

Gnatiuk Mykola Mykolaiovych
Golichenko Tetyana Samoilivna

Security Drivers of European integration: ideas and institutionalization

UDC 32.01:327.57:061.1EU
DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-9616.2025-1.26>

Gnatiuk Mykola Mykolaiovych
Doctor of Political Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy
Skovorody str., 2, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0002-9530-7229

Golichenko Tetyana Samoilivna
PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy
Skovorody str., 2, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: 0009-0008-9197-9192

European integration is a complex and multifaceted process that has been shaped throughout history by a variety of factors, with security have been playing a key role. Despite the successes of the European integration project, security challenges remain relevant, especially in the context of current geopolitical changes. The article examines the stages of formation of the security dimension of European integration, identifying key motives and mechanisms that contributed to the unification of European states and its institutionalization. The study is based on a historical analysis that allows us to trace the evolution of European integration through the prism of security motives. The author uses a wide range of sources, including the works of famous European thinkers, politicians and historians. The main findings of the study show that at least four main stages can be identified with deferent security properties: (1) early projects of European unity based on the ideas of political unification to avoid conflicts; (2) the era of nation-states, when the balance of power became the main mechanism for maintaining peace; (3) the period after the First World Wars, when the idea of European federalization gained new meaning; (4) and the stage of economic and political institutionalization as a security tool. After World War II, European integration gained a new impetus as European countries realized the need to create supranational institutions to prevent new conflicts. The creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was the first step in this direction, and the further expansion of integration structures consolidated the political and security character of the European project. The conclusions of the article emphasize that the security motives of European integration have always been of fundamental importance. The European Union, as a special mechanism for addressing security issues, continues to play a key role in maintaining peace and stability on the continent. Current geopolitical challenges demonstrate that security issues remain relevant and require further development of the EU's institutional mechanisms to effectively counter new threats.

Key words: security, European integration, European Union, integration policy, cooperation, sovereignty, theories of political science, collective security, political analysis.

Introduction. Attempts to achieve peace in Europe and to create an effective system of security are the key motive for launching the integration process in Europe. The idea of a European community whose members would not consider the possibility of war among themselves has always been the driving force behind European unification [10]. For a long time, when the echoes of large-scale interstate wars in Europe seemed to have been forgotten, the security motives of European integration seemed to have lost their significance and the EU became a victim of its own success in building the project of peace [5; 7].

With the accession of less developed countries to the EU, which primarily seek to modernize their own economies, security lost its meaning, initially also for Ukraine [1], and international politics in Europe was seen as «post-Westphalian». Europe became accustomed to peace, while the threat of war stimulates counteraction. If war becomes impossible, it may return [3; 14].

Objective. The aggression against Ukraine has once again made security the number one issue in Europe and demonstrated that the rules of interstate cooperation in Europe remain relevant, and so do the strategies for achieving security. This article is an attempt to examine security as a factor and motive that prompted European states to unite and establish supranational structures to support cooperation.

Methods. The research methodology is based on historical analysis, which allows to trace the evolution of European integration through the prism of security motives. The author uses a wide range of sources, including earlier project of European integration and the works of well-known European thinkers, politicians and historians, such as Lippgens W. [8; 9], Spinelli A. [13], Milward A. [11] among others. The research also incorporates an institutional approach to analyze the role of supranational structures in shaping the security order in Europe. The key data for this research was obtained in the Project run by the Jean Monnet Chair of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy with the support of the European Union (Jean Monnet actions, Erasmus+ program) and is available in the project's results repository.¹

Results. European integration projects dating back to the 14th century demonstrate the dominance of the security component, although it may not always be immediately apparent, particularly at the current stage of the European project's development. Several stages can be identified in the evolution of the security

¹ See: <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/project-result-content>



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

dimension of European integration, each emerging as a response to contemporary challenges and significantly contributing to joint efforts to address the security concerns facing European countries.

Different stages of Europe's historical development are characterized by different driving forces and motives for unification, as well as its political nature and scope.

(1) early projects of European unity: security and political unity:

The idea of «Europe» as a historical and cultural community, as well as a geographical construct that the EU claims to represent today, is a highly debated concept [14]. The understanding of this concept has been shaped by historical events and the competition of views among statesmen and thinkers. The projects of uniting Europe into a single political system, which have their roots in the formation of European civilization, reproduce these contradictions.

The first stage concerns the projects of European unity, which were driven by security considerations and concerned mainly the unification of European states within a single political system. Integration was seen as a useful tool to overcome internal contradictions of European countries and to satisfy their selfish interests by creating a political union or confederative association.

