

Understanding the Interplay between the European Integration and Political and Policymaking Process¹

Faisal Nurdin Idris

Abstrak

Perjalanan integrasi Eropa dan proses politik di Uni Eropa telah dibentuk dan dipengaruhi oleh faktor-faktor yang dinamis. Artikel ini secara inti berfokus pada faktor-faktor yang saling terkait serta ketergantungan kompleks yang membentuk proses Integrasi Eropa. Di saat yang sama, artikel ini dimaksudkan pula untuk menganalisa sifat dari proses pengambilan kebijakan pada area yang terkait dengan hubungan eksternal Uni Eropa yang merupakan salah satu aspek dari sekian luas kebijakan Uni Eropa. Dengan kata lain, tulisan ini ingin menjelaskan sebuah pengertian yang mendalam mengenai keadaan atau situasi yang saling mempengaruhi dan interaksi yang kompleks antara integrasi Eropa dan proses pengambilan kebijakan dan politik. Untuk memahami ini dibutuhkan analisa dan perspektif yang multidisiplin dan studi kasus yang spesifik, dari pada menggunakan sudut pandang dan analisa yang relatif sempit. Langkah ini dirasa sejalan ketika memahami Uni Eropa yang merupakan entitas yang memiliki kekhasan tersendiri.

Introduction

The European Union's integration has become fascinating phenomena in contemporary world. Having been initially rooted by the Treaty of Paris in 1951, the European Union (EU) has moved forward to become the most successful regional integration in the world, expanding from 6 countries

1 This is a revised version of a paper presented at 1st Convention of European Studies in Indonesia, held at Gadjah Mada University, in Yogyakarta 16-18 March 2009. I am indebted to many colleagues and participants of the event for their comments on earlier version of the paper.

in its beginning to the current 27 member states.² As one of the strongest economic blocs in the world, besides the United States (US) and Japan, EU was predominantly economic union marked by the closer cooperation to integrate its economic activities across member states. The exceptional feature of EU integration has inspired other regional cooperations to learn how EU could achieve such progress.

In wider context, growing EU involvement in international stage such as security and economic issue has been signalling that its international role is considerable. Taking into account such striking figures, however, European integration remains blurring not only by its native but also by the rest. It is argued that as an entity *sui generis*, the EU is not widely well understood due to its dynamics and complex configuration. In this regard, scholars mainly coming from Political Science and International Relations have developed numerous theories and approaches in order to provide valuable tools for the understanding of the EU's working.

The aim of this paper is to address how integration process has shaped European politics and *vice versa* how European politics has shaped European integration. To begin with, the paper will proceed into three sections. The *first* section will demonstrate seminal contributions from outstanding European integration "schools" which provide a conceptual framework in line with the effort to understand European integration in wider context. The *second* section analyzes EU governance and policymaking process within the construction of EU post Maastricht Treaty, while highlighting political aspects of the European Community (EC). Indeed, it helps to identify political *determinants* in the formation of EU's integration. The *last* section addresses characteristics of EU external relations, explaining EU policymaking process which corresponds to the extent of the EU external dimensions. It has an objective to provide particular example on how EU integration is applied to EU external affairs which are part of broad areas of EU policies. In final analysis, we draw concluding remarks from the explanations presented in aforementioned sections.

Conceptual Frameworks for Analyzing European Integration: Competing or Complementary?

EU studies have been originally flourished through outstanding classical debates in European integration involving two competing theories mainly

2 The name of the European Union (EU) is firstly introduced by the Maastricht Treaty which was signed in February 1992 and came into force in November 1993. The EU has a historical chronology. Briefly, it commences from the Treaty of Paris which set up the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) on 18 April 1951 and entered into force in 1952. It is then followed by the Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community (EEC) and European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC or EURATOM) which was signed on 25 March 1957 and came into force on 1 January 1958.

