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„It is better to know some of the questions than all of the answers”
James Thurber

The issue of enlargement, which finds itself in the midst of the current debate on the European Union, is a matter of importance not only for the Western Europe but Europe as a whole. The end of the Cold War left the European Community as the most powerful and influential transnational institution in Europe. The preamble to the Treaty on the European Union (Maastricht Treaty) as well as Article O and F (1) explicitly set the Union in a wider European context, by "recalling the historic importance of the ending of the division of the European continent and the need to create firm bases for the construction of the future Europe", and by adopting the aim of "an ever closer union among the people of Europe". In the light of the Treaty any European state is entitled to apply for membership, so long as it meets the Union’s conditions.

The EU Treaty moved the Community from an organisation concerned primarily with trade, market harmonisation and agriculture to a three-pillar structure, characterised by supranational and intergovernmental elements. This structure embraces a wide range of issues, covering mainly economy and two areas of intergovernmental co-operation in Common Foreign and Security Policy and Justice and
Home Affairs (Police and Judicial Co-operation in Criminal Matters - according to Treaty of Amsterdam). Policy areas and their relationships have changed in this new context. The former distinction between domestic and foreign policy was already blurred well before 1989 as a result of globalisation and internal integration. As a result of this change, security is no longer so separate from civil issues. Foreign policy, monetary policy, trade, migration policy and human rights are all more closely interrelated than they were before.

It is no longer appropriate to separate the Western Europe from the Eastern Europe, one issue area from another one and one institutional framework from another. Contemporary Europe with a wide variety of social and cultural characteristics presents a high degree of interdependence in term of economy, migration and security. It is not easy, though necessary, to combine these conceptually different issues, all being part of a process, which is shaping future co-operation and integration in Europe.

Enlargement as a very ambiguous concept can be used in many contexts. In the light of integration semantics, enlargement can be treated as a cliché. First of all cliché means a masking simplification of elements of description. However, not each simplification is cliché but only this one, which - in the light of logical analysis - masks a particular state of things, which is being described and by doing so falsifies it. Here we can speak about falsification, since it is about the simplification, as a result of which, the describing state of things not only becomes clearer, but at the same time different from that what was originally. It becomes acceptable, however, in the original form - complex not so simplified - it could be unacceptable at all or only acceptable to a certain extent.

Each description is determined by a means, which is at our disposal, by the form of this what is to be described as well as by its aim - it means the effect, which with the help of description we want to achieve. Clichés are "tendentious", which means that by making use of them the direct aim, desired effect as well as realisation of an intended purpose, become a dominant factor. The choice of a useful expression intends to generate a change in the state of things, which are being described. The guiding principle of such a change is to gain an influence on an interlocutor, a pupil, a customer as well as a voter and to manipulate them. At the base of the description structure, which simplifies a complex matter, lies the fact that one concept is easier to remember and therefore more distinct, "more convenient" than two or more. Such a linguistic operation, which is made here, has its analogon in arithmetic, in an operation of
reducing different fractions to a common denominator. We have to pay attention to the fact that in the linguistic practice as well as in many domains of culture, unnoticeable analogon becomes a model. However, the proving (a report whether a calculation agrees, whether an operation was done properly) is more difficult here then in arithmetic. Not each case of a linguistic subsumption is cliché, not each cliché is made according to the model of a common denominator. Nevertheless, there is a special relationship between the former and the latter. Under the term cliché we understand an particularly convenient element of language (used, well-worn - though aesthetic connotations are not important here), like in arithmetic, where a reduction to a common denominator is a reduction to a "more convenient" element, carried out with a view to a special purpose. Therefore, we find as a natural base for creating cliché, a complex net of overlapping and cross-cutting similarities; similarities on a large and small scale. These similarities cannot be better characterised than "family similarities", because this is the way in which cross the similarities of members of one family: stature, lineaments, eyes colour, walk, temperament, etc.