During the Middle Ages, Europe's feudal system shaped the distribution of political power, which was largely non-territorial. Political obligations were hierarchically structured, culminating in the authority of the Pope, and conflicts bore little resemblance to modern territorial wars. Within this system, faith was integral to the concept of European unity, and during the High Middle Ages, Europeans were further united by the idea of Crusades, which were perceived as more likely to succeed with a unified European effort.

(2) the era of the nation-state: security and balance of power:

The further strengthening of the nation-states and the spread of the ideas of individualism and republicanism in general contributed to pushing the idea of regional unity in Europe to the periphery of political thought. In the seventeenth century, when the European dynastic states were locked in perennial rounds of diplomatic crises and military conflicts, Duke Sully in his «Grand Design» for Europe recommended changing the territorial boundaries of states to equalize their power and thus create conditions for maintaining peaceful relations between them [12]. Similar projects to counteract territorial disputes and form institutions to maintain continental peace shaped the discussion of European political unification in the following centuries.

The flourishing of the balance of power system that emerged in Europe hardly contributed to the realization of such plans. The triumph of populism as the basis of politics, which emerged after the French Revolution

of 1789, only encouraged the strengthening of territorial nationalism in Europe. The nation-state and the principle of national self-determination finally took hold and shaped the political process for centuries to come. The nation-state seemed to be an effective solution to the urgent tasks of political modernization and economic development, but as the events of the twentieth century showed, security implications could overshadow such progress.

(3) security and the «European question» in world politics:

Even the aftermath of the First World War, which was the result of the pursuit of national greatness, could not change the interstate principles of organizing political life. The efforts the Pan-European movement succeeded in actualizing the «federalist solution» to the dangerous division of Europe into autarkic and belligerent nation-states. Its founder Richard von Coudenhove-Kalergi pointed out that the preservation of such a division would inevitably lead to another war in Europe and proposed a solution in the form of the United States of Europe [2].

The development of Europe in the postwar period demonstrated that neither the elites nor the public were ready to accept the idea of political reorganization in Europe to achieve peace. Despite the fact that the pan-European movement influenced political initiatives to conclude an agreement on the renunciation of war (1928, the Kellogg-Briand Pact) and the development of the project of the European Federal Union (1930), a wave of nationalism swept across Europe and once again led to war.

The Second World War had an extraordinary impact on rethinking the ways of achieving security in Europe. Its aftermath questioned the acceptance of anarchy as a natural state of international relations, which stimulated the search for other solutions to security problems. According to W. Lipgens, the actual self-destruction of European states in 1939-1945 was a turning point in modern European history [8]. The issue of European integration ceased to be a secondary issue and became an integrating theme for solving political and security problems, and it remains so to this day.

The prestige of the Resistance movements, which, among other things, advocated the idea of forming a new European society and not returning to pre-war conditions [9, p. 5], raised federalist ideas on the European political agenda. The political platform of the resistance movements, as noted by A. Spinelli, clearly demonstrated an awareness of the danger of nationalist victories and national fragmentation in Europe [13].

The idea of a European federation was clearly prominent in the political manifestos of this period, but this does not mean that a consensus was reached on a common project of peace building. In postwar Europe, two supranational approaches to the prospects for

further integration were clearly outlined, both of which viewed the European nation-state as the key problem in achieving peace. The alternative functional approach viewed the idea of a European federation as a transfer of the nation-state problem to a higher level. According to the representatives of this direction, fundamental changes in international politics and the elimination of the link between power and territory, which is formed by a national sovereign state, are needed. Only strengthening mutually beneficial international cooperation with the participation of international agencies can form the basis for a «positive peace.»

(4) security through integration and the first integration structures:

The radical change in international politics in Europe proposed by the federalists and functionalists looked more like an idea for discussion than a plan for political change. However, it is difficult to deny the thesis that such a discussion laid the foundation for a change in the course of European politics and the guidelines for the development of the modern European integration project. National states remained the dominant political actors, so the idea of integration was seen as improving their interaction, forming a complex network of agreements, institutions, and norms that impose restrictions and transform their behavior. Alan Millward points out that this is the trajectory of European states in the process of economic recovery that eventually led to the formation of the European Communities [11].

The changing geopolitical landscape in Europe significantly influenced the initiation of the integration process. The dominance of external powers, the United States and the USSR, and the new postwar order they established, considerably narrowed Europe's options for the future. This new international context transformed traditional relations between major European powers, leading to the consolidation of Western Europe within the American sphere of influence. This, in turn, fostered increased political support for closer regional cooperation, although, as David Ellwood argues, without a clear consensus on its ultimate form. [4].

