



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

COURSE CODE: INR 351

COURSE TITLE: EUROPE IN WORLD POLITICS



**COURSE
GUIDE**

INR 351
EUROPE IN WORLD POLITICS

Course Team Dr. Iwebunor Okwechime & Akin Iwilade -
(Course Developers/Writers) OAU

Reviewer Dr. Abdulrasheed Abdullahi, Bauchi State University.
Angela Udeoji (Course Coordinator) –NOUN



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

National Open University of Nigeria
Headquarters
14/16 Ahmadu Bello Way
Victoria Island, Lagos

Abuja Office
5 Dar es Salaam Street
Off Aminu Kano Crescent
Wuse II, Abuja

e-mail: centralinfo@nou.edu.ng

URL: www.nou.edu.ng

Published by:
National Open University of Nigeria

Printed 2013

ISBN: 978-058-951-1

All Rights Reserved

| CONTENTS | PAGE |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction | iv |
| Course Aims | iv |
| Course Objectives | iv |
| Working through the Course | iv |
| Course Materials | v |
| Study Units | v |
| Textbooks and References | vi |
| Assessment Exercises | vi |
| Tutor-Marked Assignment | vi |
| Final Examination and Grading | vii |
| Course Marking Scheme | vii |
| Course Overview/Presentation | viii |
| What you will Need in this Course | ix |
| Tutors and Tutorials | ix |
| Assessment Exercises | ix |
| How to Get the Most from This Course | x |
| Conclusion | xii |
| Summary | xii |

INTRODUCTION

INR 351 Europe in World Politics is a one semester course in the third year of B.A (Hons) degree in International Studies. It is a two unit credit course designed to introduce you to, on the one hand, the history of Europe and on the other hand, the place of Europe in the shaping of global politics. The course begins with a brief introductory module on the history and social geography of Europe which, among other things, discusses the different notions of Europe.

‘Europe in ‘World Politics’ provides an interesting background to the context within which international politics has been framed and thus to the more detailed study of international relations. It is designed to facilitate your understanding of the centrality of Europe, not so much in geography or even politics as it once was, but in the development of many of the ideas, concepts and perspectives that now drive international relations. The study units are structured into modules. Each module is structured into average of 4 units. A unit guide comprises of instructional material. It gives you a brief of the course content, course guidelines and suggestions and steps to take while studying. You can also find self-assessment exercises for your study.

COURSE AIMS

The aim of this course is to give the students of international relations a comprehensive knowledge of the role of Europe in the evolution and development of contemporary world politics.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this course is to enable you understand the role and place of Europe in international politics. The specific objectives of each study unit can be found at the beginning and you can make references to it while studying. It is necessary and helpful for you to check at the end of the unit, if your progress is consistent with the stated objectives and if you can conveniently answer the self- assessment exercises. The overall objectives of the course will be achieved if you diligently study and complete all the units in this course.

WORKING THROUGH THE COURSE

To complete the course, you are required to read the study units and other related materials. You will also need to undertake practical exercises for which you need a pen, a note-book, and other materials that will be listed in this guide. The exercises are to aid you in

understanding the concepts being presented. At the end of each unit, you will be required to submit written assignment for assessment purposes. At the end of the course, you will be expected to write a final examination.

THE COURSE MATERIAL

In this course, as in all other courses, the major components you will find are as follows:

- ii. Course Guide
- iii. Study Units
- iv. Textbooks
- v. Assignments

STUDY UNITS

There are 20 study units in this course. They are:

Module 1 History and Social Geography of Europe

- Unit 1 What or where is Europe?
- Unit 2 Europe: 1789-1945
- Unit 3 World War Two and the Immediate Postwar Years
- Unit 4 The Cold War Years

Module 2 Key Players in Europe

- Unit 1 Britain in European International Politics
- Unit 2 France in European International Politics
- Unit 3 Germany in European International Politics
- Unit 4 Russia/Formal Soviet Union in European International Politics

Module 3 Regionalism in Europe

- Unit 1 The Vision of a United Europe
- Unit 2 The Treaty of Rome
- Unit 3 Incremental Regional Integration in Europe: The Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty
- Unit 4 The European Union: Structure, Membership and Roles

Module 4 The Transatlantic Relationship

- Unit 1 An Overview of EU-US Relations
- Unit 2 The United States and European Security

Unit 3 EU-US Relations in Afghanistan, Iran, Russia etc.

Module 5 Contemporary Issues in Twenty First Century Europe

Unit 1 Terrorism and Global Security

Unit 2 Immigration and the Challenge of Multiculturalism

Unit 3 EU Expansion

Unit 4 Europe and the Rise of Global Environmentalism

As you can observe, the course begins with the basics and expands into a more elaborate, complex and detailed form. All you need to do is to follow the instructions as provided in each unit. In addition, some self-assessment exercises have been provided with which you can test your progress with the text and determine if your study is fulfilling the stated objectives. Tutor-marked assignments have also been provided to aid your study. All these will assist you to be able to fully grasp the spirit and letters of Europe's role and place in international politics.

TEXTBOOKS AND REFERENCES

At the end of each unit, you will find a list of relevant reference materials which you may yourself wish to consult as the need arises, even though I have made efforts to provide you with the most important information you need to pass this course. However, I would encourage you, as a third year student to cultivate the habit of consulting as many relevant materials as you are able to within the time available to you. In particular, be sure to consult whatever material you are advised to consult before attempting any exercise.

ASSESSMENT

Two types of assessment are involved in the course: the Self-Assessment Exercises (SAEs), and the Tutor-Marked Assessment (TMA) questions. Your answers to the SAEs are not meant to be submitted, but they are also important since they give you an opportunity to assess your own understanding of the course content. Tutor-Marked Assignments (TMAs) on the other hand are to be carefully answered and kept in your assignment file for submission and marking. This will count for 30% of your total score in the course.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

At the end of each unit, you will find tutor-marked assignments. There is an average of two tutor-marked assignments per unit. This will allow you to engage the course as robustly as possible. You need to submit at least four assignments of which the three with the highest marks will be

recorded as part of your total course grade. This will account for 10 percent each, making a total of 30 percent. When you complete your assignments, send them including your form to your tutor for formal assessment on or before the deadline.

Self-assessment exercises are also provided in each unit. The exercises should help you to evaluate your understanding of the material so far. These are not to be submitted. You will find all answers to these within the units they are intended for.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

There will be a final examination at the end of the course. The examination carries a total of 70 percent of the total course grade. The examination will reflect the contents of what you have learnt and the self-assessments and tutor-marked assignments. You therefore need to revise your course materials beforehand.

COURSE MARKING SCHEME

The following table sets out how the actual course marking is broken down.

| ASSESSMENT | MARKS |
|---|--|
| Four assignments (the best four of all the assignments submitted for marking) | Four assignments, each marked out of 10%, but highest scoring three selected, thus totalling 30% |
| Final Examination | 70% of overall course score |
| Total | 100% of course score |

COURSE OVERVIEW PRESENTATION SCHEME

| Units | Title of Work | Week Activity | Assignment (End-of-Unit) |
|---------------------|---|---------------|--------------------------|
| Course Guide | | | |
| Module 1 | History and Social Geography of Europe | | |
| Unit 1 | What or Where is Europe? | Week 1 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 2 | Europe: 1648-1945 | Week 1 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 3 | World War Two and the Immediate Post War Years | Week 2 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 4 | The Cold War Years | Week 3 | Assignment 1 |
| Module 2 | Key Players in Europe | | |
| Unit 1 | Britain in European International Politics | Week 4 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 2 | France in European International Politics | Week 5 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 3 | Germany in European International Politics | Week 6 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 4 | Russia/Formal Soviet Union in European International Politics | Week 7 | Assignment 1 |
| Module 3 | Regionalism in Europe | | |
| Unit 1 | The Vision of a United Europe | Week 8 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 2 | The Treaty of Rome | Week 9 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 3 | Incremental Regional Integration in Europe: The Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty | Week 10 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 4 | The European Union: Structure, Membership and Roles | Week 11 | Assignment 1 |
| Module 4 | The Transatlantic Relationship | | |
| Unit 1 | An Overview of EU/US Relations | Week 12 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 2 | The United States and European Security | Week 13 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 3 | EU-US Relations in Afghanistan, Iran, Russia etc | Week 14 | Assignment 1 |
| Module 5 | Contemporary Issues in Twenty First Century Europe | | |
| Unit 1 | Terrorism and Global Security | Week 15 | |
| Unit 2 | Immigration and the Challenge of Multiculturalism | Week 15 | |
| Unit 3 | EU Expansion | Week 16 | |

| Units | Title of Work | Week Activity | Assignment (End-of-Unit) |
|--------------|--|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Unit 4 | Europe and the Rise of Global Environmentalism | Week 16 | |
| | Revision | Week 17 | |
| | Examination | Week 17 | |
| | TOTAL | 17 Weeks | |

WHAT YOU WILL NEED FOR THE COURSE

This course builds on what you have learnt in the 100 and 200 Levels. It will be helpful if you try to review what you studied earlier. Second, you may need to purchase one or two texts recommended as important for your mastery of the course content. You need quality time in a study-friendly environment every week. If you are computer-literate (which ideally you should be), you should be prepared to visit recommended websites. You should also cultivate the habit of visiting reputable physical libraries accessible to you.

TUTORS AND TUTORIALS

There are 15 hours of tutorials provided in support of the course. You will be notified of the dates and location of these tutorials, together with the name and phone number of your tutor as soon as you are allocated a tutorial group. Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, and keep a close watch on your progress. Be sure to send in your tutor-marked assignments promptly, and feel free to contact your tutor in case of any difficulty with your self-assessment exercise, tutor-marked assignment or the grading of an assignment. In any case, you are advised to attend the tutorials regularly and punctually. Always take a list of such prepared questions to the tutorials and participate actively in the discussions.

ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

There are two aspects to the assessment of this course. First is the Tutor-Marked Assignments; second is a written examination. In handling these assignments, you are expected to apply the information, knowledge and experience acquired during the course. The tutor-marked assignments are now being done online. Ensure that you register all your courses so that you can have easy access to the online assignments. Your score in the online assignments will account for 30 per cent of your total

coursework. At the end of the course, you will need to sit for a final examination. This examination will account for the other 70 per cent of your total course mark.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

Usually, there are four online tutor-marked assignments in this course. Each assignment will be marked over ten percent. The best three (that is the highest three of the 10 marks) will be counted. This implies that the total mark for the best three assignments will constitute 30% of your total course work. You will be able to complete your online assignments successfully from the information and materials contained in your references, reading and study units.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

The final examination for INR 351: Europe in world politics will be of two hours duration and have a value of 70% of the total course grade. The examination will consist of multiple choice and fill-in-the-gaps questions which will reflect the practice exercises and tutor- marked assignments you have previously encountered. All areas of the course will be assessed. It is important that you use adequate time to revise the entire course. You may find it useful to review your tutor- marked assignments before the examination. The final examination covers information from all aspects of the course.

HOW TO GET THE MOST FROM THIS COURSE

- i. There are 20 units in this course. You are to spend one week in each unit. In distance learning, the study units replace the university lecture. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning; you can read and work through specially designed study materials at your own pace, and at a time and place that suites you best. Think of it as reading the lecture instead of listening to the lecturer. In the same way a lecturer might give you some reading to do. The study units tell you when to read and which are your text materials or recommended books. You are provided exercises to do at appropriate points, just as a lecturer might give you in a class exercise.
- ii. Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction to the subject matter of the unit, and how a particular unit is integrated with other units and the course as a whole. Next to this is a set of learning objectives. These objectives let you know what you should be able to do, by the time you have completed the unit. These learning objectives are meant to guide your study. The moment a unit is finished, you

must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If this is made a habit, then you will significantly improve your chance of passing the course.

1. The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources. This will usually be either from your reference or from a reading section.
2. The following is a practical strategy for working through the course. If you run into any trouble, telephone your tutor or visit the study centre nearest to you. Remember that your tutor's job is to help you. When you need assistance, do not hesitate to call and ask your tutor to provide it.
3. Read this course guide thoroughly. It is your first assignment.
4. Organise a study schedule – Design a 'Course Overview' to guide you through the course. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments relate to the units. Important information; e.g. details of your tutorials and the date of the first day of the semester is available at the study centre. You need to gather all the information into one place, such as your diary or a wall calendar. Whatever method you choose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates and schedule of work for each unit.
5. Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything to stay faithful to it.
6. The major reason that students fail is that they get behind in their coursework. If you get into difficulties with your schedule, please let your tutor or course coordinator know before it is too late for help.
7. Turn to Unit 1, and read the introduction and the objectives for the unit.
8. Assemble the study materials. You will need your references for the unit you are studying at any point in time.
9. As you work through the unit, you will know what sources to consult for further information.
10. Visit your study centre whenever you need up-to-date information.
11. Well before the relevant online TMA due dates, visit your study centre for relevant information and updates. Keep in mind that you will learn a lot by doing the assignment carefully. They have been designed to help you meet the objectives of the course and, therefore, will help you pass the examination.
12. Review the objectives for each study unit to confirm that you have achieved them. If you feel unsure about any of the objectives, review the study materials or consult your tutor. When you are confident that you have achieved a unit's objectives, you can start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course

and try to space your study so that you can keep yourself on schedule.

- i. After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for the final examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unit) and the course objectives (listed in the course guide).

CONCLUSION

This is a theory course but you will get the best out of it if you cultivate the habit of relating it to political issues in domestic and international arenas.

SUMMARY

'Europe in 'World Politics' introduces you to the history and social geography of Europe. It also explains the role and place of Europe in contemporary international politics. All the basic course materials that you need to successfully complete the course are provided. At the end, you will be able to:

- i. recount the history and social geography of Europe; its social and political evolution since at least the 17th century and how it has contributed to the shaping of world history
- ii. explain the underlying social, economic and political issues that have driven that evolution
- iii. determine the place and role of Europe in contemporary international politics
- iv. describe the role of specific European countries in the development of Europe
- v. explain the role being played by Europe, its institutions and its countries in the development of ideas like environmentalism and multiculturalism.

List of Acronyms

CAP Common Agricultural Policy

COMECON Council for Mutual Economic Assistance **EDC**

European Defence Community **EMU** European Monetary Union

EU European Union

NAFTA North Atlantic Free Trade Area

NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

UK United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland **USA**

United States of America

USSR Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

INR 351: EUROPE IN WORLD POLITICS

COURSE OVERVIEW

Module One: History and Social Geography of Europe

Unit 1: What or Where is Europe?

Unit 2: World War Two and the Immediate Post War Years

Unit 3: The Cold War Years in Europe

Module Two: Regionalism in Europe

Unit 1: The Treaty of Rome

Unit 2: Incremental Regional Integration in Europe: The Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty

Unit 3: The European Union: Structure, Membership and Roles

Module Three: The Transatlantic Relationship

Unit 1: An Overview of EU/US Relations

Unit 2: The United States and European Security

Unit 3: EU – US Relations in Afghanistan, Iran and Russia

Module Four: Contemporary Issues in Twenty First Century Europe

Unit 1: Terrorism and Global Security

Unit 2: EU Expansion

Unit 3: The Covid-19 Pandemic

Unit 4: The 2022 Russian Ukraine War

MODULE 1: HISTORY AND SOCIAL GEOGRAPHY OF EUROPE

Unit 1: What or Where is Europe?

Unit 2: World War Two and the Immediate Postwar Years

Unit 3: The Cold War Years

UNIT 1 WHAT OR WHERE IS EUROPE?

CONTENTS

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Learning Outcome

1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Europe as a Civilization

1.3.2 Europe as a Territorial Unit

1.3.3 Europe as an Idea

1.4. Summary

1.5 References/Further Reading

1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Europe has been one of the most important influences on the contemporary international system. Indeed, it is often said that the universalization of the international system is in fact a mere globalization of an essentially European system. The perception of the foundations of the contemporary international system as Eurocentric is not unfounded. As the literature has shown, the evolution of the contemporary international system can be traced to the treaty of Westphalia which established the state-based contours of international relations. This generally accepted beginning of the present international system in itself provides compelling evidence of the immense influence of European culture, history and civilization on the way global politics is being conducted at the moment.

In this unit, we will address the definition of that much talked about entity: Europe. We will examine the various issues that matter when a definition of Europe is attempted and why there are different ways to conceptualize Europe. For instance, we will look at Europe as a civilization, geographical entity and as an idea. We will also take note of the variations that characterize even these broad areas of distinction and briefly touch on the implications of these divergent notions of Europe on its role in world politics.

1. 2 LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Describe the fluid character of Europe

- vi. carve out the relevance of the various definitions of Europe to global politics
- vii. Explain the conception of the main players in Europe, the shifting nature of its boundaries and its widespread influence in many other parts of the world.

1.3. MAIN CONTENT

1.3.1 Europe as a Civilization

Europe has been described by Palmer and Perkins (2003: 396) as a civilization, a territorial unit and an idea. This description encompasses three common notions of Europe that have driven the understanding of its role in modern international history and of its potentials as a force in contemporary politics. Europe is considered the heartland of the civilization that evolved from the Judaic-Greco-Roman and Christian tradition. It is generally referred to as western civilization. As a civilization therefore, Europe has its roots in the traditions that evolved from ‘world’ empires like Greece and Rome and in the normative values of Christianity.

Interestingly however, the geographical boundaries of this distinctly European civilization have spread far beyond its heartland in continental Europe. There was indeed a time when this civilization controlled almost the entire world. For instance, it spread its values to the New World (America), New Zealand and Australia. It also effectively colonized peoples as far flung as Africa and India. In fact, throughout the modern historical period, European civilization has been largely dominant. This civilization however has its divisive strands. For instance, it has been noted that efforts should be made to distinguish between Western Christian and Western Orthodox civilizations. Western Christian civilization is centered on West and Central Europe (states like Germany, France, Britain and Spain) while Orthodox civilization finds its homeland in Russia. While there may be slight variations in these ‘two’ civilizations however, their origins and essential values are similar. The divisions are less a civilizational one as they are products of politics and economics. Non western civilizations like the Chinese are for instance very clearly distinct in origin and character.

1.3.2 Europe as a Territorial Unit

While the notion of Europe as a civilization is rather fluid and faced with challenges and divisions, its geography is perhaps less difficult to gauge. According to Charles De Gaulle, Europe ‘extends from the Atlantic to the Urals’. This implies that it covers an area of approximately four million square miles, and is divided into as many as 40 states. These states are vastly different in size and national power. From European Russia, with almost half of the entire land mass to the Vatican which covers only 108 acres, European states are the epitome of diversity. States like Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Spain and Italy wield immense influence within the continent and indeed, to varying extents, in global politics. The continent can be divided into seven main geographic regions, namely:

- iii. Eastern Europe (Russia and Poland).
- iv. South East Europe (Romania, Hungary, the former Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and European Turkey)
- v. Southern Europe (Italy, Spain, Portugal and minuscule states like the Vatican, San Marino and Andorra)
- vi. Central Europe (Germany, former Czechoslovakia, Austria, Switzerland and Liechtenstein)
- vii. Western Europe (France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Monaco)
- viii. The British Isles (the United Kingdom, the Republic of Ireland)
- ix. Islands like Cyprus, Iceland and Malta.

In general, Europe is situated on the western tip of the Eurasian land mass. Its coastal location and the belt of prevailing westerly winds give much of the continent a temperate climate and sufficient rain. Eastern Europe however suffers from extremes of heat and cold typical of continental climates while the Mediterranean basin has a dry summer climate.

1.3.3 Europe as an Idea

The third key notion of Europe is its perception as an idea. In this regard, it is a culture as well as a civilization. Shaped by its social, political, cultural and material history, Europe is in many ways a mosaic of values bound together by common notions of unity and history. This means that it is a combination or collection of values that are connected by a shared sense of history. This notion of a united Europe is framed

by the implications of its cultural and religious heritage, its topography, political history and deepening multiculturalism. Driven by both its most honored history and its darkest past, the idea of a united, peaceful and prosperous Europe, providing normative as well as substantive leadership for the world, has endured significantly since the time of the Romans. It is not unusual to encounter talk of European, or western values, having universal validity even in contemporary European Union discourses. This is very much like the notion of civilized ‘Romans’ or ‘Greeks’ as against the ‘Barbarian others’ that were common in European history. As an idea therefore, Europe represents, or at least is seen to do so by its protagonists, the quintessential essence of human civilization.

This notion understandably has its antagonists. In fact, the very definition of Europe in a physical sense is highly contentious. For instance, many people consider it rather naive to regard Russia and Turkey as parts of Europe. Some others find it difficult to exclude European colonists in America and the South West Pacific (New Zealand and Australia) from Europe. In fact, the extensive influence of European culture on former colonies in Asia and Africa make some regard Europe as extending far beyond its continental borders to include these very different peoples. The perception of Europe may also in a sense include only states that have joined the European Union. With a definition like this, ‘Europe’ becomes smaller than the continent of Europe.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

13. To what extent can Europe be described as a civilization?
14. Briefly discuss the seven main geographic regions of Europe

1.4. SUMMARY

What the above three descriptions of Europe indicate is that it is difficult, if not outrightly impossible; to set the frontiers of a continent that has never really had precise boundaries. In fact, in a globalised twenty first century, where technological advances and new media have greatly increased global interconnectivity, and with it, the ability of Europe to influence, and indeed be influenced by the rest of the world, it is a considerably difficult enterprise to determine with precision the frontiers of European culture, civilization

or even territory. This is not to suggest that Europe means the world or that the world is European, rather, it is an acknowledgement of the immense contributions of Europe to modern history and its having stamped, more than any other civilization, its distinct nature on the contemporary international system.

In this unit, we have examined the different ways in which Europe can be defined. We drew attention to the cultural, geographical and social dimensions of Europe and provided some introduction into how much Europe has both influenced and been influenced by the rest of the world.

1.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Palmer, N. & Howard, P. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*. Delhi:

AITBS.

Toynbee, A. (1953). *The World and the West*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Willis, F. R. (1968). *Europe in the Global Age: 1939 to the Present*. New York: Harper and Row.

1.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. To what extent can Europe be described as a civilization?

Europe can be considered as a civilization as its roots evolved from world empires such as Rome and Greece and the normative values of Christianity. Another factor that described Europe as a civilization is its position as a colonizer of many countries in Africa and Asia and it also controlled the New World like America, New Zealand and Australia. But this European civilization has two divisions: Western civilization with Great Britain, France, Spain and Germany and Orthodox civilization typified by Russia.

2. Briefly discuss the seven main geographic regions of Europe

Europe is situated on the western tip of the Eurasian land mass. Its coastal location and the belt of prevailing westerly winds give much of the continent a temperate climate and sufficient rain. Eastern Europe however suffers from extremes of heat and cold typical of continental climates while the Mediterranean basin has a dry summer climate.

Thus, the seven main geographic regions of Europe are: Eastern Europe (Russia and Poland), South East

Europe (Romania, Hungary, the former Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and European Turkey), Southern Europe (Italy, Spain, Portugal and minuscule states like the Vatican, San Marino and Andorra), Central Europe (Germany, former Czechoslovakia, Austria, Switzerland and Liechtenstein), Western Europe (France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Monaco), The British Isles (the United Kingdom, the Republic of Ireland), Islands like Cyprus, Iceland and Malta.

CONTENTS

2.1. Introduction

2.2. Learning Outcomes

2.3. Main Content

2.3.1 Origins of World War Two

2.3.2 The Axis Powers and their Triumphs, 1939-1942

2.3.3 The Defeat of the Axis Powers

2.3.4 Europe after the War

2.4. Summary

2.5. References/Further Reading

2.6. Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The Second World War was even more destructive than the first. The war was driven by grievance left unattended by the rather abrupt and messy end to the First World War. The implications of this conflict were felt far beyond Europe, where it started, and far beyond the years in which it was waged. It effectively changed the nature of the international system, introduced new conceptions of order and peace and framed national interest in ideological clothes.

In this unit, we will look at the origins of the Second World War. Particularly, we will attempt to draw attention to the connection between it and the First World War. We will also look at the axis advance and eventual defeat and finally examine how Europe changed significantly after the war.

2.2 LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- ii. Grasp the connection between the two World Wars
- iii. Describe the pivotal events of the Second World War
- iv. Highlight how much they changed the international conditions of Europe in the immediate postwar years and throughout the cold war.

2.3 MAIN CONTENT

2.3.1 Origins of World War Two

One can only understand the origins, progress, and results of the Second World War if one considers both World Wars as constituting one homogeneous, inwardly coherent era. The immediate roots of the Second World War lie in the termination of the First World War by the so-called "suburban treaties" of Paris in 1919.

Wilson had induced the German people to capitulate and overthrow the monarchy by the promise, soon to be broken, of a peace without annexations and indemnities. Capitulation and revolution delivered the German Empire to the mercy of the vengeful victors. Germany was not allowed to take part in the peace negotiations; the victors alone decided the conditions of peace, in a procedure without precedent in European history. On May 7, 1919, the peace conditions were handed over to the German peace delegation. Count Brockdorff-Rantzau, foreign secretary and leader of the delegation, pointed out in his speech before the delegates of the western allies and their associates:

...We know the impact of the hate we are encountering here, and we have heard the passionate demand of the victors, who require us, the defeated, to pay the bill and plan to punish us as the guilty party. We are asked to confess ourselves the sole culprits; in my view, such a confession would be a lie.

By these words the foreign secretary refused to accept article 231 of the peace treaty, the so-called war-guilt article, and the lie which claimed that Germany was solely responsible for the war and could therefore be made responsible for all the havoc wrought by the war. The victors threatened that if the German government didn't sign the treaty, they would invade Germany proper. Indignation in the Weimar National Assembly was general, and the climate of opinion favored rejection. The Social Democrat Philipp Scheidemann, who had proclaimed the German Republic on 9 November 1918, and was prime minister of the first republican government elected by the National Assembly, declared: "I ask you, who as an honest man-not even as a German, simply as an honest man feeling himself bound by contracts, is able to accept such conditions? Which hand would not wither, should it be bound in such chains? In the government's view, this treaty is unacceptable."

Scheidemann, as well as Count Brockdorff-Rantzau, resigned under protest. Important German-Jewish

economic leaders, namely Walther Rathenau and the Hamburg banker Max Warburg, took a firm stand against accepting the dictate of the victors and called for a refusal, even against the odds of an enemy invasion of Germany. The National Assembly, however, did not have the courage to maintain such a position, and under protest, voted acceptance of the Versailles dictate. It was on June 28, 1919, the date fixed by the victorious powers that the National Assembly's plenipotentiaries had to sign that treaty. The date had been chosen as a reminder of the murder at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914.

Connected with the "war guilt article" were the punitive regulations of sections 227-231, referring to the surrender of "war criminals" to the victors, the most prominent "criminal" on the lists being the German emperor, who had fled to the Netherlands. Since the Dutch government declined to extradite the emperor, the planned trial did not take place. The German government refused to hand over other prominent German leaders to the victors, and passed an act concerning prosecution of war crimes.

Adolf Hitler, then an unknown soldier, experienced the famine which lasted throughout the war and in those early post-war years. His political program was born of those experiences, particularly his idea of conquering Ukraine for the German people. Conquering the fertile regions of southern Russia could provide not only living space for the German people; it could ban forever the possibility of another hunger blockade. Hitler experienced the Revolution of November 1918 lying wounded in a military hospital. He became a passionate enemy of the November revolution and of the "Soviet Republic" in the Bavarian capital of Munich during April 1919, a political coup staged chiefly by Jews and directed by Lenin's radio commands from Moscow. Hitler became a member of the then totally unimportant "Deutsche Arbeiterpartei" (German Worker's Party) founded in January of that same year, and he soon proved to be a brilliant orator. His main topic was the Versailles dictate, which he saw as closely connected with the November revolution and the mischievous revolutionary activities of the Jews. As a German of the late Habsburg Monarchy, he was a fanatic supporter of a union of the Austrian Germans with the German Reich. The main focuses of his political activity were the fight against the peace dictate, the Marxist-Communist threat with the leading role of the Jews in the revolt, and the fight for self-determination and equality of rights for the German people. The miserable end of the Weimar Republic, "the freest democracy of the world," and its result, Hitler's dictatorship, were consequences of the Versailles dictate. The victors had won the war but lost the

peace by their treaty.

The most important stipulations of the dictate of Versailles were as follows: The German Reich had to cede 73,485 square kilometers, inhabited by 7,325,000 persons, to neighboring states. Before the war it had possessed 540,787 square kilometers and 67,892,000 inhabitants; after the war, 467,301 square kilometers and 59,036,000 inhabitants remained. Germany lost 75% of its yearly production of zinc ore, 74.8% of iron ore, 7.7% of lead ore, 28.7% of coal, and 4% of potash. Of its yearly agricultural production, Germany lost 19.7% in potatoes, 18.2% in rye, 17.2% in barley, 12.6% in wheat, and 9.6% in oats.

The Saar territory and other regions to the west of the Rhine were occupied by foreign troops and were to remain so for 15 years, with Cologne, Mainz, and Coblenz as bridgeheads. The costs of the occupation, 3,640,000,000 gold marks, had to be paid by the German Reich. Germany was not allowed to station troops or build fortifications to the west of the Rhine and in a 50-kilometer zone to the east.

