

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor

Prem Bahadur Manjhi,
Assistant Professor, Maharaja Srischandra College (University of Calcutta)

Abstract

The EU is a significant political and economic supranational unique institution in global politics. In this paper, it analyzes that the European Union is seeking a security and defense identity, not for deterrence or defense, but to promote supranational security and defense strategy for further strengthening the European political defense identity at global level. This study examines the military point of view why the European allies would seek to create a competing military force outside NATO. This proposes can be analyzed by a social-constructivist framework. This approach also examines as to how the EU has achieved and strengthens its position by taking various security and defense initiative; in particular, CSDP after the Lisbon Treaty which has emphasized for the strengthening political identity through defense integration of the EU. It also focuses on how EU is plying important role in making global peace as followed by civil and military discourses and to export this political identity apparatus like the rule of law, freedoms and democracy towards other countries. The study also argues that there are still lack of consensus among EU member's state regarding the use of police and military force because of national interest. So, it can be said that EU is still struggling for common strategic culture for civil and military capabilities. However, EU is stepping forward towards creating a supranational Army (European Union ARMY) introducing new initiative like permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) and defense fund (EDF) at EU level for strengthening the common ideas and values in the defense field.

Key words: CSDP, NATO, EU, Supranational, Defense, security, Identity, Constructivism, European Union ARMY, Cohesive, Effectiveness, PESCO, EDF, MPCC, EDIDP, CARD, TEU

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor** *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

Introduction:

The Common Security and Defense Policy is the European Union's a major part of action in the fields of defense and crisis management as well as a main component of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy. The CSDP is a part of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), based on articles 41 to 46 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) (Turunen, Tuula2019:1). CSDP engage in the operation of military and civilian missions is followed by United Nations Charter to safeguard peace, avoid conflict as well as has to support international security. The armed forces of member's state contribute for the European Union Military missions and also involve in collective self-defense. The structural integration is based upon Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) contributes 25 member's state out of 28. The CSDP lead by High Representative compromise with External Action Service, Military Committee, Military Staff, Defense Agency and many other agencies. This structure is many times called as European Defense Union. The CSDP decision for proposing and implementing is fully depending upon High Representative (HR/VP) of the EU. The decisions are taken usually requiring unanimity. It is seen that after the failure of the European Community to prevent war in Yugoslav further led to Treaty of Maastricht with the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) pillar in 1992. And with the support of NATO, West European Union developed European Security and Defense Identity. In 1998St. Malo declaration, it had been decided to create an autonomous defense structure and finalized with ESDP in 1999. The common security and defense policy was established in 1999 and the EU aimed to tackle the challenges in the field of security through deploying various civil and military missions in crises areas. The first deployment of ESDP mission was taken place in March 2003 in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Lisbon Treaty renamed the European Security and defense policy to Common Security Defense Policy. However, the CSDP/ESDP can be traced back its roots to the 1948 before the formation of European community. The security scope throughout the entire cold war period is confined to security cooperation between western European states. The European Union looked forward making CSDP cohesive and effectiveness as to strengthen the European Union's nation or identity-building project, which is essential to further integration. In the treaty of Lisbon, the EU security and defense framework became equipped with its own institutions. There are still lack of consensus among EU member's state regarding the use of police and military force because lack of common ideas and values. So, it can be said that there is no common strategic culture because EU have

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

military capabilities but still does not have European Union ARMY. Thus, the EU is far from possessing a truly 'common' security and defense policy. However, EU is trying to project as EU identity through CSDP and many others initiatives to be a Global actor. In case of military and crises management, CSDP have resolved the various crises in many parts of the world and even failed in some of the cases in early stage.

After the enforcement of the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009 the ESDP was renamed as Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). The major decisions were taken in the defense policy to make more strengthen unified defense identity as well as common structure with common action plan so that EU would be effective global actor. A mutual defense clause Article 42.7 TEU (Cirlig, Carmen-Cristina 2015: 2) was initiated among member states with Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO). The post of High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy also outdated the two posts of High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and European Commissioner for External Relations. The introduction of solidarity clause disbanded the Western European Union: a WEU's military mutual defense clause in 2011. In 2015, terrorist attack in Paris led to mutual defense clause. It is also more important that international political development compelled to EU to rethink its own self security and self-identity because of scheduled of Brexit, Russian annexation of Crimea and US President Donald Trump perspective towards Europe and role of NATO in 2016 which gave a momentum to the EU Global Strategy for self-defense identity with effective participation in the international affairs for peace and stability to be a effective global actor. It has also augmented various initiatives such as Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO; 2017), European Defense Fund (EDF; 2017), Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC; 2017). In 2018 onwards, has also given rise to a number of initiatives: The MPCC is a part of the External Action Service's Military Staff (EUMS) that constitutes the EU's first permanent operational headquarters, European Peace Facility (EPF) and Support for the industry as European Defense Industrial Development Program (EDIDP), Coordinated Annual Review on Defense (CARD; 2019) including on more cooperation with NATO.