Summing up, when we talk about manipulation we think of persuading someone to do or to choose something, while the critical consciousness is blocked. Cliché is a means of such a persuasion. It is an element of an instrumental language and not a language, which demonstrates itself; implies ethic values but not aesthetic ones. The importance of cliché results not from its instrumental structure but from realised - in this structure - intention of an interlocutor. Cliché functions through masking a certain state of things. It is equal to falsification in as much as it masks a certain state, thinking that its revealing would not lead to the choice intended by the person using cliché. Cliché is a convenient element of language. The convenience of the element of language as a means and concealment as an aim, meet in a structure of a common denominator. The theory of family similarities enables us to see the state of things, which are masked by cliché. Clichés are products of language. Clichés persuade, but not force. The protection against their influence is guaranteed by recognition not legislation. To some extent clichés can be seen as a means of realisation of a certain policy but in itself do not have a political character. Cliché of a common denominator is especially attractive because it keeps up appearances of a science.

Cliché of a common denominator derives from the concept of exactness, typical to the natural science - that is to say mathematical exactness. Since a reduction of multiple characteristics to one universal predicate or attribute finds its confirmation in
rules formulated by laws of natural science, which thanks to its progress found in our minds a value of a pattern - especially for those of us who have only a schematic idea about proper methods of scientific work - an ideal of scientific exactness wields almost unlimited power over our thinking.

The concept of enlargement, in comparison to a broad and diversified semantic field, which it marks out, carries characteristics of *cliché*, *cliché*, which is a useful element of language, suggestively simplifying and concealing the state of things, which is complex and not expressed to the end.

Enlargement is one of more frequent occurring topics, which appears with different intensity in the debate on current problems and perspectives of the European integration. Accepting the concept of integration as complex and characterised by many ambiguities, we have to be aware of the fact that enlargement as its derivative is also complex and ambiguous a term. At this point, arises the issue concerning a character of the concept of enlargement, which implicates the question: do we have do something to do with the scientific concept, which fulfils the degree of logical precision and coherence with the existing conceptual framework of a given discipline, required in such a case or with a semantic category, which came into being from the necessity to designate a certain relatively recent phenomenon, which up to now have been neither classified nor named on the ground of the language of science. The reasons of such a state of things can be of a different nature such as: difficulties in finding an adequate concept rendering at the heart of the matter or an assumption that this phenomenon resists a scientific inquiry. Since we can present a long list of scientific publications devoted to the problem of enlargement, we should initially assume that we are dealing with the matter that can be submitted to the scientific consideration. Therefore, the first task, which needs to be resolve is to give an answer to the question: whether the enlargement is a scientific concept or maybe a word belonging to the political language, known in German as *Schlagwort*.

Enlargement as a concept only seemingly does not need to be defined. At the first glance, it is a simple and univocal term. Oxford Concise Dictionary in a very lapidary way states that “to enlarge” means strictly to “make larger or wider”. Only seemingly, there is no room for any doubts. Nevertheless, just a basic knowledge of the history of the European integration and its current problems enables us to distinguish several
points of reference for the concept of enlargement. Just a chronological context justifies the distinction of following stages of enlargement, which took place in the past.