between Neo-functionalism and Intergovernmentalism. The use of neofunctionalism to analyze European integration has been commenced since the mid-1950s by the seminal work of Ernst B. Haas who is considered as the pioneer of neofunctionalists. The main premises of neofunctionalism constitute that states are not the only important actors, and supranational institutions such as the Commission and non-state actors (or supranational interest groups) are striking catalyser to drive European integration forward. Neofunctionalism has been characterised by three forms: *spillover*, elite socialization (elite groups i.e. the Commission that are loyal to supranational institutions) and the formation of supranational interest groups (Haas, 1958; and Rosamond, 2000). As a central neofunctionalist argument, spillover applies to “a situation where cooperation in one field necessitates cooperation in another”. In turn, spillover process routes the unintended consequence resulted from particular cooperation (Strøby-Jensen, 2007).

The significance of loyal transfer for political integration has been highlighted by Haas (1958: 16): “whereby political actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations, and political activities towards a new and larger center, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the preexisting states”. In addition, sovereignty of member states provokes contentious discourse in the eyes of state-centrism. For neofunctionalists, the sovereignty is pooled through supranational institutions which could avoid pitfalls of state-centric nuance in EU policies. The idea is to push integration ahead beyond the national sentiment.

The challenge remains how far neofunctionalist theory help to explain the development of European integration? For some, such a query has been put under the scrutiny since the community idea had been institutionalised in the aftermath of the Second World War through the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC).

Broadly speaking, neofunctionalists argue in favour of sector-by-sector integration on specifically economic areas and activities which has been put forward by the founding fathers, Schuman and Jean Monnet. As the architect of the European Communities, the latter suggests that economic (sectoral) integration leads to political integration which is *finalité politique* (Urwin, 2007: 19). It is initially embarked from what so-called “low politics” (economic and social cooperation) to “high politics” (politics). Seen from this perspective, the ECSC made possible to be implemented for the sake of further cooperation in political integration.

In the following years, despite its predominant debate in EU studies during the early naissance of European community, neofunctionalist theory has been criticized both for its empirical and theoretical basis. Institutional crisis and tension caused by withdrawal of French participation in Council of Ministers and the rejection of Charles de Gaulle against UK membership in 1963

and 1967 clearly demonstrate how national interests and states' preferences play significant forces in determining European integration process, although this argument has been put on the periphery by neo-functionalists.

Intergovernmentalism, the other opposing classical theory, was born as a reaction to constraints of neofunctionalism. Intergovernmentalist theory refers extensively to the work of Stanley Hoffman (in the 1960s) and Andrew Moravcsik (in the mid-1990s). Intergovernmentalist concept is realist/neorealist or state-centrism in nature in the sense that this theory put emphasis on the significant role of states in European integration process. In the view of intergovernmentalism, Cini (2007) notes that interstate bargaining invoked by domestic settings cannot be ignored when inter-state cooperation is taking place. At this point, states definitely look strong to control integration process.

It is therefore obvious that the intergovernmentalist theory represents strong proponent of greater position and bargaining of the European Council and EU Council in EU activities. As the key supporter of intergovernmentalism, Hoffman is critical of neofunctionalist theory, while defending how state still play pivotal role in European Community in the Post World War II. The clear example can be seen from the state's influence in European integration process in the aforementioned case of Charles de Gaulle's boycott. According to intergovernmentalist theory, manoeuvre and efforts demonstrated by the Franco-German axis indicate the driving force within the European Community (EC) to move forward. This feature has likely suggested the weight of state in integration process. Similarly, this Franco-German ally much determines the future path of the EC. Therefore, it is tough to imagine the existence of EU without France and Germany as both are regarded as the key member states.

Since the early 1990s, the reincarnation of intergovernmentalist theory has been revived by the appearance of Moravcsik's Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI). To understand the theory, "Robert Putnam's two-level games" played by states help to acknowledge how the logic of liberal intergovernmentalism works. Indeed, the latter puts the emphasis on 'preferences' and 'power' which states undeniably ought to play. In this respect, the state will behave rationally to manage the interplay between external (international politics) and internal (domestic politics) forces and dynamics.

