

# The Notion of the European Superpower Analyzed Through the International Relations Theories of Realism and Liberalism



**AALBORG UNIVERSITY**  
DENMARK

Nicolai Fogth Gjøde Nielsen

Aalborg University, Denmark

Thesis for the degree of Master of Science (MSc) in *International Relations, European Studies*

10th semester

Spring 2018

## Abstract

This thesis will examine the notion of Europe as a superpower, based on Andrew Moravcsik's argument in his paper *Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World*. In the article he puts forth his idea of Europe as a superpower based on five points, which are (1) that Europe is the world's second military power, (2) Europe is the world's preeminent civilian superpower as it is a spreading force of democratic values and a stabilizer of economies, (3) Europe is one of the world leaders when it comes to giving foreign aid, as the European Union member states together comprise the largest donor of foreign aid at 50 per cent of the world's total, (4) Europe is a rising global power with a growing share influence in the world, and (5) decentralized institutions are sometimes an advantage for the European Union, as they can be more flexible and effective than were they completely centralized. The theories applied in this thesis will primarily consist of John J. Mearsheimer's offensive realism, which has an emphasis on great powers, as their actions have a greater potential impact in conflicts and in international relations altogether. Moravcsik's core assumptions of a liberal international relations theory will also be incorporated in this thesis, however not necessarily applied in the same capacity realism will.

The analysis of this thesis will consist of an examination of two of the points Moravcsik outlines in his paper, which are firstly the argument of Europe as a military superpower, and secondly the argument of Europe as a civilian superpower. The first part of the analysis of Europe as a military superpower will consist of an examination of the total size of the European manpower, and to some extent, the potential firepower available in terms of, for example, tanks. Another part of the examination of the military superpower argument will be on the nuclear capabilities and its relevance as a factor for superpower status. Intercontinental power projection will also be examined, as well as the factor of the lack of European military integration. The analysis of Europe as a civilian superpower argument, will consist of an examination of the developments of the 2004 and 2007 European Union accession countries, in terms of their GDP and democratic conditions. This will be done by presenting the GDP development of the 2004 EU enlargement countries Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and the 2007 enlargement countries of Romania and Bulgaria, from the year of their accession into the European Union up until 2018. An examination of the developments of the democratic conditions of the ten countries will also be done to determine if any changes have occurred.

# Table of contents

Abstract .....	1
Introduction and problem formulation .....	3
Methodology.....	5
Literature review .....	5
Considerations .....	6
Theory .....	7
Liberalism.....	7
Realism.....	9
Analysis .....	14
Europe as a military superpower .....	15
Armed personnel of Europe.....	16
Nuclear capabilities .....	18
European intercontinental power projection.....	20
European military integration.....	21
Europe as a civilian superpower .....	22
Democratic tendencies after European Union accession.....	26
Conclusion.....	31
Discussion and Further Research .....	34
European aid.....	34
Euroscepticism .....	35
Reference list.....	40

## Introduction and problem formulation

In this thesis the notion of Europe as a superpower will be examined. The focal point will be Andrew Moravcsik's text *Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World*, featured in the book *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance*.<sup>1</sup> In this text, Moravcsik makes the argument that Europe is the world's second superpower, sharing, and even surpassing in certain cases, the rank of superpower with the United States. He bases this argument on five points, which are (1) Europe as the world's second military power, (2) Europe as the world's preeminent civilian superpower, (3) Europe in terms of foreign aid, (4) Europe as a rising global power with a greater share of influence, and (5) the advantages of the decentralized institutions of the European Union. Moravcsik also argues that Europe, as the US, has the ability to project soft power and assert influence throughout the world, as well as being the only other power besides the US to have intercontinental military power.<sup>2</sup>

However, regarding the first argument, Moravcsik writes of the European military as a single entity belonging to *Europe*, consisting of one monolithic military power. Of the military matters he mentions, he furthermore writes of them as if being under a collective leadership.<sup>3</sup> Yet, each member state of the European Union has its own national army. There is no single army for all EU member states to belong to, as there is for example in terms of economy, with the European Single Market that removes the internal borders and allows for free flow of goods and services, effectively making it a single entity in terms of economy and the free flow of goods.<sup>4</sup> Thus, as the military part of Europe seems to be much less integrated than other economic and political areas, this issue should be subject to further scrutiny and undergo further examination, in order to determine whether one can view the issue of European military power as a superpower factor. Furthermore, as he writes from a liberal perspective (as in seen within the theoretical field of international relations), he might disproportionally focus on, and not exhaustively address, certain issues that would not be considered

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance*. (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), pp. 151-174.

<sup>2</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), p. 152.

<sup>3</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), pp. 157-158.

<sup>4</sup> "The European Single Market," *European Commission*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market_en).

a superpower factor in other theories of international relations. The notion of Europe as a military superpower might therefore look different when put through other theories of international relations.

In his second argument, concerning Europe as a civilian superpower, he writes of the advantages and the progress created for the nations entering the European Union, stating that the possibility of neighboring countries attaining EU accession had positive effects “well beyond the twelve members that have joined recently”,<sup>5</sup> referring to the 2004 and 2007 enlargements of the European Union. However, the effects EU accession had in the new member countries in 2010 when Moravcsik wrote were still not fully discernible. In other words, when Moravcsik wrote in 2010 about the benefits EU accession had had on the Eastern accession countries, the effects were not fully substantial to definitively judge.<sup>6</sup> Thus, part of the aim of this thesis will be to examine if the European Union truly is a spreading force of democratic values and a stabilizer of economies, as argued by Moravcsik.<sup>7</sup> This will be done by looking into the democratic and economic conditions of the countries that joined the European Union following the Eastern enlargement of the EU in 2004 and 2007, to see whether these conditions improved, deteriorated, or remained at the same level after the accession.

This thesis therefore aims to examine two of the points Moravcsik puts forth, with the following being the problem formulation:

How does the military power of Europe look and when viewed through different theories of international relations, and what have the effects been in terms of economic and democratic development in the 2004 and 2007 European Union enlargement countries following their accession into the EU?

---

<sup>5</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), p. 159.

<sup>6</sup> Elitsa Vucheva, "EU still 'digesting' 2004 enlargement five years on," *EUobserver*, 1. May 2009, last accessed: 13-05-2018, <https://euobserver.com/enlargement/28049>.

<sup>7</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), p. 159.

# Methodology

## Literature review

Since military capabilities will be analyzed in this thesis, applying a theory that has a strong focus on those factors will be appropriate. As a different theory than Andrew Moravcsik's liberalism, John J. Mearsheimer's offensive realism has been chosen due to numerous considerations. The primary reason for using Mearsheimer's offensive realism is grounded in the extensive writing he has done in relations to the factor of military capabilities of nation states in the balance of power. Mearsheimer puts additional emphasis on the nuclear capabilities of nation states and great powers, something which is missing from other variants of realist theories. A further reason for choosing Mearsheimer is that he has previously written about the deteriorating relations between the West and Russia and a possible impending conflict in his Foreign Affairs article *Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault*.<sup>8</sup> In the article Mearsheimer argues that an increasingly encroaching European Union and NATO near the Russian border, along with two different foreign policy perceptions based on two contrasting ideological foundations, are causing misjudgements, which results in political actions that only further deteriorates the faltering relationship. Mearsheimer has also weighted in on why Europe remains peaceful in his lecture on the same subject.<sup>9</sup> Thus, already viewing the West as a single entity, as Moravcsik also does, could possibly help make better comparisons, and in extension a better analysis.

Freedom House has been chosen as the source for evaluating the democratic conditions of all nation states worldwide. The choice to use Freedom House has been done due to the organization being widely used by academics as a source of data, as for example by Francis Fukuyama in his book *The End of History and the Last Man* when examining the democratic conditions and developments.<sup>10</sup>

Non-academic sources have been used sparingly, yet have been used as in certain cases, such as articles, which can sometimes shed light on certain areas.

---

<sup>8</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, "Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault," Foreign Affairs, last accessed: 20-05-2018, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russia-fsu/2014-08-18/why-ukraine-crisis-west-s-fault>.

<sup>9</sup> "ECPR KEYNOTE LECTURE: why is europe peaceful today?," University of Chicago, John J. Mearsheimer, last accessed: 20-05-2018, <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0055.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> Francis Fukuyama, *the End of History and the Last Man*, (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2012).

## Considerations

Both theories used in this thesis have certain weaknesses in terms of explanatory power. Yet, both theories, if used in combination with another similar theory within its field, could result in a deeper understanding of a certain issue. For example, if Mearsheimer's offensive realism (which has a strong focus on military capabilities, great powers and their influence on the balance of power<sup>11</sup>) had been used in combination with a different variant of a realist theory, such as one with a focus on economic factors or domestic political factors, it could potentially give better insights into such areas. However, this has not been done, due to the first part of this thesis having its focus on military capabilities and those aspects as superpower factors, and in order to shed a possible different light on the notion of Europe as a superpower by having a different approach to the concept. The intended effect of using a different theory than Moravcsik's own rendition of a liberal theory of international relations in the analysis is neither merely to disprove his notion of Europe as a superpower nor to promote or praise Mearsheimer's theory of offensive realism. Instead, by using two opposing theories with very different focal points, a hopeful effect will be to shed light on weaknesses or strengths in Moravcsik's notion of Europe as a superpower, and possibly to narrow the gap of knowledge between them. Furthermore, the choice not to include more theories within the same variants of international relations theories (for example, coupling Mearsheimer's offensive realism with Kenneth Waltz's defensive realism) has been done in order to limit the incorporation of excessive and redundant theoretical material.

---

<sup>11</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 5.

# Theory

In the first part of this section the international relations theory of liberalism will be outlined, with a focus on Moravcsik's version of a liberal theory. In the second part of this section, the theory of realism will be presented, with an in-depth look into Mearsheimer's offensive realism.

## Liberalism

Liberalism has certain core assumptions tied to it, such as the belief of war being an outdated way of conducting international relations, and that international and domestic institutions play a vital role as world actors (whereas realism only sees nation states as the primary actors). Furthermore, liberalism views undemocratic nation states as the cause of the "corruption" of the state of international relations, which would otherwise be peaceful.<sup>12</sup> However, as Moravcsik points out, several international relations scholars have argued that liberalism (at least in an international relations context) is more an approach than an actual theory. Moravcsik cites Robert Keohane, Michael Doyle, and Mark Zacher and Richard Matthew as having said that there is a lack of core real world assumptions (such as Marxism's class struggle, or realism's central belief of the nation state being the central actor),<sup>13</sup> instead of the more idealistically influenced tenets usually ascribed to liberalism, such as the benign influence of the values of justice, liberty, and peace (however this does not mean that liberalism believes there to be a utopian style of harmony between societal actors, merely due to their shared interests<sup>14</sup>). He furthermore argues that liberalism, in its current theoretical form, "provides a general theory of IR [international relations] linking apparently unrelated areas of inquiry".<sup>15</sup>

Moravcsik, as a proponent of liberalism as a theory of international relations, therefore attempts to outline the following core principles of liberalism, so as to make the present form of essentially ungraspable values of liberalism a tenable theory of international relations. He outlines three *core assumptions* of a liberal theory of international relations, and starts with stating that the fundamental basis of liberalism is that "the relationship between states and the surrounding domestic and

---

<sup>12</sup> John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014): pp. 115-120.

<sup>13</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 515.

<sup>14</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 517.

<sup>15</sup> John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014): pp. 114-115.



transnational society in which they are embedded critically shapes state behavior by influencing the social purposes underlying state preferences”.<sup>16</sup> The first core assumption is *The Primacy of Societal Actors*. Moravcsik explains that it is the societal actors (i.e. individual and societal groups) whose demands and wishes influence and thus decides the political outcome in a nation state. These societal actors act in their own interest, which is pursuing material wealth, and therefore is said to act rationally in order to achieve this aim. As Moravcsik writes “scarcity and differentiation introduce an inevitable measure of competition”,<sup>17</sup> which creates incentives to both pursue a higher level of material wealth and potentially to exploit others for their material wealth. Thus, in a competitive environment societal actors act according to their own self-interest, which may lead towards “corporation or conflict”.<sup>18</sup> Sources of conflict between societal groups are caused by either one or more of three factors, which are “divergent fundamental beliefs, conflict over scarce material goods, and inequalities in political power”.<sup>19</sup>

The second core assumption is that nation states are not actors, as they are merely representing the societal groups. Thus, as opposed to the realist viewpoint, nation states are not primary actors in international relations, and are thereby not influenced by geographic factors or by the notion of its position in the balance of power. Representation of all societal groups at a state level, however, is not a given in all nation states, as authoritarian regimes may (or almost certainly will) show prejudice towards certain groups with deviating interests or significance.<sup>20</sup>

The third core assumption Moravcsik calls *Interdependence and the International System*. He argues that the behavior of nation states is reflected by “an underlying stake in the matter at hand, in order to provoke conflict, propose cooperation, or take other significant foreign policy action.”<sup>21</sup> Nation states do not act in an international system which is by nature malign (as is argued in realism), while it likewise is not a completely benign environment nation states operate in. Thus, a desired effect or social group preference affects the foreign (and domestic) policy being conducted by the

---

<sup>16</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 516.

