



VARIABLE CONDITIONS OF ENLARGEMENT PROCESS OF EUROPEAN UNION: SCOPE, EUROANIZATION PROCESS, SOCIAL INTEGRATION

Bahman Peyravi

Vilnius Gedimino Technical University, Vilnius, Lithuania

E-mail: bahmanpeyravi@hotmail.com

Abstract. This article goal, identify the economic development and development policies in the Central and Eastern European countries in last two decade, based on the decline of Europeanization in the existing EU to the impacts of the EU in central and eastern Europe. A majority of thinkers have largely seen the progression as a very assertive function. The anatomy of the economic progress and rivalry benefits in the territory, however, leads on the consequence that the specific access to progression of the Central and Eastern European countries trace came at a quite excessive cost. Comparative negligence and non-resistance of a adjust of policies critic for long-term progress, like science, innovation and technology politics, has led to disruption in the recent decade as much as the reinforcement of the competitive benefits of Central and Eastern European economies. In this situation, how the fiscal fragility of some Central and Eastern European countries has increased severely recently, and the area seems to have reached actual at the border of economic downfall. Onwards the CEE countries took part the EU, the CEE governances have acted progressively towards obtaining a more active place in economic development. However, these policies demand, to stay strengthened considerably by macroeconomic implementations that brake valid extreme bondage on foreign-financed growth.

Keywords: European Union accession process, access to progression of the Central and Eastern European countries, Europeanization.

Introduction

To begin with, according to Kok (2003), enlargement is the most ambitious project that the EU is undertaking- in reality it is the reunification of the European continent, divided in the aftermath of the last world war. Former enlargements have taken place in a divided Europe, but this one helps to achieve the dream of the EU's founding fathers- that is to make Europe whole and free. The candidate countries of central and Eastern Europe (CEE) have been getting on whole the responsibilities of European Union membership for some decades at the moment, so the internal impacts of adopting policies and establishments to the region are easily to be measured to the influences of the EU on its member countries. Nevertheless, the political interactions between the candidates and the EU states are very various, that impacts how Europeanization takes place.

First part exhibit a primarily status for lengthening the labour of European culture to include the European countries effects in central and eastern Europe states, debating that the penetrations are match in core, but

widely and deeper in content. Second part is arguing how to sets out a typology of direction of effects owing to which the EU can influence inner alter in CEE.

Part 3 submits an analysis of main occasions why Europeanization is dissimilar in central and eastern European countries. The factor is ambiguity built into the participation processes.

Europeanization in the present, impacts of the EU in eastern and central Europe. In the beginning, at first view condition that the influences on public policy are parallel in character to that observed in the present EU members, however more extensive and profound in scope. The candidates are getting on all the necessities of EU membership process, so the inner impacts of adopting institutions and policies to candidates are probably to be comparable with the influence of the Union on its present countries, even though the cultural and political correlations are different.

Europeanization process is determined in the literature on the European Union in addition operate in the candidate states, dedicated that they are subject to essen-

tially is similar pressures for adaptation. Nevertheless, two important differences exist: Firstly, the extensive content of the Union's agenda in the applicant states, those outlying on the other side of the necessities of membership for the present member countries. Other important difference is the political situation of a potency relationship among the European Union and the candidate states that is based on accession conditions.

The inconsistency of power among the candidates and the present member imparts the EU more compulsive lanes of effect in the candidates' inner policy-making operations than in the existing Union members because the candidates encounter additional obligations that current members do not. On the other hand there are some limitations on how the European Union utilizes its possible influence in the candidate states, specially the various extents of ambiguity built into the membership continuum.

According to the Maastricht Treaty, any European country may apply for EU membership if it meets a set of core political and economic criteria, known as the "Copenhagen criteria".

It is stressed that a country can only become a member if it fulfils all criteria for accession as first defined by the European Council in Copenhagen in 1993, and reinforced in 1995. These criteria are (European Commission. Understanding enlargement: The European Union's enlargement policy):

- 1) Political: stable institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities.
- 2) Economic: a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competition and market forces in the EU.
- 3) The capacity to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the objectives of political, economic and monetary union.
- 4) Adoption of the entire body of European legislation and its effective implementation through appropriate administrative and judicial structures.