It has been three striking features of liberal intergovernmentalism pointed out by Moravcsik when he explains why state behave rationally. *Firstly*, it relates to national preference and domestic factors. *Secondly*, relative power among states requires strategic intergovernmental bargaining in interstate relations of European integration. *Lastly*, it is institutional delegation. By this argument, institutions are set up to enable political cost and efficiency of interstate bargains while advocating other states to cooperate (Cini, 2007).

Competing interests of member states are inevitably resulted in the division of 'big' states *versus* 'small' states to take greater interests and preferences. This argument is based upon the struggle within the Council as can be seen from Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) and the major issues which are to be tackled by member states. The stakes are relatively high in this situation.

Nevertheless, several critics have been addressed to LI. Among others, LI lacks to answer the empirical day-to-day EU works in which member states has less decisive involvement.

Apart from the above mentioned contending classical theories, the emergence of new theories and approaches in European integration has been intensifying over the last twenty years in response to the complexity and dynamics of EU polity and processes. To respond the constraints of classical concepts concerning contemporary problems and challenges, new theories and approaches of European integration have emerged and have been developed as complementary and alternative analyses and tools to be 'way out' of theoretical gap from the preceding classical theories.³

These new conceptual analyses are marked by the contribution of various disciplines of social sciences consisting of political science, public policy and International Relations (IR). It has been reflected by the appearance of new institutionalism, policy networks, multilevel governance (MLG), and social constructivism in the field. As a consequence, new patterns of analyses have shifted to more specific levels and areas of integration, rather than drawing more general views.

Taking into account, for example, one of these new theories, new institutionalist theory which has modified 'old' institutionalism, has received extensive attention besides the fact that new institutionalism is made up by fundamentally different schools of thought. According to the new institutionalist perspective, institutions matter in shaping institutional norms and actor behaviour. It is therefore said that institutions shape politics.

The most striking characteristics of new institutionalist theory can be overlooked through its three types composed of rational choice institutionalism, historical institutionalism and sociological institutionalism (Aspinwall and Schneider, 2000; Rosamond, 2007). The prominent form of this theory derived from historical institutionalism, is explaining the idea of *path dependency*. This term suggests that decision taken in the past hinders the scope of decision in the present and the future. It best describes how states get into 'locked in' a situation which leads them to European integration process, being unable to escape from.

3 Some scholars would prefer naming it as a theory, while some would consider it as an approach.

The move to examine multivariate levels in EU institutional arena and structure has prompted scholars to utilize the approach of multi-level governance (MLG). At conceptual basis, the terms refer to “the existence of overlapping competencies among multiple levels of governments and the interaction of political actors across those levels” (Rosamond, 2000: 110). In MLG language, EU polity comprises the interaction of different actors in the different levels including several tiers of authority (the European, national and subnational). Segmented in its nature, decision-making procedure takes place at various levels which require a variety of channels to influence policy outcomes.

After all, correspondence between theory and reality is subject to critical analysis of European integration and EU political process. EU scholars have outlined the importance of contextualizing theories when analyzing European integration in order to match between theory and practice. With regards to the complexity of EU process, employing European integration’s theories or approaches depends heavily upon individual case study of one aspect of European integration and upon angels of scrutiny.

A wide range of elements of European integration and polity inevitably requires various theoretical analyses, rather than using single lens. As a matter of theoretical tools, Paterson (2001: 301) emphasizes the prerequisite of clarifying “what it is that is to be explained” before theorizing European integration or EU governance. In terms of application, Holland (2002: 235-242) explains remarkably how theories of European integration apply to EU development policy which represents one aspect of EU activities. He further argues that these theories which are normally internal European integration are compatible in studying other aspects of European external matters/relations

EU Multilevel Governance and Policymaking Process:

What is at Stake?

Governance is a competing concept because by its definition it is varied among scholars. It depends upon emphasis and areas of investigation. Exceptional and well-recognized term of governance has been explained by Rhode (1996) arguing that its notion is associated with “self-organizing, interorganizational networks”, while proposing six distinct uses of governance. Rhode’s definition describes the involvement of state and non-state actors in “governing structure” which has its final outcomes to better ameliorate administrative services in British Government.