<sup>17</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 517.

<sup>18</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 515.

<sup>19</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 517.

<sup>20</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 518.

<sup>21</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 519.

nation state. However, just as influential on the foreign policy conducts of a nation state are the preferences of other nation states. State preferences of foreign policy is therefore connected, as preferences from other nation states are influential, or in other words, there is interdependence between the behavior of a nation state and other nation states.<sup>22</sup>

## Realism

The opposing international relations theory that has been chosen in this thesis is realism. Realism differs from liberalism, and particularly Moravcsik's version of liberalism, in that unlike liberalism realism considers relations between nation states to be the sole determinant of international relations. Whereas liberalism might see various channels between state and non-state actors to be of equal importance (with non-state channels often being of more importance, as seen in the liberal theory section above), the focal point in realism and all its variants is state actors.

The Greek historian Thucydides in 431 BC wrote *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, wherein he chronologically covers the events of the war between Athens and Sparta (or Attica and Lacedaemon, respectively) and their allied Greek city-states. Although Thucydides' work was merely intended as to write down historic events, it nonetheless became to be seen as is viewed as the earliest account of political realism in international relations. This is due to *The Melian Dialogue*, which was the negotiations that took place between the Athenians and the much less powerful island city-state of Melos, who had chosen to remain neutral during the war between Athens and Sparta. It is also in this dialogue where the phrase "[the] question of justice only enters where there is equal power to enforce it, and that the powerful exact what they can, and the weak grant what they must"<sup>23</sup> originated, which emphasizes the principle in political realism that world order is anarchic, with no overarching authority to protect or guarantee the survival of the weaker states. In the *Melian Dialogue* Athens wanted Melos to submit to them, saying "we will now endeavour to show that we have come in the interests of our empire, and that in what we are about to say we are only seeking the preservation of your city. For we want to make you ours with the least trouble to ourselves, and it is for the interests of us both that you should not be destroyed".<sup>24</sup> The response from the Melians was to ask why it

---

<sup>22</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4, (Cambridge University Press, 2003) pp. 520-521.

<sup>23</sup> "Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War," *Perseus Project*, last accessed: 14-03-2018, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0105%3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D89>

<sup>24</sup> "Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War," *Perseus Project*, last accessed: 14-03-2018, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0105%3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D91>

would be in their interest to become the slaves of Athens,<sup>25</sup> to which the Athenians replied that that would be better in order to “avert the worst”.<sup>26</sup> When the Melians claimed that Sparta would come to their aid if Athens attacked,<sup>27</sup> the Athenians responded that though the Lacedaemonians was their enemies, they still acted rationally and would therefore not endanger themselves for the sake of other peoples.<sup>28</sup> The ultimatum thereby created an appeal to responding rationally to Athens’ power in order to ensure self-preservation, without taking ethics, pride, or any other factors, such as morality, into account.

Machiavelli in *The Prince* writes about how statesmen should act in a chaotic political environment, (which characterized the city states of fifteenth century Italy) and in an environment void of ethical and moral behavior. He also emphasizes the importance of possessing strong armed forces for a state’s survival, as he writes that “[the] chief foundations of all states, new as well as old or composite, are good laws and good arms; and as there cannot be good laws where the state is not well armed, it follows that where they are well armed they have good laws”.<sup>29</sup> Contemporary political realism, however, began with after the Second World War with Hans J. Morgenthau, who in 1948 wrote the book *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, in which he outlines six principles that represents the international relations theory of realism.<sup>30</sup> In a more modern context, realists believe certain core tenets to be true, such as the anarchic structure of the world order, nation states as the primary or sole actor in international relations and self-help and survival as the primary aim of nation states, and the existence of a balance of power.<sup>31</sup>

The subset of realist theory known as structural realism differentiates from other forms of realism in that it is believed that the anarchic structure of the international relations system is responsible for how actors act. The two most prominent structural realists are John J. Mearsheimer who wrote *The*

---

<sup>25</sup> “Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War,” *Perseus Project*, last accessed: 14-03-2018, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0105%3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D92>

<sup>26</sup> “Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War,” *Perseus Project*, last accessed: 14-03-2018, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0105%3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D93>

<sup>27</sup> “Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War,” *Perseus Project*, last accessed: 14-03-2018, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0105%3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D104>

<sup>28</sup> “Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War,” *Perseus Project*, last accessed: 14-03-2018, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0105%3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D105>

<sup>29</sup> “The Prince: Chapter XII: How Many Kinds Of Soldiery There Are, And Concerning Mercenaries,” *Constitution Society*, last accessed: 08-12-2017, <http://www.constitution.org/mac/prince12.htm>.

<sup>30</sup> Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1948), pp. 4-15.

<sup>31</sup> John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014): pp. 100-104.

*Tragedy of Great Power Politics*,<sup>32</sup> and Kenneth N. Waltz who in his book *Theory of International Politics* wrote: “In any self-help system, units [here meaning nation states] worry about their survival, and the worry conditions their behavior”.<sup>33</sup> Contrary to Morgenthau, both Waltz and Mearsheimer believe that state interests are prioritized over ideology and that no universal moral principles exist. Human nature is therefore an irrelevant factor in structural realism, while Morgenthau attributes human nature as the determining factor of how nation states act, which is due to the human desire for owning more manifests itself in international relations and how nation states conduct foreign policy.<sup>34</sup> What differs between Mearsheimer’s and Waltz’s version of structural realism, is to what extent nation states attempt to pursue power or territorial gains. Waltz argues that the desire for territorial acquisitions stops when a nation state believe the balance of power to be equal between the competing actors. Conversely, Mearsheimer argues that all nation states end goal (beside mere survival of the nation state) is to become hegemon, and thus the desire for territorial acquisition does not vanish, even if both sides believe equilibrium is restored in the balance of power.<sup>35</sup>

John J. Mearsheimer’s offensive realism and Kenneth N. Waltz’s defensive realism shares the same assumption that it the anarchic structure (thus the name *structural realism* both theories are considered part of) that not only enables but necessitates the vying for power all nation states participate in. They are both theories of international relations that shares most beliefs yet differs on the subject of the end-goal of nation states. Both of their theories differ from other realist scholars as they see the structure as being responsible for conflicts, as stated above. While Mearsheimer argues that hegemony is the end-goal, Waltz argues that achieving an equilibrium among nation states in the balance of power will result in an end to the vying for power.<sup>36</sup> According to Mearsheimer there “are no status quo powers in the international system, save for the occasional hegemon that wants to maintain its dominating position over potential rivals. [...] and they [great powers] will use force to alter the balance of power if they think it can be done at a reasonable price.”<sup>37</sup>

The reasoning behind this argument of hegemony as all nation state’s end-goal is due to five bedrock assumptions, according to Mearsheimer. The first bedrock assumption is that the system in which nation states operate and international relations take place is anarchic. However, this does not

---

<sup>32</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014).

<sup>33</sup> Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, (Waveland Press Inc., 2010), p. 80.

<sup>34</sup> Hans J. Morgenthau *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1948), pp. 21-23.

<sup>35</sup> Hans J. Morgenthau *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1948), p. 22.

<sup>36</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), pp. 18-23.

<sup>37</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), pp. 2-3.

mean that the system is filled with chaos and conflict, but instead that there is no superior power to rule or have authority over all nation states in the international system.<sup>38</sup> The second bedrock assumption is that all great powers possess offensive capabilities, meaning that nation states they have the military capacity, in any form, to attack another great power.<sup>39</sup> The third assumption is that great powers and nation states can never be completely certain about the intentions of other great powers or nation states. This therefore creates the necessity of having capable armed forces to protect against other, as all nation states are, by default, seen as dubious. This also means that an alliance is not a never-ending certainty, and that complete reliance can never be presumed, nor that a rivalry is condemned to an endless struggle, should the balance of power present an opportunity for a shift in the assessment of a nation state's or great power's foreign relationship.<sup>40</sup> The fourth assumption is that survival is the primary goal of all nation states and great powers. The struggle for survival and its importance comes as a self-evident factor, in that should a nation state or great power lose all its territory, and thus lose its sovereignty, it will cease to exist.<sup>41</sup> The fifth and final bedrock assumption is that all nation states great powers are rational actors, and act in accordance to the balance of power. Thus, an actor in the international system will not wage a war if it is deemed to be too costly or will create a rival coalition of powers against it. Starting a war which does not result in acceptable territorial gains for the potential losses it will cost, or starting a war that creates a rival coalition that can potentially result in an end to the survival of the nation state or great power, will not be waged as it is deemed unacceptable in a cost–benefit analysis. Mearsheimer furthermore asserts that “states pay attention to the long term as well as the immediate consequences of their actions”.<sup>42</sup>

In offensive realism Mearsheimer puts a large amount of focus on great power, as they can have “the largest impact on what happens in international politics”.<sup>43</sup> Great powers, according to Mearsheimer, are nation states with certain strong attributes in terms of their military capabilities. Great powers, as well as all nation states, aspire to become the hegemon in the international system, or regional hegemon if world hegemon is unfeasible. Thus, great powers are strong nation states who are closer to achieving hegemony (be it world or regional) than a regular nation state is. Mearsheimer outlines the qualifications for a nation state to be considered a great power by stating that:

---

<sup>38</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 30.

<sup>39</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), pp. 30-31.

<sup>40</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 31.

<sup>41</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 31.

<sup>42</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 31.

<sup>43</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 5.

“[...] a state must have sufficient military assets to put up a serious fight in an all-out conventional war against the most powerful state in the world. [...] The candidate need not have the capability to defeat the leading state, but it must have some reasonable prospect of turning the conflict into a war of attrition that leaves the dominant state seriously weakened, even if that dominant state ultimately wins the war. In the nuclear age great powers must have a nuclear deterrent that can survive a nuclear strike against it, as well as formidable conventional forces. In the unlikely event that one state gained nuclear superiority over all of its rivals, it would be so powerful that it would be the only great power in the system. The balance of conventional forces would be largely irrelevant if a nuclear hegemon were to emerge.”<sup>44</sup>

Furthermore, nation states and great powers operate according to their position the balance of power in the international system, and thus whether the regime of a power changes to either a liberal democracy or an authoritarian regime is irrelevant.<sup>45</sup>

Measuring the military capabilities of nation states and great powers is done in three steps: first by assessing the quality and size of the opposition’s armed forces. This involves both calculating active military personnel, as well as the size of the reserve a nation state or great power has. However, Mearsheimer, points out that is difficult to measure this, as it is not only sheer size of an opposing army, but the quality and quantity of soldiers available, as well as quality and quantity of the weaponry.<sup>46</sup> The second step is to measure the air force both available to both sides in a potential conflict. As with the first step both the quality and the quantity of the air force must be evaluated, yet “each side’s 1) ground-based air defense systems, 2) reconnaissance capabilities, and 3) battle-management systems”<sup>47</sup> must also be considered a factor and therefore estimated. And finally, third, “the power-projection capability inherent in armies”,<sup>48</sup> must be considered, as well as the presence of large bodies of water, as they will limit the effectiveness of armed forces, since they are obstacles to the mobilization of troops, logistics, and the movement of supplies, and that it is more difficult to attack a hostile territory from an amphibious position than it is through land. Thus, in order for the effective power projection of nation states and great power across large bodies of water, strong naval

---

<sup>44</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 5.

<sup>45</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), pp. 5, 17-18.

<sup>46</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), pp. 133-134.

<sup>47</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 135.