The fact for harmoniousness with the european union states: characteristic existing and scope in the context of enlargement

The Europeanization literature is relevant to the CEE applicants because these states as a matter of facts are matter to substantially the same stress of integration to EU policies as existing member countries. What is more, Grabbe (2002) emphasizes that Europeanization process

determined in the literature on the EU are easily to drive for the candidates too, given that the same policy structures and implementation procedures are used (Grabbe 2002).

During the past decade, Central-Eastern Europe (CEE) has passed on a tough transformation. The scope of the improvement in democratic reforms, economic development, regional cooperation process and assembling into worldwide financial market and economic was unimaginable even 10 years ago and was unique in the region's contemporary history (Sanfrey 2010).

According to Kohler-Koch and Eising (1999) and Cowles (2001), the experience of the EU's existing member countries would suggest the extent is not comprehensive, but it will be significantly greater for CEE. Within the current EU, there has been limited convergence of policies and institutions, and the continuing diversity of member-states has been well documented (Grabbe 2002). In particular, the Union's policy for organize the common market – which is one of the main developed policy fields (Héritier 1996). Furthermore, McGowan and Wallace, (1996) emphasizes that, EU countries can reduce the effect of regulatory arrangement on their internal political economies, irregular implementation and hence diversify impacts on public regimes. Scholars working on democratization have tended to assume that the EU has vigorously encouraged democratization by pressing the CEE countries into implementing democratic human rights regimes and open political systems (Linz and Stepan 1996, Kopecký and Mudde 2000).

Nevertheless, 3 Element assert that the European Union membership process is giving direction to the candidate states towards compatible convergence and determine and ensure the harmonization of policies with certain policy models within the existing EU. Featherstone (1998) emphasizes that the formal accession process sets out to adapt CEE institutions and policies to the EU much faster and more thoroughly than the adaptation of current EU members. This concept and the first factor is the speed of adjustment. Moreover, negotiating for transitional periods, they have made so from a much lower point of movement and with narrow scope. The member countries have been able to make pressure CEE policy reforms because of the priority of accession by their politicians and because of the institutional deficiencies ensue from communist period.

According to Batt and Wolczuk (1999) The CEE applicants are working from different starting-point in terms of institutional development, with gaps left by communist systems, so the clearance of CEE to EU ef-

fects to the process of post-communist transformation should be considered as a second factor.

Another important factor is requirements of CEE with width of the EU's agenda. It is suggested by Brusis (1998) that The CEE applicants have no possibility of opt outs from parts of the agenda, such as those obtained by the UK on the Social Chapter, Schengen or monetary union. Hence the applicants are committed to converging with a maximalist version of the EU's policies. In areas like social policy, where there is resistance to greater integration from some member-states, the Commission has tended to define a 'maximalist' version of the *acquis communautaire* for CEE states.

Determination of regulations: conditions and requirements

Europeanization in the present, impacts of the EU in eastern and central Europe. The candidates are getting on all the necessities of EU membership process, so the inner impacts of adopting institutions and policies to candidates are probably to be comparable with the influence of the Union on its present countries, even though the cultural and political correlations are different. The EU has shown a preference for using 'carrots' rather than 'sticks', and conditionality is not always applied consistently (Smith 1997). Weber (1995) emphasis that The EU applies both positive and negative forms of conditionality to third countries for benefits such as trade concessions, aid, co-operation agreements and political contacts, and since the late 1980s political conditions have increasingly been applied as well as economic ones. Both practical and ideological motivations lie behind the development of political conditionality, and protectionist politics have had an influence. The most detailed conditions to emerge were those for Central and Eastern Europe applied from 1988 onwards to aid, trade and political relations; conditionality has then developed much further following the EU's commitment in 1993 to allow post-communist CEE countries to join as member states. The aspirations of post-communist CEE countries to membership resulted in much more comprehensive conditions for membership than had been set for any previous applicant (Michalski and Wallace 1992). Nevertheless two important differences are exist: Firstly, the extensive content of the Union's agenda in the applicant states, those outlying on the other side of the necessities of membership for the present member countries. Other important difference is the political situation of a potency relationship among the

European Union and the candidate states that is based on accession conditions.