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

Historical Development of CSDP:

During the cold war, the Europeans lived in the shadow of the United States. America was their protector and main trading partner. To compete with the United States, the Europeans had no choice but to integrate both economically and politically. To get the Europeans out from under America's thumb, they pursued the formation of a uniquely European security identity, clearly separate and distinct from that of the United States. One of the first treaties in the history of European integration, The Brussels Treaty, was signed on 17 March 1948. The following countries like France and Benelux were the first signatory of the treaty. The aim was to guarantee the collective security of its signatory states. 1950 Pleven Plan was signed as European unified army, in which Germany had been included. After the Second World War, European countries proposed to European defense integration involving United States as realized potential threat from Soviet and German rearmament in future. The Western European Union and the projected European Defense Community were planned with the support of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) but this was rejected by the French government. This Brussels Treaty had been modified in 1954 following the failure of the European Defense Community (EDC) led to the creation of Western European Union. After the failure of the European Defense Community in 1954, the member states put their main focus on writing the Treaty of Rome, establishing the European Economic Community. In 1961 Fouchet Plan relating to security and defense policy which had failed due to De Gaulle's inter-governmental vision. One of the earliest examples of swaggering came with Kissinger's attempt to revive the U.S.-European relationship, battered by differences on issues ranging from Vietnam to detente, by proclaiming 1973 the "Year of Europe" and calling for a "New Atlantic Charter" (Calleo, David P. 1987: 44-64). It was not long thereafter, in the 1960's and 1970's, in response to the U.S. adoption of "flexible response," the war in Vietnam, and the failure of Kissinger's Year of Europe in 1973, that the Western European countries collectively started to disassociate themselves from American foreign and defense policy (Smith, Michael 1978: 27).

In the Copenhagen conference in 1973, the EC member states have to choose to define their own relations and place in world affairs: "The time has come to draw up a document on the European Identity. It was evident that rejection of American ways was to embrace European ways. As a result, the member states formed with a European Political Cooperation in 1970 (EPC) as an intergovernmental forum within which they could discuss foreign policy issues

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

(Document on the European Identity 1988). However, the Americans did not view Europe as an emerging power: according to Kissinger, the “United States has global interest and responsibilities. Our European allies have regional interests (Kissinger, Henry A. 1977: 104-5).” His remarks had immediate repercussions in Europe. During the same time, anti-American sentiment was rising. ‘Alan Clark, the British minister for defense procurement, explained that Europe needed to “something slimmer, less set than NATO, something capable of faster response” (Anderson, Stephanie B. 2005:1 & New York Times, December 26, 1990, A10). After the Gulf War, many of the member states started to think why the EC had so little impact internationally. Many of them argued that the absence of a military dimension EC had no impact in international relation. The EC’s impotence during the Gulf War prompted Belgium’s foreign minister to complain that Europe was “an economic giant, political dwarf and military worm” for several reasons: the member states could not agree or did not try to form a joint response, military efforts. Jacques Delors, president of the European Commission, immediately after the Gulf War, appealed to the member states for EC reform if the Community were to correct the functional imbalances within its foreign and security policy cooperation. During the 1991 IGC, the Twelve agreed to create a CFSP to increase European presence on the world stage. When the Yugoslav crisis erupted, so confident was Jacques Poos, Luxembourg’s foreign minister, of the EC’s future prowess, he declared, “It is the hour of Europe, not the hour of the Americans.” The days of political deadlock were “prehistory” (New York Times 1991: 4).

In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty was introduced and the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) adopted on the European Union. It is seen that when NATO used bomb in Serbia in 1998 (Kosovo crisis) and made possible by a political change in the United Kingdom that led to the EU Member States to establish an autonomous Common European Security and Defense Policy. The CFSP provided the basis for the discussion of security affairs within the European Union. The EU member states agreed to a full-fledged European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) in Cologne in 1999. CSDP was originally known as the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). It came into being at the 1999 Helsinki European Council where member states set themselves a Defense Capabilities target called the Helsinki Headline Goal (HHG). This called for the EU to be able to deploy a Rapid Reaction Force of up to 60,000 combat troops at sixty days’ notice for missions including crisis management, Peace Keeping

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

and peace-making operations and sustain at least one year. However, in June 2004 the HHG was reformed to replace large deployments with a series of European Battle groups of 1,500 troops, provided either by single nations or by groups of nations (Wohlforth 2005: 91). The EU's Lisbon Treaty (2007) which was implemented in 1 December 2009 renamed ESDP the Common Defense and Security Policy (CDSP). It changed the way decisions are made in the EU but, crucially, decisions on military or defense issues must still have the unanimous support of EU states. Overall responsibility for CSDP lies with the EU High Representative for the Union in Foreign and Security Policy CSFP. It is co-ordinate by the Political and Security Committee (PSC), the EU Military Committee (EUMC) and the EU Military Staff (EUMS), which are made up of military personnel from the member states. Finally, the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) are responsible for planning and overseeing civilian CSDP operations.

ESDP/CSDP after the Lisbon Treaty:

The Treaty of Lisbon was signed on 13 December 2007 and came into force on 1 December 2009. It replaces the Treaty of Nice, formerly the legal basis for EU activities under the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). The European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) have been renamed by the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) in the Lisbon Treaty. The new Article 42 of the Treaty on European Union defines the CSDP and replaces Article 17 of the Treaty of Nice. Various provisions in the Treaty of Lisbon have been modified and new provision has been incorporated to make this more cohesiveness and effectiveness in the field of CSDP/CFSP. As before, the competencies of the EU in external relations were divided between the competencies of the European Community and the other intergovernmental pillars. For example, there were at least four different Directorates-General (DGs) involved in the external relations of the EU. This division created various obstacles to the shaping of coherent EU foreign policies and the allocation of responsibilities. The most important developments in the field of CFSP/CSDP was the upgraded post of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, the establishment of the European External Action Service (EEAS), the provision of Permanent Structured Cooperation (PSC), and the extended version of the Petersburg Tasks.

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor** *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

The High Representative, Common Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the European External Action Service:

The post of High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy comes together in EU external action. It replaces the rotating Presidency as CFSP 'director' and represents the EU to third parties and within international organizations. It is supported by the newly established European External Action Service (EEAS), which will consist of personnel from the Council General Secretariat, the Commission and staff from national diplomatic services. In terms of CSDP structures, the HR will act under the authority of the Council and be in close contact with the Political and Security Committee (PSC) shall ensure the coordination of the civilian and military aspects of such tasks. The Treaty of Lisbon does not alter the institutional dimension of the CSDP. The three High Representatives: Javier Solana (10 years tenure alone) 1999-2009; Catherine Ashton 2009-2014; Federica Mogherini since November 2014 till today.