The history of the European Union has been marked by successive enlargements with the initial applications to join the Six, which were launched as early as four years after the signing of the Treaty of Rome. Following a decade of delay the initial enlargement took place in 1973 (United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark) and was followed in 1981 by Greece and in 1986 by Spain and Portugal. In the third enlargement in 1995 Austria, Finland and Sweden increased the European Union membership to fifteen states. Each wave of enlargement was different. While in 1973 the primary incentive for expansion was economic, the enlargements of 1980s were first and foremost political in nature, arising from the need to provide the applicant states with stability and support as they emerged from long period of an authoritarian or fascist rule to freedom and democracy. The next developments, in the case of EFTA applicants, released both economic and political factors. The employment of the concept of enlargement creates an illusion that we are dealing with one and the same process of territorial evolution of the Community/Union, whereas indeed each enlargement should be treated as a separate phenomenon. Each process of enlargement is characterised by different conditions such as: different points of departure, leading incentives and calculations, different stages of development of the Community/Union and its member states as well as different international context. Therefore, previous experiences should be treated more as separate cases, even though, at the first glance they seem to compose themselves in one evolutionary chain. In each of the above mentioned cases we were dealing not only with different circumstances but also different demands made to applicant countries. Common elements and similarities were not decisive each time. The cause lies not only in the natural complexity of things but also each time changing configuration of actors and roles at all levels and stages of activities. We have be conscious of the fact that the phenomenon of enlargement takes place on many levels at the same time, reflecting the complexity of national interests on the one hand and Community’s on the other. Unprecedented character of this enterprise, combined with each time different solutions, remind us of a card game where each deal creates a new start point, while at the same time unlike in a real life both rules of the game as well as the number of cards in the pack remain unchanged. Inability to act in an experienced way, the complexity of the matter and the uncertainty of the environment cause that in each situation occurs a psychological need to exorcise the reality. The situation, which is difficult to foresee and the uncertainty of reaching an intended aim cause that a need
appears to "familiarise" with the situation. Hence, the propensity to search for an analogy in the past and to explore more general rules and procedures. For such a reason, in the case of activities, previous to the final decision concerning enlargement, emerges the need to create the leading path, a rite de passage, taking a form of ad hoc obligations, which states applying to the EU are to fulfil. The procedure, laid out each time unilaterally by the Community, marks only the subsequent sequences on the way from an associate membership, through application, avis, negotiations, treaty of accession to accession. The accession negotiations embrace the following steps: (1) Commission presents aquis to applicant; (2) further explanation of aquis by Commission; (3) Commission prepares draft common position of member states; (4) consideration of common position; (5) consideration of revised common position (agreement); (6) agreement written into Treaty of Accession by the Commission and agreed by the drafting group; (7) acceptance of final documents (signing).

This creates only an organisational frame but not rules of law. We can find only procedures but not laws and this is a very important observation, because relations between an applicant country and the European Union differ from other relations accompanying every negotiation process between sovereign states under the rules of international law (including general principles of law). The fundamental tenet of any negotiating strategy must be that the accession negotiations are less negotiation and more entry examinations. Each applicant country is in a weak negotiating position in relation to the EU, which represents the largest market in the world. Not only is the applicant requesting accession, it also has to show that it is capable of assuming obligations of membership. To obtain any derogation, the applicant needs to explain the problem and make a convincing case to the EU. These problems have to be temporary otherwise the applicant runs the risk that EU may conclude that membership is impossible. Negotiating ploys such as threatening to walk out or making take-or-leave-it demands have no place in the accession negotiations. The major dilemma for the EU is to define objective criteria that differentiate according to the applicant's real capacity to become a member, while at the same time to avoid sending the wrong signals that could weaken their resolve to carry out painful domestic reforms.

As far as an adoption of the aquis communitaire is concerned, the most important question, which arises here is how much of it will have to be taken on by the applicant countries before they are deemed ready to accede to the EU. No country that acceded to the EC or EU in the past complied fully with the aquis at the time of its entry. Any
new member of the EU is expected to be able to adopt the whole of the *aquis communitaire* at the time of entry or soon afterwards. The point that needs to be emphasised here is that no member is allowed to derogate from principles that are perceived to be fundamental to the Community principles. Additionally, the CEECs will also have to demonstrate that they have established truly democratic institutions.

Taking into account the situation of the CEE applicant countries, given the momentum of the process of preparing for membership and the political importance of the eastward enlargement, it is likely that the new members will be admitted under extensive transition arrangements. Because there is also possibility of *partial* membership, this implicates a number of serious dilemmas both for the EU and the CEECs.

