

## The Influence of The Cyber Era on Decision-Making in The Common Foreign and Security Policy

### Abstract

The EU is a structured policy oriented governmental organization that has made over the last three decades fundamental changes in its mechanism of decision-making and policy generating. Since the Treaty of Lisbon, The EU is working as a united structured force whose aim is to bring peace and become a significant part of the global political arena. One of the important expressions of this shift, is of the increasing understanding in the EU regarding cyberspace, and regarding taking serious actions and policy. The cyber era, is the movement of the virtual space towards an active and evident part of the economic realm, the diplomatic and martial spheres, of individuals, societies and organizations. In this article, I wish to interpret the policy change of security and foreign affairs, since the Treaty of Lisbon, in the cyber space area, while understanding the meaning of that development to the future of the EU, and to the meaning of the cyber era to global diplomatic and security future.

### Article

Since the 90's, it is possible to follow a progress and change in the fashion in which the European institutional sphere is organized and has formed into a united entity. Therefore, the beginning of this change, could be traced back to 1992, as in Netherland, the Maastricht Treaty was established, to form an institute that would (eventually) replace the Economical European Community (EEC), with the European Union (EU). The EC, was a limited organization, formed in 1957 in Rome, and was founded as a key organization that would allow the more efficient establishment of a 'European market' (Thaler, 2016; Bradley, 2017). Meaning, the supporting of, among others, trading agreements and policies to support trade between the European countries that joined, and signed, the treaty (Barth & Bijsmans, 2018).

The limited reach of the EEC, had been replaced, in fact, in 1992, turning into the European Community (EC), whose aim was to increase the cooperation between the European countries, and to focus on three main pillars. The one of economics, that was mainly still in the hands of the EC, and two others, under the EU, focusing on law and regimentation to be united among the joint countries, as a second pillar (Ilik & Adamczyk, 2017). And to lead new policies and organizations in the issue of foreign affairs and security. In 2009, under the Treaty of Lisbon, the EC eventually became part of the EU, as it became the central and singular institute for policing and governing, in the shape of a democratic parliament, with members of the 27 countries, whose citizens are the ones to vote in democratic election. Along the parliament, three other institutes form the EU (Allen, 2012). The European Council, that is composed of prime ministers and the European governments, and the European Union council, that is composed of ministers of those governments. And finally, The European Commission, that plays the role of the executive authority of European Union (Devuyt, 2012).

As part of the Treaty of Lisbon, the concept of three pillars has been demolished, as is perceived by literature, as a significant point in the development of policy and decision-making of Europe as a single and united authority (Allen, 2012). The three pillars, until the Treaty of Lisbon,

have led to a reality in which organizations were responsible for overlapping issues while there was no real and processed communication between the three pillars, which caused great inefficiency as duplicity. The future of the EU, in its new evolution, allows that communication, which could be seen as especially crucial and transformative in the case of the pillar of security and foreign affairs (Furness & Gänzle, 2017).

The aim of the EU, could, and should be seen as a controversial attempt in the effort of creating, mainly towards the United States, an image of a structure of decision-making that resembles one of a singular state, in which internal borders are absence, one currency is accepted and used throughout the entire territory, as a joint and dependent economic system, law and other sovereign symbols (Allen, 2012). Over the years, such an attempt was considered controversial, as the EU had and still suffers from few but fundamental core struggles. The first, is the tension between the need of creating interdependency for the economic potential and survival of the joint countries, and the cultural ambition of preserving the independence of each of the countries (Novotná, 2017). The EU has managed, since its most current evolution, to experience several struggles, that put some serious doubts regarding the future of the EU as the decision-making authority and the policy shaper of the old continent. Such as, the economic crisis in 2008, that until today still add a burden as well as conflicts between the rich and the poor European countries who suffer the most from the crisis. And such is the European migrant crisis, triggered by the civil war in Syria (Mason, 2018).

The different interests, different ideologies and different capabilities between the countries, have led to mistrust between European countries, and to difficulties of the EU to function as a single operative authority. However, the decision-making in the EU, had changed quite a bit in the Treaty of Lisbon, and should be viewed accordingly (Ilik & Adamczyk, 2017). Verdun (2013), for example, emphasizes the shift from a six months presidency circulation into 2.5 years, to be significant regarding the decision-making of the EU, as it allows new emergence of continuity and consistency in the process of decision-making. Secondly, she argued, the new voting system for the European council, would lead to the reduction of decision-making done in closed rooms and in informal procedures. While both of these main changes are disputed as to their ability to be genuinely effective, research is yet to come, as more empirical data would be available following these rather new developments.

1. And indeed, while the EU is challenging its ability to dominate, but also, to create legitimate decision-making processes, a relatively new actor has emerged. It is possible to begin with the very fact, that technology has always been an actor in the fashion in which diplomacy was taken, as the relationships between governmental actors was and still are based, firstly on the power balance between them (Barrinha & Renard, 2017). Therefore, the ability of mastering and acquiring advanced technologies was the key to reach such possibilities of powers. Furthermore, today's society, or at least its western part of the world, is almost completely dependent on computer systems, that hold, instead of humans, the data and knowledge of the most fundamental aspects of governing and organizing the state institutively. Today, such computer systems are considered as the cyberspace, a space whose threat to its safety can be also the risk of the ability to have the control and authority over one such a state (Deibert & Crete-Nishihata, 2012).

The cyber space is eventually a virtual space, that is seen both metaphorically as well as physically. Such a space is the one in which lies the data and networks which allow communications between those types of data, in a space that is composed of software, hardware, and the human fact