Permanent Structured Cooperation:

Permanent Structured Cooperation is another important provision included in the Lisbon Treaty. Participating member states shall be involved in pooling together and harmonizing their security and defense resources. The PESCO is based on Article 42.6 in the Lisbon Treaty 2009 and it was first commenced in 2017. In this framework 25 member states of the 28 national armed forces took part in the defense integration. It is also apparent that 22 EU member states are NATO member. The European Defense Agency (EDA) is also becoming part of the Treaty. It can play an important role in evaluating the performance of member states' commitment to PSC. In theory, PSC will permit as many member states as possible to participate in common defense plans. Articles 27 (6) and 30 of the Treaty reflect upon the idea of PSC among EU member states (Margaras, Vasilis 2010: 3). The introduction of PSC can be seen as a new idea as it may facilitate further cooperation among those member states that want to work closely on issues of security. In 2011, European Defense Agency presented the comparison of the defense expenditure of its participating Member States with the United States. The data revealed that the EDA 26 participating Member States spent €193 billion of 1.55% of European Union GDP and also second in defense expenditure and US spent €503 billion of 4.66% of United States GDP approx. 2.5 times more from EU on defense. The combined military forces estimated 1,551,038 in the EU and deployed around 53,744 of the

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor** *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

3.5% of the total strength whereas US estimated military forces 1,4 25,113 and deployed 177,700 of 12.5% of the total strength (Guzelyte, Silvija2013: 2-16).

It is observed that many of them from European Union have been supporting this approach since long as **Jean-Claude Juncker** who was a President of European Commission was campaigning for PESCO for many years. He expected to form a new military pact as European Security and Defense Union to protect the Union. He also argued that this was an expectation of the EU citizens as well. Thus, **Federica Mogherini (Chief of the EU Foreign Affairs and Security Policy)** expressed her greeting for the establishment of PESCO as a sunrise of new age. She further explained as the initiative was an inclusive framework needed to be strengthened as a security provider of its citizen and worldwide. It is also evident that **Jean-Yves Le Drian** (French Foreign Affairs Minister) and **Ursula von der Leyen** (German Defense Minister) were in favorers of organizing the PESCO defense union. After the election of the US president Donald Trump, a serious posture rose on NATO by **Ursula von der Leyen** and felt to be important to establish its own defense plan. However, **General Jens Stoltenberg** (NATO Secretary) also expressed his greeting for launching the PESCO in the appearance of those have doubts over US President **Donald Trump's** commitment to the transatlantic defense alliance and further argued that it would “strengthen the European pillar within NATO” and “good for NATO” as well. PESCO has been signed up by the majority of EU states. However, Denmark has decided not to be the part at present, Malta still thinking over it and proposal might be rejected by the UK as set to depart EU yet UK may join at later date based on term of cooperation and advantage of whole Europe (What is the EU defense union PESCO? DW News 2017).

It is argued that for Permanent Structured Cooperation, financial assistance could be provided by European Defense Fund. PESCO could be able to lead to create a European Army in future and able to make EU's less dependence on NATO. It would not only allocate EU members states to enlarge the collective military capabilities but also create an opportunity to improve their respective armed forces and invest in shared projects as well. President **Jean-Claude Juncker** (European Commission) also comments as it is a foundation of a European Defense Union on the day of operational steps is taken by Member States. It is argued that the establishment of PESCO is seen against the shifting policy of the US President Donald Trump

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

who criticizes the European associate on military spending in a NATO summit in May 2017 which led to reduce the dependence on NATO to self-reliance. However, it is being refused to accept the pact by only three members Denmark, the UK and Malta. Yet, it is said that this defense pact agreement could lead to form EU Army (PESCO: EU army one step closer after defense pact agreement DW News 11.12.2017).

The European Defense fund: On 30 November 2016, the Commission presented the European Defense Action Plan and outlined as how a European Defense Fund and other actions can support Member States' more efficient spending in joint defense capabilities, strengthen European citizens' security and foster a competitive and innovative industrial base. European Defense Action Plan was presented on 30 November 2016 and summarized how to support the European Defense Fund, spending in joint defense capabilities, other actions, promoting innovative and competitive industrial base and reinforce European citizens' security. President **Jean-Claude Juncker** suggestion in 2016 has been considered in 2017 with €5.5 billion per year for defense coordination and investment in defense research which is managed by the member's state. This fund has two parts firstly, **Research grants:** it provides for joint research in defense technologies and products which is directly funded from the EU budget. This has been allocated with €25 million for 2017 would be allocated €90 million till 2019 and this will be allocated €500 million per year after 2020 which will make EU one of the largest financers in defense research in Europe. Secondly, **Development and acquisition:** this would support to Member States to assist on joint development and the acquisition of defense technology and equipment through co-financing from EU budget and support from Commission. The co-financing would be offered with €500 million for 2019 and 2020, under a defense and industrial development which is recommended €1 billion per year after 2020 (European Commission Press release 2017).

Thus, enhancing defense cooperation within the EU has created mistrust with US and NATO as US has warned the EU over €13-billion defense spending. This could lead to disengage the decades of Trans-Atlantic collaboration and break the NATO. The US has criticized as "poison pills" implanted in the proposed rules which could shut third country allies such as the United States out of European defense project. **Gordon Sondland** (US Ambassador to the EU) also warned the EU in his letter on this issue and raised the possibility of US sanction as well.