<sup>48</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 135.

capabilities should be present. However, if there is no such obstacle as a large body of water between two rivaling powers, naval capabilities are deemed largely inconsequential in terms of total military capabilities and effectiveness<sup>49</sup>

## Analysis

The notion of Europe as a superpower did not originate with Moravcsik. Instead Paul Kennedy, in his book *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*,<sup>50</sup> wrote of the potential of the then European Economic Community (EEC) that it could become a superpower, yet still having to face serious issues to actualize the concept. The first edition of the book was made in 1987 where the issue of the EEC as a secondary “concentration of economic and military power”,<sup>51</sup> only surpassed by the US, yet having the fundamental problem of not being a single nation state, which would become a major drawback as he saw the twenty-first century filled with great power struggles. Kennedy therefore only saw Europe then (which of course excluded all the Eastern European states of the Communist bloc) as having the potential to become what he dubbed the “fifth world power”, with the others being the US, the Soviet Union, China, and Japan.<sup>52</sup> He compares the then European Economic Union with the customs union with the nineteenth century *Zollverein* of the German Federation, which encompassed the two biggest powers, Prussia and the Austrian Empire, as well as most of the German states. With the customs union of the German Federation continuously expanding from its inception and gaining power, the obstruction of the union to achieve great power status was with internal forces bent on halting further economic and political integration, which was by some seen as a disadvantage. What kept the emergence of a great power was internal forces that caused the customs union to remain too divided to be considered a single political entity or nation state.<sup>53</sup>

Kennedy saw a potential in a European superpower, in terms of population size and its comparably high education level, high per capita income (despite great different levels between the individual member states), being an economic powerhouse in that it is the largest trading bloc with very high

---

<sup>49</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 135.

<sup>50</sup> Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2017), pp. 608-630.

<sup>51</sup> Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2017), p. 608.

<sup>52</sup> Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2017), pp. 609-611.

<sup>53</sup> Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2017), pp. 609-611.

internal trade volumes between member states, and in terms of manufacturing output. There is also potential in terms of military power, as combined there are over one million personnel in the armed forces in the member states (as of the time of his writing), and Britain and France possessing at least some nuclear weapons. Yet, there are drawbacks when it comes to the armed forces, as for example, the different languages, difference in quality of training, weapons, and general equipment. However, Kennedy identifies bigger issues which lie in the lack of political integration and a growth which continues to further stagnate.<sup>54</sup> However, as Kennedy wrote of this subject in 1987, and thus with the lack of knowledge history eventually provides, the subsequent deepening of European political and economic integration by the formation of the European Union (EU) and the collapse of the USSR are of course major events, which would alter twenty-first century great power politics. Yet, Kennedy's assessment on China, Japan, the US and the European Union as being economic powerhouses can be argued to be largely correct, as well as the notion of a European superpower.

### Europe as a military superpower

In this part of the analysis factors that determine whether Europe truly can be considered a military superpower will be examined. This will be done by looking at the military capabilities of Europe and by making comparisons to the military capabilities of other great powers through the theory of offensive realism. In *The International Institute for Strategic Studies'* (or IISS) 2018 analysis of the world's military forces shows the top 15 highest defense budgets in 2017 to be overshadowed by the United States at 602.8 billion dollars.<sup>55</sup> The next four nation states follow-ups in terms of world's largest military budgets (of which all were non-EU and non-NATO members) were China with a defense budget of 150.5 billion dollars, Saudi Arabia at 76.7 billion dollars, Russia at 61.2 billion dollars, and India at 52.5.<sup>56</sup> In terms of European and EU member states only four made the top 15, with the United Kingdom at sixth place in terms of biggest budget (behind India) at 50.7 billion dollars, France at seventh with 48.6 billion dollars, Germany at ninth with 41.7 billion dollars, and Italy at thirteenth with 22.9 billion dollars.<sup>57</sup> The collected defense spending of Europe (consisting here of the European Union and Norway) shows an increase in spending beginning in 2014-15, with

---

<sup>54</sup> Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2017), pp. 610-612.

<sup>55</sup> "The Military Balance 2018," *The International Institute for Strategic Studies*, 14 February 2018, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://www.iiss.org/en/publications/military%20balance/issues/the-military-balance-2018-545f>.

<sup>56</sup> "The Military Balance 2018," *The International Institute for Strategic Studies*, 14 February 2018, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://www.iiss.org/en/publications/military%20balance/issues/the-military-balance-2018-545f>.

<sup>57</sup> "The Military Balance 2018," *The International Institute for Strategic Studies*, 14 February 2018, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://www.iiss.org/en/publications/military%20balance/issues/the-military-balance-2018-545f>.



a spike in 2017 as many Western European countries saw a growth in their GDPs.<sup>58</sup> Defense spending in Europe (meaning here the European Union including Norway and the United Kingdom) shows great variation in the per cent of GDP each nation state. Another factor for the increase in defense spending which began between 2014 and 2015, apart from an improved economic situation in Europe, was a renewed perceived threat from Russia following the Russian annexation of Crimea.<sup>59</sup> As of 2016, the nation states with the highest per cent of GDP being used on military spending were Estonia at 2.4 per cent, Greece at 2.1 per cent, the United Kingdom at 2.0 per cent, and France at 1.8, while the lowest spenders being Ireland at 0.3 per cent, Luxembourg at 0.4, and Austria and Malta both at 0.6 per cent.<sup>60</sup> In terms of amount currently being spend compared to 2016 there has been an increase among many EU member states and Norway, and several countries have announced that defense spending will increase further in the future, including the Unite Kingdom, Spain, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Sweden, Denmark who all plan to increase spending, and Poland who announced that by 2032 3.5 per cent of its GDP will be used on defense spending.<sup>61</sup>

## Armed personnel of Europe

In order to get an understanding of the military capabilities of Europe it is first necessary to calculate the total amount of armed personnel Europe possesses. Total armed forces personnel of EU member states as of 2018 (excluding Malta, Cyprus and Luxembourg) are: France with 205.000 active and 183.635 reserve personnel, the UK with 197.730 active and 81.500 reserve personnel, Germany with 178.641 active and 30.000 reserve personnel, Italy with 247.500 active and 20.000 reserve personnel, Spain with 124.100 active and 50.600 reserve personnel, Poland with 109.650 active and 75.000 reserve personnel, Greece with 161.500 active and 252.250 reserve personnel, The Czech Republic 22.000 active and 7.050 reserve personnel, Sweden with 21.875 active and 22.000 reserve personnel, Netherlands with 42.705 active and 10.500 reserve personnel, Romania with 72.750 active and 105.000 reserve personnel, Denmark with 20.800 active and 54.350 reserve personnel, Hungary

---

<sup>58</sup> "European defence spending: the new consensus," *The International Institute for Strategic Studies*, 15 February 2018, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://www.iiss.org/en/militarybalanceblog/blogsections/2018-f256/february-1c17/europe-defence-spending-0695>.

<sup>59</sup> "European defence spending: the new consensus," *The International Institute for Strategic Studies*, 15 February 2018, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://www.iiss.org/en/militarybalanceblog/blogsections/2018-f256/february-1c17/europe-defence-spending-0695>.

<sup>60</sup> "Government expenditure on defence," *Eurostat*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Government\\_expenditure\\_on\\_defence](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Government_expenditure_on_defence).

<sup>61</sup> "European defence spending: the new consensus," *The International Institute for Strategic Studies*, 15 February 2018, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://www.iiss.org/en/militarybalanceblog/blogsections/2018-f256/february-1c17/europe-defence-spending-0695>.

with 53.250 active and 54.000 reserve personnel, Finland with 29.350 active and 232.700 reserve personnel, Bulgaria with 33.150 active and 19.500 reserve personnel, Austria with 25.000 active and 145.000 reserve personnel, Slovakia with 14.675 active and 0 reserve personnel, Portugal with 35.000 active and 233.500 reserve personnel, Belgium with 32.300 active and 6.500 reserve personnel, Croatia with 18.525 active and 3.000 reserve personnel, Slovenia with 7.500 active and 8.000 reserve personnel, Lithuania with 16.015 active and 7.000 reserve personnel, Latvia with 9.155 active and 8.000 reserve personnel, Estonia with 5.000 active and 30.000 reserve personnel, Ireland with 7.300 active and 2.200 reserve personnel. This comes to a total of 1.690.171 active military personnel, a total reserve personnel of 1.651.785, and a total armed forces size of 3.341.956.<sup>62</sup>

This compared to other great powers with data from 2018 shows that the total amount of European armed forces personnel is not only on par with other of the biggest military powers of the world but in fact larger, for example, when compared to the US with a total of 2.083.100 military personal (1.281.900 active and 801.200 reserve personnel),<sup>63</sup> Russia with a total of 3.585.128 (1.012.628 active and 2.572.500 reserve personnel),<sup>64</sup> China with a total of 2.693.00 (2.183.000 active and 510.000 reserve personnel),<sup>65</sup> and India with a total of 4.207.250 (1.352.500 active and 2.844.750 reserve personnel).<sup>66</sup> It is therefore apparent that when it merely comes to the sheer number of military personnel possessed or that can be called upon by a collective Europe, it is apparent that it does meet the criteria to be considered a superpower. However, this factor of total number of military personnel alone does not justify calling Europe a superpower. Otherwise India would be the world's leading superpower and Russia the second. Several other factors influence the superpower classification, as for example the quality of equipment and manpower. Undertaking such an investigation into the type and quality of equipment and manpower of all European nation states would be a feat greater than this thesis allows. However, a comparison of bigger arms, such as tanks could show firepower capabilities, at least regarding ground forces. According to the UK's Ministry of Defense the total amount of tanks possessed by the member states of the European Union in 2016 were roughly 7.500

---

<sup>62</sup> "European Union Powers Ranked by Military Strength," *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://www.globalfirepower.com/countries-listing-european-union.asp>.

<sup>63</sup> "2018 United States Military Strength," *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=united-states-of-america](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=united-states-of-america).

<sup>64</sup> "2018 Russia Military Strength," *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=russia](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=russia).

<sup>65</sup> "2018 China Military Strength," *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=china](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=china).

<sup>66</sup> "2018 India Military Strength," *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=india](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=india).

tanks and 9.000 artillery devices,<sup>67</sup> yet by 2018 the number of tanks had risen to 7.700 tanks.<sup>68</sup> In 2018, the United States possessed almost 5.900 tanks,<sup>69</sup> China had roughly 7.700 tanks,<sup>70</sup> and Russia had 20.300 tanks.<sup>71</sup> Thus, the amount of tanks a collective Europe possess is the same as China, higher than the amount possessed by the United States, yet relatively much lower than Russia. The quality of the tanks would play a role in assessing the amount of firepower capabilities the tanks make up, yet again undertaking such an examination on such a scale of various types of equipment would be too lengthy and ultimately inconsequential to this thesis.

## Nuclear capabilities

A different major factor in assessing the superpower potential (and arguably an even more important factor than sheer manpower size or number of tanks possessed) is the factor of nuclear capabilities. As argued by Mearsheimer, the nuclear and deterrent capabilities of a nation state are necessary not only to become a great power, but also for survival.<sup>72</sup>

By 2018 the total amount of nuclear warheads possessed by all nation states are estimated to be 14.200 down from 70.300 in 1986.<sup>73</sup> The United States and Russia have the largest stockpile of nuclear warheads with 6.450 and 6.600 total warheads in inventory respectively with both having only 1600 warheads strategically deployed (strategically deployed means that warheads are “deployed on intercontinental missiles and at heavy bomber bases”<sup>74</sup>). Of the remaining seven nation states that have a nuclear stockpile, there are only 1150 warheads between them. China possesses a total stockpile of 270 warheads, yet none are strategically deployed, as all are in reserve. Of Israel’s 80 warheads, Pakistan with 130-140 warheads, India with 120-130 warheads, and North Korea with

---

<sup>67</sup> “Vehicle and aircraft holdings within the scope of the conventional armed forces in Europe Treaty 2016,” p. 11, *UK Ministry of Defense*,

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/502574/Vehicle\\_Aircraft\\_Holdings\\_within\\_the\\_scope\\_of\\_the\\_Conventional\\_Armed\\_Forces\\_in\\_Europe\\_Treaty\\_2016.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/502574/Vehicle_Aircraft_Holdings_within_the_scope_of_the_Conventional_Armed_Forces_in_Europe_Treaty_2016.pdf).