Germany was forced to disarm almost completely, the conditions calling for: abolition of the general draft, prohibition of all heavy arms (artillery and tanks), a volunteer army of only 100,000 troops and officers restricted to long-term enlistments; reduction of the navy to six capital ships, six light cruisers, 12 destroyers, 12 torpedo-boats, 15,000 men and 500 officers. An air force was absolutely prohibited. The process of disarmament was overseen by an international military committee until 1927. Additionally, all German rivers had to be internationalized and overseas cables ceded to the victors.

The economic conditions of the Versailles treaty were as follows: After the delivery of the navy, the merchant ships had to be handed over as well, with only a few exceptions. Germany was deprived of all her foreign accounts-private ones too-and lost her colonies. For a period of ten years, Germany had to supply France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Italy with 40 million tons of coal per year, and had to deliver machines, factory furnishings, tools and other materials for the restoration of devastated areas in Belgium and the North of France. In regard to the hunger blockade, which continued until January 1920, a special hardship on the German people was the forced delivery of German cattle to the victors for breeding and slaughtering purposes.

George Kennan, the well-known American diplomat and historian, commented as follows:

vi. 'In this way, the pattern of the events that led the Western world to new disaster in 1939 was

laid down in its entirety by the Allied governments in 1918-19. What we shall have to observe from here on, in the relations between Russia, Germany and the West, follows logic as inexorable as that of any Greek tragedy.

- ii. The Second World War was thus an inevitable consequence of the First World War's termination in the peace dictates of Versailles and St. Germain. The immediate origins of the Second World War from a German point of view were the 'Allied Powers' breaking of the preliminary agreement based on Wilson's 14 Points; the refusal of the right of self-determination and of equality of rights for the German people; the creation of the eastern frontier and the "Polish Corridor"; the treaties' paragraphs on war guilt and war criminals, and impossible financial and economic claims. The outbreak of the war of 1939 was caused directly by the conflict between Poland and Germany over the "Corridor" and Danzig problems and of course by the militarism and hatred being promoted by political leaders like Hitler and Mussolini.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

1. What year was the proclamation creating the German Republic made and by who?

2.3.2 The Axis Powers and their Triumphs, 1939-1942

The belligerents during World War II fought as partners in one of two major alliances: the Axis and the Allies. The three principal partners in the Axis alliance were Germany, Italy, and Japan. These three countries recognized German hegemony over most of continental Europe; Italian hegemony over the Mediterranean Sea; and Japanese hegemony over East Asia and the Pacific.

Although the Axis partners never developed institutions to coordinate foreign or military policy as the Allies did, the Axis partners had two common interests: 1) territorial expansion and foundation of empires based on military conquest and the overthrow of the post-World War I international order; and 2) the destruction or neutralization of Soviet Communism.

On November 1, 1936, Germany and Italy, reflecting their common interest in destabilizing the European order, announced a Rome-Berlin Axis one week after signing a treaty of friendship. Nearly a month later,

on November 25, 1936, Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan signed the so-called Anti-Comintern Pact directed at the Soviet Union. Italy joined the Anti-Comintern Pact on November 6, 1937. On May 22, 1939, Germany and Italy signed the so-called Pact of Steel, formalizing the Axis alliance with military provisions. Finally, on September 27, 1940, Germany, Italy, and Japan signed the Tripartite Pact, which became known as the Axis alliance.

Even before the Tripartite Pact, two of the three Axis powers had initiated conflicts that would become theaters of war in World War II. On July 7, 1937, Japan invaded China to initiate the war in the Pacific; while the German invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939, unleashed the European war. Italy entered World War II on the Axis side on June 10, 1940, as the defeat of France became apparent.

In July 1940, just weeks after the defeat of France, Hitler decided that Nazi Germany would attack the Soviet Union the following spring. In order to secure raw materials, transit rights for German troops, and troop contributions for the invasion from sympathetic powers, Germany began to cajole and pressure the southeast European states to join the Axis. Nazi Germany offered economic aid to Slovakia and military protection and Soviet territory to Romania, while warning Hungary that recent German support for Hungarian annexations of Czechoslovak and Romanian territory might change to the benefit of Slovakia and Romania.

Italy's failed effort to conquer Greece in the late autumn and winter of 1940-1941 exacerbated German concerns about securing their south-eastern flank in the Balkans. Greek entry into the war and victories in northern Greece and Albania allowed the British to open a Balkan front against the Axis in Greece that might threaten Romania's oil fields, which were vital to Nazi Germany's invasion plans. To subdue Greece and move the British off the European mainland, Nazi Germany now required troop transport through Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

After the Italo-Greek front opened on October 28, 1940, German pressure on Hungary and the Balkan States intensified. Hoping for preferential economic treatment, mindful of recent German support for annexation of northern Transylvania, and eager for future Axis support for acquiring the remainder of Transylvania, Hungary joined the Axis on November 20, 1940. Having already requested and received a German military mission in October 1940, the Romanians joined on November 23, 1940. They hoped that

loyal support for a German invasion of the Soviet Union and faithful oil deliveries would destroy the Soviet threat, return the provinces annexed by the Soviet Union in June 1940, and win German support for the return of northern Transylvania. Both politically and economically dependent on Germany for its very existence as an “independent” state, Slovakia followed suit on November 24.

Bulgaria, whose leaders were reluctant to get involved in a war with the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia, which was nominally an ally of Greece, stalled, resisting German pressure. After the Germans offered Greek territory in Thrace and exempted it from participation in the invasion of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria joined the Axis on March 1, 1941. When the Germans agreed to settle for Yugoslav neutrality in the war against Greece, without demanding transit rights for Axis troops, Yugoslavia reluctantly joined the Axis on March 25, 1941. Two days later, Serbian military officers overthrew the government that had signed the Tripartite Pact. After the subsequent invasion and dismemberment of Yugoslavia by Germany, Italy, Hungary, and Bulgaria in April, the newly established and so-called Independent State of Croatia joined the Axis on June 15, 1941.

On June 26, 1941, four days after the Axis invasion of the Soviet Union, Finland, seeking to regain territory lost during the 1939-1940 Winter War, entered the war against the USSR as a “co-belligerent.” Finland never signed the Tripartite Pact.

After Japan’s surprise attack on the United States fleet anchored at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii on December 7, 1941, and the declaration of war on the United States by Germany and the European Axis powers within a week, the Atlantic and Pacific wars became a truly World War.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

2. What were the interests that connected the key members of the Axis?

2.3.3 The Defeat of the Axis Powers

In 1944, US and British army’s invaded the continent of Europe in the great 'Operation Overlord', landing in Normandy. It was hazardous and risky, especially for the first troops to land, who would necessarily be few in numbers. They would be slaughtered if the Germans had masses of tanks waiting for them. General

Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Allied Commander had said that success depended on two factors: First is that the Germans had to be taken by surprise. Several tricks and deceptions were used to make them think the landings would be at Calais and not Normandy. For example on 'D-Day' (the first day of the landings) the German radar screens at Calais showed what seemed to be an invasion fleet approaching; this effect was achieved by launches towing barrage balloons and aircraft circling and dropping 'window' (metalized paper).

Second, even supposing the Germans were taken by surprise, there was the danger that they might rush forces more rapidly overland than the Allies could bring in reinforcements over the sea and beaches. If they did, the Germans would drive the invaders into the sea. To win this 'battle of the build-up', as Eisenhower called it, he insisted that the heavy bomber forces should spend weeks before the invasion destroying the French railway system, which is what Germans would use to transport their troops. The French Resistance joined in with sabotage of roads and railways. The Allied air forces had control of the air -5000 of their aircraft flying on D-Day and they had shot up anything seen moving in daylight. The German panzers could only move at night.

The German leaders could not agree on how to resist the invasion. Field Marshal von Rundstedt, C-in-C in France, wanted to keep four panzer divisions well back and rush them in wherever the landings were made. Rommel, who was in charge of the channel defenses, said Allied air power would prevent this. He thought the landings would be in Normandy and he wanted four panzer divisions ready 'at the water's edge'. Hitler did not allow this. The disagreements were never sorted out. Rommel strewed the Normandy beaches with obstacles of steel and wood to wreck allied landing crafts.

On 6 June 1944 the Allied invasion force of five divisions; about 4060 vessels from ports all round southern England crossed the Channel without incident and landed on five beaches on the Normandy coast. Three airborne divisions, two American and one British, had been dropped beforehand to secure positions to each side. At dawn German sentries looked out to sea and were shaken by the sight of the vast invasion fleet. They were taken completely by surprise.

The American landings were made on the beaches code-named 'Utah' and 'Omaha'. The transport ships anchored a long way out and the troops went in on assault craft (LCAS) lowered from the lifeboat davits.

At 'Utah', the German coastal defenses were damaged by heavy bombing and a naval bombardment with big guns. Amphibious or 'swimming' tanks (ones that could be used on land and water) arrived on the beaches with the first wave of infantry, and the landing was a success. In a few hours troops were moving inland to link up with the airborne forces. At 'Omaha', however, the landings came close to disaster. The German defenses here were the strongest the Americans ever had to face. Several of the LCAs were swamped in rough seas and sank. Others only kept afloat when soaked and seasick soldiers frantically bailed out water with their helmets. The US bomber planes could not see the German coastal defenses through low cloud and dropped their bombs too far inland. Intense German gunfire from the cliffs overlooking the beach broke most of the first wave of infantry companies. Eventually 'Bloody Omaha' was captured, but many men died in the process.

In 1943 the allies invaded Sicily in an attempt to knock Italy out of the war. The invasion was one of the biggest amphibious attacks (launched from the sea) of the war, with 150000 men, as many as those landed in the great invasion of Normandy of the following year. Most went ashore in small assault craft, which were lowered, from the lifeboat davits of large transport ships. New beaching craft were used: the big LST, which could land about 60 tanks and the LCT (Landing Craft Tank), which could land about six tanks.

The allied conquest of Sicily was a success, though not easy. Patton, the American Commander, did well. He was proving to be the best blitzkrieg commander on the allied side. He was a rough, outspoken character who carried pearl-handled revolvers on his hips, cowboy style. He had to be sacked for doing what an officer should not do - striking a soldier, a mental patient in hospital whom Patton suspected of pretending to be ill.

Most Italians were fed up with the war and Mussolini was overthrown. The allies hoped that they would be able to occupy Italy without a fight. The new Italian government signed a secret peace agreement with the allies; but the Germans quickly seized control of the country. The allies then invaded Italy, making their main landing at Salerno. The Germans struck back hard and nearly drove them into the sea. Under General Kesselring's leadership, the Germans skillfully used the difficult mountainous countryside to slow down the allies, whose tactics were by contrast uninspired.

Fighting near Monte Cassino was particularly frustrating for the allies. In turn Americans, New Zealanders,

Indians and Poles attacked Cassino over a period of six months but were driven back. An Allied seaborne landing behind the German lines at Anzio did little good. French troops finally broke through in May 1944. By June the allies were in Rome and by August had reached Florence. Further north the allies suffered heart-breaking resistance right through to the end of the war.

After the Battle of Leyte Gulf, the Japanese, in desperation, made the first use of 'Kamikaze' attacks. Japanese pilots ready to die for their country made suicide dives onto Allied ships in planes loaded with bombs. This stemmed from the religious belief that to die in battle won a man a place in heaven. Kamikaze attacks proved to be extremely dangerous. The allied fleet was ringed with destroyer pickets with radar, directing fighters onto the Kamikazes, stopping most but not all. Small ships met the Kamikazes sideways on for maximum firepower, making full speed to present a moving target. The Kamikazes' speed of descent was so great that their controls became locked by air pressure and they could not maneuver. There were no survivors to question about methods. Kamikaze attacks sank 34 US ships and badly damaged 288 others but the Kamikaze did not halt the allied advance on Japan.

In February 1945, the Americans launched an assault on the volcanic island of Iwo Jima and Okinawa from Tokyo. The steep beaches of soft volcanic ash were very difficult for landing and the Marines had to scramble ashore as best they could. The Japanese had dug their defenses deeply into the lava of this volcanic island and it took the Americans a month of fighting to capture the island. Over 4000 Americans and 25000 Japanese died in the fighting.

In Okinawa, closer to the Japanese mainland, the Americans met even more fanatical resistance. The Japanese navy made its last effort here with the giant battleship Yamato, a cruiser, and destroyers. The last fuel oil in Japan was just enough to take them to Okinawa, where they were to beach themselves and fight to the end. They were stopped on the way and sunk by US carrier strikes. Over 1200 Americans died in the struggle to capture Okinawa, and countless numbers of Japanese.

Japan suffered an appalling heavy weight of bombing. The centers of five major cities were burnt out. On 6th August 1945, the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima in Japan, destroying most of the city and killing 70000 to 80000 people. Two days later another was dropped on Nagasaki, killing 40000 and injuring 60000. The Japanese finally surrendered and World War II at last ended amid scenes of

unimaginable death, horror and suffering.

The use of the atomic bomb has been questioned on moral grounds. At the time it seemed justified as a means of avoiding the bloodbath of an invasion of Japan against fanatical resistance. Other possible motives were:

- To defeat Japan before the USSR entered the war against her
- To show results for the astronomical expenditure on developing the bomb
- To warn Stalin off attempts to take more of Europe.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

3. What factors made 'Operation Overlord' successful?

2.3.4 Europe after the War

By the end of 1945, Europe lay in ruins. Infrastructure had been all but destroyed, economies lay in shambles and deprivation was high. Europe emerged out of the Second World War a truly shattered society. The power configurations that had not only kept Europe at the center of global politics but also maintained some semblance of order in its international relations had also been shattered. For the first time in hundreds of years, the most powerful states in international politics were clearly not European. The US, whose mainland had been untouched by the war, and the Soviet Union, who suffered immense devastation, became the two most powerful states and were largely able to frame the immediate postwar years along their views of the world.

There are five major developments that signposted the nature of international politics in Europe in the postwar years. The first is the immense infrastructural damage that left many cities in virtual ruins. The second is the massive flow of refugees fleeing discrimination, reprisals and social unrest all over Europe. The third is the massive infusion of American aid under the Marshall Plan. Fourth is the shift in the center of gravity of international relations to two states (the US and USSR) and finally the impact of widespread atrocities committed by all sides of the conflict on notions of human rights. We will discuss here two of them; the change in power configurations and the flow of refugees.

To start with, the global power structure of the world was drastically shifted after the end of World War II. Before the war, the world power balance was based on the interaction and interplay of multiple power bases that would shift and alter to fit the current political situation. But after the war the world was split between only two competing power bases, The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Before the war the Major Powers of the world were United Kingdom, France Japan and Germany. The Soviet Union was in a period of decline from the paranoid purges of Joseph Stalin. The United States was just recovering from the great depression. The United States was rated as a world military power just behind Romania.

The United States and the Soviet Union produced militaries that rivaled the rest of the world. Before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the United States Army was rated 18th in the world with 120 thousand under arms. By the end of the war 16 million men had served in the Military of all branches. The Soviet Union was under equipped and under manned at the time of the attack by Hitler But afterwards they had a massive army that had faced and defeated 75% of the German army. The German and Japanese armed forces were totally destroyed and the countries civilians demoralized. France and England forces had been bleed white and were a shadow of their former strength and glory.

The Survivors of World War II were split into two camps of the victors. NATO led by the United States and the Warsaw Pact led by the Soviet Union. The two sides seemed to be staging for the next conventional war. But both sides had developed Nuclear weapons. Neither side would face the other in open conflict due the fact that a massive nuclear arsenal backed up the common infantryman.

Another way the war changed Europe was in the massive unprecedented flow of refugees. Even before the end of the war the greater part of the German population of East Prussia had fled westwards - although thousands drowned en route, in overloaded ships that sank in the Baltic Sea. In the city of Königsberg, annexed by the USSR, the food supply broke down completely in 1945. People were reduced to eating offal, and human flesh was offered for sale as fried meatballs. Seven centuries of German civilization, in the city that had nurtured philosophers such as Immanuel Kant and Johann Gottfried von Herder, thus ended in cannibalism. By 1949 nearly all the surviving Germans in the region had been driven out.

In Poland, German-owned farms and houses were handed over to Poles. Germans were rounded up by Polish militias and put in camps, before being removed from the country. In Czechoslovakia, more than 2.2 million Germans were expelled, and their property was expropriated. At the peak period, in July 1946, 14,400 people a day were being dumped over the frontier. About three quarters went to the American occupation zone of Germany, and most of the remainder to the Soviet zone.

Cold War considerations, combined with calculation of labor requirements in industries such as mining, led Britain, Australia and other countries to grant Poles and some others permanent settlement. The creation of the State of Israel in 1948 finally provided a secure refuge for Jews who had been hounded from their homes in central and Eastern Europe. But the buoyant United States economy held out the most tantalizing hope to refugees.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

4. How did the Second World War change the face of European international politics?

2.4 SUMMARY

That the Second World War changed Europe in very many significant ways is undeniable. One of the most remarkable events of the immediate postwar years however is the rapid recovery of war devastated economies in Germany, France and to a lesser extent, Britain. This was due in part to US help through the Marshall Plan. More importantly however, even though industrial infrastructure lay in ruins, technical and scientific expertise had in fact improved tremendously in response to war needs. As a result, Germany and France, in particular, were able to bounce back remarkably in the postwar period. Europe also learnt that the various economies, and thus collective well being, were inextricably linked. This helped spur a rash of integration plans that eventually culminated in the European Union.

In this unit, we have addressed the devastation of the Second World War and the aftermath. We detailed what changes Europe saw at the end of the war and how its affairs began to depend on non Europeans for the first time in centuries. We also looked at the events of the war itself. First we chronicled its origins, and

then we looked at the early triumphs of the axis powers and their eventual defeat.

2.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Marrus, M. (1985). *The Unwanted: European Refugees in the 20th Century*. New York: OUP.

Proudfoot, M. J. (1957). *European Refugees: 1939-1952*. New York: Faber.

Roy, W. F. (1968). *Europe in the Global Age: 1939 to the Present*. New York: Harper and Row

2.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. What year was the proclamation creating the German Republic made and by who?

The German proclamation was made on 9th November 1918 but Social Democrat Philipp Scheidemann, who was the Prime Minister of the first republican government elected by the National Assembly.

2. What were the interests that connected the key members of the Axis?

The Axis partners in the Second World War who fought against the Allied Forces were Germany, Italy and Japan and they were united by two main interests:

- (i) Territorial expansion and the foundation of empires based on military conquest and the overthrow of the post-World War I international order; and
- (ii) The destruction or neutralization of Soviet Communism.

3. What factors made ‘Operation Overlord’ successful?

The following factors were instrumental to the success of the “Operation Overlord”:

- (i). The strategy of surprise. The Allied Forces knew that they had to take Germany by surprise.
- (ii) Secondly, they reasoned that the surprise factor may not work and so they had to previously destroy the railway lines that supported Germany’s movement of weapons and troops.
- (iii) Heavy bombardments from the air and the sea, among several other factors.

4. How did the Second World War change the face of European international politics?

The Second World War changed the trajectory of European international politics in five major ways.

They are:

- (i) The immense infrastructural damage that left many cities in virtual ruins;
- (ii) The massive flow of refugees fleeing discrimination, reprisals and social unrest all over Europe;
- (iii) The massive infusion of American aid under the Marshall Plan;
- (iv) The shift in the center of gravity of international relations to two countries, US and USSR; and
- (v) The impact of widespread human rights atrocities committed by all sides of the conflict.

UNIT 3 THE COLD WAR YEARS

CONTENTS

3.1. Introduction

3.2 Learning Outcomes

3.3 Main Content

3.3.1 The Diminished Status of Europe

3.3.2 The East -West Division

3.3.3 The Marshall Plan and Europe's Relationship with the US

3.3.4 European Integration

3.4 Summary

3.5 References/Further Reading

3.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Questions

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The cold war period was characterized by intense tension. The specter of nuclear annihilation that would not only end human civilization as it was known then, but would also kill all life on the planet was a looming possibility in the almost five decades that the cold war raged. The period is described as the cold war because, while it was characterized by knife edge nuclear tension, the main antagonists, the US and the Soviet Union, avoided direct military confrontation. In fact, even though the race to develop arms was stiffest in the period, the armaments were actually developed to prevent, rather than fight a full blown war. Military confrontations were conducted through proxy states as was seen in the Korean conflict. The US and Soviet Union both headed their respective blocs that were largely bound together by ideology. For Europe, the cold war period was a particularly difficult period. In the first place, most European states had been drawn into alliances that made them legitimate targets in the event of military, including nuclear, conflict. These states were however not only generally incapable of defending themselves, particularly if an all out war ensued, they also had little or no control over the outbreak of war. In short, Europe was faced with the unfamiliar situation of having to depend on non Europeans for their safety and even long term survival.

In this unit, we will examine the origins of this European dilemma and how Europe responded to it. We

will also examine the Marshall Plan and how it aided not only western European postwar economic recovery but also how it concretized east-west divisions that were only just emerging in the closing years of the Second World War. We will also examine European integration efforts in the context of its goals, challenges and main drivers.

3.2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Describe the cold war years, the tensions that characterized them and the key actors therein
- ii. Explain how the Second World War contributed to Europe's decline in global politics, and its efforts to recover
- iii. Analyze the key elements, goals and inspirations of early European integration, particularly the Schuman Plan etc.

3.3 MAIN CONTENT

3.3.1 The Diminished Status of Europe

Europe's reign as a world power does not mean that European countries united to dominate the world. European kingdoms frequently fought each other and a different state or states would rise to become the most dominant. For example, in the 15th–16th century, Spain and Portugal were the most prominent seafarers. They colonized the whole of what is today Latin America. Then, during the 17th and 18th centuries, the Dutch became very prominent in seafaring and international trade. They had colonies and territories in for example Asia (like Indonesia), Africa (the Cape of Good Hope), and in South America (what is today Suriname). Also, New York (called New York by Britain) used to be called New Amsterdam, after the Dutch capital Amsterdam. Between Napoleon's rise in 1799 and his fall in 1815, France became very important in world affairs. Britain's empire stretched far and wide even in the 18th century, but during the 19th century it became the most dominant world power as its empire grew and included colonies and influence all over the world. In the 20th century, Germany also became a world power, especially under Adolf Hitler. Europe as a world power therefore refers to the collective imperial and colonial force wielded

by Europe in world affairs.

After the First World War, much of Europe lay in ruins. People were shocked that their technological and philosophical advancement had contributed to such destruction and merciless killing of other human beings. Many felt that the liberal and democratic values for which they had fought during the 18th and 19th century were worthless and even dangerous. Still, the inter-war years saw Europe reach its highpoint as a colonial and world power. European nationalism grew after the First World War and the terms of the peace settlement were a bitter pill for some countries to swallow, in particular Germany. Despite the impact of the Great Depression of 1929 - 1933, which left many European economies in ruins, it would still take another World War, more destructive and costly than the first, to end Europe's reign as the dominant world power.

After the war, and despite American President Woodrow Wilson's role in establishing the League of Nations, America chose to stand aloof from world affairs and did not become a member of the League. When the Great Depression came in 1929, America was hard hit and focused on restoring her own economy. When the Second World War started in 1939, America only became involved in 1941 after Japan bombed the American naval base, Pearl Harbour. During this war, America rose to prominence and took over from a ruined Europe as the dominant world power.

By the time the Second World War ended, Europe lay in even more devastating ruins. Cities had been shattered by bombs, transport networks, farmlands and livestock were destroyed, people were hungry and homeless, and some had been forced to flee their homelands. The money needed to rebuild Europe was monumental.

Before the war, the great world powers had been Britain, France and Germany. As these states now focused on rebuilding efforts, new powers rose to become the mightiest states in the world. America had proven with its nuclear bomb that technologically, industrially and financially, it had surpassed the strength of Europe and everyone else. Although about 25 million Russians had died during the war, the USSR still had the largest army in the world and was fast expanding its influence over Eastern Europe. Europe's days as imperial powers and colonial rulers were numbered. Nationalism and independence movements were sweeping through Africa and Asia as colonies demand decolonization. In 1947 India won independence

from Britain, and in 1949 Ghana did the same. They were soon followed by other colonies in Africa and Asia. Inevitably, Europe's status as undisputed master of the world effectively ended in 1945.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

1. What was the status of the European Great Powers at the end of the Second World War and how did they seek to cope with the new realities?

3.3.2 The East - West Division

The division between East and West defined the era often referred to as the Cold War. The Cold War was a 20th century conflict between the United States of America (US), the Soviet Union (USSR) and their respective allies, over political, economic and military issues, often described as a struggle between capitalism and communism. In Europe, this meant the US led West and NATO on one side and Soviet led East and the Warsaw Pact on the other. It lasted from 1945 to the collapse of the USSR in 1991. The war was 'cold' because there was never a direct military engagement between the two leaders, the US and the USSR, although shots were exchanged in the air during the Korean War.

The aftermath of World War II left the United States and Russia as the dominant military powers in the world, but they had very different forms of government and economy, the former a capitalist democracy, the latter a communist dictatorship. The two nations were rivals who feared each other, each ideologically opposed. The war also left Russia in control of large areas of Eastern Europe, and the US led allies in control of the West. While the allies restored democracy in the West, Russia began making Soviet satellites out of its 'liberated' lands; the split between the two was dubbed the Iron Curtain.

The West feared a communist invasion, physical and ideological. The US countered with the Truman Doctrine with its policy of containment to stop communism spreading and the Marshall Plan, massive aid aimed at supporting collapsing economies which were letting communist sympathizers gain power. Military alliances were formed as the West grouped together as NATO and the East as the Warsaw Pact. By 1951 Europe was divided into two power blocs, American led and Soviet led, each with atomic weapons. A 'cold war' followed which spread globally, leading to a nuclear standoff.

The first time the former allies acted as certain enemies was the Berlin Blockade. Post-war Germany was divided into four parts and occupied by the former allies; Berlin, situated in the Soviet zone, was also divided. In 1948 Stalin enforced a blockade of Berlin aimed at bluffing the Allies into renegotiating the division of Germany in his favor rather than invading. The Allies responded with the 'Berlin Airlift': for 11 months supplies were flown into Berlin via Allied aircraft, bluffing that Stalin wouldn't shoot them down and cause 'hot' war. He didn't. The blockade was ended in May 1949 when Stalin gave up.

Stalin died in 1953 and hopes of a thaw were raised when new leader Khrushchev began a process of De-Stalinisation. In May 1955, as well as forming the Warsaw Pact, he signed an agreement with the allies to leave Austria and make it neutral. The thaw only lasted until the Budapest Rising in 1956: the communist government of Hungary faced with internal calls for reform, collapsed and an uprising forced troops to leave Budapest. The Russian response was to have the Red Army occupy the city and put a new government in charge. The West was highly critical but, partly distracted by the Suez Crises, who did nothing to help. Fearing a reborn, West Germany allied to the US, Khrushchev offered concessions in return for a united, neutral, Germany in 1958. A Paris summit for talks was derailed when Russia shot down a US U-2 spy plane flying over its territory. Khrushchev pulled out of the summit and disarmament talks. The incident was a useful way out for Khrushchev, who was under pressure from hardliners within Russia for giving away too much. Under pressure from the East German leader to stop refugees fleeing to the West, and with no progress on making Germany neutral, the Berlin Wall was built, a complete barrier between East and West Berlin.

Despite the tensions and fear of nuclear war, the Cold War division between East and West proved surprisingly stable after 1961, despite France anti-Americanism and Russia crushing the Prague Spring. There was instead conflict on the global stage, with the Cuban Missile Crisis and Vietnam. For much of the 60s and 70s a programme of 'détente' was followed, a long series of talks which made some success in stabilizing the war and equalizing arms numbers. Germany negotiated with the East under a policy of *Ostpolitik*. The fear of Mutually Assured Destruction helped prevent direct conflict.

By the 1980s Russia appeared to be winning, with a more productive economy, better missiles and a growing navy, even though the system was really corrupt and built on propaganda. America, once again

fearing Russia domination, moved to re-arm and build up forces, including placing many new missiles in Europe (not without local opposition). US President Reagan increased defense spending vastly, starting the Strategic Defense Initiative to defend against nuclear attacks, an end to Mutually Assured Destruction. At the same time Russian forces entered Afghanistan, a war they would ultimately lose.

Soviet leader Brezhnev died in 1982 and his successor, realizing change was needed in a crumbling Russia and its strained satellites which they felt were losing a renewed arms race, promoted several reformers. One, Gorbachev, rose to power in 1985 with policies of *Glasnost* and *Perestroika* and decided to end the Cold War and 'give away' the satellite empire to save Russia itself. After agreeing with the US to reduce nuclear weapons, in 1988 he addressed the UN, explaining the end of the Cold War by renouncing the Brezhnev Doctrine, allowing political choice and pulling Russia out of the arms race.

The speed of Gorbachev's actions unsettled the West, and there were fears of violence, especially in East Germany where the leaders talked of their own 'Tiananmen Square'. However, Poland negotiated free elections, Hungary opened its borders and East German leader Honecker resigned when it became apparent the Soviets would not support him. The East German leadership withered away and the Berlin Wall fell 10 days later. Romania overthrew its dictator and the Soviet satellites emerged from behind the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union itself was the next to fall. In 1991 communist hard liners attempted a coup against Gorbachev; they were defeated and Boris Yeltsin became leader. He dissolved the USSR, instead creating the Russian Federation. The Socialist era, begun in 1917, was now over and so was The Cold War.

Some books, although stressing the nuclear confrontation which came perilously close to destroying vast areas of the world, point out that this nuclear threat was most closely triggered in areas of outside Europe, and that the continent in fact enjoyed 50 years of peace and stability which were sorely lacking in the first half of the 20th century. This view is probably best balanced by the fact that much of Eastern Europe was, in effect, subjugated for the whole period by Soviet Russia.