The European Commission in its White Paper of 2001 defines governance as “rules, processes and behaviour that affect the way in which powers are exercised at European level, particularly as regards openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence”. The Commission’s White Paper

envisages the wider engagement from people and organisations policymaking process including the modification of EU treaties by acting together with member states and EU institutions in order to handle emerging issues. In this respect, five **political principles composed of openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence** are set up to underpin EU good governance. Such principles represent an engine of reform in European governance.

The basic idea of governance coming from Rhode and the Commission's White Paper seems alike in the sense that there is an impetus to make governance to be less central control and more network-structured. As per mentioned by the Commission, this reforming White Paper would renovate and strengthen the Community method in the support of greater openness in policymaking decisions.⁴

The reform in European governance gives more places to European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions to reinforce their functions as intermediaries between the EU, in one hand, and civil society and regions (provinces) in the other. As a consequence of deepening European integration, the role of interest groups and organizations is likely increasing. These interest groups are emerging in response to or in anticipation of European legislative which may affect them.

Following the introduction of *co-decision* procedure firstly introduced in the Maastricht Treaty, the role of interest groups *vis-à-vis* triangle European Institutions (the Commission, the Council and the Parliament) is growing in particular to the work and competency seized the European Parliament. The term of lobbying is increasingly present to portray extensive interactions between EU institutions and interest groups and representatives. It has been stated by many that Brussels currently becomes the second largest city of lobbying behind Washington as a consequence of an increasing number of EU laws that affects European society as a whole.

Initially, EU policy or Community law has to be transposed by member states into their national legislatures. Such a feature is associated with the *top-down* approach. However, it has been a shift in European governance to combine the so-called "*top-down* and *bottom-up* policy approaches" in entire EU policy (Citi and Rhodes, 2007). In doing so, it takes into account the significant role of interest groups as a means to absorb bottom voices as a pressure, for or against, EU and member states' policymakers.

Nowadays, in Brussels, there are much more *satellites* or *radars* of interest groups comprising a wide range of domains of actions through national,

4 Community method refers to all processes of EC decision involved by the European Commission who makes legislative initiative while executing policy, agreed by the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament (EP). Compliance of law is under the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice (ECJ).

regional/provincial and local representatives in order to monitor or influence EU policies in targeted concerns of these interest groups. As a result, this feature has encouraged the promising environment to deliberative democracy in Europe and *Europeanization* of domestic affairs in all aspects. The dynamics of EU systems affirms the existence of interconnection and interdependence between European governance and integration. According to Kohler-Koch (2005: 4), "European governance and system evolution are interdependent and part of a dynamic process of mutual structuration".

Pertaining policymaking process, EU is no doubt unique entity representing distinct characteristics of structure and functioning which differ from *traditional nation-states* and international organizations. It has been commonplace to suggest that EU's policymaking decision constitutes *multilevel* and *multipillar* characters in governance system (Kohler-Koch, 2005; Knodt and Princen, 2003; Hyde-Price, 2004). The dynamics and the complexity of EU policymaking has been source of inquiry to scrutinize decision-making process in the EU. Peterson & Bomberg (1999: 5) provides three distinct levels of analyses in multilevel EU decision-making comprising super-systemic, systemic, subsystemic levels which correspond to the history-making decision; policy setting; policy shaping respectively. Nevertheless, applicability of such levels of analyses is again subject to critical study to examine the extent and nature of decision within the EU.

Before introducing the Lisbon Treaty, EU was propped up by three pillars set up by the Maastricht Treaty (1992) and reformed by the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) and the Treaty of Nice (2003). These three pillars of the EU are following: Community Pillar (EC); the Common and Foreign Security Policy (CFSP); and police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters (PJCCM-former Justice and Home Affairs). Notwithstanding the fact that there is a growing competence of EC in many fields, CFSP and PJCCM remain Intergovernmental Conferences (IGCs).