To sum up, the process of the EU enlargement is based on examination of capabilities of the applicant - in fact unilateral adjustment to conditions and expectations of the Union. This what is called a negotiating process, is in fact the examination of adjustment of national law to the EU law. Up to now, the principle of the necessity to adopt and harmonise the whole, permanently increasing *aquis communitaire*, used in a very rigid way, results that applicants are coming up to a barrier, impossible to overcome, separating more and more applicant countries from the EU. In the case of CEECs a very rigid execution of this principle can, because of historical differences and the lack of understanding of the local cultural character, lead to long-lasting - in the best case blocking the possibility of enlargement of the EU. This principle maintained *a la long*, in the light of protracted, time and labour-consuming proceedings seems to be leading to a permanent inefficiency of the negotiating process. The scale of difficulties in carrying out this task, occurring during the negotiations with the candidates, is illustrated by the fact that the text containing the *aquis* has been estimated to run more than 60 000 pages. So it is virtually impossible to summarise in any useful form the main obligations of membership.

For an applying country the pre-accession period was meant as the time to prepare for membership. It forces an applicant country, just at the pre-accession stage, to take decisions and engage in activities, which produce legal consequences, whereas the EU to the very end does not take any legal obligations - hence, the unilateral character of obligations. This creates the situation in which applicant states are in an unequal position in relation to the EU, what contradicts the general principles of law. In
fact, the situation is that one contracting party must but the other one may. Such a procedure contradicts not only general principles of law but also rules and values of democracy, adherence to which - in law and political systems of applicant states - is formally one of the basic political demands, required from these countries at the very beginning of the application process. In practice, democratic values and principles manifest themselves in search of a consensus. Therefore, the participants are trying to reach a common position through reciprocal compromises and rapprochement. In case of the EU enlargement, in practice such a treatment does not take place - not consensus but a dictate, typical to a more powerful party. Therefore, in principle valid is a rule of unilateral adjustment of an applicant country to the demands of the EU. These demands are not even completely defined and apart from those concerning *aquis communautaire* they have the character of general conditions, which in fact are substantive obligations of membership. The essential criterion of membership requires that an applicant country must be fully functioning democracy that respects human rights; accept the overall view of the European Union as well as the constraints imposed by its gradual creation; accept the *aquis communautaire* i.e. the body of EC law and policy; demonstrate the capacity, economically and otherwise, to fit into Community system or to have the clear potential to do so; be willing and able to contribute positively to the advancement of the European identity.

Therefore, opinions are characterised by a high level of discretion. In case, contrasting differences in opinions take place, such a situation will only mean an impasse, not giving any possibility of solution of the conflict on the judicial way. The procedure adopted in case of the EU enlargement, deliberately does not foresee any instance of appeal, which would enable at least an arbitration. It is not easy to resist the impression that the pre-accession negotiations are conducted from the position of power. A very superficial analysis of the process of enlargement shows that it is dominated by economic factors, not even counting the necessity to adopt the whole *aquis communautaire*, touching upon such economic issues as: *non-discrimination, abolition of custom duties, abolition of quantitative and equivalent restrictions, no restrictions/discrimination by monopolies, free movement of workers and self employed, right of establishment, freedom to offer services, free movement of capital, no measures that distort competition, no aid incompatible with common market, no discriminatory taxes and last but not least no excessive deficit*. Reading the literature, which is cited below, leads us to the conclusion that many analyses that have been made, have as their aim to give an answer to the question concerning the potential results of
enlargement as an economic and social issue. They emphasise a high degree of interdependence in terms of trade, money, migration and security, as the most important in the EU-CEECs relations. Enlargement which in nature is closer to the domain of policy and international law, in practice avails itself of methods and instruments, which belong to a world of business. There are many reasons for such a state of affairs, however, the most important seems to be the reassessment of the economic factor in international relations. After the end of the Cold War the economic factor acquired more and more significance, substituting the concept of national and international security in the military sense by the economic security. In this context, important becomes the fact that up to the present date the Western Europe gathered the most experience in the domain of economic integration. We even come across a statement saying that the economic integration became too advanced in comparison to other kinds of integration processes in the EU. On the other hand, the acceptance - in the case of enlargement - procedures and rules governing the world of business, provokes several comments on the real character of the accession strategy, prepared by the EU for the use of the eastern enlargement. This strategy presents itself in a very clear way along with its leading assumption, which is the procedure based on the principle of mini-max, typical to trade and business enterprises. It aims at the risk minimalization in the EU; the risk related to the change, which carries a very process of enlargement and therefore sanctions the exploitation of all existing advantages with a view to maintain the EU interests. The typical element of this strategy is “not to take any obligations“ by the EU in the legal as well as political sense. Therefore, the process of application is similar to an equation with many unknown quantities. In the best case we manipulate the probability as to the direction in which things should go, however, at the same time avoiding precise timetables and the form of future decisions. Hence, many issues remain unknown to the very end. The EU, which dominates the process, by making use of such a strategy gains an additional advantage, by manipulating the uncertainty of another party. At the present power structure and being its derivative discretion criteria, the bulk of responsibility and risks rest with the applicant states.