The D-Days landings, while often overstated in their importance to the downhill of Nazi Germany, were in many ways the key battle of the Cold War in Europe, enabling allied forces to liberate much of Western Europe before Soviet forces got their instead. The conflict has often been described a substitute for a final post-Second World War peace settlement which never came and the Cold War deeply

East and West, affecting culture and society as well as politics and the military. The Cold War has also often been described as a contest between democracy and communism, while in reality the situation was more complicated, with the 'democratic' side, led by the US, supporting some distinctly non-democratic, some brutally authoritarian, regimes in order to deny countries to the Soviet sphere of influence.

The key elements of this intricate web of events are presented below:

- 1945 End of the Second World War
- 1947 Enunciation of Truman doctrine
- 1947 George Kennan's 'X' files published
- 1947 Marshall Plan launched
- 1947 Marshall Plan rejected by the USSR
- 1947 Two camps doctrine adopted
- 1949 COMECON established
- 1949 NATO formed
- 1950 European Integration relaunched
- 1955 Warsaw Pact formed.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

2. How did the final battles of the Second World War contribute to the division of Europe between East and West by 1945?

3.3.3 The Marshall Plan and Europe's Relationship with the US

The Cold War grew out of anxiety over Soviet expansionism and widespread economic problems in Europe following the Second World War. It was institutionalized in minds by 1947 and in reality in 1950 during the Korean War. The Cold War then became a system of carefully managed "irreconcilable antagonism" that evolved out of the plan to rehabilitate Europe. The Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine of Containment together defined the structure of the emerging Cold War between America and the Soviet

Union. Europe, the location of Churchill's infamous 'Iron Curtain' dividing line between the rival powers, would see its future geopolitical orientation defined by the creation and consolidation of these spheres of influence.

The Truman doctrine was outwardly a reaction to political problems in Greece. In early 1947, the British decided it was not in their interests to keep providing financial aid to the Greek government, which was under attack by communist guerrillas. This left an important strategically placed state susceptible to political upheaval and communist takeover. In George Kennan's famous 'X' article later that year he articulated publicly his views of the Soviet Union. He warned that the Soviet Union was committed to destroying capitalism, and that it could not coexist with capitalist nations. With a background of Soviet troops moving southwards towards Tehran and Turkey it did appear that there was a Soviet desire and a willingness to control the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East. Although diplomatic pressure eased this particular example, there were widespread fears within the Truman administration that if so inclined, the Soviet Union *could* conquer much of Western Europe. At the very least they would have a significant initial advantage in any such move. Kennan noted that the answer to this threat was "long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment" He believed that the Soviet Union would be patient, moving slowly forward in a multitude of geopolitical and ideological advances. The answer was for the United States to contain them and inhibit their ability to do so. Providing assistance to Greece, replacing British aid, was to be the first application of this strategy. Although Kennan later emphasized his disagreement with the confrontational language and the military emphasis of the doctrine, Truman declared that like the Greek example, America would "support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures" Turkey also received help, and the European continent became a front line of the 'first' Cold War.

The Marshall Plan is inescapably linked to the policy of containing the Soviet Union and is perhaps more than any other single element was "of pivotal significance in crystallizing the East-West conflict in Europe". Together with the Truman doctrine it consolidated two clear 'sides' in an ideological and economic conflict. It is often described as a corollary of the Truman doctrine as both are directed against Soviet expansion. However, both differ in their tactical deployment. The Truman doctrine focuses on

military aid, such as that lent to Greece and Turkey in the 1940's whilst the Marshall Plan was a package of purely economic aid, at least outwardly. In the words of Hadley Arkes, the Marshall Plan dissolved the ambiguity in the postwar European arena and consummated the Cold War. Also known as the European Recovery Plan, it was a package of aid totaling \$13 billion over duration of four years received by 16 European nations. It was "an important example of the overt use of economic power in foreign policy". Much has been written of the initial American offer of this aid to all of Europe (excluding Spain), including nations aligned or under the influence of the Soviet Union, and to the Soviet Union itself, which was included in the plan as both an aid recipient and an aid provider – which Stalin rejected. It is unclear whether that offer was sincere or not. After all, perhaps there would have been no division of Europe if the offer had been accepted by all parties it was offered to.

America perhaps only offered aid to the Eastern European nations and to the Soviet Union to avoid blame for dividing Europe. Revisionist historians see the Marshall Plan as an extension of the Truman doctrine's design to create political and economic buffers to contain the Soviet Union. Richard Freeland elaborates by noting that the aid package was deliberately designed so that it would be rejected by Stalin due to its requirement of multilateral economic policies – which the Stalin had frequently and consistently rejected in the past as incompatible with the Soviet economy. However Cromwell notes that this approach, whilst making some interesting points, ignores the domestic factors that contributed to the Marshall Plan in Washington. Congress was hostile to further bilateral aid packages to European nations and there was already an accepted inevitability within American statesmen that the division of Europe was inevitable. The collective continental approach to the aid was one made to ensure its approval in the Congress, and it was therefore as much an exercise of domestic policy in action as just foreign policy. Where Cromwell and the revisionists agree is in the certainty that the Marshall Plan was designed to fit an already divided Europe in perception, and was not intended inwardly or outwardly as a measure to reverse or ease that division. America was simply acting in its best interests by consolidating its allies and rewarding them in a mutually beneficial way. In this sense, both donor and recipients had their cake and ate it.

Of course, the role of Stalin cannot be ignored. His refusal of the American plan was (with the benefit of hindsight) a miscalculation made through overconfidence in communist power in Western Europe and a

reliance upon his rigid Marxist economics. According to this doctrine, capitalism was approaching a crisis which would cut off the flow of America aid leaving Europe ultimately in the hands of the Communists. This situation simplified the task of American leadership and led to the alienation of Communist parties in Western Europe as the public were clearly forming a consensus in support of the American economic intervention. Therefore Stalin's actions are equally to blame for the division of Europe as the polarizing climate created by the Truman doctrine and the Marshall Plan. His role underplays perfectly the much commented upon conclusion that both the Soviet Union and America were resigned and accepting of a division of Europe shortly after the Second World War, certainly by mid 1947. With the Marshall Plan being accepted by some and rejected by others, it is also safe to say that this fate was also accepted within Europe. Additionally the belligerence of Stalin gave America a degree of influence it would not have otherwise had in Europe, helping to transform American power into a position of dominance over the 'West'. Of course the mirror opposite can be said as Stalin's position did the same within his own 'bloc' albeit on different terms.

Taking into account the role of the internal politics in the Soviet Union beyond Stalin's role is also interesting in relation to the Marshall Plan. Andrei Zhdanov proclaimed a 'two camps doctrine' in September 1947 in which he stated that the world was divided into an imperialist camp headed by America, and a democratic camp headed by the Soviet Union. This was adopted as internal policy after the failed Paris negotiations in June-July 1947 and the rejection of the Marshall Plan. There is no doubt that the Marshall Plan solidified this line of reasoning, and it is worth noting again the sense of inevitability in the division of Europe as both the Soviet and the American thought processes were at least in part converging on this division before the fact of its final existence. Soviet rejection of the American offer led to the Molotov Plan, in which a series of bilateral treaties were made between the Soviet Union and Eastern European nations, beginning the process that led to the establishment of Comecon in 1949. With Comecon and the Marshall Plan operating in parallel, and the Truman doctrine of containment outwardly involving America in a reactionary process against the Soviet Union, it is certainly safe to state that by late 1947 Europe was divided in two.

In conclusion, it is clear the division of Europe had its roots in the way that the Second World War ended.

The Truman doctrine was a manifestation of foreign policy resulting from the insecurities and fears of Soviet power filling the vacuum in Europe. Together with the Marshall Plan, it solidified the Western nations of Europe into accepting the reality of a divided Europe, indeed a divided world in which two distinct economic, ideological and political systems were in conflict. In the strict sense of the word the combined effect of the Marshall Plan and the policy of containment created the structure with which the previously uncodified and loosely felt, yet inevitable tensions were spiraling around before mid 1947. Coupled with the Soviet reaction and the establishment of Comecon, the impetus whether intentional or not for the division of Europe was certainly within the realm of American foreign policy. It is not necessary to apportion blame in this analysis, but it is certainly accurate to state that all parties involved in the division of Europe did less to prevent it than to accept its perceived inevitability.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

3. How did the Soviet Union respond to the Marshall Plan?

3.3.4 European Integration

The year 1950 marked the launching of European integration—the construction of formal, centralized economic cooperation that would coordinate the national policies of individual European countries. In that year, two French statesmen, Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet, advanced the first proposals for a European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), an organization designed to coordinate the coal and steel industries of its six member countries (Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands), In 1957, the same six governments negotiated and ratified the Treaty of Rome, creating the European Economic Community (EEC). The goal of the new organization was to create a common market by 1970. As a result, all tariffs and most quotas among the members would be eliminated, a common tariff would be created vis-à-vis third-party countries, and a managed system of agricultural trade, the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), would be constructed. Three primary concerns motivated the governments that negotiated the Treaty of Rome. The first was to tie Germany firmly to the West and prevent another Franco-German war. Even after the North Atlantic Treaty organization (NATO) was established in 1949 and the

stability of West German democracy came to be taken for granted in the 1950s, German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer believed strongly in the need for Franco-German cooperation to defend German cold-war interests—not least in Berlin. The second concern was to provide an alternative to communism, the official Soviet ideology and a potent force among strong opposition groups in France and Italy. The centrist, particularly Christian democratic, political parties were strong advocates of European integration. Support for integration long remained a particularly important force in Italian, German and Benelux (Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) public opinion. By contrast, important groups in countries like Britain and Denmark remained relatively skeptical even hostile to integration.

The third and probably most important motivation for integration was economic. The West European economies were then, and are still, extremely interdependent. The value of trade per capita was many times higher than in non-European industrial countries like the U.S. or Japan, making Europe sensitive to trade fluctuations. Individual countries had their own reasons for supporting integration. Germany, for example, favored industrial trade liberalization that facilitated exports of its competitive manufactured products. France and Italy gained protected markets for their agricultural goods, at the expense of third-country producers, particularly those in the U.S.

By 1970, the broad outlines of common market and common agricultural policy had been completed, and in the decade and a half that followed, the EC continued to expand. Britain, Denmark and Ireland joined in 1973, followed by Greece in 1981, Portugal and Spain in 1986, and Austria, Finland and Sweden in 1995. Over the same period, the EC continued to broaden its activities. In 1979, after years of experimentation with international monetary coordination, agreement was reached on the European monetary system (EMS). This was an arrangement whereby governments agreed collectively to stabilize and manage currency exchange rates. Environmental rules, antitrust policy, social policy. In 1967, the EEC (or common market) and two other treaty organizations were consolidated to form the European Community (EC); with the 1993 ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, it became the EU.

In the 1980s, EC members launched the “Europe 1992” initiative to complete the single market by harmonizing and mutually recognizing regulations that impose nontariff barriers. With the Maastricht Agreement in 1992, they opened a drive to create a single European currency, which was completed with

the establishment of an independent European Central Bank in 1998 and the introduction of the euro in 2002.

With the collapse of communism in the 1990s, discussions began about the enlargement of the EU to the East and South. This process reached its culmination in the first decade of the new Millennium. After extensive negotiations, involving the imposition of substantial economic, legal, administrative and political reforms, and 12 new countries joined the EU between 2004 and 2007. Its 489 million citizens now inhabit territory that runs from Malta in the southern Mediterranean to near the Arctic Circle in northern Finland. In addition to enlargement, the last decade of EU politics has concerned the constitutional structure of the EU. Discussion of the EU's structure was launched by German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer's speech at Humboldt University in 2000 calling for a "constitutional convention." This was an effort both to encourage reform of decision making, particularly in foreign policy, and to redress the "democratic deficit" in Europe. The effort was bogged down, however, for seven years—having all but collapsed after unruly French and Dutch voters rejected a draft constitution in referendums held in 2005. Only now does the process seem to be getting back on track.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

4. Briefly discuss the motivations for the formation of the EU.
5. Is there a link between the Marshal Plan and the Cold War?

3.4 SUMMARY

Even though modern European integration began in 1950 in response to the postwar realities, it should be noted that it is an ancient idea. Since the time of Charlemagne and the Holy Roman Empire, uniting the territory of Europe under a single government had been a dream. The present efforts have gone a long way, but still remain far from uniting Europe under a single government. It is unclear if this will happen or if it is indeed desirable, but it may be safely assumed that efforts to integrate will continue to deepen.

In this unit, we have examined the diminished status of Europe in the aftermath of the Second World War;

the east-west division and its implications for Europe. We also examined the remarkable postwar economic recovery of Europe and the role of the Marshall Plan in driving it. Finally, we took a look at the various efforts at integrating Europe and the challenges that have dogged this process.

3.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Goff Richard, M. W., Janice, T. & Jiu-Hwa, U. (1983). *The 20th Century: A Brief Global History*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Larkin, P.J. (1965). *European History for Certificate Classes (1789- 1970)*. London: Hulton Educational Publications.

Roy, W. F. (1968). *Europe in the Global Age: 1939 to the Present*. New York: Harper and Row.

3.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. What was the status of the European Great Powers at the end of the Second World War and how did they seek to cope with the new realities?

The Second World War led to the defeat of Germany under Adolf Hitler – and thus, the powers of that country was considerably reduced. Although not located in the European continent, the United States participated in the war (it entered late into the war following the Japan's attack at Pearl Harbor) and became stronger and domineering over the countries of Europe when the war ended. Within Europe, France and Britain became the two major dominant countries particularly owing to the role they played during the war. Not all European countries participated in the world because countries like Spain and Portugal stayed away particularly because of local issues and troubles they were dealing with prior to and during the war.

2. How did the final battles of the Second World War contribute to the division of Europe between East and West by 1945?

At the end of the second world war that saw the Allied Armies who attacked from both the West and East to defeat Germany, it lead to the division of European countries along two major fault lines: Western Europe and Eastern Europe. The latter was under the control and influence of the Soviet Union while the former

was by America, Britain and France. So for many countries in Europe, they either belonged to the Western Bloc headed by America or the Eastern Bloc headed by the Soviet Union and this marked the beginning of the Cold War era. A few countries in Europe decided to not take any sides in the conflict and they formed the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

3. How did the Soviet Union respond to the Marshall Plan?

The Soviet Union rejected the Marshall Plan which was the brainchild of America under President Truman under the Truman Doctrine – and created their own plan for the Eastern Bloc known as the Molotov Plan, initially called the Brothers Plan. For the Soviet Union, the Marshall Plan would lead to the imperialism of the American currency, the Dollar, since the USA is throwing its weight around so as to gain influence in Europe. The objectives of the Soviet Union's Molotov Plan were to provide aid for the rebuilding of Eastern Europe that were politically and economically aligned to it.

4. Briefly discuss the motivations for the formation of the EU

These factors were those that necessitated the formation of the European Union (EU) in 1993:

(i) Political factor aimed at ending the frequent and bloody wars between European countries which led to the Second World War – and to also prevent the rise of communism and dictatorship which were both on the rise at the time. For the EU, democracy, human rights, rule of law and freedom should rather be the guiding principles for European countries.

(ii) Economic factor was geared towards repairing and fixing the economies of Europe after the destructions of the two world wars, thus countries of Europe came together to promote trade and the ease of doing business so that European companies would be competitive in the global marketplace.

(iii) To, as a group instead as individual countries, tackle common issues such as terrorism, migration, education, public health, environmental protection, technological development, etc. The belief is that approaching these issues/challenges as a group makes executing policies on them easier and cheaper.

(iv) Safeguard the continent's rich cultural and linguistic diversity which was threatened especially during the Cold War.

5. Is there a link between the Marshal Plan and the Cold War?

Several scholars have argued that there is a link between the Marshall Plan and the Cold War because the Plan, necessitated owing to the devastations of the Second World War, was a United States agenda whose ultimate objective is to prevent further advancement of the former Soviet Union in Europe since if allowed, only the Atlantic would stand between it and the United States. It is this prevention that angered USSR and thus the Cold War began. Essentially, the Marshall Plan, also known as the Truman Doctrine, was designed to also support countries fighting communist takeover by the USSR.

MODULE 2: REGIONALISM IN EUROPE

Unit 1: The Treaty of Rome

Unit 2: Incremental Regional Integration in Europe: The Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty

Unit 3: The European Union: Structure, Membership and Roles

UNIT 1 THE TREATY OF ROME

CONTENTS

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Learning Outcomes

1.3. Main Content

1.3.1. The Common Agricultural Policy

1.3.2 The European Economic Community (EEC/EC)

1.3.3 The European Free Trade Area

1.4 Summary

1.5 References/Further Reading

1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

1.1 INTRODUCTION

After the council of Europe and the ECSC, the treaty of Rome was signed to further drive the process of European integration. The units to be discussed here are essentially components of the Rome treaty that dealt with specific aspects of the integration agenda. The Common Agricultural Policy for instance had its general principles spelt out by the treaty even though the specific workings were only later worked out at subsequent meetings. In this unit, we will be discussing the key elements of the treaty of Rome in order to see how far it has gone in advancing the cause of regional integration in Europe.

1.2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Distinguish the overall significance of the treaty of Rome and understand the workings of its key elements
- ii. Describe comprehensively the Common Agricultural Policy, the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Area.

1.3. MAIN CONTENT

1.3.1 The Common Agricultural Policy

The treaty of Rome defined the general objectives of a common agricultural policy. The principles of the

common agricultural policy (CAP) were set out at the Stresa conference in July 1958. In 1960, the CAP mechanisms were adopted by the six founding member states and two years later, in 1962, the CAP came into force. The creation of a common agricultural policy was proposed in 1960 by the European commission. It followed the signing of the treaty of Rome in 1957, which established the common market. The six member states individually strongly intervened in their agricultural sectors, in particular with regard to what was produced, maintaining prices for goods and how farming was organized. This intervention posed an obstacle to free trade in goods while the rules continued to differ from state to state, since freedom of trade would interfere with the intervention policies. Some member states, in particular France, and all farming professional organizations wanted to maintain strong state intervention in agriculture. This could therefore only be achieved if policies were harmonized and transferred to the European community level. By 1962, three principles had been established to guide the CAP: market unity, community preference and financial solidarity. Since then, the CAP has been a central element in the European institutional system.

The 2003 reform and the 2008 Health Check decisions prepared the grounds for the CAP till 2013. A new budgetary and legal framework should be prepared post 2013. The communication paper has launched the institutional debate and it prepares the ground for the legal proposals on the future of the policy. The objective of the communication is to highlight key challenges and major policy issues regarding EU agriculture and rural areas. Therefore the communication does not provide a specific and detailed list of measures and policy instruments.

The CAP needs reforming: so as to better address the challenges of: food security; climate change and sustainable management of natural resources; and keeping the rural economy alive. It needs to:

- Help the farming sector become more competitive and to deal with the economic crisis and increasingly unstable farm-gate prices.
- Make the policy fairer, greener, more efficient and more effective and more understandable.

Earlier on, the commission held a public debate and a major conference on the future of the CAP. The vast majority of contributions identified three principal objectives from the CAP:

Viable food production (the provision of safe and sufficient food supplies, in the context of growing global demand, economic crisis and much greater market volatility to contribute to food security); - Sustainable

management of natural resources and climate action (farmers often have to put environmental considerations ahead of economic considerations – but such costs are not rewarded by the market); - maintaining the territorial balance and diversity of rural areas (agriculture remains a major economic and social driving force in rural areas, and an important factor in maintaining a living countryside).

The CAP has been roundly criticized by many diverse interests since its inception. Criticism has been wide-ranging, and even the European Commission has long been persuaded of the numerous defects of the policy. In May 2007, Sweden became the first EU country to take the position that all EU farm subsidies should be abolished (except those related to environmental protection).

Criticism of the CAP has united some supporters of neoliberal globalization with the alter-globalization movement in that it is argued that these subsidies, like those of the USA and other Western states, add to the problem of what is sometimes called Fortress Europe; the West spends high amounts on agricultural subsidies every year, which amounts to unfair competition.

In 2005, the HDR described the CAP as "extravagant wreaking havoc in global sugar markets. However, this report was written before the EU sugar reform took effect and its arguments are as such obsolete in 2010 where an increase in the world market price meant that world prices overtook the (much reduced after the recent sugar reform) EU reference price. As for sugar producers in the developing world, they now enjoy free access to the European market under the "Everything but Arms" agreement.

The 2005 HDR report also states "The basic problem to be addressed in the WTO negotiations on agriculture can be summarized in three words: rich country subsidies. In the last round of world trade negotiations rich countries promised to cut agricultural subsidies. Since then, they have increased them" an outcome hinted at in HDR 2003. Several reports from the latest negotiations in the WTO, however, contradict the theory of the 2005 HDR report. On July 29th, 2008 the WTO negotiations in the Doha round finally collapsed because of differences between the US, India and China over agricultural trade.

CAP price intervention has been criticized for creating artificially high food prices throughout the EU. High import tariffs (estimated at 18 - 28%) have the effect of keeping prices high by restricting competition by non-EU producers. It is estimated that public support for farmers in OECD countries costs a family of four on average nearly 1,000 USD per year in higher prices and taxes. It is true as well that the

average EU household today spends 15% of its budget on food, compared to 30% in 1960.

However there are several factors which cause food prices to rise, such as: climate change, energy, labor, transport, changing eating habits, amongst others. The price of food in supermarkets and shops has little to do with the CAP. For example, the price of cereals (which is subsidized very little by the CAP nowadays) is only 5% of the price of a loaf of bread (indeed, cereal prices have been falling for many years).

Some critics of the common agricultural policy reject the idea of protectionism, either in theory, practice or both. Free market advocates are among those who disagree with any type of government intervention because, they say, a free market without interference will allocate resources more efficiently. The setting of 'artificial' prices inevitably leads to distortions in production, with over-production being the usual result. The creation of Grain Mountains, where huge stores of unwanted grain were bought directly from farmers at prices set by the CAP well in excess of the market is one example. Subsidies allowed many small, outdated, or inefficient farms to continue to operate which would not otherwise be viable. A straightforward economic model would suggest that it would be better to allow the market to find its own price levels, and for uneconomic farming to cease. Resources used in farming would then be switched to a myriad of more productive operations, such as infrastructure, education or healthcare.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

1. To what extent has CAP aided the industrialization of European agriculture?

1.3.2 The European Economic Community (EEC/EC)

The vast majority of economists agree that trade, by allowing specialization, enhances efficiency. But as Adam Smith observed, the division of labor (the degree of specialization) is limited by market size. International trade is an obvious way of increasing market size.

Since World War II, countries have reduced barriers to trade mainly through multilateral negotiations such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). A central premise of the GATT is non-discrimination: countries should give all GATT members the same access to their markets. The main exemption to that rule is free trade areas. Partners to free trade agreements are allowed to exempt one

another's goods from import duties while maintaining tariffs and/or quotas on products from other GATT countries.

The European Economic Community (EEC), the most prominent example of a free trade area, actually is what economists call a customs union. Whereas member nations in a free trade area remove all barriers to trade among themselves, in a customs union they also adopt uniform tariffs on goods and services from outside the union. The EEC is currently attempting to transform itself from a customs union to a true common market in which capital and labor, and not just goods, are allowed to flow freely from one country to another.

The EEC's impact has been significant. In 1960 more than 60 percent of the trade of the community's 12 members was with other parts of the world. Now more than 60 percent stays within the European grouping. Where the EEC contented itself initially with removing internal barriers to trade, it has since expanded into the regulation of domestic markets and monetary unification.

The European Community is an amalgam of three separate communities: the European Coal and Steel Community, established by the Treaty of Paris in 1951 to regulate production and liberalize Europe's trade in coal and steel products; the European Atomic Energy Community, formed by the Treaty of Rome in 1957; and the European Economic Community, also created by the Treaty of Rome. All three were established to encourage political and economic cooperation among member countries, notably France and Germany that had repeatedly warred with each other. By 1967 the institutions of the European Economic Community (or Common Market) became common to all three communities. Today it is conventional to refer to the European Community (aka the EC or the Community) in the singular, whether one means the Economic Community or all three initiatives.

The EC initially consisted of six Western European nations—Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and West Germany. Britain, Ireland, and Denmark were admitted in 1973. Three southern European countries were allowed to join once they installed democratic governments—Greece in 1981, Spain and Portugal in 1986. Other Western European countries (Austria, Finland, Sweden, and Switzerland) belong to the European Free Trade Association, or EFTA (as did Britain, Ireland, and Denmark before 1973). EFTA has traditionally concentrated on trade liberalization, in contrast to the EC's

more ambitious agenda of economic and political integration.

The EC's most important achievement has been its customs union. It was completed in 1968, when each of the six members abolished tariffs and quotas on goods from the other five member countries and adopted a common external tariff on goods from the rest of the world. The evolution from a free trade area to a customs union followed inevitably: had the participants maintained different external tariffs, exports from, say, Japan could have been imported through the low-tariff countries and transhipped to the others, circumventing the high tariffs. The customs union has propelled the growth of intra-Community trade from less than 40 percent to over 60 percent of the total trade of the participating countries.

In 1988, with European integration gathering momentum, the governments of the EC member states appointed a committee, chaired by Jacques Delors, president of the European Commission, to study the feasibility of complementing the single market with a single currency. After the Delors Report appeared, the EC governments appointed an Intergovernmental Conference to prepare amendments to the Treaty of Rome. The proposed amendments—the Treaty on Economic and Monetary Union—were presented at the Dutch town of Maastricht in December 1991.

The Maastricht Treaty proposes replacing the EC's twelve national currencies with a single currency and creating a European Central Bank (ECB). These goals are to be achieved in three stages. Stage I, which began in July 1990, is marked by the removal of capital controls (as already mandated by the SEA) and attempts to reduce differences in national inflation and interest rates and to make intra-European exchange rates more stable. In Stage II, to start in January 1994, national economic policies will converge further and a temporary entity, the European Monetary Institute, will coordinate member-country policies in the final phases of the transition. If the council of ministers, made up of ministers of economics or finance from each national government, decides during Stage II that a majority of member countries meet the preconditions for monetary union, it may recommend that the council of heads of state vote to inaugurate stage III, establishing the ECB and giving it responsibility for monetary policy. To prevent stage II from continuing indefinitely, however, the treaty requires the EC heads of state or government to meet before the end of 1996 to assess whether a majority of EC countries satisfy the conditions for monetary union. Stage III will begin in any case no later than January 1, 1999. In this case, stage III may proceed with only a minority of

EC countries participating.

When stage III begins, exchange rates will be irrevocably fixed. The ECB will assume control of the monetary policies of the participating countries. It will decide how and when to replace the currencies of the participating countries with the new European currency. It may do so on the first day of stage III, or it may instruct its operating arms, the national central banks, to intervene to stabilize the exchange rates among their national currencies until these are replaced by a single currency.

Monetary integration is more controversial than the Single Market Program. Denmark rejected the Maastricht Treaty in its June 1992 referendum, and France nearly did the same three months later.

No one questions that there are benefits from using one currency instead of twelve. For one thing, a single European currency will save on transactions costs: the EC's economists estimate the savings at 1 percent of EC GNP. And removing the uncertainty created by exchange-rate fluctuations will encourage additional intra-European trade and investment.

There is, however, no free lunch. Forcing all European countries to run the same monetary policy and to maintain the same interest rates will deprive Europe's national governments of a policy tool traditionally used to address their own macroeconomic problems. When Italy has had a recession not shared by other EC countries, its central bank (the Bank of Italy) has reduced interest rates, expanded the money supply, and devalued the exchange rate, with the goal of boosting domestic demand and moderating the recession. With no exchange rate to devalue and with monetary policy turned over to the ECB, this response will no longer be possible. Europe had a taste of this problem in 1991 and 1992, when high interest rates in Germany, together with the fixed exchange rates of the European Monetary System that already tied European monetary policies together, drove interest rates up throughout the EC. As this experience reminds us, a monetary policy common to all 12 EC countries will be useful for moderating only those business cycle fluctuations that are common to the twelve countries. Insofar as European countries experience cyclical expansions and contractions at different times, their sacrifice of monetary autonomy may cost them a lot.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

2. Why are the trade related benefits of the EEC programme relatively low?

1.3.2 The European Free Trade Association

In July 1956, following the 'Spaak Report', which set the scene for the re-launch of European integration, the United Kingdom submitted to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) a proposal known as 'Plan G', to study the feasibility of an association between the Six and the other OEEC Members in the form of a free trade area. The proposal provided for the progressive abolition of all customs duties and other barriers to trade between member states, though each would retain the right to set the level of customs duties and establish trade policy in relation to third countries.

An Intergovernmental committee of experts, chaired by Reginald Maudling, the British Paymaster-General, was set up to examine the feasibility of a large free internal market. However, the French took an anti-British stance, withdrawing their support from the Maudling Committee, while the other European partners hesitated as to which side to support. The project was rejected on 14th December, 1958. The signing of the Treaty of Rome in March of the previous year had laid the foundations for the European Economic Community (EEC), despite the favorable reaction to the British proposal in some German and Dutch economic spheres. While the Benelux countries and Germany had a genuine interest in developing trade with the United Kingdom, the six were also aware of the risks of a free trade area. These included an economic element — in the absence of a common tariff, the more protectionist countries would benefit more than their liberal partners — and a political element, for the idea of a European federation would be sidelined if the free trade area succeeded.