<sup>68</sup> “European Union Powers Ranked by Military Strength,” *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018,

<https://www.globalfirepower.com/countries-listing-european-union.asp>.

<sup>69</sup> “2018 United States Military Strength,” *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018,

[https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=united-states-of-america](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=united-states-of-america).

<sup>70</sup> “2018 China Military Strength,” *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018,

[https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=china](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=china).

<sup>71</sup> “2018 Russia Military Strength,” *GlobalFirepower*, last accessed: 23-05-2018,

[https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=russia](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=russia).

<sup>72</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 5.

<sup>73</sup> Hans M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, “Status of World Nuclear Forces,” last accessed: 23-05-2018,

<https://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/>.

<sup>74</sup> Hans M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, “Status of World Nuclear Forces,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/>.

10-20 warheads, of which none are known to be strategically deployed. Only France and the United Kingdom have warheads strategically deployed with France's 280 (out of a total stockpile of 300) and the UK's 120 (out of a total stockpile of 215).<sup>75</sup> However, nuclear warheads are present in more nation states, as NATO's nuclear sharing program designed for nuclear deterrence has US owned warheads placed and deployed in Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey.<sup>76</sup>

Despite Europe not having a nuclear arsenal anywhere near as sizeable as neighboring Russia, there is still a nuclear deterrent, as NATO's arsenal (and by extension the United States') protects. However, as this deterrent is not Europe's own one can argue that this factor does not play into the superpower factor. If Europe is dependent upon the nuclear arsenal of the US (as a collected European/NATO stockpile in Europe only makes up between 575-755<sup>77</sup>), and is thus dependent upon the nuclear "shield" of the US, one can claim that this factor works against Europe being a superpower. Furthermore, if one takes into account the location of the UK, France and NATO's warheads they are not in range of where a potential nuclear threat could come from, i.e. Russia. While NATO's closest deployed nuclear missiles eastwards are in either western Germany with the Büchel Air Base located west of Frankfurt am Main or in Turkey's Incirlik Air Base, which is located by the Mediterranean sea near the Turkish-Syrian border.<sup>78</sup> In contrast to this are the deployment of Russia's nuclear missiles, as Russia has Iskander missiles (also called SS-26 Stone) deployed in the Russian exclave of Kaliningrad, according to NATO,<sup>79</sup> which is neighboring and surrounded by EU member states with Lithuania bordering to the north and Poland to the South. The Iskander missiles have a range of 500 km, which means that the deployed nuclear missiles therefore are in proximity to several of the easternmost EU member state capitals.<sup>80</sup>

Despite Russia not having nuclear superiority in the world there is still a great disparity in the number of nuclear warheads possessed between Russia and Europe. And the strategic proximity of

---

<sup>75</sup> Hans M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, "Status of World Nuclear Forces," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/>.

<sup>76</sup> Hans M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, "US tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, 2011," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0096340210393931>.

<sup>77</sup> Hans M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, "Status of World Nuclear Forces," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <https://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/>.

<sup>78</sup> Hans M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, "US tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, 2011," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0096340210393931>.

<sup>79</sup> "NATO battalion deployed one year ago: reliable deterrence," President of the Republic of Lithuania, last accessed: 12-05-2018, <https://www.lrp.lt/en/press-centre/press-releases/nato-battalion-deployed-one-year-ago-reliable-deterrence/29327>.

<sup>80</sup> "Russia deploys Iskander nuclear-capable missiles to Kaliningrad: RIA," *Reuters*, last accessed: 12-05-2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-nato-missiles/russia-deploys-iskander-nuclear-capable-missiles-to-kaliningrad-ria-idUSKBN1FP21Y>.

the Russian missiles near European NATO and EU member states places Russia at an advantage over Europe. Currently the only real deterrent would be the retaliation from the United States' equally large nuclear arsenal should Russia launch an attack NATO's eastern European member countries, should a conflict and attack occur between the two sides. In the case of a Russian aggression against eastern EU countries, it was found in a series of a simulated conflict between Russia and NATO that Russia had armed forces powerful and in close proximity enough so that Russia could successfully reach Estonia's capital Tallinn and Latvia's capital Riga within only 60 hours, using conventional forces.<sup>81</sup> A European nuclear retaliation against such an aggression would be self-defeating, as Russia clearly has a major advantage when it comes to nuclear capabilities as discussed above.

### European intercontinental power projection

In terms of military superpower, intercontinental power projection is a great factor, at least according to Moravcsik, and currently the European Union is undertaking missions on other continents. An example of this is the "EUFOR Tchad" (EUFOR meaning that the undertaking is a ground mission, as opposed to EUNAVFOR which is naval or EUTM which is training missions), which was the largest mission headed by a multinational European force in Africa with 3.700 troops from 23 EU member states. Although half the deployed troops in Chad were from France many more EU member states were represented and conducted mission as a single armed force, as the mission was headed by a "operational commander" from Ireland, and had a "EU force commander" from France.<sup>82</sup> Apart from the "EUFOR Tchad" mission there are currently 6 missions with a European led military force involved and 10 civilian missions in Africa, Europe, and Asia.<sup>83</sup> While it does appear that the military of Europe is less integrated than in political or economic areas, the European Union is present at numerous crisis areas as a single military force, and not just one member state. Despite, for example, the mission in Chad was led by France in terms of number of troops deployed and military command, there were troops present from the majority of EU member states.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> "Reinforcing Deterrence on NATO's Eastern Flank," *Rand Corporation*, last accessed: 12-05-2018, [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR1253.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1253.html).

<sup>82</sup> "Mission description," *European External Action Service*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [https://eeas.europa.eu/archives/csdp/missions-and-operations/eufor-tchad-rca/mission-description/index\\_en.htm](https://eeas.europa.eu/archives/csdp/missions-and-operations/eufor-tchad-rca/mission-description/index_en.htm).

<sup>83</sup> "Military and civilian missions and operations," *European External Action Service*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en).

<sup>84</sup> "Military and civilian missions and operations," *European Union External Action Service*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en).

## European military integration

Therefore, at the same, while the armed forces of the European Union are not as integrated as for example the US, Russia, China or other major powers that have a single central led authority, steps are being which will lead to a further integrated armed forces of Europe. Deepening of European military integration is taking place most recently and significantly in the form of the 2017 EU agreement called the Permanent Structured Cooperation (abbreviated as PESCO), which consists of 30 projects for deeper defense cooperation among EU member states.<sup>85</sup> Despite a majority of member states signing the agreement, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Ireland, Malta, and Portugal chose not to, though some showed interest in joining later.<sup>86</sup> By November 2017 a “common notification” was signed by representative ministers from EU member states, which formally initiates PESCO. By March 2018 17 projects that includes “the establishment of a European Medical Command, an EU Training Mission Competence Centre, Cyber Rapid Response Teams and Mutual Assistance in Cyber Security, to Military Disaster Relief and an upgrade of Maritime Surveillance”.<sup>87</sup> Federica Mogherini said of the deepening of defense cooperation among EU member states that “[...] 25 Member States have committed to join forces on a regular basis, to do things together, spend together, invest together, buy together, act together. The possibilities of the Permanent Structured Cooperation are immense”.<sup>88</sup> While participation in PESCO has been voluntary for EU member states, accepting to participate in the cooperation binds members to adhere to certain commitments, such as common “defence investment, capability development and operational readiness”.<sup>89</sup> Still disunity in the European armed forces will not disappear as this new agreement will not create a single defense force nor make a shared EU defense budget, yet it is a major and successful first step towards a more integrated European military force.

---

<sup>85</sup> “Permanent Structured Cooperation on defence could be launched by end 2017,” *European Union External Action Service*, last accessed: 23-05-2018, [https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage\\_en/31832/Permanent%20Structured%20Cooperation%20on%20defence%20could%20be%20launched%20by%20end%202017](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage_en/31832/Permanent%20Structured%20Cooperation%20on%20defence%20could%20be%20launched%20by%20end%202017).

<sup>86</sup> “Defence cooperation: 23 member states sign joint notification on the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO),” *European Council*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/11/13/defence-cooperation-23-member-states-sign-joint-notification-on-pesco/>.

<sup>87</sup> “Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) - Factsheet,” *European Union External Action Service*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, [https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet_en).

<sup>88</sup> “Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) - Factsheet,” *European Union External Action Service*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, [https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet_en).

<sup>89</sup> “Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) - Factsheet,” *European Union External Action Service*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, [https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet_en).

Thus, to conclude, in terms of conventional forces if viewed as a single entity, Europe does possess the manpower size and capabilities that are on par with other great powers of the world, including the US, as the strongest military power and only other existing superpower with intercontinental power projection. However, in accordance with Mearsheimer, as conventional forces are considered useless as a factor in the balance of power where one side has nuclear supremacy,<sup>90</sup> one might consider (when viewed alone without the nuclear deterrence ensured from NATO or the US) that one major potential threat, where Europe would be deemed almost powerless, could come from Russia. As Russia does possess strong nuclear capabilities and strong conventional forces in the proximity of eastern EU and NATO member states, it can be argued that a serious security threat can be posed by Russia, and thus have consequences on the concept of Europe as a superpower.

Viewing the armed forces of European as a single entity can arguably begin to take shape as the recent Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) agreement meant a start to a more integrated European military entity. However, as of Moravcsik's writing in 2004 of the armed forces of Europe and its factor in the status of Europe as a superpower, no such agreement was proposed. Thus, writing back then, in terms of a European single armed forces might, in hindsight, be deemed premature, as the armed forces existing in Europe at the time operated on a member state to member state basis, and still to a large degree do. This is unlike other great powers, including the United State. The US, as a great power and the only other superpower other than the proposed European one, does not have armies based on each state. It isn't a single state that takes on military operation abroad, it is the collected military of the United States that is involved.

## Europe as a civilian superpower

This section of the analysis will contain a comparison of the economic status of 2004 and 2007 EU accession countries with their current economic status, as well as analyzing if there has been any improvement or deterioration in terms of freedom and democratic conditions. The aim of this part of the analysis is to reveal if the economic conditions of nation states truly do improve following accession into the European Union, as argued by Moravcsik, and possibly to get insights into whether the EU is a spreader of democratic principles.<sup>91</sup> This will be done by looking at GDP data from Worldbank, and at democratic statuses from Freedom House, the organization that monitors

---

<sup>90</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: Norton & Inc., 2014), p. 5.

<sup>91</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), p. 159.

democratic tendencies in nation states across the world. The countries which will be analyzed are the 2004 and 2007 accession countries that consisted, first in 2004, of (in alphabetical order) Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, the Slovak Republic, and Slovenia, and in 2007 of Bulgaria and Romania.

The following will contain the economic developments of the 2004 and 2007 EU enlargement countries, starting with the 2004 EU enlargement countries starting in the north with Estonia and going southwards, and ending with the 2007 enlargement countries. The reason the data of the countries will be given from north to south, rather than in alphabetical order, is done in order to gain possible insights into regional developments. The data will be given in US dollars and in GDP per capita. In terms of economic development, Estonia, when it joined the European Union in 2004, had a GDP of 12.059 billion USD and by 2016 a GDP of 23.338 billion USD.<sup>92</sup> Latvia in 2004 had a GDP of 14.373 billion USD and by 2016 had risen to 27.573 billion USD.<sup>93</sup> Lithuania's GDP in 2004 was 22.65 billion USD and in 2016 had risen to 42.773 billion USD.<sup>94</sup> Thus, all three Baltic countries have seen a steeper rise in GDP every year since joining the EU in 2004. The only exceptions to this was from 2008 to 2010 and from 2014 to 2015. In the first period Estonia's GDP fell from 24.194 billion USD in 2008, to 19.652 billion USD in 2009, to 19.491 billion USD in 2010), Latvia's GDP in the same period fell from a peak 35.596 billion USD in 2008, to 26.17 billion USD in 2009, to 23.757 billion USD in 2010, and Lithuania's GDP fell from 47.851 billion USD in 2008, to 26.225 billion USD in 2009, to 22.567 billion USD in 2010, and 22.567 billion USD in 2015.<sup>95</sup>

Poland, as the biggest economy and most populous country to join the European Union in the 2004 enlargement, in 2004 had a GDP of 255.102 billion USD and in 2016 one of 471.364 billion USD.<sup>96</sup> Poland saw a steep incline between 2008 and 2009 as the GDP in 2008 was at 533.816 billion USD while it was 440.347 billion USD in 2009. However, it did see a recovery in 2011 with a GDP of

---

<sup>92</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=EE-LV-LT>.