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor** *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

However, **Federica Mogherini** (High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy) said the US apprehension were unsubstantiated after EU defense ministers met in Brussels and further said that in regards to procurement market EU was more open than the US in terms of European Union companies and equipment, in the EU there was no 'buy European' act and around 81% of international contracts went to the US firms in Europe that day and reflected to avoid the same reaction and similar course of action on US voice of disengagement, issue of NATO and US sanction against the EU defense project's proposal. Yet, US have asked the EU to respond the letter till by June 2019. European Defense Fund and the EU defense pact Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) both were approve by the European Parliament in April 2019. The plan has been made by the EU to look after the members' states to assist on projects to develop military equipment such as drones and fighter plane and on support systems such as training centers and military hospitals. **Ursula von der Leyen** (German Defense Minister) said that Europeans were doing as EU was asked by Americans to build up their defense capabilities for many years. She emphasized to trust on their defense capabilities which would benefit NATO as well. However, the US had written letter to EU her concerns and doubts (US warns EU over €13-billion defense spending DW News 2019).

The Petersburg Tasks and CSDP related issues:

According to the Lisbon Treaty, the Petersburg tasks, which are defined as: "joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilization. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their territories" (Article 28 of the Lisbon Treaty). These tasks are the primary focus of the CSDP as far as its present and future missions are concerned. Nevertheless, the Lisbon Treaty also mentions that the qualified majority voting provision may be used when member states decide to do so. Constructive abstention is mentioned in the Treaty with the addition that the existing blocking minority of one third of member states now also needs to comprise at least one third of the population of the Union. The Treaty also includes another important **Solidarity Clause** in case a member state becomes the object of a terrorist attack or natural/man-made disaster. However, there are no sanctions if member states decide to pursue their own

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

initiatives in the field of external affairs. Another positive dimension of the Lisbon Treaty is that the EU acquires a legal dimension, thus making it is possible for the Union to sign international agreements. The Europeans have different views on the use of force, different defense traditions and diverging geopolitical interests; none of which makes for a common strategic culture.

The CSDP Implementation Plan identifies three sets of priorities to which each CSDP mission can contribute: 1) Responding to external conflicts and crises 2) Capacity building of partners 3) Protecting the Union and its citizens. The Plan begin with 13 proposals which comprise a Coordinated Annual Review of Defense Spending (CARD), EU Rapid Response, including through the use of EU Battle groups, and permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) for those Member States willing to undertake greater commitments on security and defense. All of these matters were forwarded in 2017 and harmonized by a Commission initiative as **European Defense Fund** and proposals to stimulate and structure investment in defense in the EU. It proposes direct support for research, the co-financing of development under the European Defense Industrial Development Program (EDIDP) and support for the acquisition of defense capabilities by EU Member States. On 11 December 2017, the Council adopted a decision to establish PESCO and its list of 25 participants. It adopted a list of 17 PESCO projects, covering areas such as training, capability development and operational readiness in the field of defense in March 2018. On 19 November 2018, the Council adopted a list of 17 new projects. At the end of 2018, Parliament issued its annual report on the implementation of the CFSP. Its assurance that solutions to the EU's challenges can only be met collectively, Members called for a real common European foreign and security policy, based on strategic autonomy and its integration with capability. This has led to strengthening the EU's internal flexibility and external interference with establishing a common strategy with international partners. It would be the positive impact the establishment of Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) and the Coordinated Annual Review on Defense (CARD) on defense cooperation (Turunen, Tuula 2019: 2-4).

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

Theoretical perspective of European Security and Defense Policy:

In relation to EU developing a capability to project power, many International Relation theories do not offer a specific answer. Those in the offensive realist camp argue that states develop military power and the capability to influence international affairs through its use to balance the power of other states regardless of whether or not they pose a threat (Mearshimer, John 2001). In this view, states seek to ensure their security by expanding their influence whenever they can do so (Waltz, Kenneth 1979). They do not act reflexively, but rather exploit the opportunities presented by the international environment to their maximum advantage (Labs, Eric 1997). Others in the defensive realist camp claim that states engage in expansive behavior to counter specific threats (Walt, Stephen 1987). But neither of those paradigms fully explains the development of ESDP. From a realist perspective it is a relatively short step to conclude that the development of more strong and healthy independent power projection capability by the EU will lead to increase friction with the United States.

Realists cannot easily explain how major European powers would give up their sovereignty in military matters or be able to act in a coherent way through the EU. Kenneth Waltz (1993) and John Mearsheimer (1990) explicitly predicted that the EU would be rather insignificant in world politics and a more likely outcome of balancing tendencies in Europe would be a coalition of states around Germany. Barry Posen (2004, 2006) has nevertheless explained the emergence of the ESDP through a structural-realist lens, interpreting it as a weak form of balance of power behavior. However, he adds some other factors to his explanation, such as European identity, which are not easy to derive from the structural-realist standpoint. Other realists do not reject the balance of power theory, but regard it as irrational in the present-day unipolar order. These theorists dismiss the idea that EU defense integration might be considered a sign of balancing behavior and rather see it as a reaction to the decreased presence of the United States in Europe and its reduced willingness to solve Balkan-style problems for its European allies (Forsberg, Tuomas 2007: 7; Wohlforth 2005: 91).