To comparing accession process with some current member of European Union regarding to economic and social reforms:

Table 1. Economic reform priorities for the short term

Czech Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implement policies to maintain internal and external balance • improve corporate governance by accelerating industrial and bank restructuring; implementing financial sector regulation; enforcing Securities and Exchange Commission supervision
Estonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustain high growth rates, reduce inflation, increase level of national savings • accelerate land reform • start pension reform
Hungary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advance structural reforms, particularly of health care • develop private sector • implement policies to maintain internal and external balance • privatize and restructure enterprises, finance, banking and energy-intensive heavy industries
Poland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adopt viable steel sector restructuring programmed by 30 June and start Implementation • restructure coal sector • accelerate privatization/restructuring of state enterprises (including telecoms) • develop financial sector, including banking privatization • improve bankruptcy proceedings
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • act on market-driven restructuring in the enterprise, finance and banking sectors • prepare pension reform • improve corporate governance by accelerating industrial and bank restructuring; implementing financial sector regulation; enforcing Securities and Exchange Commission supervision
Lithuania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accelerate large-scale privatization • restructure banking, energy and agri-food sectors • enforce financial discipline for enterprises • advance structural reforms, particularly of health care • sustain high growth rates, reduce inflation, increase level of national savings

Slovakia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tackle internal and external imbalances and sustain macroeconomic stability • progress on structural reforms • privatize and restructure enterprises, finance, banking and energy-intensive heavy industries
Romania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • privatize two banks • transform régimes autonomies into commercial companies • implement foreign investment regime • restructure/privatize a number of large state-owned industrial and agricultural companies • implement agreements with international financial institutions
Bulgaria (additional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transform régimes autonomies into commercial companies • implement foreign investment regime • restructure/privatize a number of large state-owned industrial and agricultural Companies • prepare pension reform • improve corporate governance by accelerating industrial and bank restructuring; implementing financial sector regulation; enforcing Securities and Exchange Commission supervision

Source: Author's summary drawn from the individual countries' Accession Partnerships.

In addition to the economic priorities summarized below, there are objectives for the short and medium term in the following areas:

1. Political criteria. Short-term priorities are set here only for Slovakia (on elections, opposition party participation and minority languages) and Estonia and Latvia (integration of noncitizens and language training); all applicants have some medium-term objectives, such as improving the judicial system and prison conditions (Latvia), protection of individual liberties (Bulgaria) and integration of minorities.

2. Reinforcement of institutional and administrative capacity, including many areas of policy reform, from banking supervision to internal financial control.

3. Internal market. This objective continues many of the measures detailed in the Single Market White Paper, and pushes reform in areas such as liberalization of capital movements (Poland and Slovenia), adoption of a competition law (Estonia) and adoption of anti-trust laws (Slovenia).

4. Justice and Home Affairs. A priority for all applicants is effective border management with their eastern neighbours.

5. Environment. All of the candidates have to continue transposition of legislation, and to commence detailed programs for approximation of legislation to EU norms and implementation strategies.

Some candidates have further priorities set for industrial restructuring, agriculture, property rights, nuclear security and energy. For the medium term, there are additional priorities for fisheries, transport, employment and social affairs, and regional policy and cohesion. The priorities are similar, despite the applicants' different problems, raising the question of how precisely measures have been targeted to individual countries' circumstances (Grabbe 1999).