The very concept of enlargement is not precise and an ambiguous one, however, at the same time popular and very often used. It is above all useful as a cliché in situations, in which the recipients are suggested by its apparent comprehensibility the content, which is unclear at all and need to be defined.
Enlargement, according to the intention can be used in different semantic contexts. It can mean at the same time a process as well as a state. Enlargement by its historical context brings a priori a positive connotation, namely a successful completion of the following stages of extension of the EU, successfully masking an uncertain and difficult to foresee a result of the next stage of its development. In case of the EU, enlargement as a concept carries an idea of continuity of the European integration process and its progressive tendency, which is being maintained. From time to time, enlargement becomes also a supplementary topic of the political discourse; on the one hand focusing our attention on the future and on the other, moving away from present problems and the lack of progress in the integration deepening. The employment of the concept of enlargement in the public debate is helpful in improving the image of the EU and the actual state of integration. It enables us to exploit a natural contrast and differences between the quality of life in the EU and CEE countries. Hence, one step towards the conclusion that the EU public opinion should appreciate achievements of integration. It renders possible the manipulation, by making use of the mechanism of social and individual perception in the evaluation of the real state of integration against the background of deficiencies of the CEE countries - the EU seems to be the best of the worlds. It is addressed to the national pride, derived from membership in the EU, which through high achievements attracts other countries. Concluding, the concept of enlargement generally serves to improve the image of the EU as well as the state of the European integration. Enlargement generates positive connotations amongst the public opinion, which gives an impression that things take the right course and the whole process is under control. However, in the case of complications just at the very beginning, remedial means were foreseen. Last but not least, enlargement can mean a strategy of the EU, adopted to guarantee on the one hand a successful development of the Union, on the other to find a modus vivendi in its relations with other European countries. Such a strategy assumes the creation of the Great Europe, understood as a group of united states, which can compete successfully in the world, characterised by globalisation processes, with other centres of power such as: USA (NAFTA), China as an arising economic power, Japan and other countries of the Pacific rim and perhaps Russia with its great potential. Enlargement by its optimistic message enables to move away the perspective of other possible directions of development of the relations between the UE and the rest of Europe as well as the final form of the political system of the EU, which is neither certain nor easy to predict. Notwithstanding, the ongoing accession negotiations and the drawing visions of the EU of 27 states, we must be aware of other possible solutions, which could add new meanings to the concept of enlargement.
However, we should not allow our views to be governed by the wishful-thinking and to be aware of the fact that enlargement seen as an attempt to replicate the European Union along its present organisational and political form can fail. It can prove that an enlarged Europe of 27 states is possible only as a *Europe of different speeds* or *Europe of variable geometry* or even *Europe of regions* with clear division on centre and peripheries.

The question of the future shape of the European Union lies at the heart of any discussion concerning the prospects of integration and co-operation in Europe. Having in mind a potential Mediterranean direction of the EU widening we must recognise that in fact the eastern enlargement is the aim of the European strategy. The CEE candidate countries searching to fulfil the security vacuum after 1989 have expressed their will to join the UE as soon as possible. However, different patterns of economic, political and social development in these countries make the prospect of early membership difficult. Some EU member states and institutions believe that the enlargement would cause institutional problems and there is an opinion that accession of the CEE countries would put considerable strain on the Union budget, especially as regards agriculture and regional policy. The prospect of the European Union has fuelled also fears of losing national sovereignty and cultural and social independence in several states.
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