By contrast, the neo-functionalists that are typically associated with the liberal theory of international relations did not foresee integration extending to military matters, but rather believed that the EU would remain a civilian actor. In the view of Haas, the spill-over effect

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

would not create pressure for defense integration. For him, the spill-over of integration from one field to another was not based on economic determinism but rather on changes in the attitudes of key decision-makers and interest groups (Haas 1958; Schmitter 2005). Yet, the neo-functionalism theory remained underspecified. In fact, it is possible to know different logics of spill-over (Niemann 2006). As realism and liberalism have been under attack by constructivists and other critical approaches for failing to explain many other crucial phenomena in international politics, there is a possibility that these theories could offer a more solid theoretical background for explaining the emergence of the ESDP. Steve Smith, for example, has argued that 'reflective and constructivist approaches offer a much richer set of accounts about European integration than do rationalist theories (Forsberg, Tuomas 2007:8-9; Smith, Steve 2000: 51).' Yet, constructivism has often been accused of being too unclear to produce testable theories. It can be seen that in many literatures on the development of the European defense as well as the surrounding political discourse usually refers to three common explanations. These three explanations are: the natural expansion of the integration process, the EU's rivalry with the United States, and the practical needs of crisis management in a changed security environment (Forsberg, Tuomas 2007: 10; Stromvik 2005). The first narrative views European integration as a peace project aimed at preventing the recurrence of another European civil war. The second is a new heroic narrative of the European Union as defending and saving Western values from their misrepresentation and abuse by the United States. The third narrative sees the EU as a project to manage globalization.

The first explanation about the emergence of the European defense cooperation is based on the idea of completing the process of integration. This account can mix both federalist top-down as well as neo-functionalism bottom-up processes. The former refers to the idea shared by key decision-makers to build Europe as a superpower, or at least as a new kind of entity that represents national sovereignty and defense cooperation. The latter follows the neo-functionalism spill-over logic that explains the emergence of defense cooperation through the logical expansion of integration from economic and political fields to security and defense (Forsberg, Tuomas 2007: 11; Medley 1999).

The second explanation stems from the belief that the defense cooperation of the EU represents an attempt to balance US power in world politics. In other words, the ESDP is based

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

on the view that European defense cooperation is not merely motivated by integration itself, but by rivalry with the United States. This is also the view represented by Margaret Thatcher (2002: 357) who argued that 'the French and those who think like them have been so insistent on achieving an autonomous European defense capability precisely because they see it as constituting a vital attribute of a new European superpower which will rival the United States' (Forsberg, Tuomas 2007: 12). Theoretically, this understanding is rendered plausible through realist theory that views common threat as the classic reason for defense cooperation between any states. Looking at the historical development of the CFSP, Stromvik (2005) has concluded that 'the political will to cooperate has periodically increased when EU members have disagreed with American strategies on international security management' (Forsberg, Tuomas 2007: 12; Smith, Michael 2005).

Social Constructivism and the EU:

The EU is an important political and economic actor in global politics and it is also moving towards security integration. It has been analyzed by the constructivist approach. Constructivism did not have origins from within the European Regional Integration studies. It was in fact firstly introduced by International Relations, with the main focus being on the social nature of and ideational factors in international affairs (Arkan, Zeynep 2014). According to Mark A. Pollack Constructivism can be defined as 'social ontology which insists that human agents do not exist independently from their social environment and its collectively shared systems of meanings (culture in a broad sense) (Gandra, Helena 2015:5; Pollack 2007). It explains the role of agents and structures. It argues that actors behave according to the appropriateness of their behavior rather than on the basis of a rational cost and benefit consequences of their actions. For social constructivists, the social environment defines who we are and what we think, and in turn we (collectively) reproduce this social environment through our actions. This fundamentally revolves around the notion that human beings are not separate from their environmental context (structure) and that the ideas and beliefs that form the ideational environment that an actor finds themselves within inform the actions of individuals. In turn social constructivism holds that individuals (collectively) reproduce or 'reconstruct' this environment through their behavior and actions. Risse argues that constructivism "is based on a social ontology which insists that human agents to not exist independently from their social environment and its collectively shared systems of meanings

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor** *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

(‘culture’ in a broad sense)” (Risse 2005: 160).

Unlike Intergovernmentalism and Neo-functionalism, constructivism is not ontologically rationalist or materialist actors as acting rationally on the basis of the maximization of their material benefits and the minimization of costs. Rather, constructivism sees actors as profoundly impacted by ideas, beliefs and their identity (their beliefs about themselves). The constructivism breaks down the distinction between agents (actors such as individuals or states) and the structural context that they find themselves in (for example the interstate system, a European Council meeting). Intergovernmentalism, for example, is an agency centered theory. It is concerned with what agents do on the basis of their interests (it does of course recognize that actors exist within a structure – the structure of power and material interstate bargaining in the EU). Constructivists, by contrast, see agents and structures as mutually constitutive.

In operating to a logic of appropriateness one is acting in accordance with what is the right thing to do in a given society or context. The opposite, the ‘logic of consequences’, refers to situations when actors operate according to what will happen to them (i.e., will they benefit or lose out from their actions). We could see some of the theories being based on both logics. Intergovernmentalism, for example, operates on logic of consequences. States take decisions on the basis of whether they will benefit or not from a certain decision. It is the consequences of their actions that determine whether they decide to integrate at the European level. On the other hand, sociological institutionalism holds that states behave according to the logic of appropriateness. The assumptions of this theory argues that states do not behave on the basis of what they will get out of a decision, but rather on what is acceptable and the right thing to do in a given situation.

Social constructivism and the study of the EU:

Social constructivism suggests that identity is a core part of states’ decisions to integrate at the European Union. Those states that feel more ‘European’ are more likely to cooperate at the EU levels. States perceptions about what is considered the ‘right thing to do’ are thought to impact on their decision making at the European Union. States are more likely to cooperate on issues where EU action is seen as the right thing to do (appropriate) or where the values imbued in

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

EU action are seen to be 'right'. Ultimately, constructivism is useful in the context of European politics as it draws attention to how the normative, ideational context that actors find themselves in at the European level impacts on their behavior and the decisions they take. This provides a useful counter argument to materialist rationalist theories that see politics as determined by actors' rational decisions based on how much they are set to gain or lose from their actions in a given circumstance. The CSDP itself is a tool importance to the European Union for national building and it is not projecting for duplicate NATO. European Union is seeking security and defense identity. Constructivist provides a useful frame work to explore the EU CSDP a union identity.