Opposition from several member states to eastward enlargement was overcome by setting what were seen as basic conditions to ensure that the countries joining could be integrated relatively easily; the conditions set out at the Copenhagen European Council in 1993 were designed to minimize the risk of new entrants becoming politically unstable and economically burdensome to the existing EU. The conditions were formulated as much to reassure reluctant member states as to guide CEE applicants, and this dual purpose to conditionality has continued to play an important role in the politics of accession within the EU. The fourth condition reflects anxieties among member states about the impact that enlargement might have on EU institutions and policies because of the increase in numbers and diversity, apart from the specific problems that CEE members might bring in; it is a condition for enlargement, whereas the others are conditions for entry (Grabbe 1999).

To take in to the consideration these views on the Copenhagen Conditions:

1. Membership requires that the candidate country has achieved stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities.

2. Membership requires the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union.

3. Membership presupposes the candidate's ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union.

4. The Union's capacity to absorb new members, while maintaining the momentum of European inte-

gration, is also an important consideration in the general interest of both the Union and the candidate countries (Grabbe 1999).

The candidate countries must meet before being admitted to full membership in the stated criteria. These criteria are the political, economic, and grouped into three categories, including the adoption of the *acquis communautaire*.

The roots of the problems these countries are facing today can be found in their past and can be used for integration process. According to Mossley (1991) The Copenhagen conditions are not a straightforward case of conditionality, and they are in several ways different from the traditional conditionality for benefits used by international financial institutions (IFIs) such as the development banks. In its simplest formulation, IFI conditionality links perceived benefits to the fulfilment of certain conditions; in the case of IMF and World Bank finance, conditionality is primarily linked to the implementation of specific economic policies, such as structural adjustment, and the main benefit is finance. It is a means of ensuring the execution of a contract, “a promise by one party to do something now in exchange for a promise by the other party to do something else in the future”, as an analysis of World Bank conditionality puts it.

To summarize, South-East countries face important common features, such as a history full of conflicts, multi ethnic composition of their societies, low GDP per capita levels in comparison to the EU – 27 averages, and a strategic orientation towards the EU. The European integration is widely recognized as key strategy towards economic development in the region. (Paul, Alexe 2012). The splitting of the Yugoslav Republic into Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, FYR of Macedonia, Serbia, and Montenegro was a consequence of internal conflicts and civil wars. These „new“ but heterogeneous micro- countries are not naturally attractive for FDI because they have small market size and they lack intra-regional integration and intangible resources. (Fabry, Zeghni 2010).

Insturaction of europeanization in to the applicant countries: social and economic impacts

First of all it should be noted that enlargement of the EU to take in new applicant countries has been primarily aimed at continuing the process of integrating the European continent through peaceful means, by extending this area of stability and prosperity towards new members. It remains essential to guarantee peace, democracy and

human rights in CEE, as recent conflicts in Europe in the Balkans have shown, through economic, civil and political progress. Through enlargement, the EU is able to contribute to this process by creating a common internal market, ending the long period of division in Europe (Research and Development in South East Europe).

The concept of ‘Europeanization’ can be used to investigate the effects that the EU is having on public policy in the candidate countries. It categories the different mechanisms of Europeanization at work in CEE public policy, distinguishing between those that are similar to the mechanisms in the EU and those that are particular to the accession process. Mechanisms of Europeanization: EU accession involves different processes that effect some degree of institutional and policy transformation in CEE. This section tackles the question ‘what is Europeanized?’ by dividing the mechanisms into five categories (Grabbe 2002):

- **Models:** provision of legislative and institutional templates. The candidate countries have to take on all the EU’s existing laws and norms, so they are subject to the same Europeanization pressures as member-states in the policies and institutional templates that they ‘download’ from EU level. Legal transposition of the *acquis* and harmonization with EU laws are essential to becoming a member-state, and they have so far been the central focus of the accession process and preparations by the candidates. Legislative gaps and institutional weaknesses are also identified by the screening process that takes place with each applicant prior to negotiations on the 31 negotiating ‘chapters’.
- **Money:** aid and technical assistance. The EU is the largest external source of aid for CEE, providing funds administered by the European Commission and also bilateral programs from individual member-states. The amounts transferred to CEE are relatively small in comparison with the fiscal transfers to current member-states under the structural and cohesion funds. However, they have an important role in reinforcing the transfer of EU models, because the aid helps to pay for implementation and the technical assistance builds institutional capacity to use EU practices. The co-financing requirements force applicant countries to allocate public resources to particular

policy areas too, so EU aid can change the order of priorities on a government's agenda.