With the introduction of the Treaty of Lisbon (2007), however, the pillar structure (the 1st, 2nd and 3rd) of the preceding Treaties have been merged together. As a result, under the reformative Lisbon Treaty, areas under the triangle pillars will be known as the Union's competence. For instance, it is wording "*The Union's competence in matters of common foreign and security policy*" (Article 24 of the Lisbon Treaty, ex Article 11 Treaty on European Union). Nonetheless, does this reformative Treaty will modernize areas of competence? To bear in mind, it has to wait more than 15 years before the Lisbon Treaty entering into force. Over that period since the Maastricht Treaty in which three pillars were firstly introduced, problematic competence over cross-pillars has been taking place. In fact, the pillar structure now remain similar in its nature, albeit the introduction of Lisbon Treaty.

As explained earlier, the EU policymaking decision operates with the involvement and interaction of various actors in different levels and in

different arena. Such interactions pose inevitable tensions among interest actors, which it may be positive or negative effects. The dynamics and the complexity of EU policymaking are highlighted by Polo (2003) in studying one of EU policy areas. Using the approach of historical institutionalism, he analyzes the creation of post within the Commission in charge of audiovisual policy. He then suggests that “the process of institutionalization and internal competition and tension is taking place in the EU administration in which politico-administrative actors including national and European levels, professionals and experts in targeted policies, interest groups, and member states all defend their own logics and particular interests”.

Polo’s account in accordance with audiovisual matters demonstrates the involvement of variety and of widely formal or non-formal actors in producing and influencing policies within the EU. Hence, EU policy process is segmented across multiple levels and actors. It is noteworthy to suggest that the EU governance is experiencing ongoing process. Being unique feature of polity, EU system of policy-making has been subject to the transformation and revitalization from time to time in search of efficient governance structure.

Understanding Complex Configuration of EU External Relations

EU’s external relations have come in the concern of EU in 1970s in the form of humanitarian and development assistance and cooperation. Initially, the most beneficiary states were African countries. The EU aid was then extended to Asia, Latin America and the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean. The traditional EU assistance comprising trade and financial and technical support to beneficiary countries, has expanded to other targeted sectors. The place of the EU in international arena is likely moving up, if we look at EU increasing role as donor. It is not surprising to say that the EU becomes global player. The EU engagement dealing with international affairs meets its relevance in the context of the Post-Cold War marked by complex process and a multiplication of actors and the transformation in international system.

Growing international contemporary challenges ranging from the threat of international security to economic matters require EU’s strategic response and presence along with other international actors and international institutions. Consequently, the need of EU for reorienting its role as global player has been echoed by many to outstrip EU’s origin which was predominantly economic integration. A number of European observers and scholars have shared ideas that European integration and its enlargement has a huge impact on EU’s capacity, coherence, recognition and effectiveness to engage an act in international arena.

It is not surprising then the competing *Euroenthusiastic* and *Eurosceptic* standpoints become inevitable in response to how EU can play its role in European internal and external matters as well as a global actor. At the same

time, due to current economic downturn and global recession, unemployment rates are raising in Europe, accounted for 9.7% of EU 27 in April 2010 compared to 8.7% of EU 27 in April 2009 (Eurostat, 01 June 2010). It unavoidably affects the degree on how EU is able to support the development in third countries and involve in international stage, whereas EU ought to tackle the climbing unemployment across EU 27.

Back to EU external affairs, the Post-Cold War era has been a turning point for EU while the latter endeavours to extend and boost its role as a global player. In this regard, EU's external policies play a significant role in increasing its influences, interests, norms, values, preferences and concerns to its interlocutors in the world. Since the image of bipolarity is no longer useful to describe the structure of international politics, there has been a shift from *hard* power to *soft* power even nowadays *smart* power to exercise the internationalisation of one's preferences, norms and interests. Some suggest that Europe should develop a coherent and effective common foreign policy in response to American primacy (Clark, 2008). This idea seems plausible if we look at dominant role of the United States (US) at international stage.