<sup>93</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=EE-LV-LT>.

<sup>94</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=EE-LV-LT>.

<sup>95</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=EE-LV-LT>.

<sup>96</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=PL-HU-CZ-SK-SI-CY&start=1990>.



528.725 billion USD, yet saw a fall again from 2014 to 2016 where the GDP fell from a peak 545.076 billion USD in 2014 down to 471.364 billion USD in 2016.<sup>97</sup>

The Czech Republic in 2004 had a GDP of 119.162 billion USD and in 2016 one of 195.305 billion USD. The Czech Republic had its GDP peak at 235.719 billion USD, yet saw a decline the following year with a 206.18 billion USD GDP in 2009. The only recovery year for the Czech Republic was in 2011, but the following years have only seen a decline in GDP, except in 2016 where a small increase was seen from the previous 186.83 billion USD in 2015.<sup>98</sup> The Slovak Republic in 2004 had a GDP of 57.241 billion USD and in 2016 one of 89.769. The Slovak Republic in 2008 had a GDP of 100.325, which only fell slightly the next two years to largely hover with little incline until its peak in 2014 with 100.948 billion USD, only to fall in 2015 and 2016.<sup>99</sup>

Hungary as the second biggest economy after Poland, in 2004 had a GDP of 104.067 billion USD, and in 2016 one of 125.817. Hungary likewise saw a decline after 2008 with the GDP dropping from a peak 157.998 billion USD in 2008 to 130.594 billion USD in 2009. In the following years the GDP somewhat hovered around the same figure with only slight increases and declines.<sup>100</sup> Slovenia in 2004 had a GDP of 34.47 billion USD and one of 44.709 billion USD in 2016. Slovenia did see an increase in its GDP following its accession into the European Union and reached its peak in 2008 with a GDP of 55.59 billion USD, however has then seen its GDP hover around 50 billion USD only to decline after 2014 where it went from 49.905 billion USD to 43.072 billion USD in 2015, only to slightly recover in 2016.<sup>101</sup>

The two Mediterranean island republics of Cyprus and Malta have seen two very different developments in their GDPs. Cyprus in 2004 had a GDP of 17.422 billion USD and in 2016 one of 20.047 billion USD. In 2008 Cyprus saw its GDP peak at 27.839 billion only to see a steady decline every year with only in very minor inclines in 2011 and 2016. Thus, from 2004 with its accession into the European Union until 2008 it did indeed see an incline steeper than in the previous years,

---

<sup>97</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=PL-HU-CZ-SK-SI-CY&start=1990>.

<sup>98</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=PL-HU-CZ-SK-SI-CY&start=1990>.

<sup>99</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=PL-HU-CZ-SK-SI-CY&start=1990>.

<sup>100</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=PL-HU-CZ-SK-SI-CY&start=1990>.

<sup>101</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=PL-HU-CZ-SK-SI-CY&start=1990>.

only to see its GDP almost decline every year since 2008.<sup>102</sup> Malta on the other hand saw a greater development in its GDP, as it in 2004 had a GDP of 6.063 billion USD and one of 10.999 billion USD in 2016. Malta, as opposed to the previous nations above, saw only a minor decline in its GDP after 2008 where it went from 8.977 billion USD in 2008 to 8.528 billion USD in 2009. However, the following years the GDP not only recovered but also increased, with only few years of relative small declines. Its peak was in 2014 where the GDP was 11.218 billion, however, in 2015 it fell to 10.286 billion USD, only to almost fully recover in 2016 with 10.999 billion USD.<sup>103</sup> Malta has therefore seen a near doubling of its GDP since joining the European Union.

Thus, none of the 2004 accession nations have seen a GDP lower than when they joined the EU, and all have seen an incline immediately after they joined, an incline which in all cases lasted until 2008 with the worldwide economic crisis.

The 2007 accession countries, Romania and Bulgaria have seen similar discrepancies as with Malta and Cyprus. Romania in 2007 had an already relatively high GDP of 171.537 billion USD and saw its peak only a year later in 2008 where the GDP was 208.182 billion USD. In the following years its GDP only fell slightly below its 2007 GDP in 2010 and 2011. After 2008 the GDP has been having relatively large ups and downs, yet staying within 160 and 200 billion USD, with a 2016 GDP of 187.592 billion USD.<sup>104</sup> Bulgaria in 2007 had a GDP of 44.766 billion USD, which it saw increase in 2008 to 54.409. However, the following years has only seen stagnation of the GDP, as it hovered around 55 billion USD, with a GDP in 2016 of 53.238 billion USD.<sup>105</sup> Thus, as an initial effect Romania saw a steep incline in its GDP after its EU accession, whereas Bulgaria has only seen minor effects on its GDP.

In terms of regional developments there seems to be no greater GDP developments that varies greatly from other regions. For example, the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, despite being in same region and having somewhat similar population sizes and economies (although Lithuania is the largest economy and the most populous nation) all follow the GDP developments of the other 2004 and 2007 accession nations. The GDP of the 2004 and 2007 EU accession nations therefore largely follow a similar trend.

---

<sup>102</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=PL-HU-CZ-SK-SI-CY&start=1990>.

<sup>103</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=MT&start=1990>.

<sup>104</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=RO-BG&start=1990>.

<sup>105</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=RO-BG&start=1990>.

It is apparent that the countries following the EU accession in both 2004 and 2007 all saw an increase in GDP, and all countries saw an immediate decrease in GDP after 2008, which, however, was in alignment with the rest of the world, in terms of total GDP decrease.<sup>106</sup> However, there are discrepancies in terms of total GDP growth following the EU accession, there seems to be a somewhat common stagnation in terms of growth.<sup>107</sup> Thus, Moravcsik's argument of the European Union as a stabilizer of the economies of neighboring countries can be considered true, at least in terms of the 12 accession countries analyzed here, as the economies of the accession countries did steadily develop. Nonetheless, none of the twelve countries have seen major economic instabilities in terms of GDP, at least no significant permanent decline following accession into the European Union. However, whether the immediate rise of the GDPs and the subsequent stability (or stagnation) can be directly attributed to accession into the European Union or if other factors are responsible could be subject for further study.

## Democratic tendencies after European Union accession

The following section will contain the democratic conditions for the same EU enlargement countries of 2004 and 2007, as according to Freedom House. The grading method *Freedom House* incorporates in rating democratic conditions is a score system between 1 and 7, with 1 being the highest score thereby indicating good democratic conditions, while 7 is the lowest score indicating non-democratic conditions. There are five categories a nation state can be classified into in terms of the degree of democratic conditions, which from best to worst are: a consolidated democracy, a semi-consolidated democracy, a transitional government or hybrid regime, a semi-consolidated authoritarian regime, and a consolidated authoritarian regime. Examples of nation states within each category in 2018 are Russia, Belarus, and the Central Asian countries of Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan as consolidated authoritarian regimes. Armenia as a semi-consolidated authoritarian regime. Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia as transitional governments or hybrid regimes. Croatia, Serbia, and Montenegro as semi-consolidated democracies. And Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as consolidated democracies.<sup>108</sup> The order in which the countries will be

---

<sup>106</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?end=2016&start=1960&view=chart>.

<sup>107</sup> "World Bank Data," World Bank, last accessed: 14-05-2018, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?end=2016&locations=EE-LV-LT-CY-CZ-HU-MT-PL-SK-SI-BG-RO&start=2004>.

<sup>108</sup> "Nations in Transit 2018: Confronting Illiberalism," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/nations-transit-2018>.

analyzed will be the same as above analysis of the GDPs (i.e. in the order of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Hungary, Slovenia, Cyprus, Malta).

Estonia in 2004 had a total democracy score of 1.92 (with an electoral process score of 1.50, a civil society score of 2.00, an independent media score of 1.50, a judicial framework and independence score of 1.75, a corruption score of 2.00, and a governance score of 2.25). Freedom House identified a “still sizable portion of the population without citizenship (mainly ethnic Russians), the generally low levels of political participation among citizens, and the corresponding low levels of trust in governmental institutions”,<sup>109</sup> as the biggest weaknesses for the future of Estonia’s democratic development in 2004. In 2018 the democracy score had slightly improved to a 1.82.<sup>110</sup>

Latvia in 2004 had a democracy score of 2.17 (with an electoral process score of 1.75, a civil society score of 2.00, an independent media score of 1.50, a judicial framework and independence score of 2.00, a corruption score of 3.50, and a governance score of 2.25).<sup>111</sup> In 2018 the democracy score had slightly improved to 2.07 with an improvement mainly in corruption with a score of 3.00.<sup>112</sup>

Lithuania in 2004 had a democracy score of 2.13 (with an electoral process score of 1.75, a civil society score of 1.50, an independent media score of 1.75, a judicial framework and independence score of 1.75, a corruption score of 3.50, and a governance score of 2.50).<sup>113</sup> In 2018 the democracy score had deteriorated to 2.36.<sup>114</sup>

Poland in 2004 had a democracy score of 1.75 (with an electoral process score of 1.50, a civil society score of 1.25, an independent media score of 1.75, a judicial framework and independence score of 1.50, a corruption score of 2.50, and a governance score of 2.00).<sup>115</sup> In 2018 the democracy score had deteriorated relatively significantly to 2.89 with significant decreases in the scores of civil society which went down from a near perfect 2004 score of 1.25 to 2.00, an independent media score

---

<sup>109</sup> “Nations in Transit: Estonia,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/estonia>.

<sup>110</sup> “Nations in Transit: Estonia,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/estonia>.

<sup>111</sup> “Nations in Transit: Latvia,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/latvia>.

<sup>112</sup> “Nations in Transit: Latvia,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/latvia>.

<sup>113</sup> “Nations in Transit: Lithuania,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/lithuania>.

<sup>114</sup> “Nations in Transit: Lithuania,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/lithuania>.

<sup>115</sup> “Nations in Transit: Poland,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/poland>.

that went down from 1.75 to 3.00, a judicial framework and independence score that deteriorated most of all down from 1.50 in 2004 to 4.25 in 2018.<sup>116</sup> Despite having seen these deteriorations in the scores, Poland is still a consolidated democracy, and classified as a free nation, yet the freedom of press status is only considered “partly free”.<sup>117</sup> Some of the reasons for the decline in score are the ruling party’s recent 2017 judicial reform that, according to Freedom House, “undermines separation of powers”,<sup>118</sup> as well as changes to the country’s electoral law, and “a weakening of local governments due to the centralization of powers, and strong pro-PiS propaganda [*Prawo i Sprawiedliwość* or *Law and Justice*, the current ruling party of Poland] in state-owned media.”<sup>119</sup>

The Czech Republic in 2004 had a democracy score of 2.33 (with an electoral process score of 2.00, a civil society score of 1.50, an independent media score of 2.25, a judicial framework and independence score of 2.50, a corruption score of 3.50, and a governance score of 2.25).<sup>120</sup> In 2018 the democracy score had very slightly improved to 2.29.<sup>121</sup>

The Slovak Republic in 2004 was 2.08 (with an electoral process score of 1.50, a civil society score of 1.25, an independent media score of 2.25, a judicial framework and independence score of 2.00, a corruption score of 3.25, and a governance score of 2.25).<sup>122</sup> In 2018 the democracy score had decreased to 2.61, with decreases in corruption and civil society.<sup>123</sup>

Hungary in 2004 had a democracy score of 1.96 (with an electoral process score of 1.25, a civil society score of 1.25, an independent media score of 2.25, a judicial framework and independence score of 1.75, a corruption score of 2.75, and a governance score of 2.50).<sup>124</sup> In 2018 the democracy score had deteriorated to 3.71 (thereby becoming an only semi-conducted democracy), with the electoral process score going from a near perfect 1.25 in 2004 to 3.25 in 2018, civil society score

---

<sup>116</sup> “Nations in Transit: Poland,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/poland>.

<sup>117</sup> “Nations in Transit: Poland,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/poland>.

<sup>118</sup> “Nations in Transit: Poland,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/poland>.

<sup>119</sup> “Nations in Transit: Poland,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/poland>.

<sup>120</sup> “Nations in Transit: Czech Republic,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/czech-republic>.