- **Benchmarking and monitoring:** Progress towards EU accession is a central issue in CEE political debates, so the EU can influence policy and institutional development through ranking the applicants, benchmarking in particular policy areas, and providing examples of best practice that the applicants seek to emulate. Monitoring is a key mechanism in the conditionality for membership, through the cycle of 'Accession Partnerships' and 'Regular Reports' published by the European Commission on how prepared each CEE applicant is in different fields. Conditionality for aid and other benefits is based on implementing the Accession Partnerships issued to each applicant since 1998. These documents provide a direct route into domestic policy-making in CEE, because the EU sets out a list of policy 'priorities' that have to be implemented within the year or in the medium term (defined as five years). The European Commission then reports on each applicant's progress in meeting each priority in the autumn of the year, and may publish a revised Accession Partnership for a particular candidate for the following year.
- **Advice and twinning:** The EU has a direct line into policy-making structures in CEE through its 'twinning' program. Twinning pays for the secondment of civil servants from EU member-states to work in CEE ministries and other parts of public administration. That provides a direct route for cognitive convergence, as EU civil servants work alongside CEE counterparts. However, because twinning projects use civil servants and focus on implementation, most twinning agents are concerned with standards and technical issues rather than overall institutional models or policy direction. Moreover, the advice and expertise offered by the twinning agents are not controlled centrally by the EU, so the impact on CEE public administrations is likely to be diffuse rather than reflecting any consistent European model.
- **Gate-keeping:** access to negotiations and further stages in the accession process. The EU's most powerful conditionality tool is access to

different stages in the accession process, particularly achieving candidate status and starting negotiations. Aid, trade and other benefits can also be used to promote domestic policy changes, but they have not had such direct and evident consequences as progress towards membership. It has taken a decade for the EU to evolve an explicit use of conditionality in a gate-keeping role, where hurdles in the accession process are related to meeting specific conditions. For several years after the conditions were first set in 1993, it was not clear exactly which elements of the political and economic conditions had to be fulfilled for an applicant to be admitted to which benefits. However, by the time of the Luxembourg 1997 and Helsinki 1999 European Councils, a rough progression had emerged of stages in the accession process.

During the accession negotiations to EU, the Central and Eastern European Countries had to shape their administrative systems and to develop an uniform model of public administration in order to join the European Union. All this process called Europeanization was possible by using five conditionality instruments (Grabbe 2001).

Whole five instruments are figuring out policy-implementations in CEECs, however most significantly is the reality that European Union has accomplished use of the dissymmetry of power to finalize important goal. The primary tool is reach to negotiations and paths in the integration process to EU. An instrument used for controlling the progress of the candidate countries are Benchmarking and monitoring and its take secondary tool. In the third place, the legal connections of the *acquis communautaire* and the conformity with European Union regulations. Another instrument is money that connects to the technical assistance of the candidate countries. Finally the fifth instrument is suggestion and twinning.

According to Ladrech (1994) this asymmetry of potency is enforced by conditionality and evidences the top-down collaboration between the EU and the candidate countries. As mentioned earlier EU has submitted a kind of requirements that applicant states had to achieve in order to take on the most significant provision from European Union. Schimmelfenning and Sedelmeier (2004) emphasis that , EU political requirements has pursued the way of reinforcement by reward and continued to mention that, The inducements which were directed to CEECs referred to the reach to inner market, reach to the subsidies of the EU's territorial and agricultural policies, final-

ize solidarity in the decision making process, barely. These inducements have helped to readjust the costs and benefits of the exigencies' fulfilment and in this way they have fortified a profounder compliance of the targeted governments.

