) and Head of the Romanian Mission to NATO (1998-2001). Currently Comanescu is Ambassador of Romania in Germany. In his view, “the EU constitutes a union designed to answer the interests of its citizens; it is a Union in which every European citizen can identify with; it is a Union in which people have freedom of movement.”

**Cristian Diaconescu (PUR),** Minister of Foreign Affairs (2008-2009). At this moment it is unclear to what political party Diaconescu is affiliated since there is evidence of his affiliation with PSD (2002-2010) and National Union for the Progress of Romania (UNPR). UNPR is a political entity in flux with center-left ideology claiming to represent an “alternative to politics as usual” and according to Diaconescu the party has 156,000 members from which 60% have no previous affiliations with other political parties. Diaconescu is a native of Bucharest, has a BA in law and a PhD degree in law from the University of Bucharest and had served as Minister of Justice (March 2004-December 2005), Deputy Minister for European Relations within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2003-2004). Diaconescu served as vice-president of the Romanian Senate and is acting as Romanian Foreign Affairs Minister. With respect to Romania’s integration in the EU Diaconescu argues that the “EU creates conformity in terms of

---


238 Cristian Diaconescu, about: http://www.cristiandiaconescu.com/about/ [Last Accessed on 31 December 2011].
customs, trade, cooperation and legal systems” and that Romania’s integration in the EU reflects “a political decision” of EU member states.\textsuperscript{239}

\textit{Theodor Baconschi (PD-L)} Minister of Foreign Affairs from 23 December 2009 to January 2012 claiming to be a politically independent figure, Baconschi served as state secretary and Ambassador of Romania to France (2007-2009), Portugal (2002-2004), Vatican, San Marino and Malta (1997-2001). Baconschi is a native of Bucharest, with a degree in theology (1985) and a PhD in Religious Anthropology and Comparative History of Religions from the Sorbonne University of Paris. Prior to entering politics Baconschi worked as director of Anastasia Publishing of Bucharest, religious advisor to Minister of Culture and Religions as well as presidential adviser. As Minister of Foreign Affairs Baconschi credits in his speeches the US support for Romania especially during the Clinton administration that subsequently helped Romania achieve its goal of European integration.\textsuperscript{240}

\textit{Teodor Atanasiu (PNL)}, Minister of Defense (2004-2006). Atanasiu is member of PNL since 1990. He is a native of Cugir, Alba of the Transylvanian region and has a degree in mechanical engineering.\textsuperscript{241} In 2006, Atanasiu solicits the Romanian Supreme Council of National Defense for the (CSAT) withdrawal of Romanian troops from Iraq at a time coinciding with Basescu’s visit in the US. CSAT rejects the Minister’s request and the President intervenes arguing that such decisions taken by the PM and Atanasiu in the absence of consultations with the members of the coalition or the allies can have important consequences for Romania’s image and


\textsuperscript{240} Federal News Service, 4 June 2010. ‘Remarks by Romanian Foreign Minister Teodor Baconschi’ (Part 3-Final).

\textsuperscript{241} Teodor Atanasiu CV on the AVAS site available at: http://www.ivas.gov.ro/upload_files/documente/CV\%20ATANASIUM2i6hf7laujls120o14enj1fo3.pdf [Last Accessed on 31 December 2011].
credibility in the international forum. At the beginning of July 2006 Atanasiu is taken to Court by one of presidential advisors to dispute dual accusations made with one of presidential advisers. On 12 September Atanasiu was suspended by President Basescu in conformity with the prerogatives of the Constitution. On 6 October Atanasiu was absolved by the Court of previous allegations however, Romanian President refused his re-nomination. Atanasiu resigned on 25 October 2005 and Prime Minister designated Atanasiu to lead the Authority for State Recovery Assets (AVAS) where he continues to act as president.

**Sorin Frunzaverde (PD),** Minister of National Defense (2006-2007), native of Caras-Severin region of Banat, member of PD since 1990 and of Romanian Parliament Frunzaverde served twice as National Defense Minister from 13 March 2000 to 28 December 2000 and from 25 October 2006 to 5 April 2007. He has an engineer degree in metallurgy from the Polytechnic University of Bucharest and a PhD in economic and military sciences from Vest University of Timisoara and National Defense University respectively. Frunzaverde is a former member of the European Parliament where he represented the European Peoples Party, EPP (2007-2008), a former Minister of Water, Forestry and the Environment (1997-8) and Minister of Tourism (April-December 1998).

**Teodor Melescanu (PNL),** Minister of Defense (2007-2008), former Minister of Foreign Affairs (1992-1996), native of Hunedoara, a Transylvanian city Melescanu has a law degree from University of Bucharest and a PhD in political science and international law from Geneva University. Most of his carrier is based on diplomatic activity related to international relations.

---
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security, politics and teaching. Melescanu teaches courses of law, European security, principles and practices of diplomacy in the Political Science Department at Bucharest University. After three months of mandate Melescanu considered that the Ministry of Defense was on track with its reforms unfolding in an efficient and professional system.\textsuperscript{246}

\textit{Mihai Stanisoara (PD-L)}, Minister of Defense (2008-2009), native of Craiova, Oltenia region, Stanisoara served as Presidential advisor on matters related to national security (2007-2008). He served as Deputy for national defense (2004-2007) and foreign affairs heading the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (2000-2004). Stanisoara has a degree in mechanical engineering from the Polytechnic University of Timisoara, a PhD in science and technology and is expecting a second PhD from the Romanian Police Academy Al. I. Cuza.\textsuperscript{247} Stanisoara acts as PD-L Senator of Mehedinti in Romanian Parliament serving on the Joint Standing Committee of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate to exercise parliamentary control over the activity of Romanian Intelligence Service (SRI). Within the Minister of Defense, Stanisoara’s resignation was called for after Mircea Basescu, the brother of Romanian President Basescu, was identified by the Romanian intelligence service as being involved in illegal arms trafficking, a process involving a group of high rank generals and officials from the Ministry of Defense including Aurel Cazacu, former Romarm and Romtechnica director.\textsuperscript{248} Stanisoara refused to resign and his mandate ended in 2009 when he was not reappointed to a new Cabinet formed by Boc IV.

\textsuperscript{247} Mihai Stanisoara, Biography available at Romanian Senate: http://www.senat.ro/FisaSenator.aspx?ParlamentarID=8f2baca-e11e-4a41-a3f5-71ec192f117e [Last accessed on 31 December, 2011].
Gabriel Oprea (Independent/UNPR), Minister of Defense from 2009 to present. Oprea is a native of Calarasi, the Wallachian region of Romania and was a member of PSD (2003-2009). At this time, similar with Diaconescu, it is unclear to what political entity Oprea is affiliated. Oprea is a military officer by training who worked as an officer in the Ministry of National Defense (1983-1990). Oprea has a law and PhD degree from the University of Bucharest. He served as member of Chamber of Deputies (2004-2008) and Minister of Administration and Interior (2008-January 2009). He also teaches at the National Defense College in Bucharest and mentors PhD students at the Police Academy. Romania’s National Interest within the European Integration is among the books published by Oprea. The term limits for Romanian Defense Ministers is two years and according to the Constitution the defense minister must be a civilian.