When General de Gaulle took up office on 1st June, 1958, he hammered a nail into the coffin of the British proposal. General de Gaulle and the German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer were striving above all to enhance solidarity among the six. Following a vain attempt to delay the entry into force of the Treaty of Rome, the British supported the signature, on 4th January, 1960 of the Stockholm Convention, creating the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) with seven founding members, namely the United Kingdom, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland and Portugal. In terms of trade, Western Europe was

divided between the six and the seven.

After the British delegation's withdrawal in November 1955 from the work in Brussels of the Intergovernmental Committee created by the Messina Conference, the government in London was faced with two options: either to allow integration to continue on the continent, at the risk of finding itself quickly isolated, or to come up with an alternative. The United Kingdom certainly did not want to end up with a common market based on a customs union with an external tariff, which could harm its privileged trading position in the sterling zone and with the Commonwealth. Peter Thorneycroft, the Minister for Trade, lost no time in setting up working groups to look at speeding up the abolition of tariff barriers and quantitative restrictions in Europe. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), created in 1948 to administer the Marshall Plan of economic aid for Europe, immediately appeared to be the structure most capable of responding to Britain's concerns. Having tried in vain to undermine the current negotiations between the six member states of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which they viewed as 'Little Europe', the British then decided they would prefer to establish a regional free trade zone excluding agricultural products, a project known as Plan G. The British government, invited in the meantime to join the Val Duchesse negotiations on the common market and Euratom, proposed to send an observer to Brussels but refused to consider the Spaak Report as the basis for future negotiations. The six rejected this out of hand.

Having tried and failed to win time in order to have a clearer idea of whether Europe's relaunch was likely to succeed, the British submitted their plan for a large free trade area to the OEEC Council of Ministers on 17th July, 1956. Two days later, the OEEC Council of Ministers decided to set up a working group, known as the Group of Seventeen, to study the establishment of a multilateral system combining the customs union of the six and the other OEEC member states. On a proposal from Harold Macmillan, the British prime minister, Baron Jean-Charles Snoy et d'Oppuers, the secretary-general of the Belgian Ministry for Economic Affairs and head of the Belgian delegation to the Intergovernmental Conference on the Common Market and Euratom, led the working group.

The British thus hoped to be able to establish a close link between the two European projects and to have direct access to information on the progress of the Val Duchesse negotiations. For London, the free trade

area was intended to meet three objectives: giving the United Kingdom a more clearly defined position if the Imperial Preference System with the Commonwealth were maintained, confirming its dominant role in the OEEC, and enabling it to retain influence over the development of European integration through close links between the free trade area and the common market.

With this formula, the British officials wanted to abolish obstacles to trade between the member countries of the area for industrial products only, while maintaining for each of these countries an individual customs tariff vis-à-vis countries outside the area. However, Spaak feared that the British initiative was just a tactical ploy to delay the relaunch, which he regarded as vitally important, and he refused to view the British plan as an alternative solution. The USA, which actively supported the efforts of the six, also warned the government in London against any action that would hamper the implementation of the future common market.

It was not until 13th October, 1957 therefore, that the OEEC council decided to set up a steering committee in the form of an Intergovernmental committee chaired by Reginald Maudling, the British government's paymaster-general. Two weeks later, Maudling handed the 17, a note recommending the internal dismantling of customs tariffs and the abolition of quotas following the same stages as those in the EEC Treaty. He also proposed to introduce controls on the origin of industrial products in order to counter the risk of deflection of trade.

However, the definition of the origin of products, the application of safeguard clauses and the harmonization of tariffs led to serious clashes between the British and French delegations, particularly when, in March 1958, the French Government put before its EEC partners a new plan which did not go as far as the British plans for a free trade area, but provided for a multilateral association arrangement with the other OEEC member countries. The French authorities, however, occupied from May onwards by the armed uprising in Algiers, dragged their feet. Led by Ambassador Roger Ockrent, the head of the Belgian delegation to the OEEC, the Six nevertheless prepared a joint memorandum on the European Economic Association. But it was not until the end of the Venice conference, also attended, on 20th September, 1958 by the EEC Commission, that the Six reached agreement. One month later, the Ockrent Report was put before the OEEC.

The negotiations between the 17 became bogged down, however, and on 15th November General de Gaulle, French president for the last six months, unilaterally rejected the British plan for a free trade area. One month later the discussions were definitively suspended. The three Benelux countries' attempts at conciliation came to nothing. In spring 1959, seven OEEC member countries reacted to this failure by opening new negotiations with a view to setting up a smaller free trade area themselves that would give them some of the benefits of eliminating customs barriers. On 20th November, 1959 the representatives of Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, Sweden and the United Kingdom initialed the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) Treaty in Stockholm.

In 1958, following the failure of negotiations between the Member States of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) to conclude an agreement on a free trade area, the main concern of the countries that were not members of the new European Economic Community (EEC) was to avoid being left on the sidelines of Western European integration. They therefore decided to establish their own convention.

In Stockholm on 4th January, 1960, Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom signed the convention establishing the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) to be based in Geneva. The Seven together comprised a market of 90 million people. Finland became an associate member of EFTA on 27th March, 1961 and a full member in 1986, and Iceland acceded in 1970. While EFTA was established to counterbalance the emerging EEC, it never sought to be its rival, pursuing exclusively economic goals. In addition, EFTA operated on a strictly intergovernmental basis.

Its highest institution was the Council, which was assisted by an advisory committee representing the economic sector, a committee of parliamentarians and technical committees. EFTA was a flexible organization with a secretariat limited to a maximum of 100 staff and headed by the council. It operated at the level of ministers or permanent representatives and was based in Geneva.

Its fundamental objective was to ensure free trade in industrial goods. The status of fish and agricultural products varied depending on whether they were processed (and thus generally subject to free trade) or non-processed (in which case they did not fall within the scope of the Convention). Non-processed products were, however, the subject of bilateral agreements and preferential regulations. In parallel,

common regulations on competition, the opening up of public procurement and the alignment of technical regulations made the mechanism complete. EFTA did not provide for any form of economic integration or set any common external customs tariff.

The activities of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) principally entailed cooperation with the European Economic Community (EEC). The conclusion of a free trade agreement with the EEC and the entry into force of common definitions relating to rules of product origin ensured the almost totally free movement of industrial goods.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

3. What was the main focus of the EFTA?

1.4. SUMMARY

The above suggests that there are still major problems and challenges associated with the specific letters of the regional project in Europe. For one, the European Economic Community is for instance accused of not adding much economic value to member states and there are still concerns for the implications of these processes for the sovereignty of states. Be that as it may however, it is undeniable that these efforts and other like them have been very useful in smoothening the space for more recent advances like the creation of the Eurozone.

In this unit, we examined the key elements of the Treaty of Rome. We looked at the Common Agricultural Policy; its successes, failures and contemporary challenges. We also discussed in similar fashion, other projects like the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Area. We also touched on cooperation between these various programmes and how it has helped to solidify the idea of European unity.

1.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Emerson, M., Aujean, M., Catinat, M., Goubet, P. & Jacquemin, A. (1988). "The Economics of 1992"

European Economy 35.

Kenen, P. (1992). *EMU After Maastricht*.

Tsoukalis, L. (1991). *The New European Economy: The Politics and Economics of Integration*.

Viner, J. (1950). *The Customs Union Issue*.

1.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. To what extent has CAP aided the industrialization of European agriculture?

The CAP, Common Agricultural Policy, was introduced in 1962 and as at 2017 commitment to it took 37% of the budget of the European Union. It originated from a political compromise between France and Germany where German industries would have access to French Markets and in exchange, Germany would pay France's farmers. The CAP has aided the industrialization of European agriculture as it encouraged industrialized agriculture across the European continent through its two main pillars: (i) Agricultural production support, and (ii) Rural development.

2. Why are the trade related benefits of the EEC programme relatively low?

One of the trade benefits of being a member of the EEC is that it gives member countries price stability insofar as the continent's single currency, the Euro, makes it easier, cheaper and safer to buy and sell using the Euro which lead to improved economic stability and growth and better integration in the continent. But as with everything, things do not always pan out as they are planned and/or intended to be. The hurdle of meeting regulations is a difficult issue for many countries and this reduces the benefits they get from the EEC programme. Also, the absence of a common language among European countries throws in communication barriers and with it comes lower patronages. Again, the fact that countries have less say in what is bought and sold within their border jurisdictions have made some countries to question the importance of the programme viz-a-viz a country's sovereignty.

3. What was the main focus of the EFTA?

The European Free Trade Association (EFTA) is an intergovernmental body established for the purpose of

promoting free trade and economic integration to the benefits of its four European member states of Iceland, Liechtenstein, Switzerland and Norway – and those of their partners around the world. Although the main objective of the EFTA is the removal of trade barriers among its four member countries, each member is also allowed to maintain its own individual commercial policy towards other countries who are not members of the organization.

CONTENTS

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Learning Outcomes

2.3 Main Content

2.3.1 The Single European Act

2.3.2 The Maastricht Treaty

2.3.3 The European Monetary Union

2.4 Summary

2.5 References/Further Reading

2.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

2.1 INTRODUCTION

While the Treaty of Rome set the general parameters for many specific integration policies, it had to be revised by the 1980s to allow for a more robust process that takes into account the realities of a changing world. In this unit, we will address some of those revisions to the treaty in order to demonstrate the gradual deepening of European integrations and its expansion to include states in Southern and later Eastern Europe.

2.2 LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Describe the connection between the Single European Act, the Maastricht Treaty, the European Monetary Union and the Treaty of Rome
- ii. Explain the specific letters of each of these treaties and demonstrate the connection between them.

2.3. MAIN CONTENT

2.3.1 The Single European Act

This was the first major revision to the Treaty of Rome. It was christened the Single European Act and was agreed to in 1985. It set a target date of 1992 to create a true common market in Europe. The *Europe 1992* proposal mandated about states to follow a comprehensive set of 300 directives from the European Commission, aimed at eliminating non tariff barriers to free trade in goods, services, labour and capital within the EC. The issues tended to be complex and highly technical. For instance, professionals licensed in one state should be free to practice in another; but licensing requirements were, at that time, not exactly uniform. The commission's bureaucrats worked hard to smooth out such inconsistencies and create a uniform set of standards. Each national government had to pass laws to implement these measures.

The single European Act also gave new push to the creation of a European central bank, which was situated in Frankfurt, Germany, and a single currency and monetary system. These were long standing goals that have since been accomplished. As long as the economies of European states were tied to separate states with separate central banks, efforts to maintain fixed exchange rates were difficult.

The 1992 process moved economic integration into more political and thus controversial areas, eroding sovereignty more visibly than ever before. It also deepened a trend toward the EU's dealing directly with provinces rather than with the states they belong to- thus beginning to hollow out the state from below as well as from above. However, Europe 1992 continued to put aside for the future the difficult problems and military integration.

2.3.2 The Maastricht Treaty

The Treaty of the European Union (TEU), also known as Treaty of Maastricht for having been signed in that Dutch town, constitutes a turning point in the European integration process. By modifying the previous treaties - Paris, Rome and Single European Act -, the initial economic objective of the community, building a common market, was outstripped and, for the first time, a distinctive vocation of political union was claimed.

The Treaty of Maastricht changed the official denomination of the EEC. Henceforth, it will be known as

European Union. The term union is used from the very beginning of the treaty to clearly convey the advancement in a historical project. This way, the article 2 of the Treaty of the European Union affirms that: "This treaty marks a new stage in the process of creating an ever closer union among European states. The Treaty has a structure based on three pillars, according to the artificial parlance created by those who devised and edited it. The metaphor used refers to a TEU made up as an Greek temple sustained by three pillars:

- i. The first pillar, the central one, alludes to the Community dimension and comprises the arrangements set out in the EC, ECSC and Euratom Treaties, i.e. union citizenship, community policies, economic and monetary union, etc.
- ii. The new pillars, the lateral ones, are not based on supranational competences as the previous one, but in the cooperation among the governments: the second pillar is the Common foreign and security policy (CFSP) and the third one refers to Police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters.

The Treaty of the Union instituted as one of the objectives of the union the search of social and economic cohesion among the diverse regions and countries of the community. To achieve it, it was agreed that a denominated Cohesion Fund, created in 1994, would provide less developed regions and countries with financial aid focused on sectors as environment or transport infrastructures. The member states eligible to receive this aid were those whose GDP per capita was inferior to 90% of the union average and comply with convergence criteria. The *Cohesion countries* were Spain, the most benefited state, Greece, Portugal and Ireland.

The TEU has also meant a noticeable advancement in the EU competences in fields as economic and monetary policy, industrial policy, Transeuropean networks and transport policy, educational networks, etc. In spite of these reforms, the common agricultural policy (CAP) still absorbed more than a half of the whole union budget.

As regards educational affairs, the TEU limited the union role to promote intergovernmental cooperation. The European Union launched different programmes (Socrates, Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci) to facilitate contacts and combined work among European students and teachers.

Regarding the European Union institutions, the TEU introduced important changes: the Parliament increased its competences, the ministers council was denominated henceforth council of the European Union, the Commission received the official name of commission of the European communities, the court of justice, the Court of Auditors and the Economic and Social Committee reinforce their competences, a committee of the regions was established, and, the founding of the European Central Bank was foreseen at the beginning of the third phase of the economic and monetary union.

As far as the second pillar is concerned, the common foreign and security policy (CFSP) allows one to undertake common actions in foreign policy. The European Council, where decisions must be adopted unanimously, agrees the principles and general orientations of the CFSP. The Treaty on European Union raised Western European Union (WEU) to the rank of an *integral part of the development of the Union* and commissioned it the mission of elaborating and implementing decisions and actions with defense implications.

The foundation of the Europol (European Police Office), embryo of a future European police, was one of the most outstanding changes in this sphere. It is also necessary to point out that in 1990 the denominated Schengen convention that developed the Schengen Agreement, was signed so as to build a European Union without frontiers.

The ratification of the Treaty of Maastricht by the national parliaments was brimmed with difficulties. The symbolic year of 1992 was gloomed by three crises that broke the pro-Europe impulse brought about by the signing in Maastricht of the TUE on 7th February, 1992:

- a. Firstly, Europe went through a serious and deep economic crisis that caused governments and public opinion to focus on economic problems, setting aside the European construction;
- b. Secondly, there were serious monetary tensions that challenged the European Monetary System and the objective of the economic and monetary union (EMU);
- c. Thirdly, the EU appeared unable to implement a common foreign and security policy in the crisis of Yugoslavia, and kept powerless observing how war came back to our continent after many years of peace.

In these conditions, the first ratification process took place in Denmark. The 'NO' to the Treaty of

Maastricht won in a referendum for a scarce difference of 50,000 votes. A *eurosceptical* wave extended to the other member countries. However, the ratifications of the Treaty were gradually taking place in the rest of the countries. In France, the 'YES' won with a scarce 51.4% of the votes in favor of the TEU. Negotiation with Denmark started and the Copenhagen government was granted with a special protocol, known, in the EU parlance, as *opting out* clause, that is to say, the possibility of not following the other members when the third phase of the EMU began -a similar clause got United Kingdom when TEU was signed and in all defense matters. On 20 May 1993, Danish people approved in a referendum this agreement with 53.8% of YES votes.

The Treaty of Maastricht came into force on 2nd November, 1993. The treaty foresaw their own future revision in view of the successive enlargements of the union. In spite of the difficulties that the union was going through and the dramatic transformation of the world in those years, the candidatures to accession to the EU continued being submitted to Brussels: Austria in 1989, Malta and Cyprus in 1991, Finland, Norway and Switzerland in 1992. This last country retired its candidature a few months later after a referendum.

Negotiations with Austria, Sweden, Finland and Norway began in 1993 and were quite easy due to the high economic development of those countries. The ratification of the Treaties was accomplished in 1994. However, Norwegian people rejected again the accession to the EU. The 'NO' to the European Union won in a referendum with 52.2% of the votes. It was the second time that Norway refused to join the community. On 1st January, 1995, the fourth enlargement of the EU took place with the accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden. The *Europe of the 15* was born. In early 1996, in the European council of Turin, an Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) commenced with the purpose of elaborating a new treaty that reformed the treaty of Maastricht. The objectives were focused on developing the Europe of citizens, fomenting the EU role in international politics, reforming the institutions and tackling a new enlargement to the applicant countries of Central and Eastern Europe. After a long and intricate negotiation, the member states governments reach an agreement in the European council held in Amsterdam on 16-17th June, 1997. The treaty of Amsterdam was born.

2.3.3 Monetary Union

Among the European states, EMU officially stands for Economic and Monetary Union. Other countries also use EMU to refer generally to the European Monetary Union. EMU is the agreement among the participating member states of the European Union to adopt a single hard currency and monetary system. The European Council agreed to name this single European currency the Euro. The European states decided that the EMU and a single European market were essential to the implementation of the European Union, which was created to advance economic and social unity among the peoples of Europe and to propel Europe to greater prominence in the international community.

In 1979, the European Council adopted the European Monetary System, known as EMS, which employed an exchange rate mechanism, or ERM, to encourage participating countries to keep the fluctuations of their currency exchange rates within an acceptable band. The permissible limits of the ERM were derived from the European Currency Unit, or ECU, a referential currency calculated from an average of the participating countries' national currencies. In 1988, Jacques Delors, the president of the European Commission, chaired a committee which proposed a three-stage plan to reach full economic union, including the establishment of a European Central Bank and a single currency which would replace any existing national currencies. With each stage, the monetary policies of the participating countries would become more closely entwined, culminating in full convergence in the EMU.

Plans for the EMU were formalized in provisions within the Maastricht Treaty, which founded the European Union. The Maastricht Treaty was signed in 1992, and subsequently ratified by all of the member states. Some countries approved the treaty by a public vote, while other countries ratified the treaty through a legislative vote. The treaty set up the conditions, or "convergence criteria," which each member state in the European Union must meet before it could join the EMU. These conditions for EMU membership were considered necessary because when the member states join the EMU, domestic economic crises in one member state will affect all of the other member states. To participate in the initial formation of the EMU, each member state had to meet the following five convergence criteria by 1998: (1) the national legislation governing the country's financial system had to be compatible with the treaty provisions controlling the European System of Central Banks; (2) the country had to achieve a rate of inflation within 1.5% of the rates in the three participating countries with the lowest rates; (3) the country had to reduce its government

deficits to below 3% of its gross national product; (4) the country had to keep its currency exchange rates with the limits defined by the ERM for at least two years; and (5) the country had to keep its interest rates within 2% of the rates in the three participating countries with the lowest rates.

Eleven of the 15 European Union member states initially qualified to join the EMU in 1998. Those states were: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain. As part of the EMU, these 11 countries now make up the world's second-largest economy, after the United States. Some analysts have suggested that only by using flexible definitions did Belgium and Italy meet the deficit-related criteria. Two countries, Greece and Sweden, failed to meet the convergence requirements in time to join the EMU in the first round. Sweden failed to satisfy two of the conditions: laws governing Sweden's central bank were not compatible with the Maastricht Treaty and the currency exchange rates in Sweden were not sufficiently stable for the previous two years. Greece failed to meet all of the requirements. These countries will be reevaluated every two years to determine if they meet the requirements for joining the EMU. The two remaining members of the European Union, the United Kingdom and Denmark, chose not to join the EMU immediately. Both of these countries made provisions in the Maastricht Treaty that preserved their right not to join the EMU. To ensure stable currency exchange rates among all of the European Union member states, the currencies of those states that did not qualify to join the EMU or that chose not to participate in the EMU initially were linked to the single European currency of the EMU, the euro, by a new currency exchange rate mechanism, known as ERM2.

On January 1, 1999, the currency exchange rates of the 11 participating member states became permanently fixed, marking the beginning of the third and final phase of the EMU. On this date, the euro became a legal currency. Citizens in participating countries now can write checks, use credit cards, and write traveler's checks denominated in Euros. Banks and businesses now have the option of using Euros to transact business. The production of the first euro coins and banknotes began on January 1st, 1999. An estimated 12 billion banknotes and 80 billion coins will be minted initially. On 1st January, 2002, the participating countries must begin to remove their national currencies from circulation. By the first of July 2002, the old national currencies will no longer be legal tender, and all transactions from that date forward in the participating EMU states must be conducted in Euros. Once they are retrieved from circulation, the old

national coins and banknotes will be destroyed.

As an integral part of the EMU, a new monetary institution was founded in Frankfurt, Germany-the European Central Bank, or ECB. The ECB sets monetary policy for the EMU independently from the influence of any of the national governments or any other outside influence. The ECB together with the central banks of all of the states in the European Union form the European System of Central Banks, or ESCB, which is charged by statute with maintaining price stability. The ESCB implements the monetary policy of the ECB, and administers the foreign exchange reserves of the participating member states, among other tasks. The conversion to a single European currency provides a number of advantages. Use of the common euro eliminates the currency exchange fees from the cost of doing business between the European states.

Companies will be able to quickly compare prices with their competitors, which may encourage competition and may result in lower prices for consumers. By encouraging stability and efficiency, proponents of the EMU hope that the use of the euro will stimulate economic growth and may reduce the unemployment rates in the participating member states. International investors will likely diversify their portfolios with Euros, encouraging more investment in the European continent. The European states want the euro to become one of the premier currencies in the international financial market, alongside the dollar and the yen.

Concerns about the EMU centre on the loss of national sovereignty for each of the individual participating states. Some fear that the participating states may not be able to pull out of a national economic crisis without the ability to devalue its national currency and encourage exports. Others worry that the participating European states will be forced to give tax breaks to compete with each other and that companies may have to lower wages for their employees and to lower prices on goods that they produce. Because taxes continue to be levied at the national level and not by the EMU, tax policy cannot be used as a tool to help individual states that may be experiencing an economic downturn.

In this way, the EMU differs from the United States which has both a single federal monetary policy and a primarily centralized tax system. In the United States, the residents of an individual state with a lagging economy can pay less tax and the residents of another state with a soaring economy can make up some of the tax deficit. In the EMU, because tax policy is not centralized, the other states cannot help out an 62

individual participating state that is economically troubled by shouldering a greater proportion of the tax burden. Also, because the participating EMU countries vary so much culturally, the labor force in these countries is not nearly as mobile as between the states of the United States. Because the labor force is fairly stationary, problems of high unemployment may persist in certain individual EMU states while other countries may not be able to fill positions with qualified employees. Finally, some countries (like the United Kingdom) may fear that joining the EMU may pull their country down to the economic equivalent of the least common denominator, saddling them with the economic problems of countries with a less successful economy.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. Describe events leading to the launch of the EMU.
2. What are the main criticisms of the EMU?

2.4 SUMMARY

It should be recognized that these treaties were neither clean breaks from the past nor were they novel acts but rather, a deliberate attempt to deepen the work of the Treaty of Rome. The single European act of 1992 was in particular, a major turning point in Europe's approach to integration. It set the parameters for expansion and through the EMU and similar projects; it eventually helped create the Eurozone.

In this unit, we have discussed the revisions to the Treaty of Rome and identified their general adherence to time honored principles of European integration. Beyond this however, we discussed the specific goals, institutions and principles that undergird projects like the EMU. We also analyzed the events, sentiments and politics that surrounded the launching of these projects and how they have fared since then.

2.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Davies, N. (1996). *Europe: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Goff, R., Walter, M. Terry, J. &

Jiu-Hwa, U. (1983). *The 20th Century: A Brief Global History*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Larkin P.J. (1965). *European History for Certificate Classes (1789- 1970)*. London: Hulton Educational

Publications.

Tsoukalis, L. (1991). *The New European Economy: The Politics and Economics of Integration*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

2.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. Describe events leading to the launch of the EMU

EMU, the Economic and Monetary Union, is the agreement among the participating member states of the European Union to adopt a single hard currency and monetary system so the European Council agreed to name this single European currency the Euro. European countries decided that the EMU and a single European market were essential to the implementation of the European Union programmes which was created to advance economic and social unity among the peoples of Europe and to propel Europe to greater prominence in the international community.

In 1979, the European Council adopted the European Monetary System, known as EMS, which employed an exchange rate mechanism, or ERM, to encourage participating countries to keep the fluctuations of their currency exchange rates within an acceptable band. In 1988, Jacques Delors, the president of the European Commission, chaired a committee which proposed a three-stage plan to reach full economic union, including the establishment of a European Central Bank and a single currency which would replace any existing national currencies. With each stage, the monetary policies of the participating countries would become more closely entwined culminating in full convergence in the EMU.

Plans for the EMU were formalized in provisions within the Maastricht Treaty which founded the European Union. The Maastricht Treaty was signed in 1992, and subsequently ratified by all of the member states. Some countries approved the treaty by a public vote, while other countries ratified the treaty through a legislative vote. The treaty set up the conditions, or "convergence criteria," which each member state in the European Union must meet before it could join the EMU. These conditions for EMU membership were considered necessary because when the member states join the EMU, domestic economic crisis in one member state will affect all of the other member states.

3. What are the main criticisms of the EMU?

- i. The EMU was no longer an optimum currency area because its affairs became overburdened by politics and this affected its operations.
- ii. The Euro, the common currency, was not beneficial to every European country – particularly Germany who the Euro was a disadvantage to - because of a lack of proper private and public debt constraints.
- iii. A member country of the EMU has a higher default risk than a country using its local currency because EU member countries do not have access to their own currency so the financial market would force the country into sovereign debt.
- iv. It is argued in some quarters that the EMU has the potential of leading to the solvency of the economies of its 19 member countries.

UNIT 3 THE EUROPEAN UNION: STRUCTURE, MEMBERSHIP AND ROLES

CONTENTS

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Learning Outcomes

3.3 Main Content

3.3.1 Structure

3.3.2 Membership

3.4 Summary

3.5 References/Further Reading

3.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This unit takes our earlier discussions of European integration even further. It does so by looking at the institutions, structures and roles of the European Union; a body that now encapsulates much of the various programmes promoting European unity. This is particularly important because the creation of a coherent unit like the EU was one of the key goals of the integration project. Even though the EU does not embody all the dreams of the various interests who desire integration in Europe, it has gone a long way in resolving some of the most difficult questions.

3.2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Identify and analyze the main bodies of the EU and their key goals, roles and challenges
- ii. Describe the evolutionary process of EU institutions and how this has helped the cause of European integration
- iii. Recognize the member countries of the EU as well as the different stages at which the ascension negotiations for candidate countries are.

3.3 MAIN CONTENT

3.3.1 Structure

The organizational and institutional system of the European communities and of the European Union, based on it since 1993, is complicated. It results mainly from the fact that this system and decision making mechanisms connected with it have been shaped in the course of many years' evolution of the European communities and institutions connected with them. The European Union is an organization which develops permanently and in connection with this its organization still undergoes changes. The aim is to perfect this system so that it is best adjusted to the enlarging community and changing social, political and economic conditions. The treaty of Lisbon, accepted in 2009, leads in this direction.

The European Union should be viewed from a perspective of an interstate organization created by the founder countries (member states). This organization was created on the basis of *the Treaty of Maastricht on European Union*, signed on 7th February, 1992 (TEU). The treaty entered into force on 1st November, 1993. In *The Treaty on European Union* the founder countries did not assign legal personality to the European Union on the international arena. In this document it was only written that "By this Treaty, the High Contracting Parties establish among themselves a European Union (...)". The European Union did not have its own institutional structure. If we commonly talk about „ Union's institutions" until recently we meant the European Communities' institutions. The European Council, in accordance with art four of the TEU, was the only organ of the European Union.

The European Union cannot be classified as a typical interstate organization or a federation or a confederation of countries. The optimal definition of the European Union was suggested by professor Jan Barcz, a distinguished Polish lawyer, according to whom the European Union is a specific organizational structure which is not a legal person (until *The Treaty of Lisbon* entered into force, the insertion by the editorial staff), functioning on the basis of an international agreement and undergoing constant development. In pursuance of the TEU, "The union shall be founded on the European Communities, supplemented by the policies and forms of cooperation (...)". Three Pillars represented them: the First Pillar "European Communities", the second Pillar II "Common Foreign and Security Policy", the third Pillar "Policy and Judicial Co-operation in Criminal Matters".

The first Pillar was a continuation of economic co-operation of the European community executed before the TEU entered into force. Its aim was to tighten economic co-operation among the European Union's member states in the scope of a single market and customs and monetary union. The functioning of the first Pillar was based on a communal regime community integration method, which meant that all the European Union's member states had to strictly conform to common agreement pertaining to the functioning of the economic and monetary union and the communal law regulations in this sphere.

The goal of the second Pillar was to coordinate foreign policies of the European Union's member states. The purpose was the protection of common values, interests and integrity of the community, strengthening its international safety, peacekeeping in the world, support of international co-operation as well as development and strengthening of democracy. The functioning of the second Pillar was based on the intergovernmental co-operation method, which meant that the co-operation among the European Union's member states in the sphere of common foreign and security policy took place at the level of governments of the individual member states. The lack of the communal regime in the second Pillar caused the fact that individual member countries of the community did not always conform to common decisions pertaining to foreign and security policy.

The third Pillar initially encompassed co-operation in justice administration and internal affairs, and from 1999 police and judicial co-operation in criminal matters. Its goal was to assure internal safety of the European Union. The purpose was to conduct coordinated policy among others in the sphere of fight against drug addiction and drug trafficking, organized crime and terrorism, as well as protection of external borders of the community. Similarly to the second Pillar, the functioning of the third Pillar was based on the intergovernmental co-operation method.