<sup>121</sup> “Nations in Transit: Czech Republic,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/czech-republic>.

<sup>122</sup> “Nations in Transit: Slovakia,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/slovakia>.

<sup>123</sup> “Nations in Transit: Slovakia,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/slovakia>.

<sup>124</sup> “Nations in Transit: Hungary,” *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/hungary>.

also going from a near perfect 1.25 to 3.00, independent media from 2.25 to 4.50, and corruption score from 2.75 to 4.75.<sup>125</sup> Thus, Hungary's score is the only of one the 2004 accession countries that resulted it in going from being a consolidated democracy at its accession into the European Union to currently a semi-consolidated democracy in 2018. The reason behind this steep decline in democratic conditions can be attributed, according to Freedom House, to oligarchs gaining a stronger position in the Hungarian society as "politics and a strong state set up corruption networks and use public power and resources to reward friendly oligarchs",<sup>126</sup> alongside fewer independent media outlets.<sup>127</sup> For comparison, Russia in 1989 was deemed "not free" with a score lying close to the middle between 5 and 6, to improving to "partly free" in 1995 with a score close to the middle between 3 and 4,<sup>128</sup> to 2018 where Russia has been downgraded to "not free" again with a 6.6 score out of 7.<sup>129</sup>

Slovenia in 2004 had a democracy score of 1.75 (with an electoral process score of 1.50, a civil society score of 1.50, an independent media score of 1.75, a judicial framework and independence score of 1.75, a corruption score of 2.00, and a governance score of 2.00).<sup>130</sup> In 2018 Slovenia's democracy score had slightly deteriorated to 2.07, with the worst deteriorating score of corruption going from 2.00 in 2004 to 2.75 in 2018.<sup>131</sup>

By the time of writing this thesis full data on both Cyprus and Malta are limited compared to the data of the countries above. However, Cyprus and Malta in both 2004 and 2018 had a freedom status

---

<sup>125</sup> "Nations in Transit: Hungary," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/hungary>.

<sup>126</sup> "Nations in Transit: Hungary," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/hungary>.

<sup>127</sup> "Nations in Transit: Hungary," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/hungary>.

<sup>128</sup> "2004 Annual Report," Freedom House, last accessed 13-05-2018, [https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline\\_images/2004.pdf](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline_images/2004.pdf). (P 16.)

<sup>129</sup> "Nations in Transit: Russia," Freedom House, last accessed 13-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/russia>.

<sup>130</sup> "Nations in Transit: Slovenia," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/slovenia>.

<sup>131</sup> "Nations in Transit: Slovenia," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/slovenia>.

as free, and furthermore classified as free in terms of both political rights and civil liberties.<sup>132 133 134</sup>  
135

Romania in 2007 had a democracy score of 3.29 (with an electoral process score of 2.75, a civil society score of 2.25, an independent media score of 3.75, a judicial framework and independence score of 3.75, and a corruption score of 4.00).<sup>136</sup> In 2018 the democracy score of Romania was 3.46, with a decrease in the electoral process score from 2.75 to 3.00 and in the independent media score which went from 3.75 to 4.25, yet an improvement in corruption which went from 4.00 in 2007 to 3.75 in 2018.<sup>137</sup> Romania was thereby the country with the lowest democracy score upon accession into the European Union of the 2004 and the 2007 accession countries.

Bulgaria in 2007 had a democracy score of 2.89 (with an electoral process score of 1.75, a civil society score of 2.50, an independent media score of 3.50, a judicial framework and independence score of 2.75, and a corruption score of 3.75).<sup>138</sup> In 2018 Bulgaria's democracy score had deteriorated to 3.39, which a decrease in the scores of the electoral process, which went from 1.75 to 2.25, independent media which went from 3.50 to 4.25, judicial framework and independence which went from 2.75 to 3.50, and corruption which went from 3.75 to 4.25.<sup>139</sup>

Thus, twelve years later after the 2004 EU accession the countries have seen some setbacks in terms of democratic conditions, the countries seeing the worst setbacks being Poland and Hungary. Of the two 2007 accession countries both have seen setbacks in their democratic conditions, even though Romania when joining the European Union had the lowest democracy score of all the ten 2004 and 2007 accession countries. Of both the 2004 and 2007 accession countries Estonia, Latvia, and the Czech Republic were the only countries to have improved their democracy score in the time between joining the EU and 2018. Furthermore, all three had a relative high score at the time of their

---

<sup>132</sup> "Freedom in the World: Cyprus," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2004/cyprus>.

<sup>133</sup> "Freedom in the World: Cyprus," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/cyprus>.

<sup>134</sup> "Freedom in the World: Malta," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2004/malta>.

<sup>135</sup> "Freedom in the World: Malta," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/malta>.

<sup>136</sup> "Nations in Transit: Romania," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2007/romania>.

<sup>137</sup> "Nations in Transit: Romania," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/romania>.

<sup>138</sup> "Nations in Transit: Bulgaria," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2007/bulgaria>.

<sup>139</sup> "Nations in Transit: Bulgaria," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/bulgaria>.

accession. Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic, Hungary, Slovenia, Romania, and Bulgaria all saw decreases in their democracy score, albeit at various degrees. For example, between 2004 and 2018, Lithuania's score only deteriorated by 0.23, and Slovenia's by 0.32, whereas Poland's democracy score deteriorated by 1.75, and Hungary's by 1.14.

## Conclusion

The first part of the problem formulation, which this thesis outlined and aimed to answer, was how a European superpower looked in terms of military power when analyzed through another theory of international relations. Changes in certain analytical focal points that differentiate from liberalism on results in findings that indicate a much weaker European military power, than originally argued by Moravcsik. For example, Moravcsik argues that “although the realist view of power—whereby global influence is grounded in population and aggregate national income, which then feeds into mass military mobilization and gross military spending—might not be entirely irrelevant, it is no longer central to most issues in world politics, if indeed it ever was”.<sup>140</sup> However, as focus is put on a wider array of matters of military capabilities, it appears that Moravcsik's liberal theory lacks in depth analytical capabilities. Although there arguably is some merit to Moravcsik's argument of not merely analyzing military capabilities to determine whether a nation state can be considered a superpower, it does appear that in this case Moravcsik has sacrificed analytical power in this area, whereas Mearsheimer's offensive realism arguably provides better insights into this area. However, from a liberal perspective one could argue that that is the only area in which realism does provide better insights into, yet insights that remain rather unnecessary, as Moravcsik argues that this factor is only one among many that determines superpower status.

At its core, Moravcsik's argument is on the irrelevance (or at least lesser relevance) of a nation state's armed capabilities, which is an argument that can be disputed as a somewhat flawed assumption, as the European Union is currently actively pursuing a more integrated and stronger common military force to combat potential outside threats, along with a mass increase in military

---

<sup>140</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010).



spending among EU members states. If indeed this argument is that the notion of military capabilities for the sake of security, or for the sake of regional preeminence, was obsolete, then surely the current trends among the majority of great powers pursuing greater military capabilities would reduce the validity or even disprove this argument.

While what Moravcsik writes regarding Europe's preeminence in global military capabilities is certainly a factor for the consideration as a superpower, there are some major issues that he does not address. In terms of total military manpower Europe is on par, and even surpasses, other major great powers in the world. Yet, as argued by Mearsheimer and written about above in this thesis, having a sizeable traditional army without any form of nuclear deterrence renders a traditional army obsolete. In terms of nuclear capabilities, Europe lacks any serious means itself of such means, and likewise lacks the capabilities to protect itself against such a threat from the nearest nuclear power. Russia is the nearest power that does possess such capabilities and is furthermore the most serious potential threat against Europe. Since Europe itself is reliant on the nuclear shield of the United States or NATO one could argue that this is a glaring factor which could, in a hypothetical conflict between only the EU and Russia, make Russia the nuclear hegemon in such a scenario.

Another factor is the lack of a single European military. Moravcsik, when in 2010 wrote his text *Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World* (wherein he clearly outlined Europe as being not just the only other power to project its military capabilities intercontinentally but also writing of it as a single entity) there were no such treaty in sight. Thus, even then as now, it is questionable to make the military capabilities of Europe a superpower factor, as the lack of integration clearly showed a collection of nation states with individual armed forces, rather than one monolithic European military entity. And despite having had numerous military operation over time, it is arguably doubtful whether one can justly attribute superpower status to Europe due to those operations. Moravcsik does not entirely dismiss the role of armed forces nor reducing its significance to non-existing, yet it is apparent that armed forces are being focused on by the European Union member states, as recent events (being, arguably, a response to a new perceived threat from Russia, following the annexation of Crimea) has caused them to put more emphasis on such capabilities. This is apparent as the recent PESCO agreement shows that aims to deepen military integration among EU member nations is clearly desired by a vast majority of have chosen to participate.

Regarding Moravcsik's argument of Europe as a spreading force of democratic values and a stabilizer of economies, it is clear that after initially joining the European Union there were seen relatively significant increases in both GDP and democratic condition in all the 2004 and 2007

accession countries. This trend of increase in GDP was only stalled in the accession countries (and indeed the entire world) by the financial crisis, and thereby saw a decrease in GDP in the following the year 2008. Subsequent recoveries consisted among the accession countries mainly of slight increases, stagnation or in a few cases small declines in GDP. Most of the countries furthermore saw their GDP peak in 2008 and with few exceptions did not experience it return nor surpass that level since.

In terms of democratic conditions, the 2004 and 2007 accession countries already had a high democratic score, meaning they were already free and consolidated democracies, except for Romania and Bulgaria. Following the accession into the European Union several countries have seen a decline in their democratic score, especially Hungary as it has seen such setback that it is no longer considered a consolidated democracy, but is now a semi-consolidated, and Poland as it is nearing semi-consolidated democracy and a press freedom status which is now only partly free<sup>141</sup>. While not all countries have seen setbacks, such as Estonia, Latvia, the Czech Republic who actually saw increases in their democratic scores, the majority did experience decreases in their scores.<sup>142</sup> Thus, the discussion becomes whether improvement in democratic conditions was an active or passive process; in other words, one could argue either that merely being in the proximity to EU results in an improvement in democratic conditions, as it projects liberal ideals, or that if neighboring non-EU nation states aspire to become members they will aim to alter their democratic conditions on their own accord, so as to fit EU accession requirements. Accession into the EU does thereby not necessarily ensure continued high democratic conditions, as we have seen above. However, this can more so be attributed to internal factors in the individual member state and arguably not due to a failure on the part of the European Union.

Moravcsik's argument of Europe as superpower is therefore questionable, at least in terms of Europe as a military and civilian superpower, when seen through offensive realism. As a military superpower, the military capabilities of a collected Europe (which it, as of yet, far from is) can fairly easily be challenged by a strong neighbor with an arguably stronger armed forces and even nuclear capabilities to boast that is in close proximity, and to which, on its own, Europe has no real form of deterrence towards this potential threat, should a conflict between the European Union and Russia occur. As a civilian superpower there might be some merit to Moravcsik's argument of the European

---

<sup>141</sup> "Nations in Transit: Poland," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/poland>.

<sup>142</sup> "Nations in Transit 2018: Confronting Illiberalism," *Freedom House*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/nations-transit-2018>.

Union as a spreader of democratic values and a stabilizer of economies. Yet, admission into EU does not guarantee the continuation of those factors, despite them already being in place before accession.

## Discussion and Further Research

### European aid

Another topic for further study is the type of aid Europe is giving, primarily to African nations. Moravcsik states that “EU member states and the European Commission together dispense about 50 percent of the world’s foreign aid, while the U.S. share amounts to about 20 percent”.<sup>143</sup> According to the China Africa Research Initiative at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, who conducts research on Chinese involvement in Africa, the total amount of aid Africa received from China were about 2.2 billion USD in 2016.<sup>144</sup> According to the European Commission, just Sub-Saharan African countries received 10.5 billion USD from the European Union in 2016.<sup>145</sup> For comparison, the amount of aid from the European Union given to Syria alone in 2016 was over 1.5 billion USD, and the amount given to Cuba was 2.2 billion USD.<sup>146</sup> Thus, in terms of monetary aid the amount the European Union gives to Cuba alone constitutes the total amount China gives to the entire continent of Africa. Yet, one crucial difference in the type of aid Africa receives from China and the type of aid from Europe, is that Europe will merely donate money to the individual country, while China will often give aid in the form of, for example, infrastructure projects.<sup>147</sup> Furthermore, aid by China will also often be given in the form of loans and subsidies for joint projects, which will often be carried out by Chinese companies and by Chinese workers.<sup>148</sup> Chinese laborers are heavily present in some African countries, such as Angola, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Kenya, with

---

<sup>143</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance*. (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), p. 162.