Obviously integration to the Europe culture is connected to the enlargement policy actually, owing to a double-way process which causes backlash impacts from cultural integration in CEECs onto restructuring of accession policy. Nevertheless, formation of propagation policy and Europeanization must maintain distinct at a notional grade. Mineshima (2002) mentioned that the political conditions have been ambiguously defined and therefore caused disorientation within targeted governments regarding the necessary steps to take that would have satisfied Brussels.

Conclusions

In conclusions it should be stressed that it is crucial to raise public awareness about the role of science, technology and innovation which are of utmost importance for assuring economic growth and development. More appropriate policies, both national and international are therefore needed. Higher Education, Research and Innovation are important fields of human activity in which CEE countries should increasingly cooperate at all levels thus overcoming barriers and facing challenges (UNESCO BRESCE 2009).

Taking into consideration, this work examines the progress of the Accession collaboration as section of process of existing European Union conditionality for accession. The conditions applied to candidate states transformed as the EU's usual Copenhagen criteria have detailed and evaluated in variant phases. Conditionality of accession is finalized by the Unity's in the accession continuum. The inconsistency of power among the candidates and the present member imparts the EU more compulsive lanes of effect in the candidates' inner policy-making operations than in the existing Union members because the candidates encounter additional obligations that current members do not. On the other hand there are some limitations on how the European Union utilizes its possible influence in the candidate states, specially the various extents of ambiguity built into the membership continuum.

Europeanization is also an field of investigation. This is an instrument to make sensibility of event in candidate states which include interior policy continuum. Social and cultural integration, therefore, needs more

attention to elaborations of European Union policies and it is also needs more than elementary 'equilibrium of potency' study design. It symbolizes a route of interior transformation in institutions, processes and policies to novel regulations, implementation emanating and methods from the leadership of European system. Analytical structure of Europeanization allows us to study process on both internal and transnational levels.

Lastly, integration process may be matched with political options, complex socio-economic and liability for the states involved. However, Europeanization is parallel with modernization, advancement, stability and safety based on benefits of solidarity. Consequently, existing candidate states are now better place to influence the aspect of Europeanization.

References

- Batt, J. and Wolczuk, K.. 1999. The political context: building new states' in Paul Hare, Judy Batt and Saul Estrin (eds), *Reconstituting the Market: The Political Economy of Microeconomic Transformation*, Amsterdam: Harwood, 33–48.
- Brusis, M. 1998. Central and Eastern Europe on the Way into the European Union: Welfare State Reforms in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia, München: Centrum für Angewandte Politikforschung.
- Cowles, M., Green, C., James A., and Risse, T. 2001. *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fabry, N.; Zeghni, S. 2010. Inward FDI in seven transitional countries of South Eastern Europe: a quest of institutional-based attractiveness. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, Vol. 1, Issue 2, 2010.
- Featherstone, K. 1998. Europeanization' and the Centre Periphery: The Case of Greece in the 1990s', *South European Society & Politics* 3, 23–39.
- Grabbe, H. 1999. European University Institute.
- Grabbe, H. 2001b. *Profiting from EU Enlargement*, London: Centre for European Reform.
- Grabbe, H. 2002. Stabilizing the East while keeping out the easterners: internal and external security logics in conflict' in Externalities of integration: the wider impact of Europe's immigration and asylum policies, eds. Sandra Lavenex and Emek Uçarer, Lanham MD: Lexington Books, 91–104.
- Grabbe, H. 2002. *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press vol. 2.draft.
- Héritier, A. 1996. The accommodation of diversity in European policy-making and its outcomes: regulatory policy as a patchwork, *Journal of European Public Policy* 3 (2), 149–167.
- Kohler-Koch, B.. and Eising, R. 1999. *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*, London: Routledge.
- Kok, W. 2003. Enlarging the European Union. Achievements and Challenges. European University Institute. 26 March, 2003.
- Kopecký, P. and Mudde, C.. 2000. 'What has Eastern Europe taught us about the democratisation literature, *European Journal of Political Research* 37, 517–539.
- Ladrech, R. 1994. Europeanization on Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 32, no. 1.