Common ideas and values in the field CSDP:

This Lisbon Treaty makes a claim on values and foreign policy by claiming that the principles of the Union's external action are described as those that: "have inspired its own creation, development and enlargement, and which it seeks to advance in the wider world: democracy, the rule of law, the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity, and respect for the principles of the United Nations and the Charter of international law" (Article 21).

Ideas and values in the strategic culture of the EU:

The development of strategic culture is an ongoing process that has brought small but positive results in the field of security and defense. The 'soft' approach on the use of force, the development of a selective humanitarian agenda, the Petersburg Tasks and the acceptance of the military capabilities and Civilian Crisis Management as tools of intervention are the cornerstone values of the strategic culture of the EU, but the acquisition of a UN Security Council Mandate and the question of the NATO-EU relationship constitute grey areas in the cognitive map of this common culture.

A Critical analysis of CSDP Initiative:

In addition, the belief in the intergovernmental nature of CSDP, the lack of clearly defined interests and the existence of different geographic priorities among the EU member states constitute great obstacles to the development of a vibrant strategic culture. **A 'selective' humanitarian agenda:** The ESDP missions have been engaged in various parts of the world

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

in order to tackle various humanitarian crises when it comes to the ‘interpretation’ of the Petersberg Tasks some member states are less willing to engage with ‘combat forces’ than others. The EU is very selective when it comes to intervention. **A careful development of Civilian Crisis Management instruments:** This idea to deal with security issues through that includes civilian and military instruments is widely accepted by all EU member states. However, there is a gap between the rhetoric of CSDP and its practical implementation. Because of the limited resources that EU member states invest in the EU Civilian Headline Goal, progress in this field is still slow. **CSDP and importance of national sovereignty:** It can be seen that decision-making in the CSDP field is subject to member state veto and requires unanimity. Achieving unity and cohesion in issues of security is difficult. Such thinking is not encouraged by the Lisbon Treaty, which maintains the intergovernmental nature of security and defense. Furthermore, the Lisbon Treaty also mentions that if an EU member state becomes a victim of armed aggression, then “the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all the means in their power”. However, the article does not mention the use of ‘military’ assistance to tackle such aggression, which is another sign of cautiousness on the part of the Europeans when it comes to engaging with the question of defense. **No clearly defined EU interests:** Various EU member states still deploy missions unilaterally, in order to satisfy their own geopolitical interests, before reaching an agreement with their EU counterparts. **Multilateralism and its limitations:** Various CSDP missions still are open to contributions from third countries and institutions such as ASEAN, the African Union, the UN and NATO. However, cooperation with third countries and institutions is not always an easy task. **UNSC Role and EU:** For some EU member states the acquisition of a UNSC mandate is important to participate in a security mission, while for others it is less so. The difference of opinion on the priority of the UNSC mandate is proof of another important division among EU states when it comes to the legalization of the use of force.

Global strategy, New Plan for European ARMY as well as new initiative taken to be an effective Global Actor:

In June 2015, the European Council recommends the responsibility as the High Representative with preparing an EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy (EUGS) by June 2016. The EU Global Strategy identifies five priorities for EU foreign policy: 1) The

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

security of our Union 2) State and societal resilience to our East and South 3) An integrated approach to conflicts 4) Cooperative regional orders 5) Global governance for the 21st century. The CSDP Implementation Plan identifies three sets of priorities to which each CSDP mission can contribute: 1) Responding to external conflicts and crises 2) Capacity building of partners 3) Protecting the Union and its citizens. The Plan begin with 13 proposals which comprise a Coordinated Annual Review of Defense Spending (CARD), EU Rapid Response, including through the use of EU Battle groups, and permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) for those Member States willing to undertake greater commitments on security and defense. All of these matters were forwarded in 2017 and harmonized by a Commission initiative as **European Defense Fund** and proposals to stimulate and structure investment in defense in the EU.

On 19 November 2018, the Council adopted a list of 17 new projects. At the end of 2018, Parliament issued its annual report on the implementation of the CFSP. Its assurance that solutions to the EU's challenges can only be met collectively, Members called for a real common European foreign and security policy, based on strategic autonomy and its integration with capability. This has led to strengthening the EU's internal flexibility and external interference with establishing a common strategy with international partners. It would be the positive impact the establishment of Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) and the Coordinated Annual Review on Defense (CARD) on defense cooperation (Turunen, Tuula: 2019). EU involved in 6 Military mission or operation, 10 Civilian missions and more than 5000 people currently deployed for the purpose of preventing conflicts and promoting peace to strengthen international security. It also engaged in preventing piracy, human trafficking and supporting the rule of law (EEAS 2019) 'The EU Foreign Affairs Council argued that EU action promoted rule-based multilateralism. In this unified and rapidly changing world EU depend on effective and inclusive global institutions, a rules-based international order and commonly agreed rules within and beyond the United Nations (UN) system, to ensure peace, security, human rights, prosperity and sustainable development for all. International law, agreements and rules establish a level playing field for large and small countries alike. An effective, relevant and resilient multilateral system must be capable of facing new global realities; remain true to the rules and principles of the UN Charter; and promote the peaceful resolution of disputes among states (Council of the European Union: 2019)'. It is evident that since 2003 the EU has conducted 28 civilian and military operations,