<sup>144</sup> "Data: Chinese Foreign Aid," *Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies*, last accessed: 25-05-2018, <http://www.sais-cari.org/data-chinese-foreign-aid-to-africa/>.

<sup>145</sup> "EU Aid Overview," *European Commission*, last accessed: 25-05-2018, <https://euaidexplorer.ec.europa.eu/AidOverview.do>.

<sup>146</sup> "EU Aid Overview," *European Commission*, last accessed: 25-05-2018, <https://euaidexplorer.ec.europa.eu/AidOverview.do>.

<sup>147</sup> Deborah Brautigam, *The Dragon's Gift* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 11, 26-27.

<sup>148</sup> Deborah Brautigam, *The Dragon's Gift* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 11-13.

official Chinese sources stating that 227.407 Chinese laborers were present in all of Africa in 2016.<sup>149</sup> Thus, a topic for further research could be whether China's unique form of aid if having a greater positive impact on the African nations where China is heavily present, and perhaps even result in a form of soft power projection from China, or if the actual impact is still overshadowed by the much larger amount of direct monetary aid given to African nation states by the European Union.

## Euroscepticism

Another factor worth considering regarding the superpower status of Europe, and for further research, is the seemingly increasing resistance the European Union encounters from the public in its members countries. Moravcsik himself writes in his text *Europe: Rising Superpower in Bipolar World* that "European leaders continue to pursue EU enlargement courageously in the face of low-in some countries single-digit or low double-digit-public opinion support".<sup>150</sup> The factor of faltering support for enlargement and continued participation in the European Union should be considered, as it could be detrimental to the status of the union as a whole.

The perhaps most striking example of this phenomenon can be found with the United Kingdom in the case of *Brexit*, where a majority voted to leave the European Union (albeit only by a slim majority in that the Leave side got 51.9 percent and Remain side got 48.1 percent of the votes totaling of about 1.3 million voter difference of a total electorate of about 46.5 million voters<sup>151</sup>), making it a case which is unprecedented since a sovereign nation state with such a large economy as the United Kingdom has withdrawn from the European Union based on public preference.

The faltering enthusiasm for the European Union project is also visible in numerous (if not the majority) of the elections in the European Union member states. In Germany the new Eurosceptic opposition party AfD (*Alternative für Deutschland*) saw a steep incline in votes in the 2017 Elections to the German Bundestag, as they received 12.6 percent, which amounted to 94 seats in the Bundestag (out of a total of 709 seats), thereby becoming the third largest political party in Germany. Meanwhile, established parties such as Angela Merkel's CDU/CSU and the SPD (*Sozialdemokratische Partei*

---

<sup>149</sup> "Data: Chinese Workers in Africa," *Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies*, last accessed: 25-05-2018, <http://www.sais-cari.org/data-chinese-workers-in-africa>.

<sup>150</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan Alexandroff and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), p. 159.

<sup>151</sup> "EU referendum results," *The Electoral Commission*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/find-information-by-subject/elections-and-referendums/past-elections-and-referendums/eu-referendum/electorate-and-count-information>.

*Deutschlands*) then led by Martin Schulz, saw a voter decline however, with the SDP losing 5.2 percent from the last 2013 election, as the voter percent fell from 25.7 in the 2013 election<sup>152</sup> down to 20.5 percent in 2017.<sup>153</sup> The CDU/CSU, despite still being the largest party in Germany, saw an even greater decline in votes as the party received 32.9 percent (and lost 65 seats in the Bundestag),<sup>154</sup> which is the lowest percentage the CDU/CSU has received since the 1949 Bundestag Election where the party received 31.0 percent of the votes.<sup>155</sup>

In Austria's 2017 election, the center-right *Österreichische Volkspartei* (Austrian People's Party) saw a sizeable increase in votes and won most votes with 31.5 percent, while The Social Democratic Party of Austria won 26.9, which no significant change from the previous election.<sup>156</sup> The right-wing and Eurosceptic *Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs* (The Freedom Party of Austria) saw an increase in votes and won 26 percent.<sup>157</sup> In the Netherlands the Eurosceptic The Party for Freedom (*Partij voor de Vrijheid*) led by Geert Wilders, saw an increase in votes from the previous election and became the second largest in the Netherlands by winning 13.1 percent, coming second to the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (*Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie*) run by Mark Rutte, which won 21.3 percent, yet saw a significant decrease in votes from the previous election.<sup>158</sup>

In France's latest presidential election in 2017, the final results ended in a victory for the candidate Emmanuel Macron of the pro-European Union party *La République En Marche!*, who received 66.1 percent of the votes. At second place and receiving 33.9 percent of the votes, was Marine Le Pen of the Eurosceptic party *Front National*.<sup>159</sup> Despite Macron's electoral win over Le Pen with almost double the number of votes, the Eurosceptic side still received a significant and unprecedented portion of the votes. The situation is similar in Denmark, where, despite not gaining a majority vote in elections, the number of votes that Eurosceptic parties receive is still significant enough for them to

---

<sup>152</sup> "Elections to the German Bundestag," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/de/bundestag.php?election=2013&land=DE>.

<sup>153</sup> "Elections to the German Bundestag," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/de/bundestag.php?election=2017>.

<sup>154</sup> "Elections to the German Bundestag," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/de/bundestag.php?election=2017>.

<sup>155</sup> "Elections to the German Bundestag," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/de/bundestag.php?election=1949&land=DE>.

<sup>156</sup> "Results of Austrian Parliamentary Election 2017," *Austrian Embassy Washington*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://www.austria.org/the-latest/2017/10/30/austrian-parliamentary-election-2017>.

<sup>157</sup> "Results of Austrian Parliamentary Election 2017," *Austrian Embassy Washington*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://www.austria.org/the-latest/2017/10/30/austrian-parliamentary-election-2017>.

<sup>158</sup> "Elections to the Dutch Tweede Kamer (House of Representatives)," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/nl/house.php?election=2017>.

<sup>159</sup> "Presidential and Legislative Elections in France," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/fr/president.php?election=2017>.

gain influence. In Denmark the right-wing Eurosceptic Danish People's Party (*Dansk Folkeparti*) saw an unprecedented increase in parliament seats as they went from 12.3 percent of the votes in the 2011 election<sup>160</sup> to 21.1 percent in 2015, meaning an increase in seats from having 22 seats to 37 out of a total of 179 in the Danish Parliament.<sup>161</sup> This also meant that the party went from being the third largest party in Denmark to the second largest and even surpassing the party leading the coalition the Danish People's Party is part of, being *Venstre* (known as the Liberal Party of Denmark) which went down from being the largest party in 2011 with 26.7 percent<sup>162</sup> to 19.5 percent in 2015,<sup>163</sup> going down to being only the third largest party. The far-left Eurosceptic party *Enhedslisten* had a slight 1.1 percent increase from 6.7 in 2011<sup>164</sup> to 7.8 percent in 2015,<sup>165</sup> as had the libertarian, Eurosceptic *Liberal Alliance* party, which saw a slightly larger increase from 5 percent<sup>166</sup> to 7.5 percent.<sup>167</sup>

When Hungary in April 2018 held their parliamentary election, it resulted in Viktor Orbán's Eurosceptic party Fidesz - Hungarian Civic Union (*Fidesz - Magyar Polgári Szövetség*) winning with 44.9 percent.<sup>168</sup> In a speech given by Orbán in 2016 about the future of the state of Europe he ended it by asking the question: "‘Shall we live in slavery or in freedom?’ That is the question – give your answer!"<sup>169</sup> The far-right Eurosceptic party Movement for a Better Hungary (*Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom*) received 20.4 percent and coming in second in terms of single party votes alone.<sup>170</sup>

---

<sup>160</sup> "Elections to the Danish Folketing," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2011&district=>.

<sup>161</sup> "Elections to the Danish Folketing," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2015>.

<sup>162</sup> "Elections to the Danish Folketing," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2011&district=>.

<sup>163</sup> "Elections to the Danish Folketing," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2015>.

<sup>164</sup> "Elections to the Danish Folketing," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2011&district=>.

<sup>165</sup> "Elections to the Danish Folketing," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2015>.

<sup>166</sup> "Elections to the Danish Folketing," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2011&district=>.

<sup>167</sup> "Elections to the Danish Folketing," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2015>.

<sup>168</sup> "Elections to the Hungarian National Assembly," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/hu/assembly.php?election=2014>.

<sup>169</sup> "Speech by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on 15 March," *Website of the Hungarian Government*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/speech-by-prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-15-march>.

<sup>170</sup> "Elections to the Hungarian National Assembly," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/hu/assembly.php?election=2014>.

Greece's latest election in 2015 resulted in the far-right Eurosceptic party Golden Dawn (*Χρυσή Αυγή*) received 7 percent of the votes, while Syriza (short for The Coalition of the Radical Left or *Συνασπισμός Ριζοσπαστικής Αριστεράς*) a left-wing Eurosceptic party received 35.5 percent of the votes.<sup>171</sup>

The Italian parliament election resulted in the Eurosceptic Centre-right coalition with *Lega Nord*'s Matteo Salvini as leader winning a majority of seats in both the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, with 37.49 percent senate votes for the league in the Senate (*Lega Nord* getting 17.63 percent out of these),<sup>172</sup> and 37 percent in Chamber of Deputies (with 17.37 percent for *Lega Nord*).<sup>173</sup> The party that took second place was the Five Star Movement (*Movimento 5 Stelle*), also a Eurosceptic party, but with no allegiance to any coalition, which took 32.21 percent of votes for the Senate,<sup>174</sup> and 32.66 percent for the Chamber of Deputies.<sup>175</sup> This outcome of election results ending in Eurosceptic parties taking near or over half of the votes (in one of the six founding members of the European Economic Community) should be considered a factor for the future of Europe as a superpower, being that if this trend continues then the longevity of the European Union is threatened as further political disintegration becomes a certainty.

In a Eurobarometer survey conducted by the European Commission in 2015, 67 percent of EU citizens are reported to feel like an EU citizen, while 31 percent do not feel like an EU citizen. Germans were most like to feel likely an EU citizen with 81 percent, while only 50 percent in Cyprus and Greece felt the same.<sup>176</sup> At the same time citizens in the European Union report that 38 percent identify themselves by nationality only, 52 percent identified by nationality first then as European, while only 6 percent identified as European first then by nationality of member country, and only 2 percent identified as European only. This makes a total of 60 percent that identify in some way as European.<sup>177</sup> Germans had the lowest percent of citizens identifying by nationality at only 25 percent,

---

<sup>171</sup> "Elections to the Hellenic Parliament (Vouli)," *Election Resources*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://electionresources.org/gr/vouli.php?election=2015>.

<sup>172</sup> "Senato," *Dipartimento per gli Affari Interni e Territoriali*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://elezioni.interno.gov.it/senato/scrutini/20180304/scrutiniSI>.

<sup>173</sup> "Camera," *Dipartimento per gli Affari Interni e Territoriali*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://elezioni.interno.gov.it/camera/scrutini/20180304/scrutiniCI>.

<sup>174</sup> "Senato," *Dipartimento per gli Affari Interni e Territoriali*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://elezioni.interno.gov.it/senato/scrutini/20180304/scrutiniSI>.

<sup>175</sup> "Camera," *Dipartimento per gli Affari Interni e Territoriali*, last accessed: 24-05-2018, <http://elezioni.interno.gov.it/camera/scrutini/20180304/scrutiniCI>.

<sup>176</sup> "Standard Eurobarometer 83 Spring 2015: European Citizenship Report," *European Commission*, last accessed: 27-04-2018, [http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83\\_citizen\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83_citizen_en.pdf). pp. 19-20.