- Linz, Juan J. and Stepan, A. 1996. Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America and Post-Communist Europe, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- McGowan, F. and Wallace, H. 1996. Towards a European Regulatory State, *Journal of European Public Policy* 3 (4), 560–576.
- Michalski, A. and Helen, W. 1992. The European Community: The Challenge of Enlargement, London: RIIA.
- Mineshima, D. 2002. The Rule of Law and EU Expansion, *Liverpool Law Review*, vol. 24. Olsen, J. P. (2002) Many Faces of Europeanization, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 40, no. 2.
- Mosley, P, Harrigan, J. and Toye, J. 1991. Aid and power: the World Bank and policybased lending, Routledge: London and New York.
- Paul, A.; Alexe, I. 2012. Comparative Analysis of South Eastern Europe Economies Facing the Crisis. Future Prospects for the Region. *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 2012.
- Research and Development in South East Europe. 2006. A Cross-National Comparative Study for Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, FYR of Macedonia, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro.
- Sanfrey, P. 2010. *South-eastern Europe: lessons from the global economic crisis*. European Bank for Restriction and Development, Working Paper No. 113, February, 2010.
- Schimmelfenning, F., Sedelmeier, U. 2004. Governance by Conditionality: EU Rule Transfer to the Candidate Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 11, no. 4.
- Science, Higher Education and Innovation Policy in South Eastern Europe. UNESCO BRESCE, 2009.
- Smith, K. E. 1997. The use of political conditionality in the EU's relations with third countries: how effective? EUI Working Paper SPS No. 97/7, San Domenico (FI): European University Institute.
- The Maastricht Treaty. 1992. Treaty on European Union and the Treaties Establishing the European Communities. 7 February 1992.
- Weber, S. 1995. European Union Conditionality, in eds. Barry Eichengreen, Jeffrey Frieden and Jürgen von Hagen, *Politics and Institutions in an Integrated Europe*, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 193–220.
- cijas, kultūrinę integraciją ir ekonominį patvarumą, o tai savo ruožtu daro įtaką vidinei politikai Centrinėje ir Rytų Europoje. Naujos valstybės narės gali bendradarbiauti su valstybėmis, kurios pastaruoju metu prisijungė prie Europos Sąjungos, ir panaudoti jų patirtį siekiant narystės. Šis bendradarbiavimas gali padėti valstybėms kandidatėms integruotis į Europos Sąjungos sistemą

Reikšminiai žodžiai: stojimo į Europos Sąjungą procesas, Centrinės ir Rytinės Europos šalių progresas.

EUROPOS SĄJUNGOS PLĖTROS PROCESO KINTAMOSIOS SĄLYGOS: TAIKYMO SRITYS, EUROPĖJIMO PROCESAS, SOCIALINĖ INTEGRACIJA

B. Peyravi

Santrauka

Centrinės ir Rytinės Europos šalys yra mažiau išvysčiusios savo ekonomikos lygį ir institucines reformas, tai yra didelė problema siekiant įstojimo. Buvo taikoma teisinių dokumentų, mokslinių straipsnių ir statistinių duomenų analizė. Šio straipsnio tikslas, identifikuoti ekonominės plėtros ir vystymosi politiką Centrinės bei Rytų Europos šalyse per pastaruosius du dešimtmečius, atsižvelgiant į mažėjančią europeizaciją dabartinėje Europos Sąjungoje bei jos įtaką Centrinei ir Rytų Europai. Dauguma autorių išvelgė progresą, kaip sudėtingą procesą. Ekonominės plėtros charakteristika ir konkurencija yra naudinga regionui, bet tuo pačiu ši nelygiavertė konkurencija veda į Centrinės ir Rytų Europos šalių išlaidų padidėjimą. Sunkumai, siekiant tapti Europos Sąjungos nare, įtakoja ilgalaikes investi-