The European Union's organization system based on the three pillars was abolished when the *Treaty of Lisbon* entered into force on 1st December, 2009. At this moment the European Union became legal personality on the international arena and took over competencies previously belonging to the European community. Law, on the basis of which the European communities and the European Union functioned until that time, termed communal law, became law of the European Union.

Until the *Treaty of Lisbon* entered into force, the European Union did not form institutions separate from

those created in the treaties establishing the European Communities (the European Coal and Steel community, the European Economic Community the European community and the European Atomic Energy Community). Only the European community had legal personality and had their own institutions. The institutions of the European Communities were the institutions of these Communities and not of the European Union created when *the Treaty on European Union* (TEU) entered into force. However, the TEU charged the communal institutions with the realization of particular activities belonging to common tasks of the European Union's member states.

Main Institutions

- The European Parliament
- The European Council
- The European Commission
- The Court of Justice of the European Communities
- The Court of First Instance
- The European Court of Auditors

Advisory Bodies

- The Committee of the Regions
- The European Economic and Social Committee

Financial Bodies

- The European Central Bank
- The European Investment Bank
- The European Investment Fund Inter-Institutional Bodies
- The Office of Official Publications of the European Communities
- Publications Office
- The European Personnel Selection Office
- The European Administrative School Decentralized Bodies (Agencies)

- Community agencies
 - Common foreign and security policy agencies
 - Police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters agencies
 - Executive agencies Other Specialized Bodies
- The European Ombudsman
 - The European Data Protection Supervisor

The European council constituted a separate category which was not included in the communal institutions (as the only body of the European Union). Mainly the European Commission, the European Parliament and the European Council take part in the decision making process in the European Union. So far only the European Commission had the right of legislative initiative, thus it could put forward applications for new legal acts. Both the European Parliament and the European Council act jointly with the European Commission in the process of communal law constituting. Decision making procedures in the European Union are described in details in the treaties. Every new legislative proposal of the Commission must have its legal foundation in the treaties. The decision making process is very complicated. Three basic decision making procedures are applied in it - codecision, consultation and agreement.

The Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, TL, also called the Reform Treaty, introduced a unified organizational structure of the European Union and gave legal personality to the Community. According to the provisions of the TL, the European Union functions on the basis of two hitherto basic documents, that is *the Treaty on European Union (TEU)* and *the Treaty establishing the European Community(TEC)*, which were amended by the establishments of the International Conference on 29 October 2004 during which a draft of *the European Constitution* was accepted. The settlements of first part of *the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe* were included in the TEU, whereas the communal policy principles contained in the third part of the Constitutional Treaty were added to the TEC. As mentioned before, the TL, gave legal personality to the European Union. The European Union became a legal successor of the European Community (EC). The Treaty establishing the European Community (TEC) was renamed to *the Treaty on the Functioning of the*

European Union (TFEU). The new treaty abolished the three pillar organisational system of the European Union, retaining certain separateness within the community, related to the previously functioning the Second and Third Pillars. The implementation of the TL provisions results in the division of the community's competences into three areas:

- The European Union's competences (the realization of the EU's goals and foreign policy and safety)
- Shared competences (in which communal/union's law takes precedence over national law of the European Union's member states, excluding certain areas which are in the competence of the member states)
- Competences in which decisions are made independently by the individual member states of the European Union.

The TL changed the way of leadership in the council of the European Union. The hitherto six months' Presidency of the member states the European Union was substituted by the leadership conducted commonly by three member states for 18 months. Also a function of a president of the European council was established, termed informally "the President of the European Union". The treaty strengthened the role of the European Parliament, providing it with new competences in the sphere of the creation of communal law, budgetary issues and political control. For the first time the citizens of the European Union's member states gained the indirect right of legislative initiative. The implementation of the TL provisions results in the change in the European Commission composition. It was decided that from 2014 on the European Commission will be composed of the representatives of two to three of the Community's member states and the individual countries will nominate commissioners in a rotating system. The TL appointed the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Polity, whose aim is to lead the European External Action Service.

One of the most important changes introduced by the TL is the voting system in the Council of the European Union. The hitherto voting system by the qualified majority voting (the Nice Treaty System) is to be valid till the end of October 2014 and then a double majority voting system will be introduced (55% of the EU's states representing at least 65% of the community's population). Additionally a stipulation was made that

till 31st March, 2017. Each member state of the European Union will be able to demand repetition of particular voting according to the Nice System. From 2017 on it is planned to move totally to the double majority system (retaining a safety mechanism enabling member states to delay decision taking for a particular period of time even when they don't have the required blocking capacity (a mechanism analogous to the Ioannina compromise).

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

1. Mention the main bodies running the EU.
2. Mention the EU candidate countries.

3.3.2 Membership

The EU currently has 27 member countries, which have transferred some of their sovereignty – or lawmaking authority – to the EU. A number of other countries have applied to become members of the EU. The member countries are Austria ,Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, and Finland. Others are France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland , Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The EU also has candidate countries that are at the moment undergoing preparatory reforms for membership. They are Croatia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Iceland.

There are also states that are potential candidate countries. These include Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo under UN Security Council Resolution 1244, Montenegro and Serbia.

3.4. SUMMARY

The EU is growing and will continue to see growth in the economic, political and social spheres in the foreseeable future. The community appears quite effective in tackling its major challenges and even though it faces, at the moment an economic recession, its role in the global economy, as well as international politics is growing. One of the reasons is the growing effectiveness of the EU's institutions and their equally

growing coherence.

In this unit, we have primarily discussed the institutional evolution of the EU, its structures and roles in the integration project. We found that the EU has a strong power of attraction as is evidenced by the desire of states like Turkey to join it. It is also evident that the EU's institutional effectiveness has been strengthened over time and that it can now play a more coherent role on the global stage.

3.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Blouet, B. W. (2001). *Geopolitics and Globalisation in the 20th Century*. London: Reaction Books.

Davies, N. (1996). *Europe: A History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moravcsik, A. (1998). *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

3.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. The main bodies that together run the activities of the European Union (EU) are: The European Parliament, European Council, European Commission, Court of Justice of the European Communities, Court of First Instance, European Court of Auditors, Committee of the Regions, European Economic and Social Committee, European Central Bank, European Investment Bank, European Investment Fund,

2. Austria, **Belgium**, Bulgaria, **Cyprus**, Czech Republic, **Denmark**, Estonia, **and** Finland. **Others** are France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

MODULE 3: THE TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONSHIP

Unit 1: An Overview of EU-US Relations

Unit 2: The United States and European Security

Unit 3: EU-US Relations in Afghanistan, Iran, Russia etc

UNIT 1 AN OVERVIEW OF EU-USRELATIONS

CONTENTS

- 1.1 Introduction**
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes**
- 1.3 Main Content**
 - 1.3.1 The Bond of Mutually Shared Values**
 - 1.3.2 Some European Institutions and EU-US Relations**
- 1.4 Summary**
- 1.5 References/Further Reading**
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises**

1.1 INTRODUCTION

European civilization is by far the most dominant foundation for what is now regarded as the American way. It is therefore no surprise that the US retains a very deep, vibrant and productive relationship with Europe. The relationship spans areas of both high and low politics. From security to agriculture, from education to science and from trade to the arts; the transatlantic relationship appears to be the single most important one in the contemporary international system.

In this unit, we intend to explore two main areas of that relationship. The first one relates to cultural affinity. This is what we will call the ‘bond of mutually shared values’. In this, we will look at how similar values in democracy, human rights, freedom etc make it easy, and perhaps even inevitable, that these two powers will work closely together. The other one explores the development of European institutions that aid and facilitate the EU-US relationship. This area is important because it helps us to properly situate specific issue-based cooperation.

1.2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Describe the nature of mutually shared values in Europe and the US
- ii. Explain how this smoothens rough edges in a highly productive and long lasting relationship.
- iii. Identify the relevance of specific institutional developments within the structures of the EU
- iv. Demonstrate the relevance of these structures for strengthening the EU-US relationship.

1.3 MAIN CONTENT

1.3.1 The Bond of Mutually Shared Values

Unique in both breadth and depth, the European Union's partnership with the United States often lends itself to superlatives: the biggest, the deepest, and the longest-lasting. In fact, the transatlantic economic partnership is a key driver of global economic prosperity and represents the largest, most integrated, and most enduring relationship in the world. The two transatlantic partners account for half of the global economy, and according to the WTO, in 2008 the EU and the U.S. combined accounted for close to 40 percent of world trade. Together, the EU and the U.S. provide the bulk (80 percent) of official development assistance worldwide. However, it is the shared allegiance to deeply held values that is the core of the EU-U.S. relationship and that instills within it the strength to meet 21st century challenges, including globalization and the emergence of new powers and a multi-polar world. Both the EU and the U.S. are committed to the rule of law, the democratic process, respect for human rights, alleviating poverty, and a free and fair market economy as essential to modern societies.

European Commission president José Manuel Barroso has linked transatlantic values to common interests: He notes "Why do the U.S. and the EU promote regulatory and legal mechanisms to solve their political and economic conflicts? Because the rule of law is a value we share. Why do we condemn the use of force by authoritarian regimes against their own people? It is because we value individual rights, democracy, and freedom. Why do we lead the world in development policies? It is because we believe in solidarity, and the value of all human beings.

Why have we spent the last 60 years promoting global free trade? Because we value economic freedom, and the wealth and stability it creates." Such common values, in addition to the deeply interdependent transatlantic economy and the trust and confidence that has been built up through many years of collaboration, make the EU and the U.S. natural partners to tackle global issues through mechanisms like the Transatlantic Economic Council and the EU-U.S. development dialogue. The EU and the U.S. work together to eliminate obstacles for free and fair commerce, to jointly target poverty, and to help societies in transition build the institutions necessary to ensure the rule of law.

1. What values connect the EU and U.S?

1.3.2 Some European Institutions and EU -US Relations

As the EU continues to evolve—becoming stronger, more visible, more unified, and more efficient—it is becoming an ever more effective partner to the U.S. in addressing global and regional concerns. Over the past year the European Union has been transformed by a new treaty; a newly appointed 27-member European Commission; a newly elected European Parliament; a European Council headed by a new permanent President; a common foreign service in the making, led by the newly created inter-institutional position of EU high representative for foreign affairs and security policy; a new phase in the EU-U.S. relationship following the election of President Barack Obama; and the first EU ambassador to the United States.

Although the EU and the U.S. established diplomatic relations in the early 1950s, formal cooperation was introduced in 1990 with the Transatlantic Declaration, which launched regular presidential summits. Five years later, the EU and the U.S. adopted the New Transatlantic Agenda, which governs the relationship and outlines a joint action plan revolving around four major goals. These are promoting peace and stability, democracy and development around the world, responding to global challenges, contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations and finally, building bridges across the Atlantic.

As the EU's political and legal personality has evolved, active cooperation between the EU and the U.S. has expanded to encompass areas including counterterrorism, crisis management, energy and energy security, the environment, research and development, and education and training. The first formal EU-U.S. summit under the Obama administration took place in Washington, D.C. in November 2009 and resulted in two new important tools for transatlantic cooperation. Launched at the summit, the EU-U.S. Energy council is a new cabinet-level group focused on issues including global energy problems.

According to a December 2009 study conducted for the European Commission—the EU's executive arm—tackling existing non-tariff measures for trade and investment between the EU and the U.S. would produce

substantial economic benefits on both sides of the Atlantic. For the U.S. benefits from aligning the non-tariff measures are estimated at €41 billion annually in increased GDP and a six percent rise in exports to the EU. Cost savings would be generated primarily in electrical goods, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, financial services, and insurance. For the EU, aligning non-tariff measures and regulatory convergences could translate into a potential annual gain of €122 billion in GDP and a two percent increase in exports to the U.S. Cost savings would accrue mainly from gains in motor vehicles, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, food, and electric goods.

Tackling non-tariff measures can yield major benefits for the EU and the U.S. energy security, new technologies, energy policy, and research. Additionally, after a hiatus of more than a decade, the EU-U.S. development dialogue was re-launched in Washington D.C. on April 25, 2010. Designed to tackle poverty at the global level, its priorities include the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), food security, and climate change.

The Transatlantic Economic Council (TEC) advances EU-U.S. economic integration by bringing together governments, the business community, and consumers to work on key areas where greater regulatory convergence can reap rewards on both sides of the Atlantic. Currently chaired by EU trade commissioner Karel De Gucht and Michael Froman, U.S. deputy national security adviser for international economic affairs, the TEC provides a high-level forum to address such complex areas as investment, the financial markets, mutual recognition of accounting standards, and secure trade, as well as more technical regulatory issues. Of particular value is the opportunity to defuse transatlantic trade disputes through consultation on standards as they are being formulated, rather than after the fact. A new EU-U.S. innovation dialogue aims at spurring growth, productivity, and entrepreneurial activity, by sharing best policy practices and improving the policy environment for innovative activities by drawing on talents and ideas from both markets. TEC is advised by representatives from the Transatlantic Business Dialogue, the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue, the Transatlantic Consumer Dialogue, and labour.

European Commission vice-president and EU high representative for foreign affairs and security policy annual summits, held alternately in the EU and the U.S., take place between the presidents of the European Commission and the European Council and the president of the United States. The most recent summit

took place in Lisbon, Portugal in November 2010. The Senior Level Group (SLG), comprising senior EU and U.S. State department officials, prepares for EU-U.S. summits with the support of a joint task force which meets regularly to oversee the day-to-day implementation of summit decisions. Thematic dialogues ensure that a wide range of actors contributes to the EU-U.S. policy process by encouraging legislators, businesspeople, consumers, scientists, academics, and citizens' groups to build and sustain links with their transatlantic counterparts.

The Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD) between the U.S. Congress and the European Parliament fosters ongoing dialogue between American and European lawmakers on issues ranging from foreign policy to trade and economics to energy and the environment. The TLD, which attracts high-ranking members of both the European Parliament and the U.S. Congress as participants, contributes to a more harmonized approach to issues of mutual concern and works to pre-empt disputes before they occur by promoting awareness of the transatlantic impact of legislation and regulation and allowing for an exchange of ideas to resolve possible conflicts. The Transatlantic Business Dialogue, the Transatlantic Consumer Dialogue, and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue all provide input to the Transatlantic Economic Council. An EU-U.S. Transport and Border Security Dialogue involving the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice began in 2004. EU-U.S. cooperation in crisis management, conflict prevention, and capacity building is reflected in the partners' stabilization efforts in the Balkans and Kosovo. Cooperation on regional challenges (including Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, and the Middle East) is intensifying and includes a greater focus on civilian capacity-building to ensure long-term stability. The EU-U.S. Science and Technology Agreement expand ongoing transatlantic scientific cooperation. Since 1999, joint research activities have been undertaken in a number of fields such as medical research, biotechnology, environment, materials science (including nanotechnology), and non-nuclear and renewable energy. The EU-U.S. Education policy forum strengthens education cooperation across the Atlantic and provides for the exchange of ideas on challenges and trends in the areas of higher education reforms. "As the EU develops a more powerful and unified foreign policy voice in the wake of the Lisbon Treaty, our transatlantic partnership will continue to grow."

The Transatlantic Consumer Dialogue (TACD) brings together representatives from more than 60

consumer organizations in the EU and the U.S. to develop joint consumer policy recommendations. TACD helps safeguard consumer rights and welfare on both sides of the Atlantic, and it focuses on issues including financial services, food and product safety, trade, intellectual property, climate change, net neutrality, and nanotechnology. The Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD) between the U.S. Congress and the European Parliament fosters ongoing dialogue between American and European lawmakers on issues ranging from foreign policy to trade and economics to energy and the environment. The TLD, which attracts high-ranking members of both the European Parliament and the U.S. Congress as participants, contributes to a more harmonized approach to issues of mutual concern and works to preempt disputes before they occur by promoting awareness of the transatlantic impact of legislation and regulation and allowing for an exchange of ideas to resolve possible conflicts.

The Transatlantic Business Dialogue, the Transatlantic Consumer Dialogue, and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue all provide input to the Transatlantic Economic Council. An EU-U.S. Transport and border security dialogue involving the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice began in 2004. EU-U.S. cooperation in crisis management, conflict prevention, and capacity building is reflected in the partners' stabilization efforts in the Balkans and Kosovo. Cooperation on regional challenges (including Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, and the Middle East) is intensifying and includes a greater focus on civilian capacity-building to ensure long-term stability.

The EU-U.S. Science and technology agreement expands ongoing transatlantic scientific cooperation. Since 1999, joint research activities have been undertaken in a number of fields such as medical research, biotechnology, environment, materials science (including nanotechnology), and non-nuclear and renewable energy. The EU-U.S. Education Policy Forum strengthens education cooperation across the Atlantic and provides for the exchange of ideas on challenges and trends in the areas of higher education reforms.

1.4 SUMMARY

This relationship has strengthened immensely in the last five decades. Even though there have been series of sharp disagreements, it has not threatened, in any fundamental sense, the continued vibrancy of the relationship. A good example is the disagreements over the Iraq invasion and the placement of nuclear

tipped missiles and/or missile defense systems in parts of Europe. Overall however, the EU-US relationship is one of the most enduring and perhaps important partnerships in modern international system.

In this unit we have discussed a brief overview of the EU-US relationship. We identified the strong role a shared value system and civilization plays in building, strengthening and sustaining the transatlantic relationship. We also provided a short introduction to our subsequent discussions on more substantive aspects of this very important relationship.

1.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Brezinzi, Z. (1998). *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*.

Basic Books.

Davies, N. (1996). *Europe: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Goldstein, J. & Pevehouse, J.

(2009). *International Relations*. Pearson-Longman: New York.

Prior, R. & Wilson, T. (2000). *The First World War*. J. Keegan (Ed.). London: Orion House.

1.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. What values connect the EU and U.S?

The EU and U.S. diplomatic relations dates back to the early 1950s but formal cooperation between the two was introduced in 1990 with the Transatlantic Declaration which launched regular presidential summits. In 1995, the EU and the U.S. adopted the New Transatlantic Agenda that governs the relationship and outlined a joint action plan revolving around four major goals: (i) promoting peace and stability, (ii) democracy and development around the world, (iii) responding to global challenges, contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations and (iv) building bridges across the Atlantic. Launched at the summit, the EU-U.S. Energy council is a new cabinet- level group focused on issues including global energy problems.

As the EU's political and legal personality evolved, active cooperation between the EU and the U.S. expanded to encompass areas including counterterrorism, crisis management, energy and energy security, the environment, research and development, education and training. According to a December 2009 study

conducted for the European Commission, which is the EU's executive arm, tackling existing non-tariff measures for trade and investment between the EU and the U.S. would produce substantial economic benefits on both sides of the Atlantic.

2. Discuss two EU institutions that facilitates cooperation with the

US i. The Transatlantic Economic Council (TEC)

This institution advances EU-U.S economic cooperation by bringing together the two governments, the business community and consumers to the table to discuss and work on key areas where they can reap greater regulatory convergence rewards on both sides of the Atlantic. Currently co-chaired by the White House Deputy National Security Advisor for International Economic Affairs and the EU Commissioner for Trade, the TEC provides a high-level forum for the US and the EU to address complex areas as investment, the financial markets, mutual recognition of accounting standards, secure trade as well as more technical regulatory issues. Of particular value is the opportunity to defuse transatlantic trade disputes through consultation on standards as they are being formulated, rather than after the fact. EU-U.S relationship under the TEC aims at spurring growth, productivity, and entrepreneurial activity by sharing the best policy practices and improving the policy environment for innovative activities through drawing on talents and ideas from both markets. TEC is advised by representatives from the Transatlantic Business Dialogue, the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue, the Transatlantic Consumer Dialogue, and labor.

ii. The Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD)

The TLD fosters dialogue between American and European lawmakers on issues ranging from foreign policy, trade, economics, energy and the environment. The TLD, which attracts high-ranking members of both the European Parliament and the U.S. Congress as participants, contributes to a more harmonized approach to issues of mutual concern and works to pre-empt disputes before they occur by promoting awareness of the transatlantic impact of legislation and regulation and allowing for an exchange of ideas to resolve possible conflicts.

UNIT 2: THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPEAN SECURITY

CONTENTS

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Learning Outcomes

2.3 Main Content

2.3.1 EU/NATO

2.3.2 The Nuclear Umbrella

2.4 Summary

2.5 References/Further Reading

2.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Security is one of the main areas of the transatlantic relationship. There is immense cooperation between Europe and the US in the area of security. Dating to the world wars, the US has played a very important role in European security. At the end of the war in 1945, the US practically served as a guarantor of European peace and security, particularly in relation to the threat posed by the defunct Soviet Union. There have been strains in this relationship but it has generally endured since that period. In this unit, we will take a look at two important elements of that security cooperation. These elements are NATO and the US nuclear umbrella.

2.2 LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Explain the relationship between the EU and NATO and to see how NATO objectives generally align with those stated out in the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP).
- ii. Describe the role of the US nuclear umbrella during the Cold War and its declining relevance in the Post Cold War period.

2.3 MAIN CONTENT

2.3.1 EU/NATO

Strong bilateral relationships between the United States and individual European countries remain a vital foundation for transatlantic relations. At the same time, the relationship between the United States and the European Union has been taking on a growing significance. The EU has become an increasingly important interlocutor for the United States because its 27 member countries now take common decisions and formulate common policies in a wide range of areas—including many economic and social issues and a growing number of law enforcement and judicial matters—at the level of the EU institutions. The EU is also continuing efforts to develop a stronger Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). In December 2009, the EU adopted the Lisbon Treaty, introducing reforms intended to enhance the credibility and coherence of the EU’s foreign policy voice, and to streamline the EU’s institutional arrangements and decision-making procedures.

Members of congress and officials in the Obama administration have stated their support for the initiatives of the Lisbon Treaty and affirmed their intention to work closely with the new institutions and arrangements launched by the treaty.

NATO remains the preeminent security institution of the Euro-Atlantic community. Like the EU, NATO, too, has been experiencing dramatic change in recent years. Since the end of the Cold War, the alliance has added 12 new member states from central and Eastern Europe. Also during this time, NATO has sought to redefine its mission. Some members maintain that NATO should return to focusing on collective territorial defense and deterrence, while others believe NATO’s relevance depends on “out-of-area” expeditionary operations and an ability to address new types of global security threats.

While NATO has worked to transform itself and develop new capabilities, most observers contend that more resources are needed should NATO decide to fully commit itself to challenges such as stabilization and reconstruction operations, crisis management, counterterrorism, energy security, or cyber security. At the NATO Summit in Lisbon in November 2010, the 28 member countries approved a new Strategic Concept document that provides an updated vision for the alliance.

NATO and the European Union (EU) share common values and strategic interests, and are working side

by side in crisis-management operations. At the Lisbon Summit in November 2010, the Allies underlined their determination to improve the NATO-EU strategic partnership, as agreed by the two organizations. At Lisbon, the allies welcomed recent initiatives from several allies and ideas proposed by the secretary-general to improve NATO-EU cooperation. Building on these initiatives and on the guidance provided by the new strategic concept, they encouraged the secretary-general to continue to work with the EU high representative and to report to the council on the ongoing efforts in time for the meeting of NATO foreign ministers in Berlin, in April 2011.

NATO's new strategic concept, adopted at Lisbon, commits the alliance to prevent crises, manage conflicts and stabilize post-conflict situations, including by working more closely with NATO's international partners, most importantly the United Nations and the European Union.

The strategic concept clearly states that an active and effective European Union contributes to the overall security of the Euro-Atlantic area. Therefore the EU is a unique and essential partner for NATO. The two organizations share a majority of members, and all members of both organizations share common values. NATO recognizes the importance of a stronger and more capable European defense. The allies welcome the entry into force of the European Union's Lisbon treaty, which provides a framework for strengthening the EU's capacities to address common security challenges. Non-EU Allies make a significant contribution to these efforts. For the strategic partnership between NATO and the EU, their fullest involvement in these efforts is essential.

NATO and the EU can and should play complementary and mutually reinforcing roles in supporting international peace and security. The allies are determined to make their contribution to create more favorable circumstances through which they will:

- i. Fully strengthen the strategic partnership with the EU, in the spirit of full mutual openness, transparency, complementarity and respect for the autonomy and institutional integrity of both organizations
- ii. Enhance practical cooperation in operations throughout the crisis spectrum, from coordinated planning to mutual support in the field
- iii. Broaden political consultations to include all issues of common concern, in order to share

assessments and perspectives

- iv. Cooperate more fully in capability development, to minimize duplication and maximize cost-effectiveness.

Institutionalized relations between NATO and the European Union were launched in 2001, building on steps taken during the 1990s to promote greater European responsibility in defense matters. The political principles underlying the relationship were set out in the December 2002 NATO-EU Declaration on ESDP. With the enlargement of both organizations in 2004 followed by the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union in 2007, NATO and the European Union now have 21 member countries in common. NATO and EU officials meet on a regular basis to discuss issues of common interest. Meetings take place at different levels including at the level of foreign ministers, ambassadors, military representatives and defense advisors. There are regular staff contacts between NATO's International Staff and International Military Staff, and the European Union's Council Secretariat and Military Staff as well as the European Defense Agency.

Permanent military liaison arrangements have been established to facilitate cooperation at the operational level. A NATO Permanent Liaison Team has been operating at the EU Military Staff since November 2005 and an EU Cell was set up at SHAPE (NATO's strategic command for operations in Mons, Belgium) in March 2006.

The NATO-EU Declaration on ESDP, agreed on 16 December 2002, reaffirmed the EU assured access to NATO's planning capabilities for its own military operations and reiterated the political principles of the strategic partnership: effective mutual consultation; equality and due regard for the decision-making autonomy of the European Union and NATO; respect for the interests of EU and NATO members states; respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; and coherent, transparent and mutually reinforcing development of the military capability requirements common to the two organizations.

As part of the framework for cooperation adopted on 17 March 2003, the so-called "Berlin-Plus" arrangements provide the basis for NATO-EU cooperation in crisis management by allowing the European Union to have access to NATO's collective assets and capabilities for EU-led operations, including command arrangements and assistance in operational planning. In effect, they allow the Alliance to support

EU-led operations in which NATO as a whole is not engaged.

In July 2003, the European Union and NATO published a "Concerted Approach for the Western Balkans". Jointly drafted, it outlines core areas of cooperation and emphasizes the common vision and determination both organizations share to bring stability to the region.

Together with operations, capability development is an area where cooperation is essential and where there is potential for further growth. The NATO-EU Capability Group was established in May 2003 to ensure the coherence and mutual reinforcement of NATO and EU capability development efforts. This applies to initiatives such as the EU Battle Groups, developed within the "Headline Goal" for 2010, and the NATO Response Force, and efforts in both organizations to improve the availability of helicopters for operations. Following the creation, in July 2004, of the European Defense Agency (EDA) to coordinate work within the European Union on the development of defense capabilities, armaments cooperation, acquisition and research, EDA experts contribute to the work of the Capability Group.

Both NATO and the European Union are committed to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. They have exchanged information on their activities in the field of protection of civilian populations against chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) attacks. The two organizations also cooperate in the field of civil emergency planning by exchanging inventories of measures taken in this area.

Since the enlargement of NATO and the European Union in 2004 and the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union in 2007, the organizations have 21 member countries in common. In parallel, NATO recognized the need to develop a "European Security and Defense Identity" within the organization that would be both an integral part of the adaptation of NATO's political and military structures and an important contributing factor to the development of European defense capabilities.

In January 2001, an exchange of letters between the NATO Secretary General and the EU Presidency formalized the start of direct relations between NATO and the EU. Since then, considerable progress has been made in developing the NATO-EU strategic partnership, though its full potential is yet to be realized.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. In what way does a strong bilateral relation with individual European states strengthen the US's relationship with the EU?

2.3.2 Challenges of the Nuclear Umbrella

Another very important part of EU-US security cooperation is what has been described as the nuclear umbrella. The US guaranteed the security of its allies in Europe during the Cold War largely through the so called nuclear umbrella. This defense strategy was hinged on the commitment of the US to fight, with nuclear weapons if necessary, to defend its allies in the case of attack by the Soviet Union. The end of the Cold War has however significantly reduced, or even removed, the threat of a nuclear attack from Russia, the Soviet Union's successor state. As a consequence, questions are now being raised as to the continued relevance of the so called nuclear umbrella. Most controversial is the continued deployment of tactical (short and intermediate range) nuclear tipped missiles in parts of Europe and the training and arming of non nuclear states for the possible delivery of nuclear weapons.

Some of the sharpest criticism of the nuclear umbrella comes from the supposed beneficiaries themselves; that is European states. They argue that the continued adherence to this strategy betrays a fixation with Cold War military doctrines that have little or no relevance to contemporary reality. They point, for instance, at the emergence of new threats like terrorism which such nuclear weapons cannot possibly counter. This position has been strong within Europe for some time now.

At every juncture and following every reductions and modification of the posture, NATO bureaucrats have reaffirmed the importance of maintaining U.S. nuclear weapons forward-deployed in Europe. The justifications are poorly explained and muddled, consisting of remnants of Cold War rationales about a Russian threat, vague missions such as war prevention, ambiguous suggestions like deterring proliferation of weapons mass destruction, and dubious claims about nuclear weapons providing a unique link between Europe and its North American allies.