<sup>177</sup> "Standard Eurobarometer 83 Spring 2015: European Citizenship Report," *European Commission*, last accessed: 27-04-2018, [http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83\\_citizen\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83_citizen_en.pdf). pp. 21-24.

while the highest percent of citizens identifying with nationality only was in Greece, Cyprus and the United Kingdom with 51, 57 and 64 percent respectively.<sup>178</sup> In the Autumn 2017 Eurobarometer 70 percent responded that they felt like citizens of the European Union.<sup>179</sup>

A subject for further study on the same issue could therefore be analyzing the difference between European superstate identification vs. national identification, and a comparison with, for example, American federal state vs. national identification. In other words, one could analyze if there is a disparity between how there is a lack of European as primary identity over national identity and the proposed superpower by Moravcsik, with American identification with the United States as a nation rather than with the federal state, and if this could be considered a factor in the superpower qualification. The issues discussed above of the rising Eurosceptic tendencies in Europe, and the lack of identification with the European Union first, and rather identifying with the nationality of the member state first, could be some of the issues that could be further researched, analyzed, and used as factors into if one can truly speak of a European superpower.

---

<sup>178</sup>“Standard Eurobarometer 83 Spring 2015: European Citizenship Report,” *European Commission*, last accessed: 27-04-2018, [http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83\\_citizen\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83_citizen_en.pdf). p. 25.

<sup>179</sup> “Standard Eurobarometer 88 Autumn 2017: Public opinion in the European Union,” *European Commission*, last accessed: 27-04-2018, [http://www.poci-competite2020.pt/admin/images/Standard\\_Eurobarometer\\_88\\_UE\\_dez-2017.pdf](http://www.poci-competite2020.pt/admin/images/Standard_Eurobarometer_88_UE_dez-2017.pdf). p. 39.



## Reference list

References are given in alphabetical order. The last name of the author is given first. When no author is present the title of, for example, the article, publication, or webpage will be used first instead.

“2004 Annual Report.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed 13-05-2018.

[https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline\\_images/2004.pdf](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline_images/2004.pdf).

“2018 China Military Strength.” *GlobalFirepower*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

[https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=china](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=china).

“2018 India Military Strength.” *GlobalFirepower*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

[https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=india](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=india).

“2018 Russia Military Strength.” *GlobalFirepower*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

[https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=russia](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=russia).

“2018 United States Military Strength.” *GlobalFirepower*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018,

[https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country\\_id=united-states-of-america](https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=united-states-of-america).

Baylis, John, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. *The Globalization of World Politic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Brautigam, Deborah. *The Dragon's Gift*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

“Camera.” *Dipartimento per gli Affari Interni e Territoriali*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<http://elezioni.interno.gov.it/camera/scrutini/20180304/scrutiniCI>.

“Data: Chinese Foreign Aid.” *Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies*.

Last accessed: 25-05-2018.

<http://www.sais-cari.org/data-chinese-foreign-aid-to-africa/>.

“Data: Chinese Workers in Africa.” *Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies*. Last accessed: 25-05-2018.

[http://www.sais-cari.org/data-chinese-workers-in-africa.](http://www.sais-cari.org/data-chinese-workers-in-africa/)

“Defence cooperation: 23 member states sign joint notification on the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO).” *European Council*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/11/13/defence-cooperation-23-member-states-sign-joint-notification-on-pesco/>.

“Elections to the Danish Folketing.” *Election Resources*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

[http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2011&district=.](http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2011&district=)

“Elections to the Danish Folketing.” *Election Resources*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

[http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2015.](http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2015)

“Elections to the Dutch Tweede Kamer (House of Representatives).” *Election Resources*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

[http://electionresources.org/nl/house.php?election=2017.](http://electionresources.org/nl/house.php?election=2017)

“Elections to the German Bundestag.” *Election Resources*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

[http://electionresources.org/de/bundestag.php?election=2017.](http://electionresources.org/de/bundestag.php?election=2017)

“Elections to the Hellenic Parliament (Vouli).” *Election Resources*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

[http://electionresources.org/gr/vouli.php?election=2015.](http://electionresources.org/gr/vouli.php?election=2015)

“Elections to the Hungarian National Assembly.” *Election Resources*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

[http://electionresources.org/hu/assembly.php?election=2014.](http://electionresources.org/hu/assembly.php?election=2014)

“EU Aid Overview.” *European Commission*. Last accessed: 25-05-2018.

<https://euaidexplorer.ec.europa.eu/AidOverview.do>.

“EU referendum results.” *The Electoral Commission*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/find-information-by-subject/elections-and-referendums/past-elections-and-referendums/eu-referendum/electorate-and-count-information>.

“European defence spending: the new consensus.” *The International Institute for Strategic Studies*. 15 February 2018. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

<https://www.iiss.org/en/militarybalanceblog/blogsections/2018-f256/february-1c17/europe-defence-spending-0695>.

“European Union Powers Ranked by Military Strength.” *GlobalFirepower*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018. <https://www.globalfirepower.com/countries-listing-european-union.asp>.

“Freedom in the World: Cyprus.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2004/cyprus>.

“Freedom in the World: Cyprus.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/cyprus>.

“Freedom in the World: Malta.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2004/malta>.

“Freedom in the World: Malta.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/malta>.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2012.

“Government expenditure on defence.” *Eurostat*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

[http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Government\\_expenditure\\_on\\_defence](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Government_expenditure_on_defence).

Kennedy, Paul, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*. London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2017.

Kristensen, Hans M. and Robert S. Norris. "US tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, 2011." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0096340210393931>.

Kristensen, Hans M. and Robert S. Norris. "Status of World Nuclear Forces." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018. <https://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/>.

Mearsheimer, John J. "ECPR KEYNOTE LECTURE: why is europe peaceful today?." *University of Chicago*. Last accessed: 20-05-2018.

<http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0055.pdf>.

Mearsheimer John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton & Inc., 2014.

Mearsheimer, John J. "Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault." *Foreign Affairs*. Last accessed: 20-05-2018.

<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russia-fsu/2014-08-18/why-ukraine-crisis-west-s-fault>.

"Military and civilian missions and operations." *European External Action Service*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

[https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en).

"Mission description." *European External Action Service*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

[https://eeas.europa.eu/archives/csdp/missions-and-operations/eufor-tchad-rca/mission-description/index\\_en.htm](https://eeas.europa.eu/archives/csdp/missions-and-operations/eufor-tchad-rca/mission-description/index_en.htm).

Moravcsik, Andrew. "Europe: Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World." in Alan Alexandroff and

Andrew Cooper, eds. *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance*. (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010).

Moravcsik, Andrew. "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organization*, volume 51 issue 4. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1948.

"NATO battalion deployed one year ago: reliable deterrence." *President of the Republic of Lithuania*. Last accessed: 12-05-2018. <https://www.lrp.lt/en/press-centre/press-releases/nato-battalion-deployed-one-year-ago-reliable-deterrence/29327>.

"Nations in Transit 2018: Confronting Illiberalism." *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/nations-transit-2018>.

"Nations in Transit: Bulgaria." *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2007/bulgaria>.

"Nations in Transit: Bulgaria." *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/bulgaria>.

"Nations in Transit: Czech Republic." *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/czech-republic>.

"Nations in Transit: Czech Republic." *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/czech-republic>.

"Nations in Transit: Estonia." *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/estonia>.

- “Nations in Transit: Estonia.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/estonia>.
- “Nations in Transit: Hungary.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/hungary>.
- “Nations in Transit: Hungary.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/hungary>.
- “Nations in Transit: Latvia.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/latvia>.
- “Nations in Transit: Latvia.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/latvia>.
- “Nations in Transit: Lithuania.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/lithuania>.
- “Nations in Transit: Lithuania.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/lithuania>.
- “Nations in Transit: Poland.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/poland>.
- “Nations in Transit: Poland.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/poland>.
- “Nations in Transit: Romania.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2007/romania>.
- “Nations in Transit: Romania.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/romania>.

- “Nations in Transit: Russia.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed 13-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/russia>.
- “Nations in Transit: Slovakia.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/slovakia>.
- “Nations in Transit: Slovakia.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/slovakia>.
- “Nations in Transit: Slovenia.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2004/slovenia>.
- “Nations in Transit: Slovenia.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/slovenia>.
- “Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) – Factsheet.” *European Union External Action Service*.  
Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
[https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/34226/permanent-structured-cooperation-pesco-factsheet_en).
- “Permanent Structured Cooperation on defence could be launched by end 2017.” *European Union External Action Service*. Last accessed: 23-05-2018.  
[https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage\\_en/31832/Permanent%20Structured%20Cooperation%20on%20defence%20could%20be%20launched%20by%20end%202017](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage_en/31832/Permanent%20Structured%20Cooperation%20on%20defence%20could%20be%20launched%20by%20end%202017).
- “Results of Austrian Parliamentary Election 2017.” *Austrian Embassy Washington*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.  
<http://www.austria.org/the-latest/2017/10/30/austrian-parliamentary-election-2017>.
- “Presidential and Legislative Elections in France.” *Election Resources*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<http://electionresources.org/fr/president.php?election=2017>.

“Reinforcing Deterrence on NATO’s Eastern Flank.” *Rand Corporation*. Last accessed: 12-05-2018.

[https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR1253.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1253.html).

“Russia Country Profile.” *Freedom House*. Last accessed 13-05-2018.

<https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2018/russia>.

“Russia deploys Iskander nuclear-capable missiles to Kaliningrad: RIA.” *Reuters*. Last accessed: 12-05-2018.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-nato-missiles/russia-deploys-iskander-nuclear-capable-missiles-to-kaliningrad-ria-idUSKBN1FP21Y>.

“Senato.” *Dipartimento per gli Affari Interni e Territoriali*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<http://elezioni.interno.gov.it/senato/scrutini/20180304/scrutiniSI>.

”Standard Eurobarometer 83 Spring 2015: European Citizenship Report.” *European Commission*.

Last accessed: 27-04-2018.

[http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83\\_citizen\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83_citizen_en.pdf).

“Standard Eurobarometer 88 Autumn 2017: Public opinion in the European Union.” *European Commission*. Last accessed: 27-04-2018.

<http://www.poci->

[compete2020.pt/admin/images/Standard\\_Eurobarometer\\_88\\_UE\\_dez-2017.pdf](http://www.poci-compete2020.pt/admin/images/Standard_Eurobarometer_88_UE_dez-2017.pdf).

“Speech by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on 15 March.” *Website of the Hungarian Government*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.

<http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/speech-by-prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-15-march>.

“The European Single Market.” *European Commission*. Last accessed: 24-05-2018.



[https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market_en).

“The Military Balance 2018.” *The International Institute for Strategic Studies*. 14 February 2018.

Last accessed: 23-05-2018.

<https://www.iiss.org/en/publications/military%20balance/issues/the-military-balance-2018-545f>.

“The Prince: Chapter XII: How Many Kinds Of Soldierly There Are, And Concerning Mercenaries.”

*Constitution Society*. Last accessed: 08-12-2017.

<http://www.constitution.org/mac/prince12.htm>.

“Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War.” *Perseus Project*. Last accessed: 14-03-2018.

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0105%3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D89>.

“Vehicle and aircraft holdings within the scope of the conventional armed forces in Europe Treaty 2016,” *UK Ministry of Defense*,

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/502574/Vehicle\\_Aircraft\\_Holdings\\_within\\_the\\_scope\\_of\\_the\\_Conventional\\_Armed\\_Forces\\_in\\_Europe\\_Treaty\\_2016.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/502574/Vehicle_Aircraft_Holdings_within_the_scope_of_the_Conventional_Armed_Forces_in_Europe_Treaty_2016.pdf).

Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Politics*. Waveland Press Inc., 2010.

“World Bank Data.” *World Bank*. Last accessed: 14-05-2018.

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?end=2016&start=1960&view=chart>.

“World Bank Data.” *World Bank*. Last accessed: 14-05-2018.

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=EE-LV-LT>.

“World Bank Data.” *World Bank*. Last accessed: 14-05-2018.

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?end=2016&locations=EE-LV-LT-CY-CZ-HU-MT-PL-SK-SI-BG-RO&start=2004>.

“World Bank Data.” *World Bank*. Last accessed: 14-05-2018.

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=MT&start=1990>.

“World Bank Data.” *World Bank*. Last accessed: 14-05-2018.

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=PL-HU-CZ-SK-SI-CY&start=1990>.

“World Bank Data.” *World Bank*. Last accessed: 14-05-2018.

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=RO-BG&start=1990>.