The creation of the first integrative entity, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), while significant, did not represent a radical transformation of the European political system in the way that earlier proposals for reducing or eliminating nation-states in Europe had envisioned. This initial project of regional integration focused on the specific issue of Franco-German reconciliation, aiming to prevent a recurrence of the security dilemma between the two countries. However, the concept of sectoral integration was revolutionary in the context of traditional interstate relations, as it involved establishing a supranational body to control a strategic resource.

With the establishment of two additional communities, the European Economic Community

(EEC) and Euratom, and the political failure of the third, the European Defence Community, the trajectory of European integration became clearly defined in the 1950s. The existing institutions held powers only in areas of limited political scope, leaving broader political issues to sovereign states. However, this regional formation also possessed a political and security dimension, and was not exclusively economic. Its political character was reinforced by continuous efforts to deepen and broaden the integration process, including the eventual incorporation of foreign and security policy issues.

Integration initiatives, both those that have been implemented and those that have been rejected, help to define more clearly the nature of the European integration project. For example, the failure to create a European army within the European Defense Community and the assignment of defense functions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the receipt of US security guarantees have determined the trajectory of the EU's development as a special non-military force and today define its model for achieving security [6].

The emergence of an intergovernmental cooperation mechanism alongside the existing integration communities transformed the European Union into a political union. Beginning in the 1970s, EEC member states established a mechanism for coordinating their foreign policy, the European Political Cooperation, which later evolved into the Common Foreign and Security Policy. This was further augmented by the Common Security and Defence Policy under the Lisbon Treaty of 2007. The political and security motivations for integration, the historical context, the unavoidable acquisition of a foreign policy role, and its unique internal political structure make the European Union a distinctive mechanism for addressing security issues.

Conclusions. The stages of European integration outlined above reveal a specific vision of security challenges and the mechanisms developed to address them. Despite the distinct characteristics of each stage, political and security motives have consistently been paramount. The European communities that emerged after the war were never solely focused on trade or economic growth. Security motives have always been fundamental to European integration and continue to shape European policy, whether in the context of creating an effective European security order or establishing a unified «European voice» on the international stage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Anghel V., Džankić J. Wartime EU: consequences of the Russia – Ukraine war on the enlargement process. *Journal of European Integration*. 2023. № 3 (45). C. 487–501.

2. Coudenhove-Kalergi, R. Pan-Europe. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926. 215 p.
3. Della Sala V. Ontological security, crisis and political myth: the Ukraine war and the European Union. Journal of European Integration. 2023. № 3 (45). C. 361–375.
4. Ellwood D. Rebuilding Europe: Western Europe, America and Postwar Reconstruction. Harlow: Routledge, 1992. 286 p.
5. Gnatiuk M. European Peace Project: Federalist Perspective. National Interest Vol. 2, No.8 May – July 2022. 12–27.
6. Gnatiuk M. Integration and the European Security Solution: Overcoming the Security Dilemma. Ukrainian Policymaker, Volume 10, 2022. 18–26.
7. Koppa M. The evolution of the Common Defence and Security Policy: critical junctures and the quest for EU strategic autonomy. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022. 250 p.
8. Lipgens W. A History of European Integration, 1945–1947. London: Oxford University Press, 1982. P. 44–52.
9. Lipgens W. European Federation in the Political Thought of Resistance Movements during World War II. Central European History. 1968. Vol. 1, No. 1 P. 5–19.
10. Maurer H., Raube K., Whitman R. G. “Zeitenwende” as coming of age? EU foreign & security policy through war & peace. European Security. 2024. № 3 (33). C. 345–363.
11. Milward A. The reconstruction of western Europe, 1945–51. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984. 527 p.
12. Ogg D. Sully's Grand Design of Henry IV: From the Memoirs of Maximilien de Béthune Duc de Sully (1559–1641). Forgotten Books, 2018. 64 p.
13. Spinelli A. European Union in the Resistance. Government and Opposition. 1967. Vol. 2. P. 321–329.
14. Zwolski K. Researching European security integration. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2024. 233 p.