What characterizes these justifications is an infatuation with Cold War rationales and a fear of taking the next bold step to finally bring Europe out of the Cold War: At a time when NATO and the United States

seek a new partnership with Russia and are concerned over the security of Russian tactical nuclear weapons, the interests of the alliance are not served by keeping hundreds of nuclear weapons forward-deployed in Europe. The presence of these weapons is a continuous irritant to normalizations and an unnecessary and counterproductive factor in Russian military planning.

At a time when both Europe and the United States are engaged in high-profile diplomatic nonproliferation efforts around the world to promote and enforce non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, deploying hundreds of such weapons in non-nuclear NATO countries and training the air forces of non-nuclear NATO countries – in peacetime – to deliver these weapons in times of war is at cross purposes with an effective non-proliferation message. All of the non-nuclear NATO countries that host nuclear weapons on their U.S. Nuclear weapons in European territory (Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey) have signed the 1970 nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) under which they pledge: "... not to receive the transfer ... of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly".

Likewise, as a nuclear weapons state party to the NPT, the United States has committed itself to: "... not to transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices directly or indirectly"

There is also the issue of safety. Throughout the 1990s, NATO and U.S. officials assured the public that the nuclear weapons in Europe were secure, only to admit in internal upgrade programs and inspections that serious concerns existed. At one point in 1997, they found, this even included the risk of an accidental nuclear detonation. Despite efforts to improve nuclear proficiency of its nuclear personnel, the U.S. Air Force continues to experience serious deficiencies. In 2003, the pass rate for air force nuclear surety inspection hit an all-time low, with only half of the inspections resulting in a pass (the historical pass rate is 79 percent).

And then there is the question of how forward deployment fits the new reality of war on terrorism. Are the benefits of deploying 480 nuclear weapons at a dozen installations throughout Europe justified considering the potential threat from a terrorist attack? In October 2003, Tunisian born Nizar Trabelsi was sentenced to 10 years in prison for plotting to bomb the Kleine Brogel air base in Belgium. Trabelsi joined the al Qaeda

terrorist network and planned to drive a car containing a bomb into the canteen of the base to kill American soldiers. Two accomplices received lesser sentences. Trabelsi said he did not plan to detonate nuclear weapons stored at the base.

After the terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001, the U.S. government has changed the way it views security of its nuclear weapons. Prior to 2001, the nuclear weapons security philosophy was based on the premise that “people would try to steal them,” according to National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Director Linton Brooks. But now it is obvious that there are individuals who are willing to sacrifice their lives just to create a nuclear incident, he said. As a result, NNSA has expanded its security perimeters so that potential attackers can be stopped farther away from a nuclear facility.

Finally, there is the question of burden sharing and whether this long- held principle of NATO nuclear planning is eroding. Although a third of the U.S. forward-deployed nuclear bombs in Europe are earmarked for deliver by half a dozen non-nuclear NATO countries, many of those countries are showing signs of retreating from of the nuclear mission. Nuclear weapons were removed from Greece in 2001, Italy only has nuclear weapons on one national air base, and Germany also only has nuclear weapons left on one national air base and closed another base in 2003. And Germany may phase out its nuclear mission altogether with its planned replacement of the Tornado aircraft with the Eurofighter in the next decade.

In conclusion, a final review of the forward deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe is long overdue. This time, the U.S. Congress and European parliaments must ask tough questions about the rationale for the deployment. They should not be content with vague justifications from the past about nuclear weapons “preventing war” or “providing a political link between Europe and North America.” The focus must be on exactly who the enemy is and where the targets are for these weapons, which essential and unique benefits the weapons provide to NATO’s security that cannot be met through other means, and how the training in peacetime of pilots from non-nuclear countries to deliver nuclear weapons in wartime matches European and U.S. nonproliferation messages.

2.4 SUMMARY

As can be gleaned from the two units we have discussed, the US is a very critical component of the

European security architecture. Even though European states like France in particular have characteristically worked to create an independent military defense capability, it appears that if there is ever a war with a major power like Russia or China, Europe will still have to depend significantly on the US. Even its ability to project power in defense of its interests in distant theatres like Africa and Asia depends on American political and military support. The ongoing military interventions in Libya provide a very important illustration.

America's decisive military superiority is a product of both its superior advances in weapons technology and widespread political opposition to military spending on offensive capabilities in key states like Germany. Overall, both Europe and its American ally benefit from this strong bond. While the US can count on Europe for political support (at least most of the time) and of course military contributions in times of war, Europe is able to concentrate on economic growth by freeing funds from expensive military ventures and diverting them to social issues.

In this unit, we addressed the intimate security relationship between the US and Europe. We looked at the most successful military defense alliance in history; NATO, and also discussed the US nuclear umbrella over Europe and the challenges it now faces. Overall, all the issues we addressed demonstrated the vibrancy and dynamism of the transatlantic relationship and its relevance to contemporary international stability.

2.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Buzan, B. & Weaver, O. (2003). *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reichard, M. (2006). *The EU-NATO Relationship: A Legal and Political Perspective*. Burlington:

Ashgate Publishers.

Sloan, S. (2005). *NATO, the EU and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged*.

London: Rowman and Littlefield.

2.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. In what way does a strong bilateral relation with individual European states strengthen the US

relationship with the EU?

One of the many ways that the relationship between the EU and the US can be strengthened is through a strong bilateral relation among individual European countries. This is important because in this moment, the US is the most powerful country in the world and for the EU to benefit from its relationship with it, it is imperative that countries within Europe close ranks and speak with one voice in their dealings with the US. In the instance where there are dissenting voices, there is the likelihood that discussions on interest areas would be delayed and this delay has the potential of leading to negative repercussions for individual European countries in particular and the European Union in general. Therefore, a strong relation among individual European countries where they speak with one voice is important if it must maintain a beneficial relationship with the USA, who is the obvious world hegemon.

2. Discuss the Cold War relevance of the nuclear umbrella

The “nuclear umbrella’ as a product of the Cold War is a guarantee given by a nuclear weapons country to defend a non-nuclear allied/friendly country. The deal of the nuclear umbrella came out as a result of the fallout of the Cold War when the two main countries in that war, the United States of America and Russia, began a rat race of stockpiling weapons and building their nuclear arsenals as a form of deterrent to one another. It is this nuclear weapons competition between the USA and Russia that necessitated the need for a nuclear umbrella because countries who are not nuclear weapons making/owning countries had to pitch tent with one of the two sides and doing so means needing the protection of that country over the other side. Thus, the Cold War necessitated the need for a “nuclear umbrella” that shields a non-nuclear weapons country from been attacked by a nuclear weapons country. The umbrella depicts protection from the “sun’ of nuclear weapons attack.

UNIT 3 EU-US RELATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN, IRAN, RUSSIA ETC

CONTENTS

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Learning Outcomes

3.3 Main Content

3.3.1 Afghanistan

3.3.2 Iran

3.3.3 Russia

3.4 Counter Terrorism, Economic Relations

3.5 Summary

3.6 References/Further Reading

3.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

3.1 INTRODUCTION

While the preceding unit has helped us to appropriately understand the general nature of the transatlantic relationship, particularly in the area of security, this unit will look at specific states and issues and try to operationalize our earlier understanding of the relationship. Afghanistan, Iran and Russia have selected for two general reasons. First, the three states have been, to varying degrees, major sources of disagreement and conflict within the EU and between the EU and the US. Second, the issues at stake in these states; terrorism in Afghanistan, nuclear proliferation in Iran and emerging power challenge to the west in Russia; represent three of the most pressing concerns for European international politics in the twenty first century. Operationalizing our analysis with these states therefore gives insight into critical international relations issues of our age and how Europe engages with them.

As noted above, how to react to issues in states like Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Russia have been, to varying degrees, irritants in the transatlantic relationship. There has been an attempt to balance different perceptions and interests in order to present a common and unite front. Of course, this is not to suggest that there is unity even within Europe itself or that it presents a common front with regard to these issues. The different perceptions of threat and appropriate action have sometimes hindered the smooth operation of the alliance. However, as what we will be discussing below demonstrates, there are still many areas of consensus that has allowed differences to be easily smoothed out and decisive action taken.

3.2 LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Describe the specific issues attached to EU-US policy in states like Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan
- ii. Describe US-EU relations with regard to counter terrorism and economy.

3.3. MAIN CONTENT

3.3.1 Afghanistan

Many observers argue that Afghanistan remains the most urgent and important international security issue for the transatlantic alliance. As of October 2010, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) consists of more than 130,000 troops from 46 countries, including all 28 members of NATO.

With considerable force increases in 2009-2010, these numbers represent a substantial commitment of alliance and partner country resources. In addition, following two U.S. strategic policy reviews in 2009, the alliance and its partners have been pursuing a strategy that emphasizes the integration of civilian and military efforts, the promotion of governance capacity and economic development, and the training of Afghan army and police forces.

Despite this range of efforts, it remains uncertain whether sufficient progress is being made to begin drawing down military forces and transferring more responsibility to the Afghan authorities by president Obama's stated target date of July 2011. Leaders at NATO's Lisbon summit agreed to 2014 as the goal for ending the ISAF mission. Some officials and analysts have asserted that the international strategy is working, both in terms of state-building and combating the Taliban and the insurgents. On the other hand, insurgent violence continues to cause instability in many parts of the country and serious questions persist about corruption, the Afghan economy, and the self-sufficiency of Afghan institutions. Although precise definitions for success or failure in Afghanistan vary, the outcome has major ramifications for the future of NATO—possibly either reaffirming NATO's central role in addressing 21st century security threats or, alternately, raising difficult questions about the utility, and by extension the fundamental role and purpose, of the alliance.

Afghanistan also represents a test of cohesion for the alliance. Considerable segments of the public in Europe have never been sold on their country's participation in Afghanistan, and strong public opposition to the war in many European countries has been pressuring governments to define an exit strategy and a timeline for withdrawal. On top of flat or shrinking European defense budgets and persistent shortfalls in military resources, an atmosphere of economic austerity in Europe offers an additional challenge to those seeking to justify their country's deployments.

The debate about extending the Netherlands' participation in ISAF brought down the Dutch government in early 2010, causing the country to end its combat mission in August 2010 and begin withdrawing its contingent of nearly 2,000 troops. Although no immediate changes are foreseen by the other major contributors, additional strains are likely to be felt in 2011. The continued commitment of European countries to the mission in Afghanistan is an important tone setter in transatlantic relations, and questions about alliance unity or the equality of burden sharing in Afghanistan could affect the strength and cohesion of the transatlantic partnership.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

1. Have the challenges of the Afghanistan campaign undermined the transatlantic relationship?

3.3.2 Iran

Transatlantic cooperation regarding Iran's nuclear program has been close and extensive. Since the discovery of Iran's covert enrichment activities in 2002, the "EU-3" (France, Germany, and the United Kingdom) have led diplomatic efforts to curtail them. In 2006, China, Russia, and the United States joined the EU-3 to form the "Permanent Five Plus One" (P5+1) negotiating group, and EU high representative Catherine Ashton has now been leading talks with Iran on behalf of the P5+1. Between 2006 and 2008, the EU-3 and the United States successfully pushed for United Nations Security Council (UNSC) approval of three rounds of limited sanctions on Iran (Resolutions 1737, 1747, and 1803).

Early in 2009, the Obama administration indicated a willingness to increase direct U.S. engagement in talks

with Iran. European leaders welcomed and encouraged this prospect, although emphasizing that it should be closely coordinated within the P5+1 framework. During direct negotiations between the P5+1 and Iran in October 2009, the United States, France, and Russia advanced a proposal to enrich Iranian uranium outside the country for use in an Iranian research reactor. Iran declined to formally accept this proposal, however, and would not agree to a date for continued negotiations, leading the United States and the EU to pursue further U.N. sanctions in early 2010. Despite a last minute attempt at mediation by Brazil and Turkey, the UNSC voted in June 2010 to authorize a tougher new round of sanctions (Resolution 1929) targeting the Iranian financial and energy sectors.

In July 2010, the EU announced it would apply these U.N. authorizations to implement its toughest sanctions yet: measures include a ban on new investment, equipment sales, technical assistance, and technology transfers to Iran's gas and oil industry; a ban on trade support measures such as export credit guarantees and on insurance contracts longer than two years; a ban on new relationships with Iranian financial institutions and on Iranian banks opening new branches or subsidiaries in the EU; a new requirement in which bank transfers over €10,000 (about \$13,000) to or from Iran must be reported to national authorities, and transfers over €40,000 (about \$52,000) must be authorized; a ban on insurance and reinsurance of Iranian government institutions; a ban on Iranian air cargo flights in and out of the EU; increased inspections of ships suspected of carrying prohibited articles; and an extension of travel bans and asset freezes to more than 40 additional Iranian companies and officials.

Many observers were surprised at how far these latest EU measures went, observing that they send a strong signal and bring U.S. and European sanctions policy on Iran into a broad alignment. Although the United States has strongly supported EU-3 efforts in this issue, in the past some Americans have pointed to European economic ties with Iran as a sign of European reluctance to press Tehran too hard, urging Europeans to adopt tighter sanctions. Some differences remain—observers note that the new EU measures do not ban the sale of refined petroleum products, leading critics to assert they still fall short of the restrictions imposed by recent U.S. legislation (Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, P.L. 111-195). The EU takes its cues on sanctions strictly from the U.N.—since Resolution 1929 did not specifically authorize banning sales of refined petroleum, the EU does not consider

there to be a legal basis for such measures to be implemented as a common EU policy. Individual member states may take separate action and pressure their national firms not to do such business with Iran. Many European financial and energy firms have reportedly pulled out of Iran voluntarily, although some reportedly continue to do business there.

In addition, the EU has long opposed the U.S. Iran sanctions act as an extraterritorial application of U.S. law. While most analysts believe that sanctions are having a substantial economic effect on Iran and possibly significant political and social effects as well, it appears more doubtful that sanctions are influencing the country's commitment to its nuclear program and ambitions. No clear strategic consensus exists between U.S. and EU policymakers regarding next steps if sanctions fail to achieve the desired results, or even on a specific timeline or criteria for judging the success or failure of sanctions. Iran has indicated an interest in including additional topics—such as broader questions of regional security and economic issues—in possible future negotiations, rather than limiting talks to its nuclear activities. Without a more cooperative Iranian approach to the nuclear issues, however, it appears unlikely that the United States and the EU are prepared to broaden the topics of discussion.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

2. What are the mutually shared interests that bind the EU and US in Iran?

3.3.3 Russia

In the aftermath of its August 2008 conflict with Georgia, relations between Russia and the West reached what some observers consider their lowest point since the end of the Cold War. In fact, relations had already grown increasingly tense in recent years, with numerous issues including past and prospective NATO enlargement, and Western support for the independence of Kosovo, serving as points of irritation and contention. Against this backdrop, officials and observers in Europe and the United States have also expressed concern about what is perceived as the increasingly authoritarian character of the Russian government and its assertiveness and quest for influence in the Russian “Near Abroad” and beyond. Many

European countries have complex and interdependent relationships with Russia in terms of energy and economics, and EU member states have had a difficult time formulating a common approach to their eastern neighbor.

The Obama administration's "reset" initiative appears to have helped alleviate some of the tension that had built up. In April 2009, following an initial meeting between president Obama and president Medvedev, leaders at NATO's 60th anniversary summit decided to resume the meetings of the NATO-Russia Council, which had been suspended due to the Georgia conflict. President Obama travelled to Moscow for a summit in July 2009, and the two sides reached an agreement allowing the transit of U.S. military material through Russia to Afghanistan, among other areas of cooperation. The administration's September 2009 decision to alter U.S. plans for missile defense installations in Poland and the Czech Republic diminished a primary source of past friction, and negotiations continue about Russia's potential role in a joint missile defense system. In March 2010, the United States and Russia concluded negotiations on the new START treaty, in June 2010 Russia backed UNSC 1929 authorizing tougher international sanctions against Iran, and in September 2010 Russia cancelled the sale of air defense missile systems to Iran. President Medvedev also accepted an invitation to attend the NATO summit that was held in Lisbon in November 2010.

At the same time, considerable U.S. and European concerns and objections remain regarding Russian policy on many issues, including Georgia and Russia's recognition of the breakaway provinces Abkhazia and South Ossetia, Russia's unilateral suspension of its obligations under the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty, and matters of internal governance and human rights. Russian officials have been advocating for talks about a new European security architecture, a proposal that some analysts view as an attempt to undermine NATO. Europe has for some time been divided between those who believe in a firm, vigilant stance toward Russia, and others inclined more toward pragmatism and engagement. Of the former, notably countries such as Poland and the Baltic states some see in Russia a potential threat to the political independence and even territorial sovereignty of themselves and neighbors, and look to a U.S. approach that robustly guards against Russian assertiveness. Some officials and observers in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, concerned that U.S. dealings with Russia could have effects detrimental to their security interests and to the cohesion of NATO, were initially vocal in

expressing their concerns about the U.S. “reset” policy. Some fear that improved relations with the United States could embolden Russia in its actions toward neighbors, leading in turn to regional instability. Advocates of engagement, on the other hand, notably countries such as Germany, France, and Italy, assert that the maintenance of extensive ties and constructive dialogue is the most effective way to influence Russia.

They argue that Russia should be viewed as a strategic partner and observe that Russian cooperation is important on issues such as Iran, climate change, arms control, and energy. A measure of Polish-Russian rapprochement appears to have helped diminish the sharpness of inter-European divisions about Russia. Relations were improved by the joint commemoration and recognition of the World War II Katyn massacre and by the sympathetic cooperation which followed the airplane crash that killed the Polish president and high-ranking Polish officials on their way to the commemoration ceremony in Russia.

Regarding energy, the EU as a whole is dependent on Russia for more than one-quarter of its gas and oil supplies, a number expected to grow substantially over the next 20 years. For some individual countries, dependence on Russian gas is already much greater. Cut offs—as occurred most recently in the dispute between Russia and Ukraine in January 2009—have major implications for wider European energy security. Although that dispute was nominally about payment, some analysts have described a trend in recent years in which Moscow seems to use energy supplies as an instrument of foreign policy. Additionally, in recent years Russia has been actively engaging in bilateral energy deals with a number of European countries and acquiring large-scale ownership of European energy infrastructure, while not applying Western standards of transparency and market reciprocity regarding business practices and investment policy. There is concern in the United States over the influence that Russian energy dominance could have on the ability to present European—and, by consequence, transatlantic—unity when it comes to other issues related to Russia. For this reason, some have expressed the desirability of decreasing European reliance on Russian energy through diversification of supply, and supported European steps to develop alternative sources and increase energy efficiency. Analysts have also advocated the development of a common European energy policy that would push Russia to introduce more competition and transparency in its energy sector.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

3. Describe EU-US cooperation in relation to Russia.

3.4 Counter Terrorism, Economic Relations

Homeland security and counterterrorism also continue to rank at the forefront of transatlantic concerns. Following the attempted bombing of a transatlantic flight in December 2009, terrorism alerts and suspected terrorist plots in 2010 have reinforced that Europe remains both a primary target of radical Islamist terrorists and a potential base for cells seeking to carry out attacks against the United States.

In the years since the 9/11 attacks, U.S.-EU cooperation on counterterrorism has been strong. Spurred on by 9/11, the March 2004 bombings in Madrid, and the July 2005 bombings in London, the EU has sought to strengthen and coordinate its internal counterterrorism capabilities. While the EU has thus been increasing its relevance in this area, bilateral intelligence sharing and cooperation between the United States and individual European countries also remains key for efforts to disrupt terrorist plots and apprehend those involved.

U.S. and EU officials from the cabinet level down maintain regular dialogues on issues related to homeland security and counterterrorism, and relevant U.S. and EU agencies have established cooperative relationships that include information sharing and, in some cases, an exchange of liaison officers. In early 2010, new U.S.-EU treaties on extradition and mutual legal assistance entered into force following their approval by the U.S. Senate in 2008. The treaties, which were negotiated in 2003, are largely intended to promote transatlantic cooperation that aids prosecutors dealing with terrorism cases. The treaties update and harmonize the bilateral agreements between the United States and EU member countries and streamline extradition and assistance procedures. The United States and the EU also actively work together to track and counter the financing of terrorism, in forums such as the Financial Action Task Force and through information sharing deals such as the U.S.-EU “SWIFT agreement.” Under a 2004 U.S.-EU agreement on customs cooperation and the U.S. Container Security Initiative, U.S. customs officers stationed at a number of European ports help screen U.S.-bound cargo containers. Additionally, a U.S.-EU agreement on sharing

the passenger name record (PNR) data of U.S.-bound air passengers has been provisionally in force since 2007.

Although overall counterterrorism cooperation is strong, numerous areas of tension exist. European concerns over data privacy have affected cooperation on the SWIFT and PNR agreements. The EU considers data privacy a basic right, and the EU has strict regulations protecting personal data. In early 2010, the European Parliament voted against final approval of the SWIFT agreement on the grounds that it did not sufficiently protect the privacy of citizens' personal data. The United States and the EU subsequently re-negotiated the agreement with added safeguards, and the European Parliament approved the new version in July 2010. However, similar privacy concerns have been raised ahead of negotiations and an eventual Parliament vote on a new PNR agreement. Some observers assert that a broader U.S.-EU framework agreement on principles of privacy and data protection would help ease European concerns and promote closer cooperation.

In addition, European opposition to the U.S. death penalty could impede extradition deals in some terrorism cases, and many Europeans consider U.S. provisions for 100% screening of U.S.-bound cargo containers as unrealistic and financially burdensome to ports and businesses. U.S. and EU officials have discussed ways to strengthen airport security, but many Europeans are strongly opposed to the installation of "full body" security scanners at European airports. European interest in the detention centre at Guantánamo Bay appears to have declined since the Obama administration took office, but there are still concerns in Europe about human rights and the treatment of detainees, objections which long stood at the centre of European criticism of U.S. counterterrorism practices during the Bush administration. U.S. officials have been concerned that rendition-related criminal proceedings against CIA officials in some EU states may put vital counterterrorism cooperation between U.S. and European intelligence agencies at risk. Lastly, although some EU member states include Hezbollah on their national lists of terrorist organizations, the EU has for years resisted adding Hezbollah to its common list, despite repeated entreaties from members of congress and U.S. administrations.

Another very important area that features strongly in the transatlantic relationship is in the economic arena. The global financial crisis and the ensuing recession of 2008-2009 have affected the transatlantic economic

relationship and tested the political relationship. Promoting stability in financial markets and restoring strong economic growth are overriding priorities for leaders on both sides of the Atlantic.

The United States and the European Union have the largest trade and investment relationship in the world. In 2009, the value of the two-way transatlantic flow of goods, services, and income receipts from investment totaled approximately \$1.25 trillion. U.S. and European companies are also the biggest investors in each other's markets—total stock of two-way direct investment came to about \$3.2 trillion at the end of 2009. Additionally, transatlantic economic activity provides an estimated 14 million jobs in the United States and Europe.

With the United States and the EU together comprising more than half of global Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the transatlantic economic relationship is also the world's most influential in terms of shaping standards and regulations. U.S.-EU cooperation has been the key driving force behind efforts to liberalize world trade. A coordinated response to the crisis has been outlined in a series of G-20 meetings since late 2008, and this initially focused on avoiding protectionism. While numerous European countries undertook stimulus measures in 2009, however, European leaders have since resisted U.S. calls for greater stimulus spending, opting instead to introduce budgetary austerity programs. A number of EU member states have been severely impacted by the crisis, with some facing highly problematic deficit and debt situations. Starting with Greece in spring 2010, followed by Ireland in November, and threatening Portugal and possibly Belgium, Spain, and Italy, a Euro-zone debt crisis has been slowly playing out which could call into question the viability of the euro, the common currency shared by 16 EU member states.

The United States has extensive export and investment interests in Europe that are affected by the Euro-zone crisis. For the longer term, analysts are concerned that economic difficulties in Europe could act as a brake on U.S. growth and the world economy. A dawning age of austerity in Europe could also impact transatlantic cooperation on international issues including defense and development assistance. In addition, there is a wider debate between the United States and the EU and within the G-20 about how to deal with imbalances in competitiveness, consumption, and trade flows in the world economy. On a global scale, this discussion focuses largely on China, but is also mirrored with regard to Germany's role within the Euro-zone. Germany has strongly rebutted criticism of its national economic model, which is based on exports

and wage restraint.

While the majority of the transatlantic economic relationship is smooth and mutually beneficial, trade disputes persist over issues such as poultry, subsidies to Boeing and airbus, hormone treated beef, and bio-engineered food products. Differences with countries in the developing world have been the primary reason why the Doha round of multilateral trade negotiations has stalled but the inability of the United States and EU to agree to a common position on agricultural subsidies has not helped matters. The United States and the EU have made a number of attempts to reduce remaining non-tariff and regulatory barriers to trade and investment. The Transatlantic Economic Council (TEC), headed on both sides by cabinet/ministerial-level appointees, was created in 2007 and tasked with advancing the process of regulatory cooperation and barrier reduction.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

4. Identify and discuss the main issues
affecting EU-US relations with Russia.

3.5 SUMMARY

As we can see from the above, the wide range of EU-US relations is indicative of both challenges and opportunities. The relationship however remains very strong and enduring. This vibrancy nonetheless, there are areas of very sharp disagreements that may undermine the relationship. Overall however, there is relative consensus on the perceptions of threat and opportunity in diverse areas from Iran to Russia. Where there is relative discord is often in the area of how to react to a problem.

In this unit, we discussed the workings of the transatlantic alliance in states like Iran, Russia and Afghanistan. We also looked at counter terrorism and of course, economic cooperation. We also examined the impact of the 2008 economic crisis on the alliance in relation to the opportunities it presented and challenges it posed.

3.6 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Johnson, D. & Robinson, P. (2005). *Perspectives on EU-Russia Relations*. London: Routledge.

Keohane, D. (2005). *The EU and Counter Terrorism*. Brussels: Center for European Reform.

Moussavian, H. (2006). *Iran-Europe Relations: Challenges and Opportunities*. London: Routledge.

3.7 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. Have the challenges of the Afghanistan campaign undermined the transatlantic relationship?

Some have argued that Afghanistan remains the most urgent and important international security issue for the transatlantic alliance between the US and the EU. As of October 2010, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) consists of more than 130,000 troops from 46 countries, including all 28 members of NATO. With considerable force increases in 2009-2010, these numbers represent a substantial commitment of alliance and partner country resources. Despite this range of efforts, it remained uncertain whether sufficient progress was being made to begin withdrawing foreign military forces and the transfer of more responsibility to the Afghan authorities by President Obama's stated target date of July 2011. Leaders at NATO's Lisbon summit agreed to 2014 as the goal for ending the ISAF mission but this did not happen until recently when President Joe Biden took over as the American President. Even when he eventually pulled out from Afghanistan many years after the original agreed year, there were still massive criticisms about how he went about it with many accusing him of rushing the pullout such that some American and European citizens were left behind and stranded in the country. By and large, the transatlantic objective in Afghanistan has not been a resounding success before immediately the pullout was made, the legitimate government was chased out of office and the Taliban took over the government. Today, Afghanistan is under Taliban rule; the very reason why the USA and NATO entered the country in the first place. So it is convenient to say that although there were successes recorded, the 'adventure' has been largely unsuccessful and so it has undermined and called to question the necessity of the transatlantic relationship.

2. What are the mutually shared interests that bind the EU and US in Iran?

Both the EU and the US are interested in denuclearization of Iran's nuclear weapons. This began in 2002

when the “EU-3”; France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, led diplomatic efforts to curtail Iran’s nuclear arms buildup. To broaden the scope, 2006 saw China, Russia and the United States join the EU-3 to form the “Permanent Five Plus One” (P5+1) negotiating group with EU’s High Representative; Catherine Ashton. leading the talks with Iran on behalf of the P5+1. Between 2006 and 2008, the EU-3 and the United States successfully pushed for United Nations Security Council (UNSC) approval of three rounds of limited sanctions on Iran. Early in 2009, the Obama administration indicated a willingness to increase direct U.S. engagement in talks with Iran. European leaders welcomed and encouraged this prospect although emphasizing that it should be closely coordinated within the P5+1 framework. During direct negotiations between the P5+1 and Iran in October 2009, the United States, France, and Russia advanced a proposal to enrich Iranian uranium outside the country for use in an Iranian research reactor. Iran declined to formally accept this proposal, however, and would not agree to a date for continued negotiations, leading the United States and the EU to pursue further U.N. sanctions in early 2010. Despite a last minute attempt at mediation by Brazil and Turkey, the UNSC voted in June 2010 to authorize a tougher new round of sanctions (Resolution 1929) targeting the Iranian financial and energy sectors.

3. Describe EU-US cooperation in relation to Russia.

The United States and the EU working under the auspices of NATO have been wary of Russian growing influence in Eastern Europe just as Russia is bothered about US/EU/NATO expansion eastward, which it sees as a threat to its national security. The EU and US are cooperating in different areas in their relationship with Russia and one of them is in the area of the dependence of Europe on Russian energy; oil and gas. Russia is the biggest energy producer in Europe and as such most of Europe depends on her for its energy and this affects their relations in ways they cannot help. Enter the USA. There is concern in the United States that Russian energy dominance influences on the ability to present European and by consequence, transatlantic unity when it comes to other issues related to Russia. For this reason, the US have expressed the desire to decrease European reliance on Russian energy through the diversification of supply and supporting European steps to develop alternative sources and increase energy efficiency.