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

including 6 military missions, including: Operation Concordia in Macedonia (2003), Operation Artemis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (2003), Operation Althea in Bosnia-Herzegovina (2004), EUFOR Tchad/RCA in Eastern Chad (2008). The EU acted independently in the case of DR Congo and Eastern Chad, but with access to NATO's equipment and command structures in the case of Macedonia and Bosnia. The EU had 15 missions on 3 continents, suggesting that its role in global security is expanding. In 2008, the EU launched its first ever naval mission (EU NAVFOR Atlanta, 2008) to prevent piracy off the Somali Republic's coast. The EU is also conducting a police and justice mission in Kosovo (EULEX Kosovo, 2008), which declared independence from Serbia in February 2008. This mission was nearly compromised in April 2008 when Russia argued that it was illegal and that the UN should have police for Kosovo's transition to independence rather than the EU. In 2019, at present, EU involved in 6 Military mission or operation, 10 Civilian missions and more than 5000 people currently deployed for the purpose of preventing conflicts and promoting peace to strengthen international security. It also engaged in preventing piracy, human trafficking and supporting the rule of law (EEAS 2019).

However, it can be argued that as "Rather than being in a cocoon, the European Union has pursued its own security and defense policy as a way to increase its importance and respect on the world stage and among its people at home; in other words, the ESDP is for nation-building purposes, and not for defense *per se*" (Anderson, Stephanie & Seitz, Thomas 2006: 29). The ESDP not only provides the European Union with another attribute of a state but also serves as a way to create a foreign and security policy distinct from America's that increases the prestige of the union both among its peoples and abroad.

In conclusions:

It can be seen that various institutional innovations have been included in the Lisbon Treaty in order to address the cohesion and effectiveness problem of the EU. However, in this paper adopts a more 'constructivist' approach, arguing that 'ideas matter'. Unless the EU acquires its own solid strategic culture, it will not be able to act in an efficient way in the field of security and defense. The acquisition of such a strategic culture is no easy task. Member state strategic cultures have been strongly consolidated, since they have followed the identity formation of their own national identities. The EU needs to engage in a construction of its own strategic

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

culture that will combine elements of the strategic cultures of its member states, but since the strategic cultures of EU states are somewhat contradictory (e.g., Atlanticism versus Europeanist).

It can be argued that the EU possesses its own beginning strategic culture, characterized by certain values and ideas. This strategic culture has the Petersburg Tasks at its epicenter and is characterized by a selective approach to humanitarian crises. The strategic culture of the EU suffers from a lack of defined EU interests as well as from the insistence of EU member states on maintaining Intergovernmentalism as the main form of decision-making. In case of military and crises management CSDP and EU missions, EU could not be able militarily intervene in other state without the mandate of UN. The USA can no longer carry the majority of the burden of defense through NATO - the EU needs to pull its own weight. However, external affairs democratically elected representatives should make decisions about war and peace. CSDP is run by an unelected and therefore less accountable High Representative. CSDP needs resources.

Thus, Lisbon treaty of the EU security and defense framework became equipped with its own institutions. However, lack of consensus is due to lack of common ideas, values and practices regarding the use of police and military force in Europe. So, it can be said that there is no common strategic culture. Still, the EU is far from possessing a truly 'common' security and defense policy as it has no cohesive strategic culture. However, EU is trying to project as EU identity through CSDP and to be a global actor. European Union is seeking a security and defense identity, not for deterrence or defense, but to promote a European political defense identity. However, lack of political will and fear of pooling sovereignty of individual state has become the hindrance for strategic identity. European allies would seek to create a competing military force outside NATO but process is very slow. EU has taken many positive initiative in terms of security and defense policy as well as creation of defense fund. However, EU has the defense capability but it is still lagging behind in creating uniform European Army. Despite of these the EU is still a major global actor.

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

References

Anderson, Stephanie B. (2005), “Developing Europe into a “Third Great Power Bloc”: The United States, France and the Failure of the European Defense Community,” (this paper was presented at the European Union Studies Association Conference in 2005 March 31-April 2), [Online: Web] Accessed 30 June 2019, URL: <http://aei.pitt.edu/cgi/export/3269/HTML/aei-archive-3269.html> or <http://aei.pitt.edu/id/eprint/3269>.

Anderson, Stephanie & Seitz, Thomas (2006), “European Security and Defense Policy Demystified Nation-Building and Identity in the European Union”, *Armed Forces & Society*, 33(1): 24-42.

Arkan, Zeynep (2014), “Via Media' vs. the Critical Path: Constructivism(s) and the Case of EU Identity”, *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace*. 3: 21-21. 10.20991/allazimuth.167325, [Online: Web] Accessed 30 June 2019, URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315860624_Via_Media'_vs_the_Critical_Path_Constructivisms_and_the_Case_of_EU_Identity.

Calleo, David P. (1987), “Beyond American Hegemony: The Future of the Western Alliance”, New York: Basic Books.

Cîrlig, Carmen-Cristina (2015), “The EU’s mutual assistance clause: the provisions of Article 42(7) TEU”, European Parliament, European Parliamentary Research Service, [Online: Web] Accessed 30 June 2019, URL: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/572799/EPRS_BRI%282015%29572799_EN.pdf.

Council of the European Union (2019), “Council conclusions – EU action to strengthen rules-based multilateralism”, Brussels, 17/06/2019, [Online: Web] Accessed 30 June 2019, URL: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/39791/st10341-en19.pdf>.

DW News (2017), “What is the EU defense union PESCO? Berlin”, 13. November.2017[Online: Web] Accessed 30 June 2019, URL: <https://www.dw.com/overlay/media/en/what-is-the-eu-defense-union-pesco/41361706/48738562>.

DW News (2017), PESCO: EU army one step closer after defense pact agreement, Berlin, 11 December 2017, [Online: Web] Accessed 15 January 2018, URL: <https://www.dw.com/en/pesco-eu-army-one-step-closer-after-defense-pact-agreement/a-41741828>.