The European Commission had released its communication (2006) entitled *Europe in the World - Some Practical Proposals for Greater Coherence, Effectiveness and Visibility*, to overcome the globally contemporary challenges. This communication asks the Member States and the EU institutions for working together on "how to develop and implement European external policy, how to increase the effectiveness and impact or EU coherent policies and actions, and how to strengthen the democratic accountability and visibility and to increase public acceptance".

It has been also underlined in the subsequent Communication that *public diplomacy* becomes a frontline in projecting EU models and policies and increasing the visibility of EU external actions. Nevertheless, Laïdi (2008: 3) argues that European preferences to its interlocutors are linked to 'the degree of Europe's engagement in promoting them'. From this perspective, the efforts to raise the EU visibility as a global actor as well as EU's 'exporting model' cannot be separated from the way in which the EU is perceived in the World. In facing the changing world, EU has to consider *smart* approaches to deal with its global counterparts by means of *multitrack diplomacy* and *soft diplomacy* in order to achieve EU outcomes.

As was aforementioned above, EU policymaking process is underpinned by multilevel and multipillar configuration which leads to complicated analyses and theories themselves. These EU characteristics are similarly embedded when EU deals with its external affairs. One issue or problem may be handled between two pillars. It is therefore that the boundaries between three pillars are somewhat puzzling and blurring. For instance, while EU imposes economic sanctions against Serbia (third countries), its political

decision is undertaken under Pillar II and implementing decision under *communautaire* Pillar 1. Buchet de Neuilly (2003) points out that long series of tough negotiation and discussion are taking place along with the technical, institutional, legal arguments as well as economic interests of member states in targeted country. As consequence, several delays of days even months had occurred for every decision.

The other example of multipillars configuration of EU has been mentioned by Wiessala (2002: 43) to describe the Asian awareness among EU decision makers. He suggests that “*intergovernmentalism*, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy, working parties/groups (such as the Council Working Group responsible for Asia and Oceania-COASI) and the rotating Presidency play an important part in defining, shaping and refining the EU’s Asia strategy”. Thus, these two examples have proved the argument asserting that EU’s external policies have been conducted through inter-pillar and multilevel actors, structures and processes.

As the executive arm of the European Union, the European Commission plays a central role in initiating and carrying out policy in particular with its competences under Community pillar (pillar 1). A raising role of the EU as global actor economically and politically has been taken into account by the European Commission to establish several Directorate Generals (DGs) dealing with external affairs comprising DG External Relations, DG Trade, DG Development, DG Enlargement, EuropeAid Co-operation Office, and DG Humanitarian Aid (DG ECHO).

With regards to EU external policies, EU external relations have brought interconnection with internal EC policies. It reminds us to idea of spillover which has driven unintended consequences in EU policies internally and externally. That is to say, EU’s internal policies are inevitable to cope with external dimension of EU activities in response to current challenges. Smith (2007: 228) argues when the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was set up to regulate a policy within the Community, nowadays, CAP deals either with external policies such as the “regulation of food imports” (from third countries).

Taking into account differences in features, contexts and cases among nation-states as well as international organisations, one may observe that EU’s external conducts should be varied in its implementation with regard to distinct third countries. The overwhelming focus on the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) in pillar II would pose problems of neglecting equally significant dimensions of the external activities of the EU under pillar I. Indeed, the relations with third countries are not merely handled under intergovernmental pillars. Depending upon concerns and contexts, EU-USA relations may have distinct conducts compared with EU’s relations with

developing countries. It means that EU external policies should vary from one of third countries to another. However, the study of EU's external relations which concentrate on a large scale of competencies under pillar I, does not receive still adequate attention, compared to those which deal with pillar II. It is not surprising EU external relations have been vast focused on the fields of Common Foreign & Security Policy (CFSP), Common European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), EU enlargement and TransAtlantic allies. In fact, EU's contemporary external relations are encompassing political, economic, development, environment etc which are more than just foreign affairs/policies or **security and military dimensions**.