4. Identify and discuss the main issues affecting EU-US relations with Russia.

The answer to Exercise Three above also suffices – but must be explained in a different manner.

MODULE 4: CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN 21st CENTURY EUROPE

Unit 1: Terrorism and Global Security

Unit 2: EU Expansion

Unit 3: The Covid-19 Pandemic

Unit 4: The Russian Ukraine War

UNIT 1 TERRORISM AND GLOBAL SECURITY

CONTENTS

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Learning Outcomes

1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 An Overview of Terrorism

1.3.2 EU Efforts at Combating Terrorism

1.4 Summary

1.5 References/Further Reading

1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Terrorism is not new, and even though it has been used since the beginning of recorded history it can be relatively hard to define. Terrorism has been described variously as both a tactic and strategy; a crime and a holy duty; a justified reaction to oppression and an inexcusable abomination. Obviously, a lot depends on whose point of view is being represented. Terrorism has often been an effective tactic for the weaker side in a conflict. As an asymmetric form of conflict, it confers coercive power with many of the advantages of military force at a fraction of the cost. Due to the secretive nature and small size of terrorist organizations, they often offer opponents no clear organization to defend against or to deter.

That is why preemption is being considered to be so important. In some cases, terrorism has been a means to carry on a conflict without the adversary realizing the nature of the threat, mistaking terrorism for criminal activity. Because of these characteristics, terrorism has become increasingly common among those pursuing extreme goals throughout the world. But despite its popularity, terrorism can be a nebulous concept. Even within the U.S. Government, agencies responsible for different functions in the ongoing fight against terrorism use different definitions.

This unit addresses Europe's approach to the problem of terrorism. It provides a general overview of terrorism and then examines, step by step, Europe's efforts at combating the problem.

1.2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Describe contemporary terrorism and adequately analyze how it undermines global security\
- ii. Describe and analyzes Europe's efforts at combating the scourge.

1.3 MAIN CONTENT

1.3.1 An Overview of Terrorism

Terrorism has a negative impact on global security, which affects every nation because they are all so intricately connected to one another. This connection is fundamental because terrorism has been in practice throughout history and throughout the world. It is affecting global security in the 21st century because it is becoming more rampant. Terrorism affects the foreign policy of many nations. A huge amount of lives have been destroyed, and properties worth billions also destroyed. People live in perpetual fear of insecurity because they do not know the next turn of events, or where it would take place. As a result of modern and sophisticated technology, the world has been reduced to a global village, hence the impact of terrorism on global security. It affects the whole world. Terrorism threatens the security of a nation.

International terrorism continues to pose difficult challenges to state and human security in the international system. Apart from the fear of insecurity terrorism brings about, it also reflects in economic decline, unemployment, inability to pay salaries of workers, debt burden; it brings about poverty and a general sense of frustration amongst the victims.

Terrorism involves acts dangerous to human-life. They are a violation of the criminal laws of any state, so that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or any state. The acts appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion, or affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping. The act of terrorism transcend national boundaries in terms of the means of which they are accomplished, the persons they appear intended to coerce or intimidate, or the locale in which the perpetuation operate or seek asylum.

Terrorism is a war about identity-politics, the exclusive claim to power on the basis of identity, be it ethnic, religious or linguistic. And this kind of conflict cannot be channeled into peaceful directions. And because

the world has entered a new era of interdependence, it has not learnt how to adjust its institutions and its traditions of government to the new conditions. And the world is so closely knitted together now that it is no longer possible for a nation to run amok on one frontier while her neighbor on another is hardly aware. Every war threatens to become a world war.

Terrorism is threatening the viability of a nation-state, there by bringing about economic crisis, instability, etc. Terrorism is a threat to tourism, energy-sector, civil-aviation, maritime, transportation and civil transportation. The problem of terrorism has refused to go away' instead, it has kept people in perpetual fear, robbing people of freedom and security. The nature of terrorists groups are similar whether conventional terrorists or information warrior. Conventional terrorist traditionally have operated as members of larger terrorists organizations. Throughout history, cases in which individuals unaffiliated with any group have carried out major terrorists acts are rare. It does not mean that, terrorist members have never acted alone while on a mission (i.e. suicide bomber). Although, one or two people may carry out a violent tactic or operation, a larger base of people and support exists elsewhere for them.

Each terrorist whether a group or individual relies on the organization of which individual is a member. Terrorists' organizational structure is similar to that of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. The hierarchy of terrorist organizations demands that an extensive leadership and support structure exist if it is to survive or succeed in its goals. The organization is composed chiefly of the hard-core leadership, active cadre, active support and passive support. The leaders in a terrorist organization play important roles. The organization's complexity depends upon the skills of the insurgent leaders in identifying, integrating and coordinating the different tasks and rules essential to combat operations, training, communications, transportation, information and supervision. The leaders are the heart of the terrorist organization. The leaders profile emphasizes their ability to plan better than other members. The leaders usually come from higher economic classes, and are usually dedicated group of professionals, with background in medicine, law or philosophy.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

1. What is the impact of new media technologies on terrorism?

1.3.2 EU Efforts at Combating Terrorism

With the suicide bombing attacks on London in July 2005, anti- terrorism has become the absolute top priority for Europe. The EU anti- terrorism policy, in place since the 2001 US attacks and extended after the 2004 bombings in Madrid, is being stepped up and will be updated on an ongoing basis.

Europe has suffered from terrorism from various sources for decades (eg ETA, IRA) and a policy of increased judicial co-operation between member states had already been agreed as part of the Tampere programme when the attack against the US took place in 2001.

Immediate reaction to the twin tower attacks was the September 2001 anti-terrorism action plan, followed by a framework decision defining terrorist offences and aligning the level of sanctions between member states. Following the Madrid bombings, the council issued a declaration against terrorism and appointed Gijs de Vries as counter- terrorism coordinator. The action plan is updated every 6 months, most recently in December 2010. From December 2005, the commission also produced a scoreboard showing the level of implementation of action plan measures.

The Hague programme, adopted in November 2004 to succeed Tampere, includes a number of ambitious measures on exchange of information, border control, security of travel documents and police and judicial co- operation. In December 2004, the council adopted specific measures on combating terrorist financing, civil protection policy, and prevention of recruitment, critical infrastructure protection and external security policy.

Following the London attacks in July 2005, EU interior ministers held an extraordinary meeting where they agreed that all measures already decided on should be implemented as a matter of urgency. These include:

- European evidence warrant
- strengthening of Schengen and visa information systems
- biometric details on passports
- combating terrorist financing (see below)
- prevention of recruitment and radicalization
- greater controls over trade, storage and transport of explosives.

In September 2005, the Commission came up with a further package including a proposed directive on data

retention, a communication on radicalization and a decision to allocate €7 million to prevention, preparedness and response to terrorist attacks.

In December 2005 the Council of justice ministers approved a new strategy for counter terrorism. Its main aim is to set out EU policy clearly and comprehensively for the general public. A set of slides accompanied by written details explains the strategy under four broad objectives: prevent, protect, pursue and respond. Across these four categories, the strategy seeks to link strands from different policy areas and emphasize the close interaction of measures at member state, European and international level.

The European arrest warrant, introduced in Jan 2004, replaces old extradition procedures and has been implemented in all member states, the last being Italy on 21 July 2005. A commission report in February 2005 held it to be a success, from the fact that 104 people have been surrendered under the warrants in an average of 45 days (the previous average was nine months). There have, however been arguments in Germany and some other member states that implementing legislation breaches national constitutional rights.

The December 2005 justice council, reached agreement on a framework decision for a European evidence warrant. This will create a standard form warrant for obtaining objects, documents and data in cross-border cases. After translation as appropriate, it will be capable of immediate execution (i.e without court approval).

Specific criminal and therefore anti-terrorist measures are within the competence of the member states only. The main role of the EU, therefore, is *co-ordination* and the greatest emphasis so far has been on the exchange and sharing of information among member states. A specific programme to create a Legal Enforcement Network (LEN) which will facilitate exchange of information between police forces has been launched. Other main agencies promoting co-operation are Europol, Eurojust and latterly, the European Border Agency. Also, within the council, a body called SitCen brings together external and internal intelligence experts to co-ordinate strategies.

From 2005, biometric data was included in passports and, eventually, visas, which were made computer-readable. The Schengen Information System (SIS) already stores data on persons wanted for arrest, those to be refused entry to the EU, missing persons and persons to be put under surveillance. Biometric 112

identifiers will be stored on the second generation SIS II.

An external borders agency (FRONTEX) to co-ordinate between member states, provide training for border guards and carry out risk assessments formally was also opened in July 2005. A proposal for a corps of external border guards is under consideration. The commission has also put forward proposals to extend police powers of surveillance and pursuit of suspects in border areas.

A proposal that telephone companies and internet providers be compelled to keep details (not including content) of all phone calls, e-mails and website visits was first put forward by the UK, France and Sweden in 2004. It did not succeed following doubts over the legal procedure used and firm rejection by Parliament. In September 2005 the commission published a new proposed directive whereby phone call data (mobile and fixed) would be kept for one year and internet communications for six months. The cost of the system is to be met by member states. In parallel to this, the commission published proposals on 4th October, 2005 for a framework decision on data *protection*, seen as necessary to balance the increased exchange of personal data between member states being necessitated by the fight against terrorism and organized crime. Following the US anthrax scare, fears have been raised that terrorists could resort to chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear (CBRN) weapons. In June 2003, the commission adopted a communication on preparedness and response to biological and chemical agent attacks. DG Health has issued guidelines on the management of specific bioterrorist disease outbreaks and general guidelines for the public.

The Council has also finalized a new CBRN programme which sets out steps to be taken to prevent an attack and (were an attack to happen) to limit its consequences (i.e. risk assessment, protecting critical infrastructure and co-operation between emergency services). This will be complemented by a European programme for critical infrastructure protection and a crisis alert system to be called ARGUS.

The third money laundering directive was adopted by the Council on 20th September, 2005. It extends the existing provisions to terrorist crimes and is designed to reflect the recommendations of the international Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FAFT). It provides that suspicious transactions of €15000 or more must be reported to special national financial intelligence units by the bodies covered by the directive (e.g. financial institutions, accountants, lawyers, estate agents and casinos). These measures have been highly controversial.

In December 2005, the Commission put forward a communication on terrorist financing with two aims:

- i. To develop a code of practice common amongst member states on generating and exchanging information that can lead to the cutting off of terrorist funding.
- ii. To tighten up the financial transparency and accountability practices of not-for-profit organizations through a code of conduct.

Radicalization and recruitment are also major areas of the EU's anti terrorism efforts. This strand of anti-terrorism policy, an element that emerged in the 2004 action plan, is increasing in importance. Many are arguing, particularly since it was discovered that the London bombers had been living in the UK, that looking at the reasons why young men are resorting to such action is key. In September 2005, the commission published a communication which analyses ways in which the radicalization of individuals can be deterred through education (both in schools and through the internet), integration policies, interfaith dialogue and the promotion of inter-cultural understanding. The December 2005 Council approved a paper outlining the work in this area.

EU action against terrorism has been predicated on the preservation of fundamental rights and liberties as enshrined by the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Some of the member state actions, however, have been heavily criticized for riding roughshod over these principles and EU policies have been questioned for being overly influenced by the US, which has pushed its own approach at international level through the G8.

The EU network of independent experts in fundamental rights has expressed concern over the looseness of the definition of 'terrorism' in the 2002 framework decision, a definition most member states have simply taken in to their own legislation. As the commission of 'terrorist' offences is being met with the curtailment of ordinary liberties, a more precise definition is required. It also takes the view that member states must provide control mechanisms within their legislation to protect fundamental rights.

Statewatch has published a report showing trends towards greater secrecy and less accountability in organizations dealing with terrorism. It details plans for information gathered by undercover surveillance (such as phone-tapping) to be available EU-wide, unproven intelligence evidence to be used in courts, the criminalization of preparatory terrorist acts and "control orders" in the UK. The author of the report,

Statewatch editor Tony Bunyan, says that the initiatives "herald a new, dangerous, era of pre-emptive state action where the emphasis is shifted from bringing people before the courts to face criminal charges to targeting all those suspected of involvement or even allegedly "supporting" terrorism". In April 2005, Statewatch also launched, together with the American Civil Liberties Union, an international campaign against mass surveillance, warning that anti-terror measures are endangering fundamental freedoms.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

2. How effective have EU counter terrorism efforts been?
3. Discuss the implications of the September 11, 2001 attacks on the US on Terrorism.

1.4 SUMMARY

Terrorists are improving their sophistication and abilities in virtually all aspects of their operations and support. The aggressive use of modern technology for information management, communication and intelligence has increased the efficiency of these activities. Weapons technology has become more increasingly available, and the purchasing power of terrorist organizations is on the rise. The ready availability of both technology and trained personnel to operate it for any client with sufficient cash allows the well-funded terrorist to equal or exceed the sophistication of governmental counter-measures.

Likewise, due to the increase in information outlets, and competition with increasing numbers of other messages, terrorism now requires a greatly increased amount of violence or novelty to attract the attention it requires. The tendency of major media to compete for ratings and the subsequent revenue realized from increases in their audience size and share produces pressures on terrorists to increase the impact and violence of their actions to take advantage of this sensationalism.

Today, most experts believe that certain parts of the Middle East, Pakistan and Afghanistan are turning out to be the main power centers for terrorism. Decades of lawlessness and corruption have seen Islamic terrorist groups fill the power vacuum in this region and continue to turn out an alarming number of religiously motivated terrorists.

European anti terrorism policy is adapting itself to these new realities. Efforts in Afghanistan, Libya etc are evidence of the EU's commitment to fighting not only the military battles but also, the social problems that allow terrorist ideas to take root.

In this unit we discussed a general overview of the problem of terrorism and its implications for global security. We also examined the EU's anti terrorism measures and noted how it has become greatly expanded and more effective since 2001. We also noted the cooperation between the EU and other stakeholders like the US and within the EU itself as a result of a general perception of terrorism as a global rather than national problem.

1.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Spence, D. (2007). *The European Union and Terrorism*. London: John Harper Publishing.

Whitaker, D. (2007). *Terrorism: Understanding the Global Threat*. London: Longman.

1.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. What is the impact of new media technologies on terrorism?

The new media, popularly known as social media, is now the most important media source in the world such that these days, it is where many people go to for their connections and news as opposed to yesteryears when the traditional media such as newspaper, radio and television were the norm. As with most things, the pervasiveness of the new media aka social media with platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, Twitter, WhatsApp, etc have both positive and negative impacts on individuals, communities, nations and the world. Prior to the advent of the social media, terrorist organizations and their agents hitherto recruited new members for their different cells from different locations on the "streets" in places such as schools, playgrounds, markets, sport centers, etc – and this is often a lot difficult to do because of the prying eyes of security agents like the police and secret service. Enter the social media and it has now become a lot easier for terrorist recruiters to reach out to thousands of young people in one fell swoop and recruiting them en masse for the purpose of disturbing the peace of their communities, nations and the world. Although national governments have established cyber security agencies to monitor and flag the activities

of terrorists on the cyberspace/new media, they are finding it more difficult hunting down these terrorist recruiters and the newly recruited - so the present realities, the new/social media is still contributing to the growth of terrorism around the world mainly as a recruitment hub. But of course the new technologies also help government and security agencies to make arrests and thereafter prosecute the sponsors, recruiters and members of terrorist organizations.

2 How effective have EU counter terrorism efforts been?

Europe has suffered its own fare share of terrorism and as a unit, the European Union is working at countering terrorism on the continent. With the suicide bombing attacks on London in July 2005, anti-terrorism has become the absolute top priority for Europe. The EU anti- terrorism policy, in place since the 2001 US attacks and extended after the 2004 bombings in Madrid, is being stepped up and will be updated on an ongoing basis. The EU action against terrorism has been predicated on the preservation of fundamental rights and liberties as enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Some of the member state actions, however, have been heavily criticized for riding roughshod over these principles and EU policies have been questioned for being overly influenced by the US which has pushed its own approach at international level through the G8. In December 2005, the Commission put forward a communication on terrorist financing with two aims: (i) To develop a code of practice common amongst member states on generating and exchanging information that can lead to the cutting off of terrorist funding and (ii) To tighten up the financial transparency and accountability practices of not-for-profit organizations through a code of conduct.

As with most security measures, the EU counter-terrorism efforts have been largely successful in that it has been able to stop the growth of terrorism and terrorist attacks on the continent although there have been some failures in several areas, particularly in the area of recruitment. In spite of the measures put in place by the EU, recruiters for terrorist groups are still making inroads into the heartland of Europe and recruiting new members with the technology and cover that the social media and its different platforms avails them.

3 Discuss the implications of the September 11 2001 attacks on the US on Terrorism.

The twin September 11 2001 attack on the homeland of the USA impacted heavily on that country's perception of terrorism and terrorist activities around the world. On September 11 2001, terrorists hijacked two commercial airplanes flying them into the Pentagon (which is the headquarters of the US military) and the World Trade Center killing themselves, hundreds of passengers aboard the two planes and hundreds of Americans and nationals of other countries working in and/or visiting with the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. From media reports, many countries suffered casualties because the World Trade Center is a commercial and business hub where people from different countries have offices and do local and international businesses in the USA. After this attack which was considered a direct affront to the American government and people because it happened on American soil, the American President at the time, George Bush swore to go after the terrorists – and this singular event have to this day changed the American government and people worldview of terrorism and have implications on American and other parts of the world.

One of such implications is that America became more direct and brutal with terrorism and terrorists activities around the world, and sometimes sacrificing issues of fundamental human rights on the altar of national security. After the 911 attack, Osama bin Laden's Al-Qaeda claimed responsibility arguing that it is retaliation over the USA forceful intervention into the politics of the Arab world. With this admittance, the USA under President George Bush began a massive manhunt for Osama bin Laden by first invading Afghanistan, which was his base and the home of the Taliban. Even after the end of President Bush's tenure, the new President Barack Obama continued with the mission and Osama bin Laden was killed in Pakistan where he had relocated to. Osama's death did not stop the USA as it went ahead to topple the Taliban out of power in Afghanistan and supported representative democracy where a new president was elected. Since then, the USA has continued to support efforts against terrorism in many other parts of the world. It is also because of the September 11 2001 terrorist attack on the USA that stronger measures have been put in place in scrutinizing foreigners, particularly Arabs and Africans, who enter their country, and also the reason why the USA government placed a ban on some countries identified as terrorist havens.

UNIT 2: THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

CONTENTS

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Learning Outcomes

2.3 Main Content

2.3.1 Covid-19 Pandemic: An Overview

2.3.2 The Development of Vaccines

2.3.3 Impacts of Covid-19 on European Nations

2.3.4 European Response: The Role of the European Union

2.4 Summary

2.5 References/Further Reading

2.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The last time a health pandemic ravaged the world was in 1917 just before the end of the First World War when the Spanish Influenza, otherwise known as Spanish Flu, broke out. It lasted for three years, until 1920, and infected an estimated 500 million people, which was a third of the world population at the time, and caused the death of an estimated 17 million to 50 million people globally. The Spanish Flu started in February in Kansas in the United States and by April, it had moved into other countries like France, Germany and the United Kingdom. Since 1920 when the Spanish Influenza pandemic ended, the world did not witness another pandemic until December 2019 when a type of corona virus, christened Covid-19, reared its ugly head and within few weeks was in almost every country of the world. According to the World Health Organization, WHO, Covid-19 developed from a government laboratory in the city of Wuhan, in China – and before one would scream Jack Robinson, the virus had entered every nation, with Europe and America becoming the hardest hit.

As president of the United States of America when Covid-19 emerged, Donald Trump refused to call it corona virus but “Chinese virus” because it was his firm belief that the virus was intentionally developed and released by China. Although China’s Xi Jinping denied President Trump’s accusation, the USA and some of its partners in Europe believe that the emergence of Covid-19 is not accidental. President Donald Trump also accused the World Health Organization, WHO, of conniving with China in keeping mum over the outbreak until it became too late to be contained. It is for this reason that President Trump stopped America, the biggest contributor to the finances of the WHO, from its financial obligation to the world health body. But after taking over from Donald Trump, President Joe Biden has resumed America’s financial contributions to the international organization. Immediately he took over office, President Biden pledged the sum of \$280 million to the WHO.

Since Covid-19 became a pandemic in March 2020, European countries, particularly the United Kingdom, Italy, Germany, France and Spain, have suffered most with thousands of daily infections and the death of

many from the virus – even though the continent has one of the most developed healthcare system. To avert the rising spread of the virus, which is usually brought into a country by air travelers, European countries had no other option but to impose flight bans from other countries that resulted into the shutting down of airports which was followed by the imposing lockdowns, curfews and movement restrictions in European cities.

In discussing contemporary issues in Europe, the Covid-19 pandemic has an elevated position. It is for this reason that this unit is a discussion of the Covid-19 pandemic and the impacts it had on European nations. At the end of this unit, the student should be able to understand and trace the history of the emergence of Covid-19 and how it is changing the socioeconomic trajectory and politics of European countries. To achieve this, the unit shall discuss the origin of Covid-19, the unprecedented development of vaccines against the virus, the impacts of the virus on Europe and the response of the continent under the umbrella of the European Union, EU, to tackling these impacts. The student must note that historians, political scientists and international relation scholars have agreed that no singular event has threatened the existence of Europe since the Second World War like the Covid-19 pandemic. It is for this reason that any contemporary discussion of European politics must include the Covid-19 pandemic.

2.2 LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, the student should be able to:

- i. Narrate the origin of Covid-19.
- ii. Be able to explain how Covid-19 vaccines were developed.
- iii. Describe the different impacts of Covid-19 on Europe.
- iv. Explain the measures taken by the European Union to tackle the virus.

2.3 MAIN CONTENT

2.3.1 Covid-19 Pandemic: An Overview

According to the World Health Organization, WHO, corona virus, popularly known as Covid-19, because

it reared its ugly head in the year 2019, even though the first human corona virus was first discovered in the 1960s, is an infectious disease caused by the SARS-Cov-2 virus. Khan (2005) pointed out that “since 2003, at least 5 new human corona viruses have been identified, including the severe acute respiratory syndrome corona virus, which caused significant morbidity and mortality”. The main symptoms of Covid-19 after infection is the experience of mild to moderate respiratory illness but the patient can recover from it without special treatment. But older people, particularly those who have preexisting medical conditions such as respiratory disease, diabetes or cancer, are likely to become seriously ill when infected by the virus and would need urgent medical attention. Typically, the virus spreads from one infected person to another through touch or through the mouth or nose when one sneezes or breathes.

According to several conventional reports, Covid-19 was first detected in November 2019 in a government laboratory in Wuhan, China, and since its discovery, there has been many conspiracy theories relating to its purpose with one arguing that it was developed as a biological weapon by China against the United States of America – and this was why former American president Donald Trump described the virus as the “Chinese virus”. While the accusations and counter accusations over the emergence and *raison d’être* of Covid-19 went on between China and the United States of America, the World Health Organization, on 11th March 2020, officially declared the virus a global pandemic. The student should note that a disease is described as a “pandemic” when it has become a global concern – that is, when it affects more than one continent. As at March 2020, four months after its entrance, the number of Covid-19 cases outside China had increased 13 fold while the number of countries affected had tripled. Within this period, there were more than 118,000 Covid-19 infections in 114 countries of the world’s 190 countries that resulted to the death of 4,291 persons.

Before the emergence of Covid-19, the world has had epidemics such as SARS in 2003 and the Ebola in 2014 but none of these two became a pandemic. On December 29th 2019, the first four cases of the virus were reported and by February of 2020, the virus had spread to almost every country in the world, but particularly into European countries and the United States of America where casualties grew daily. To prevent its spread, countries around the world imposed lockdowns that stopped people from entering and leaving their countries, curfews were announced, mass campaigns on the need to always wear a mask,

maintaining at least one meters safe distance from others, the use of soap and water and alcohol-based hand rub to wash/clean the hands regularly, covering of ones nose and mouth with a bent elbow or tissue when coughing or sneezing and staying at home when feeling unwell became the rule rather than the exception in many countries. And when vaccines against the virus were unprecedentedly developed, people were encouraged to go get vaccinated by taking two shots at different intervals. Up until this moment, some people have refused to be vaccinated because they do not trust the purposes and intentions of the producers of the vaccines.

Presently, Covid-19 is under control and the fear many had over its emergence is reduced but it is not yet uhuru since the virus is still spreading. China's Shanghai region with a population of 26 million people is the latest metropolitan city to be placed under lockdown due to an increased infection rate. As at early April 2022, the global figure of corona virus cases is 496,752,563 cases with 6,196,442 deaths and 432,527,080 recoveries. The US leads with the most cases and next is India, Brazil, France, Germany, United Kingdom, Russia, Italy, South Korea and Turkey. From this Top Ten infected countries, one notices that five are European countries with a total of 182,742,599 infections – and why a discussion of the Covid-19 pandemic is important and strategic to contemporary European politics per world politics.

2.3.2 The Development of Vaccines

Although Covid-19 emerged in November 2019, by April 2022 the confirmed infections in Europe was over 180 million with 1.1 million deaths in a continent whose combined population is about 527 million, 44 countries and with 27 member European Union countries. By March 2020, almost every country in Europe had imposed national lockdowns including the closing of schools and nonessential businesses, movement restrictions, social distancing and ban on large gatherings as measures meant to control the spread of the virus – although each country had different implementation strategies since while some enforced full lockdowns others imposed partial lockdowns and curfews. Many European countries also implemented border control measures that prevented people from using the land borders into their countries since air travel had been cancelled, which was the main form for which the virus moved from one country

to another. Reopening and the easing of these control measures started in mid-April and early May 2020 although most countries still restricted nonessential international travels into and out of their countries.

A very important period in the world and Europe's battle against Covid-19 was the unprecedented development of vaccines. The development of vaccines for Covid-19 is unprecedented because they were developed in less than a year of its emergence although many scientists have attributed this feat and quick success to many years of previous research on related viruses that had shown faster ways of manufacturing vaccines and which was built upon and the availability of money for the funding clinical trials. Many years prior to January 2020, researchers had worked on related corona viruses caused also by SARS (severe acute respiratory syndrome) and MERS (Middle East respiratory syndrome) so when this particular virus sprang up, it was a lot easier, not easy, for scientists to quickly produce the vaccines needed to curtail its spread around the world.

In this unprecedented development, scientists have agreed that the slowest part in vaccines development is in testing them first with animals and then humans, which often take years. Typically, human testing goes through three phases of testing requiring increasing number of people and high costs. The Covid-19 vaccines went through all the stages vaccines testing usually passes through but it was faster than others before it because of the billions of dollars injected into the process. With these huge sums of money, vaccine firms were able to do preclinical and phase I, II and III trials in parallel instead of sequentially.

Following this achievement, the World Health Organization, WHO, approved the use of nine vaccines for emergency or full use. They are: Novavax, Pfizer-BioNTech, Moderna, Oxford-AstraZeneca, Sinopharm BIBP, Janssen, CoronaVac, Covaxin and Medicigo. By March 2022, 11.29 billion doses of Covid-19 vaccines have been administered worldwide.

It is important for the student to note that these vaccines are not silver bullets because there have been reports across the world of people who have taken the double or even third shots (called booster shot) of the vaccines but who were still infected and/or die by the virus. Therefore, although vaccines are helpful in the control and spread of Covid-19 through human to human contact, they are not 100% reliable. Maybe in the near future, they would be.

2.3.3 Impacts of Covid-19 on European Nations

European leaders and political cum historical watchers unanimously agree that the Covid-19 pandemic is Europe's biggest challenge since the end of the Second World War. They say this because not only does the pandemic impacts on the health of their people, as it is first and foremost a health challenge, it has potentially far reaching political, social and economic impacts on the continent as it has upended life as many Europeans knew it.

In this section, we discuss the impacts or effects if you may, of the Covid-19 pandemic on European countries and her people from four different perspectives: economic, public health, political and social impacts. The student should know that there are other impacts such as educational, environmental, etc.

- i. Economic impact;
- ii. Social impact;
- iii. Public health impact; and
- iv. Political impact.

I. Economic Impact: The economic impact of Covid-19 varies across countries but one thing is sure, the rapid spread of the virus necessitated the imposition of lockdowns, curfews and the restriction of nonessential movements across countries in Europe and the rest of the world - and this had negative impacts on the European economy of in several ways.

Lockdowns typically meant that businesses and service delivery operations such as government offices, hotels, restaurants, saloons, etc, were forced to shutdown - and as such, those who work could not go to work and this affected the production processes on the continent. In a 2020 report by the European Union, EU, it was recorded that due to lockdowns and curfews, Europe's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for 2020 declined by 8% when compared to the previous year, 2019. While 8% is the general decline for Europe, some countries in Central Europe had it worse. For example, Italy (which suffered the most from Covid-19 among the countries in Europe) and Croatia suffered an 11% decline of their GDP.

Alongside the effect on GDP, another area Covid-19 affected the economies of countries of Europe was a drop in the labor market with many people working fewer hours and some completely unable to get

jobs/becoming unemployed. In Hungary, Austria and Germany for example, unemployment figures rose by 1% between June 2019 and June 2020. Italy and Poland also witnessed rising unemployment figures in 2020 when compared to 2019. Unemployment in Italy, Poland and Slovenia increased due to a forced reduction by the government of these countries in the hours most people worked. In some countries, people who used to work 12 hours were restricted to working for 6 hours and this meant less pay. This was more noticeable with jobs typically done by women because the virus easily affected sectors dominated by women such as the retail trade sector more than those where men work.