DW News (2019), US warns EU over € 13 billion defence spending, Berlin, 15 May 2019, [Online: Web] Accessed 30 June 2019, URL: <https://www.dw.com/en/us-warns-eu-over-13-billion-defense-spending/a-48738562>.

European Commission (2017), Press release: A European Defence Fund: €5.5 billion per year to boost Europe's defense capabilities Brussels, 7 June 2017, [Online: Web] Accessed 15 January 2018, URL: https://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-17-1508_en.htm.

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor** *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

EEAS (2019), Military and civilian missions and operations, European External Action Service, Brussels, 5 March, 2019, URL: [Online: Web] Accessed 30 June 2019, https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/eu_csdp_missions_and_operations_may2019_web.pdf.

Forsberg, Tuomas (2007), "Explaining The Emergence of The ESDP: Setting The Research Agenda," University of Helsinki Finland, Paper Prepared for the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), Standing Group for International Relations (SGIR) Conference, Turin, September 12-15, 2007, [Online: Web] Accessed 15 January 2018, URL: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.408.5728&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.

Gandra, Helena (2015), "Constructivism in the EU: Perspectives on Cultural Identity and Vertical Integration", Europa-Universität Flensburg, 2015/03/16, [Online: Web] Accessed 15 January 2018, URL: https://www.academia.edu/14179601/Constructivism_in_the_EU_Perspectives_on_Cultural_Identity_and_Vertical_Integration.

Guzelytė, Silvija (2013), "EU-US Defense Data 2011", European Defense Agency, Brussels, September 2013, URL: [Online: Web] Accessed 30 June 2019, <https://www.eda.europa.eu/docs/default-source/news/eu-us-defence-data-2011.pdf>.

Henry A. Kissinger (1977), "The Year of Europe" (Address to the Associated Press Annual Luncheon, New York, 23 April, 1973), in American Foreign Policy, 3rd ed. (New York: Norton, 1977), 104-5.

Haas, E.B. (1958), "The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces, 1950-57", Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Labs, Eric (1997), "Beyond Victory: Offensive Realism and the Expansion of War Aims", *Security Studies*, 6 (4).

Margaras, Vasilis (2010), "Common Security and Defense Policy and the Lisbon Treaty Fudge: No common strategic culture, no major progress", Working Paper No. 28 / June 2010, The European Policy Institutes Network (EPIN) pp. 1-12, [Online: Web] Accessed 15 January 2018, URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2001354.

Mearshimer, John (2001), "The Tragedy of Great Power Politics", New York: W.W. Norton. Medley, Richard (1999), "Europe's Next Big Idea. Strategy and Economics Point to a European Military", *Foreign Affairs* (78):5, 18-22.

Medley, Richard (1999), "Europe's Next Big Idea. Strategy and Economics Point to a European Military", *Foreign Affairs* (78):5, 18-22.

New York Times (1991), Conflict in Yugoslavia; Europeans Send High- Level Team by Alan Riding, June 29, 1991, Section 1, Page 4, [Online: Web] Accessed 15 January 2018, URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/1991/06/29/world/conflict-in-yugoslavia-europeans-send-high-level-team.html>.

How to Cite:

Prem Bahadur Manjhi (July 2019). **A Constructive Approach as Understanding the CFSP/CSDP a Security and Defense Identity After Lisbon Treaty: An EU is Engaged in to be a Global Actor**
International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13(1), 46-68.
Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article>

Niemann, Arne (2006), “Introduction” In: Niemann, Arne (ed.): Explaining Decisions in the European Union, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pollack, Mark A. (2006), “Rational Choice and EU Politics (October 2006)”, ARENA Working Paper No. 12, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1011326> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1011326> [Online: Web] Accessed 15 January 2018, URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1011326.

Risse, T. (2005), “Social Constructivism and European Integration”, In Weiner, A. & Thomas, D. European Integration Theory, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Michael (1978) “From the ‘Year of Europe’ to a Year of Carter: Continuing Patterns and Problems in Euro-American Relations,” *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 17 (1): 27.

Smith, Michael (2005), “Taming the Elephant? The European Union and the Management of American Power”, *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* (6):1, 129-154.

Schmitter, Philippe. (2005), “Ernst B. Haas and the legacy of neofunctionalism”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Routledge 12(2): 255-272.

Smith, Steve (2000), “International Theory and European Integration” in Morten Kelstrup, & Michael Williams, International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration: Power, Security and Community, London: Routledge.

Stromvik , Maria (2005), “Balancing Global Influence The “transatlantic conflict syndrome” and the CFSP”, Lund University, Lund, Paper to be presented at the EUSA Ninth Biennial International Conference, Austin, Texas, March 31-April 2, 2005. [Online: Web] Accessed 15 January 2018, URL: http://aei.pitt.edu/3099/1/EUSA_paper_final.pdf.

Strömvik, Maria (2005), “To Act as Union. Explaining the Development of the EU’s Collective Foreign Policy”, Lund Political Studies 142, Lund University: Department of Political Science, in Szwed, Stefan (2018). Poland, Germany and State Power in Post-Cold War Europe: Asymmetry Matters. Germany: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Thatcher, Margaret (2002), “Statecraft Strategies for a Changing World”, New York: Harper Collins.

Turunen, Tuula (2019), Common security and Defence policy, Fact sheets on the European Union 4/2019.

Waltz, Kenneth (1979), “Theory of International Politics”, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Walt, Stephen, (1987), “The Origins of Alliances”, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Wohlforth, W. and Brooks, S. (2005), “Hard Times for Soft Balancing”, *International Security*, 30(1), 72-108.