Likewise, the existence of various personalities on behalf of the EU raises question: "Who speaks for Europe (EU)? For many, such a question is provoked by the obscurity of single personality and voice of the EU within key EU internal institutions and bodies when acting in external matters with third countries. In addition, it comes to our mind to "what do EU external relations signify? Are they complementary or competing notion *vis-à-vis* EU foreign affairs?

The notion of external actions is no doubt fragmented and varies among scholars and practitioner. The term has been widely used in EU external matters. In this paper, I am not going to **problemetize such definition**. To take clear terms, Maddalon (2008: 1) maintains "the external action carried out by a state or an international organization, traditionally comprise three dimensions: diplomatic wording (discourse, position paper and political meetings); economic relations (development relief, trade policy); and security and defence". Since the world has become *global village* and new global challenges rise, the fields of foreign affairs are consequently developed, exceeding its traditional-foreign matters. Indeed, EU external dimensions represent a wide range of activities with third countries.

As the legal framework for EU external actions, consolidated Treaty on European Union (TEU) and the Treaty Establishing the European Community (TEC) has generally outlined a wide range of activities in EU external affairs. Article 3 of Common Provisions states:

"The Union shall in particular ensure the consistency of its external activities as a whole in the context of its external relations, security, economic and development policies. The Council and the Commission shall be responsible for ensuring such consistency and shall cooperate to this end. They shall ensure the implementation of these policies, each in accordance with its respective powers".

However, the Treaty of Lisbon repeals this article, while addressing the external dimension of EU action under Title V of General Provisions on the Union's External Action and Specific Provisions on the Common Foreign

Security Policy. In spite of being more comprehensive than previous Treaties, it still remains difficult to identify the scope of external relations due to the fact that external dimension of internal policies are not completely included in external actions such as environment. But, on the top of that, the reformative Lisbon Treaty establishes single external representative of the European Union by creating the new post for the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy which merges both High Representative of CFSP and the European Commissioner for External Relations which is now assured by Catherine Ashton. *Spillover* consequence from this recent development is that EU establish its own diplomatic corps under European External Action Service (EEAS) in early 2010.

Concluding remarks

Overall, by exploring political factors and process driving internal European integration to move forward, this paper comprehensively attempts to understand the interplay between the European integration and political and policymaking process in contemporary EU. Embarking from providing classical and new conceptual perspectives in European Integration, this paper presents an insight how European integration and policymaking process interact. It has been demonstrated the interdependence of various actors whether at EU level or national, regional and local ones as well as the role of supranational institutions in forging European integration ahead.

It is clear that European integration is at stake for EU. In brief, the most striking display of contemporary EU characteristics is multilevel and multipillar configuration. In spite of the fact that we found some constraints of dynamics and complexity of EU expressed in this paper, EU project of integration is moving ahead in relevance to the idea of spillover in which one area has extensively fragmented and spread to other areas of integration and cooperation.

As one element of EU concerns, EU external relations constitute dynamics and complexity of European governance in matters of external affairs. It includes multiplicity of actors, national and EU, and multilevels in the political and policymaking process. In some policy areas, the EU has to share competences with member states particularly in accordance with the domains of CFSP and ESDP. These unique characteristics are two folds: *firstly*, it gives more room for manoeuvre among concerned actors to defence their interests or achieve their goals. *Secondly*, it may undermine EU capacity to act externally at international level. In this regards, Putnam's two-level games approach help best to explain such interactions within EU context internally and externally. The other point related to the subject is that EU external relations reflect a broad range of external activities with third countries comprising traditional or non-traditional external dimensions which are much more than just "foreign affairs". ●

References

Books and Articles:

- Aspinwall, Mark. D and Schneider, Gerard. 2000. "Same Menu, Seperate Tables: The Institutionalist Turn in Political Science and the Study of European Integration", *European Journal of Political Research*, 38: 1-36
- Buchet de Neuilly, Yves. 2003. "European External Relations Fields: The Multipillar Issue of Economic Sanctions against Serbia", in Knodt, Michèle and Princen, Sebastiaan (eds). *Understanding the European Union's External Relations*, Routledge.
- Cini, Michelle. 2007. "Intergovernmentalism", in Cini, Michelle (ed), *European Union Politics*, 2nd edition, Oxford University Press.
- Citi, Manuele and Rhodes, Martin. 2007. "New Modes of Governance in the EU: Common Objectives versus National Preferences", *European Governance Papers (EUROGOV)* No. N-07-01 / January 16.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2006. *Communication from the Commission to the European Council: Europe in the World – Some Practical Proposals for Greater Coherence, Effectiveness and Visibility*, Brussels, 8.6.2006 COM (2006) 278 final.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2001. *European Governance: A White Paper*, Brussels, 25.7.2001 COM (2001) 428 final.
- Council of the European Union, "Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union", Brussels, 30 April 2008.
- Haas, Ernst B. 1958. *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economical Forces 1950-1957*, London: Stevens & Sons Limited.
- Holland, Martin. 2002. *The European Union and the Third World*, Palgrave
- Hyde-Price, Adrian. 2004. "Interests, institutions and identities in the study of European foreign policy", in Tonra, Ben and Sen, Thomas Christian (eds), *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy*, Manchester University Press.
- Juris Classeur Europe Traité. 2006. *UNION EUROPÉENNE. Histoire de la construction européenne*, LexisNexis SA.
- Knodt, Michèle and Princen, Sebastiaan (eds). 2003. *Understanding the European Union's External Relations*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Kohler-Koch, Beate. 2005. "European governance and system integration", *European Governance Papers (EUROGOV)*, No. C-05-01 / March 14.
- Làidi, Zaki. 2008. "European Preferences and their Reception", in Làidi, Zaki (ed) *EU Foreign Policy in a Globalized World: Normative power and social preferences*, Routledge/GARNET series: Europe in the World.
- Maddalon, Philippe. 2008. 'L'action Extérieure de l'Union Européenne', *Europe* no 7, July, dossier 11 (electronic version).
- Peterson, John. 2001. "The choice for EU theorists: Establishing a Common

- Framework for Analysis”, *European Journal of Political Research* 39: 289-318
- Peterson, J and Bomberg, E. 1999. *Decision-making in the European Union*, London and New York: Macmillan and St. Martin’s press.
- Polo, Jean-François. 2003. ‘La Naissance d’une Direction Audiovisuelle à la Commission : La Consécration de l’Exception Culturelle’, *Politique Européenne*, no 11, automne, pp. 31-56.
- Rhodes, R. 1996. “The New Governance: Governing without Government”, *Political Studies*, Vol. 44: 652-667
- Rosamond, Ben. 2000. *Theories of European Integration*, New York: Macmillan Press LTD.
- _____ (2007), “New Theories of European Integration”, in Cini, Michelle (ed), *European Union Politics*, 2nd edition, Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Michael. 2007. “European Union External Relations”, in Cini, Michelle (ed) (2007), *European Union Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edition
- Strøby-Jensen, Carsten. 2007. “Neo-functionalism”, in Cini, Michelle (ed), *European Union Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edition.
- Urwin, Derek. W. 2007. “The European Community: From 1945 to 1985”, in Cini, Michelle (ed), *European Union Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edition.
- Jacquot, Sophie and Woll, Cornelia. 2008. ‘Action Publique Européenne: Les Acteurs Stratégiques Face à l’Europe’, *Politique Européenne*, No. 25, printemps, p.161-192.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. 1996. “The New Governance: Governing Without Governance”, *Political Studies*, XLIV, 652-667.

Websites:

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/index_en.htm#1b

<http://www.connex-network.org/eurogov/>

http://ec.europa.eu/world/what/external_relations/index_en.htm

http://europa.eu/abc/12lessons/lesson_4/index_en.htm