REFERENCES:

1. Anghel, V., & Džankić, J. (2023). Wartime EU: consequences of the Russia – Ukraine war on the enlargement process. Journal of European Integration, 45(3), 487–501.
2. Coudenhove-Kalergi, R. (1926). Pan-Europe. Alfred A. Knopf.
3. Della Sala, V. (2023). Ontological security, crisis and political myth: the Ukraine war and the European Union. Journal of European Integration, 45(3), 361–375.
4. Ellwood, D. (1992). Rebuilding Europe: Western Europe, America and Postwar Reconstruction. Routledge.
5. Gnatiuk, M. (2022). European Peace Project: Federalist Perspective. National Interest, 2(8), 12–27.
6. Gnatiuk, M. (2022). Integration and the European Security Solution: Overcoming the Security Dilemma. Ukrainian Policymaker, 10, 18–26.
7. Koppa, M. (2022). The evolution of the Common Defence and Security Policy: critical junctures and the quest for EU strategic autonomy. Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Lipgens, W. (1982). A History of European Integration, 1945–1947. Oxford University Press, pp. 44–52.
9. Lipgens, W. (1968). European Federation in the Political Thought of Resistance Movements during World War II. Central European History, 1(1), 5–19.
10. Maurer, H., Raube, K., & Whitman, R. G. (2024). “Zeitenwende” as coming of age? EU foreign & security policy through war & peace. European Security, 33(3), 345–363.
11. Milward, A. (1984). The reconstruction of western Europe, 1945–51. University of California Press.
12. Ogg, D. (2018). Sully's Grand Design of Henry IV: From the Memoirs of Maximilien de Béthune Duc de Sully (1559–1641). Forgotten Books.
13. Spinelli, A. (1967). European Union in the Resistance. Government and Opposition, 2, 321–329.
14. Zwolski, K. (2024). Researching European security integration. Palgrave Macmillan.

Безпекові фактори європейської інтеграції: проєкти та інституціоналізація

Гнатюк Микола Миколайович
доктор політичних наук,
доцент кафедри політології
Національного університету «Києво-
Могилянська академія»
вул. Сковороди, 2, Київ, Україна
ORCID: 0000-0002-9530-7229

Голіченко Тетяна Самойлівна
кандидат філософських наук,
доцент кафедри політології
Національного університету «Києво-
Могилянська академія»
вул. Сковороди, 2, Київ, Україна
ORCID: 0009-0008-9197-9192

Європейська інтеграція є складним та багатограним процесом, який протягом історії формувалася під впливом різноманітних факторів, серед яких безпека відігравала одну із ключових ролей. Незважаючи на успіхи європейського інтеграційного проєкту, безпекові виклики залишаються актуальними, особливо в умовах сучасних геополітичних змін. У статті розглянуто етапи формування безпекового виміру європейської інтеграції, визначено ключові мотиви та механізми, які сприяли об'єднанню європейських держав, а також інституціоналізацію. Дослідження базується на історичному аналізі, який дозволяє простежити еволюцію європейської інтеграції через призму безпекових мотивів. Автор використовує широкий спектр джерел, включаючи праці відомих європейських мислителів, політичних діячів та істориків. Основні результати дослідження показують, що безпекові мотиви були одними із ключових у процесі європейської інтеграції, хоча їх значення змінювалося в залежності від історичного контексту. Автор виділяє чотири основні етапи розвитку безпекового виміру європейської інтеграції: (1) ранні проєкти європейської єдності, засновані на ідеях політичного об'єднання для уникнення конфліктів; (2) епоха національних держав, коли баланс сил став основним механізмом підтримання миру; (3) період після Першої світової війни, коли ідея федералізації Європи набула нового значення та (4) етап економічної та політичної інституціоналізації як інструмент забезпечення безпеки. Після Другої світової війни європейська інтеграція набула нового імпульсу, оскільки країни Європи усвідомили необхідність створення наднаціональних інституцій для запобігання новим конфліктам. Створення Європейської спільноти вугілля

та сталі (ЄСВС) стало першим кроком у цьому напрямку, а подальше розширення інтеграційних структур закріпило політичний та безпековий характер європейського проекту. Висновки статті підкреслюють, що безпекові мотиви європейської інтеграції завжди мали фундаментальне значення. Європейський Союз, як особливий механізм вирішення безпекових питань, продовжує відігравати ключову роль у підтриманні миру та стабільності на континенті. Однак сучасні виклики, зокрема загострення геополітичного протистояння, демонструють, що безпекові питання залишаються актуальними і вимагають подальшого розвитку інституційних механізмів ЄС для ефективного протидіяння новим загрозам.

Ключові слова: безпека, європейська інтеграція, Європейський Союз, політика інтеграції, співпраця, суверенітет, теорії політичної науки, колективна безпека, політологічний аналіз.