Generally, Covid-19 led to the closing of several micro, small and medium scale enterprises and the subsequent loss of profits, of jobs and the reduction in the working hours that meant lower incomes culminated into huge economic losses for much of Europe. Presently, European nations are beginning to implement measures that are helping their economies recover.

II. Social Impact: Most European citizens are men and women who like to spend their free time engaged in outdoor activities perhaps because of the beautiful cities they live in. It is because of this that outdoor activities and sports such as swimming, eating and drinking in outdoor restaurants and pubs, cycling, playing and/or watching football or basketball, taking long walks, sitting down in open parks and gardens, etc are common in Europe and almost a daily routine for most Europeans.

Then enter Covid-19 and all these had to stop because governments had no other option but to impose lockdowns, curfews and movement restrictions, enforcing social and physical distancing and the closure of business who do not offer essential services. These measures immediately affected the social life and relationships of many Europeans such that some individuals, particularly those who live alone, became isolated and lonely – just as some became depressed and attempted/committed suicide. Tied to this is the reality that many people whose businesses offer outdoor services suffered from low or no patronage, thus making them lose their source of livelihood and enthusiasm to live.

The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations noted that the social crisis created by Covid-19 increased inequality, exclusion, discrimination and unemployment in Europe with reverberations around the world.

III. Public health impact: Covid-19 pandemic first casualty was the health of people as the virus resulted

in the mass loss of human lives in almost country of the world with Europe being the epicenter of infections, sickness and casualties. Alongside the deaths, the pandemic challenged public health in Europe and pushed many people into poverty and increased the number of the malnourished because for most people, lockdowns meant the inability to go out and work resulting to no income that translated to no food, or, at best, less food and less nutritious food.

Apart from people falling sick and dying, the pandemic also impacted on the mental/psychological health of Europeans. Different studies on the effect of Covid-19 concluded that it impacts the psychology of individuals as it led to prolonged exposure to stress. Several studies have demonstrated that the stress levels of people increases when they are separated from loved ones, when they are uncertain over the advancement of the disease, when they loss their freedom of movement and association and when they feel helpless. Add to this the possibility of these issues leading to a rise in the cases of suicide, which has been found to have a connection with the feeling of anger caused by stressful conditions such as self-isolation and/or quarantine demanded of anyone who is infected with the corona virus.

One research had a sample of 1,143 parents of European children, Italians and Spaniards, where the result showed that parents observed emotional and behavioral changes in their children during the time of quarantine. Symptoms relating to difficulty concentrating was 76%, boredom was 52%, irritability was 39%, restlessness was 38,8%, nervousness was 38%, sense of loneliness was 31.3%, uneasiness was 30.4% and worries was 30.1%. The study also reported that these symptoms were more in Italian children than Spanish children.

Covid-19 made many Europeans stressed, anxious, depressed, and lonely and put together, their mental health was negatively affected. Garcia-Castrillo et al., (2020) also noted that health care workers were not excepted from stress caused by Covid-19 and such stress often led to post-traumatic stress disorder, burnout syndrome, physical and emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and dissociation. These symptoms particularly affected health care workers in Europe who became overworked owing to the rising infections and deaths due to the virus.

IV. Political impact: While much of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic in Europe is mainly on public health, social life and the economy, there are also far-reaching political impacts.

One of the major political impact of the virus is that it threw open the argument of the role of governments of European countries seeing that splits are have now appeared between those who are of the opinion that because of the emergence of the pandemic, governments became the biggest obstacle to citizens freedom of movement, association and socialization. On the other hand are those who believe that citizens who think like this, that is citizens who do not want to obey the movement restrictions and lockdowns imposed by the government, are the real threat to their survival. These two group of European citizens; those who are against the government decisions and those who support the government, have redefined the role of government in the daily lives of Europeans. In Europe, young people tend to belong to the latter group while the old belong to the former – and this is understandable because while the old can sit indoors for hours and days unbothered, the young are gregarious and outgoing.

In a poll conducted by the European Council on Foreign Relations, Europeans in the north and west of the continent (Sweden, Iceland, Belarus, Russia, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Ireland, Denmark, France, Netherlands, Austria, Germany) feel unaffected by the pandemic because they are not directly affected by the virus unlike Europeans in the east and south (Georgia, Cyprus, Greece, Bulgaria, Moldova, Portugal, Romania, Poland, Spain, Croatia, Italy, Kosovo, Montenegro, Hungary, North Macedonia, Malta, San Marino) who have suffered more from the pandemic in terms of direct consequences in the areas of death, serious illness and economic distress. With this difference towards the impact of the virus, the attitudes of Europeans to politics, the idea of freedom, the role of the state/government, the role of the European Union (in the face of member states agreeing to buy vaccines collectively, instead of individually), etc. are been shaped. On a wider scale, this division has consequences on how Europeans perceive the political ideas of freedom of movement, the future of EU and its recovery plan and the Europe's relationship with other countries in the areas of vaccine diplomacy and overseas aid.

2.3.4 European Response: The Role of the European Union

While most countries in Europe are tackling the Covid-19 pandemic individually, the European Union is playing a leading role in how Europe responds to the impacts of the virus. In doing this, the EU harmonizes

the different health policies of member countries so as to prevent internal discord and at the same time promote solidarity within the Union.

One of the roles the EU played in responding to the Covid-19 pandemic is the coordination of the bloc-wide travel restrictions imposed by individual European governments on foreigners seeking to enter the continent. The organization also ensured that sufficient personal protective equipment (PPE) and other medical supplies were provided for each country. The European Union also supported the research and development of treatments, diagnostics of vaccines through international donor efforts.

Table: COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in Europe: Top 10 Affected Countries (by number of cases, as of January 14, 2022)

| Country | Cases | Deaths | Deaths Per 1000 | Fertility Rates |
|-------------|------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| UK | 15,064,685 | 151,833 | 227.18 | 1.00% |
| France | 13,351,053 | 127,520 | 190.16 | 1.00% |
| Italy | 8,115,645 | 140,188 | 232.49 | 1.70% |
| Spain | 7,930,528 | 90,620 | 192.49 | 1.10% |
| Germany | 7,866,784 | 115,343 | 138.75 | 1/50% |
| Poland | 4,265,433 | 101,419 | 267.10 | 2.40% |
| Netherlands | 3,539,335 | 21,610 | 124.68 | 0.60% |
| C. Republic | 2,562,235 | 36,765 | 334.57 | 1.40% |
| Belgium | 2,347,164 | 28,566 | 248.74 | 1.20% |
| Romania | 1,875,887 | 59,150 | 305/58 | 3.20% |

Source: Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Corona virus Resource Center, updated daily at <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>

The EU procured vaccines on behalf of all member states instead of countries doing so individually. Although initial production delays and a slow start to vaccine distribution sparked frustration among some European leaders and publics, the EU procurement initiative is largely regarded as a success given the relatively high vaccination rates across the continent.

The EU also focused on promoting economic recovery. In April 2020, the EU agreed a €540 billion (about \$590 billion) financial aid package for pandemic-affected workers, businesses, and member states. In February 2021, the EU finalized a €750 billion (around \$911 billion) recovery fund to member states in the form of bonds plus an attached €1.1 trillion (roughly \$1.3 trillion) as budget for 2021-2027. The European Central Bank, which manages the EU's common currency (the euro) used by 19 members, established an emergency bond-buying program totaling €1.8 trillion (about \$2.2 trillion) as of December 2020 scheduled to end in March 2022.

The European Commission, the political and independent arm of the European Union also contributed to the responses against the virus in Europe through key areas such as providing financial support, supply of medical products, supply of vaccines, and restricting visa policy of member states. Financially, the European Commission, through its research and innovation programme known as *Horizon 2020*, mobilized 450 million Euros for the development of Covid-19 treatment, tests and vaccines. It has also set aside 400 million Euros for the European Investment Bank meant to fund Covid-19 research and development at an early stage. As part of its medical supports, the European Commission signed a contract with Gilead, a pharmaceutical company, to secure treatment doses of *Veklury*, the brand name for Remdesivir; the first drug authorized by the European Union to treat Covid-19. The European Commission has also commissioned a team of epidemiologists and virologists from various EU countries to work on how the continent would deploy a coordinated action against the virus.

The interventions and responses of both the European Union and the European Commission to the impacts of Covid-19 on Europe are continuing because the virus is still in circulation.

2.4 SUMMARY

It has been said that since the end of the Second World War in 1945, no single global event has affected the economy, politics, safety and security of lives and property of Europe like the outbreak of Covid-19 which emerged in the closing months of 2019. Although the virus is still in existence, many countries in Europe, the continent mostly affected by the virus, have counted their losses and are beginning to pick up the 'remains'. Most countries and governments in Europe have lifted the lockdowns, movement restrictions, flight bans, curfews and social distancing measures that they had no other option but to impose on their citizens. As such European economies, through individual country and collective European Union economic policies, are learning to live with the virus.

In most countries of Europe, which is the epicenter of football, many football clubs in countries like Spain, Germany, Italy, United Kingdom, France, etc had suffered huge losses because they played games without fans in the stands. But today, they have reopened the stadiums and are beginning to make profits and giving fans, coaches and footballers the much needed psychological respite that watching live football in a stadium

as opposed to watching at home with a television, gives. The unprecedented development of vaccines is at the center of this recovery. Although it is not yet uhuru, the harsh impacts of the corona virus on European politics and socioeconomic life are beginning to disappear.

In this unit, we discussed the issue of corona virus aka Covid-19, traced its origin to a government lab in the city of Wuhan in China, the unprecedented development of vaccines against the virus that has helped the world and Europe tackle its adverse impacts, the ways the virus affected countries in Europe and how the responses of Europe's sociopolitical association, the European Union, is helping the continent combat the spread of the virus.

We noted that prior to November 2019 when Covid-19 broke out; no other health pandemic had ravaged the world as the last was the Spanish Flu of 1917 – 1920. We also noted that the emergence of Covid-19 has several devastating impacts on Europe ranging from social, public health, economic and political – and that the development of vaccines in a record time of less than one year, is helping Europe cope and recover from these negative impacts/effects. Scientists have told us that like common cold and catarrh, Covid-19 is here to stay for a long time so we must learn to live with it. No other continent is committed to living this scientific reality that Europe.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. In what ways has the emergence of Covid-19 impacted Europe?
2. The European Union and the European Commission played critical roles in the continent's battle against Covid-19. Briefly discuss.
3. What was Europe's position over the claim by former President Donald Trump that Covid-19 was a deliberate weapon by China in connivance with the World Health Organization (WHO)?

2.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Archick, K, Belkin, P, Garding, SE, Mix, EM and Martin, RL. (2022). "Europe, Covid-19 and US Relations". Congressional Research Service. January.

Roloff, R. (2020). "Covid-19 and No One's World: What Impact for the European Union?".

Partnership for Peace Consortium of Defense Academics and Security Studies Institutes.

Snowden, F.M. (2019). *Epidemics and Society: From the Black Death to the Present*. Yale University Press

Crawford, D. (2011). *Viruses: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

2.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. In what ways has the emergence of Covid-19 impacted Europe?

The emergence of the Covid-19 virus impacted on the countries on the continent of Europe in ways never imagined – because prior to the breakout of the virus from a government owned laboratory in the city of Wuhan in China, the last time Europe and the rest of the world witnessed a disease that became a pandemic was in 1917 when the Spanish Influenza, also known as Spanish Flu, broke out. The Spanish Flu ravaged the world for three years from 1917 – 1920. It was because of this “lull” that Europe was unprepared for Covid-19 when the corona virus emerged in November 2019 and became a pandemic affecting every part of Europe and the world by March 2020. Thus, Covid-19 brought with it many consequences with impacts felt in four key areas among European nations: political impact, public health impact, economic impact and social impacts.

Politically, the outbreak of Covid-19 brought the countries of Europe closer because they were to realize early that they cannot fight the battle as individual nations, hence the need for them to close ranks and collectively utilize the framework of the European Union to tackle the spread of the dangerous virus on the continent with the highest casualties per infections and deaths. Economically, Covid-19 increased the number of the unemployed and underemployed in Europe as many businesses were completely or partially forced to close shop following the spread of the virus. By this, the economies of most European countries began to shrink negatively as individuals, families and group livelihoods began to suffer. The impact of the virus on public health was such that because many people became infected with a virus that was not expected/prepared for, public hospitals, isolation centers, medical facilities, machines and equipments became inadequate for most countries to bare and this inadequacy led to the death of people who would still be alive if there were enough facilities and equipments such as oxygen to go around. In this regard, the public health systems of Italy, United Kingdom and Spain suffered most. Socially, Covid-19 led to

depressions and loneliness that together challenged the mental health of many Europeans particularly people who were living alone when the virus struck. With almost every European country's government placing lockdowns, travel bans and movement restrictions on their populations because of the virus, Europeans were forced to stay indoors and away from the outdoor life they were accustomed to. This negatively affected many. Till this moment, some people are still suffering from one form of mental illness or the other owing to the 'hazard' that Covid-19 heaped on them. There are reports of people going on to commit suicide out of depression and loneliness.

2. The European Union and the European Commission played critical roles in the continent's battle against Covid-19. Briefly discuss.

Europe remains the most affected continent when Covid-19 became a pandemic and as such the different governments realized early that for them to confront the impacts of the virus on their individual countries and the continent, they have to do so as a collective as opposed to individually. It was because of this consciousness that the European Union and the European Commission played very critical roles in Europe's battle against the deadly virus. One of the roles the EU played in responding to the Covid-19 pandemic was the coordination of the bloc-wide travel restrictions imposed by individual European governments on foreigners seeking to enter the continent. The organization also ensured that sufficient personal protective equipment (PPE) and other medical supplies were provided for each country. The European Union also supported the research and development of treatments, diagnostics of vaccines through international donor efforts.

Also, the EU procured vaccines on behalf of all member states as opposed to countries doing so individually. Although initial production delays and a slow start to vaccine distribution sparked frustrations and apprehension among some European leaders and publics, the EU procurement initiative was largely regarded as a success given the relatively high vaccination rates across the continent. Through the instrumentality of the EU and EC, focus was placed on promoting the recovery of the continent's battered economy. In April 2020, the EU agreed a €540 billion (about \$590 billion) financial aid package for pandemic-affected workers, businesses, and member states and in February 2021, it finalized a €750 billion

(around \$911 billion) recovery fund to member states in the form of bonds plus an attached €1.1 trillion (roughly \$1.3 trillion) as budget for 2021-2027. The European Central Bank, which manages the EU's common currency (the euro) used by 19 members, established an emergency bond-buying program totaling €1.8 trillion (about \$2.2 trillion) as of December 2020 scheduled to end in March 2022.

3. What was Europe's position over the claim by former President Donald Trump that Covid-19 was a deliberate weapon by China in connivance with the World Health Organization (WHO)?

When Donald Trump became the President of America, he immediately began implementing his MAGA (Make America Great Again) campaign slogan and promise by ensuring that his government puts the interest of Americans and America first before any other interests as opposed to previous governments where sometimes the interests of others, in Donald Trump's judgment, were placed above those of Americans and America. It was this MAGA stance of President Donald Trump that made him immediately blame China for the emergence of Covid-19 and the reason why he nicknamed it "the Chinese virus" because he believes its emergence is the result of a deliberate action by China in its quest to counter-balance American continuing and rising power and influence in the world. President Donald Trump also had some blames for the WHO so he stopped the sending of American financial commitments to the organization because he believed that the organization, in connivance with China, deliberately refused to alert America and the rest of the world when the virus broke out from Wuhan. President Donald Trump accused the WHO of assisting to cover up China's negligence over the virus's emergence. Although countries of Europe, especially through the auspices the European Union and NATO, have been historically friends with the USA, America under President Donald Trump did not focus much attention on Europe and as such Europe did not take sides when the American President made those claims and accusations against China and the WHO. Basically, Europe remained "nonaligned" between the two feuding parties and it is for this reason that even when America stopped its financial contributions to the world organization, most countries of Europe continued to send in their own. Note that America is the single biggest financial contributor to the purse of the WHO. President Joe Robinette Biden, the man who replaced Donald Trump in the Oval Office, has since resumed the paying of American financial

commitment to the world health body.

UNIT 3: THE 2022 RUSSIA UKRAINE WAR

CONTENTS

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Learning Outcomes

3.3 Main Content

3.3.1 Russia in the European Order

3.3.2 Russia's Annexation of Crimea

3.3.3 Russia's Invasion of Ukraine

3.3.4 The Role of the USA, EU and NATO in the Conflict

3.3.5 Impacts of the war on Europe

3.4 Summary

3.5 References/Further Reading

3.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

3.1 INTRODUCTION

With a population of 145 million, Russia is the most populous nation in Europe and with an area of 17,125,191 square kilometers; it is the largest country in the world. The country is also one of the richest in the world with a gross domestic product (GDP) of \$4.28 trillion and a per capita income of \$29,485. On the other hand, and according to the World Bank, Ukraine is one of the poorest countries in Europe and the continent's second largest country after Russia. Ukraine is a country of 44 million people, GDP of \$584 billion and a per capita income of \$14,150. Both Russia and Ukraine are in Eastern Europe and they are neighbors since until 24th August 1991 when Ukraine declared independence and freedom from Russian laws, it was a part of the former Soviet Union from which the Russia is the biggest single country after the breakup. Thus, it is commonplace to see Russians with Ukrainian relatives and vice versa. It is because of this close affinity between the two countries that no one believed a war could break out between them, particularly not in 21st century Europe where direct combat between two or more countries is viewed as an aberration, an exception rather than the rule.

But from December 2021, Russian troops and tanks began moving towards the Ukrainian border but Russia's President, Vladimir Putin, continued to reassure Ukraine and the rest of the world that it would not invade the country. But on the morning of 24th February 2022, Ukrainians woke up to Russian airstrikes, tanks and boots on Ukrainian territory and it dawned on everyone that indeed, a war in 21st century Europe has begun and it is a possibility.

The immediate cause of the war was the feelers in Russia that Ukraine was preparing to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), an organization that Russia sees as an enemy. Russia's argument is that it would not allow its closest neighbor to play host to its fiercest enemy since such an alliance means the stationing of NATO troops in Ukraine which Russia's sees as a direct threat to its national security.

The remote cause of the war was the February and March 2014 annexation of Crimea by Russia that led to the establishment of two federal authorities; Federal City of Sevastopol and Republic of Crimea, in the

region. Russia's annexation of Crimea was roundly condemned by the international community, particularly most European countries and the United States of America; who along with Canada outside of Europe, are members of NATO. Russia's backing of separatist groups in the Donbass region and its announcement, on 21st February 2022, that it recognizes them as the official government, is another immediate cause of the invasion/war.

In the light of the above, this unit discusses the intrigues, undercurrents, calculations, interests and politics including the roles of key actors and associations that culminated into the war between Russia and Ukraine, a war that many people did not believe would happen until it did. The unit also discussed the fallouts and impacts of the war on not only the two countries involved in direct combat but on the rest of Europe. It is important for the student to note that while Belarus is the only publicly known supporter of Russia in the ongoing war between the two unequal countries, Ukraine has the support and backing of most European countries under the EU and NATO umbrellas and also that of the USA and Canada, countries outside of Europe.

3.2 LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to do the following:

- i. Display a good understanding of the intrigues, undercurrents, interests, calculations and politics that culminated into the 2022 February 2022 invasion of Ukraine by Russia.
- ii. Be able to explain the fallouts and the impacts of the war on not only the two countries directly involved in combat but on the rest of Europe.
- iii. Make recommendations that would end the war and prevent this kind of war from happening again in Europe.

3.3 MAIN CONTENT

3.3.1 Russia in the European Order

For many years, Europe was the center of world politics and for over three hundred years, the interests, rivalries and ambitions of European countries shaped those of others. The First World War which was fought from 1914 to 1918 was principally a European war, although we like to describe it as a "world war".

Even during the Second World War, 1939 – 1945, that saw America play the part of a “dispute manager”, it was about settling the quarrels between European countries. Scholars like Tooze and Krastev have also argued that while the Cold War was a battle between the USA and the Soviet Union, it was Eurocentric because the prize each sought to win are the countries of Europe plus the reality that both democratic capitalism and communism are brainchildren of European scholars and thinkers. Thus, for more than three hundred years, world politics is another name for European politics.

After the Cold War, which historically ended in 1991, European countries began to move towards integration and orderliness instead of force, demonstrated by the peaceful transfer of power. This was in contrast with the 1989 Chinese use of force when it clamped down on pro-democracy agitators at the Tienanmen Square. Thus, Europe intentionally decided to be different from other parts of the world in solving disagreements peacefully as opposed to military intervention. Europe then became the poster child of mutual interference in the domestic affairs and security of other nations in the world based on openness and transparency under the umbrella of the European Union (EU).

Therefore, the emerging and generally embraced new European order rejected the deployment of the use of force in settling disputes and instead promoted mutual dependence between countries in the European Union. After 1989 Europe’s ambition was to change the very nature of the borders, to open them for capital, people, goods and ideas – until Russia decided to annex Crimea proving that it is not in agreement with a peaceful and tolerant European order.

Mikhail Gorbachev, former leader of the Soviet Union, signed into the order of mutual dependence of European countries so as to protect it from the secessionist drive of several Soviet peoples but this did not stop the Union from disintegrating, and Russia; the most powerful after disintegration, does not subscribe to the order of Europe under the EU. Instead Russia favors a narrow type of sovereignty where countries do not interfere in the affairs of others but still, it invaded Ukraine because of resents the orderliness that the North Atlantic treaty organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU) pursue.

For Russia, a new European/world order should suffice such that instead of mutual dependence, sovereignty should be at the center of international politics. For Russia, this means discouraging citizens of countries from protesting against their own governments and that governments should have the right to clamp down

on dissidents - and when this happens, Russia expects other nations to not interfere.

3.3.2 Russia's Annexation of Crimea

One of the immediate factors that led to the invasion of Ukraine by Russian forces on 24th February 2022 is the February 20th to 26th March 2014 (one month and 6 days) annexation of the Crimean Peninsula carried out by Russia. Another name for Crimea is Tauridia. The peninsula was first taken by Russians in 1873 but it was once under Scythian, Gothic, and even Genovese control – and Ottoman forces in 1475. Geographically, Crimea is situated along the northern coast of the Black Sea and has a human population of 2.4 million who are mainly ethnic Russians, Ukrainians, Crimean Tatar minorities, Belarusians, Pontic Greeks, Crimea Germans, Armenians, etc. The Crimea peninsula is located south of the Kherson Blast in Ukraine territory and west of Krasnodar Krai in Russia territory.

Although many ethnic groups are found in Crimea, 75% of the people living in Crimea consider themselves Russians while 97% see themselves as Russian speakers. Crimea was transferred administratively from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) in 1954, and it is the only region of Ukraine whose population identifies itself as predominantly ethnic Russian – and this is at the center of the controversy where the peninsula should be under. Although Crimea is recognized as a Ukrainian territory Russia had forcefully grabbed it for itself. While Crimea is internationally recognized as part of Ukraine, Ukrainians acknowledge that the peninsula (and the Donbass region comprising of Luhansk and Donetsk) are Russian dominated. It is for this reason that former Ukrainian President Viktor Yushchenko once referred to Crimea and the Donbass as ““where our language practically does not exist, where our memory is nonexistent, where our church is absent, where our culture is absent...utterly foreign lands”. In the same vein, Bohdan Chervak, the former chairman of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, once described Crimea as ‘not Ukrainian territory by content’ – yet the government of Ukraine sees the area as Ukrainian territory hence the conflict with the Russian Federation.

The 2014 annexation of Crimea by Russia resulted to the following:

- i. The Supreme Council declared the Republic of Crimea as an independent and self-governing entity and a referendum was held that voted Crimea as part of the Russian Federation.
- ii. On 18th March 2014, a treaty was signed between the Republic of Crimea and the Russian Federation at the Kremlin that formally initiated Crimea's accession into the Russian Federation.
- iii. The next day, 19th March 2014, Ukrainian Armed Forces were evicted from their bases by Crimean protesters and Russian troops. After this happened, Ukraine announced the withdrawal of its troops from Crimea.
- iv. On 21st March 2014, a law was passed that admitted the Republic of Crimea as part of the Russian Federation.
- v. Russia was suspended from the G8 and international sanctions were placed on her.

After the admittance of Crimea into the Russian Federation, Russia installed Sergey Aksyonov as the leader of the Republic of Crimea after it declared Crimea an independent country. Alongside the Republic of Crimea, Russia also incorporated the Federal City of Sevastopol.

Several countries including Ukraine and the United Nations General Assembly condemned the annexation as a violation of international law and agreements entered by Russia to safeguard the territorial integrity of Ukraine under the *Belavezha Accords* of 1991, the *Helsinki Accords* of 1975, the *Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances* of 1994 and the *1997 Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership between Russia and Ukraine*. The UN resolution noted that the referendum that annexed Crimea and made it a part of the Russian Federation has no validity and so it cannot form the basis for any alteration of the status of Crimea. The UN called on all countries and international organizations not to recognize Crimea as part of Russia – and urged them to recognize the Republic of Crimea and the Federal City of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine. As expected, President Putin of Russia condemned the position of the UN and argued that the referendum followed due process and abide by the people of Crimea's right to self-determination. Thus, the *Minsk Accord* signed on 5th September 2014 failed to impose the ceasefire that it was intended to. It is from this that many analysts agree that it is the failure of the *Minsk Accord* that necessitated the invasion of Ukraine by Russia in 2022.

3.3.3 Russia's Invasion of Ukraine

After months of speculations and assurances by President Vladimir Putin of Russia that he would not attack Ukraine, President Zelenskyy of Ukraine, other Ukrainians and the rest of the world woke up on the morning of 24th February 2022 to the invasion of Ukraine by Russia.

And six weeks after the invasion began; more than 4.2 million Ukrainians have fled the country with more than 2 million of them, particularly women, girls and boys under 18 years, are now refugees in Poland. The February 2022 invasion of Ukraine by Russia which President Putin has refused to call a war but a “special military operation” which he says is to demilitarize and denazify Ukraine, marked a major point in the conflict between the two countries since Russia annexed Crimea in 2014 and Russian backed separatist groups seized the Donbas region of Ukraine.

It is estimated that Russia has up to 19,000 troops prosecuting its war in Ukraine after President Putin accused Ukraine of harboring neo-Nazists who he claimed persecuted ethnic Russians. Importantly, the invasion of Ukraine by Russia is a move that stands against the eastward movement of NATO which President Putin and his government sees as a direct threat to Russia's national security. One of Putin's demands is that Ukraine, its neighbor, does not become a member of NATO, which it regards as a violation of western powers informal assurances that NATO would not expand eastward.

As a prelude to its invasion, on 21st February 2022 and three days before it dropped boots, tanks and airstrikes on Ukraine, Russia recognized two Russian separatist groups Donetsk People's Republic and the Luhansk People's Republic and their control of the Donbas region. The next day, the Federation Council of Russia authorized the use of military force abroad which allowed overt Russian troops to enter Donbas. As a result, four major Russian offensives; Kyiv offensive, the Northeastern Ukraine offensive, the Eastern Ukraine offensive and the Southern Ukraine offensive targeted at Chernihiv, Kharkiv, Kyiv, Sumy, Kherson and Mariupol were launched by the Russians but they met with stiff Ukrainian resistances and experienced logistical and operational challenges that hampered their progress.

So far, and as at 12th March 2022, Ukrainian authorities reported that they have lost 1,300 soldiers while the United States say between 2000 and 4000 Ukrainian soldiers have been killed. On the part of Russia,

and as at 25th March 2022, it reported that 1,351 Russian soldiers have been killed and 3,825 wounded. On 23rd March 2022, NATO reported that 30,000 – 40,000 Russian soldiers have been killed, wounded, missing or captured. For the USA, more than 10,000 Russian soldiers have been killed so far. As for civilians, and as at 4th April 2022, Ukraine reported that 6,769 – 7,096 civilians have been killed while the United Nations, and as at 7th April 2022, reported that 1,563 civilians have been killed with 2,213 wounded. More than 4.2 million Ukrainians are now refugees in neighboring countries like Poland, Moldova and Hungary, while 6.5 million have been internally displaced within the country.

The international community, mainly the United States of America and NATO member countries have condemned the invasion. On its part, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution that also condemned the attack and demanded full Russia withdrawal from Ukraine. There have also been protests around the world against the invasion and some Russians in Hungary joined in protesting against the invasion of Ukraine by their president. The global condemnation of Russia's invasion also saw a Russian American businessman place a one million dollars bounty for the assassination of President Vladimir Putin. To punish Russia for invading Ukraine, the USA and other countries like France, United Kingdom and Canada have imposed economic sanctions on the country but many NATO members, particularly Germany, are hesitant on placing a ban on Russian oil and gas because Russia is Europe's biggest exporter of oil and gas - and it is their thinking that a sanction against the buying of Russian oil and gas would have adverse effects on the economy and lifestyles of their citizens, particularly for Germany who imports more than 60% of its oil and gas from Russia.

Other countries, particularly African and Asian countries, have remained, nonaligned over the matter. This is not surprising because these countries, perhaps because they are not powerful in the comity of nations, tend to always take a nonaligned position so as not to please and/or displease any of the fighting parties, who in this instance are powerful and influential in the international system; Russia and then a poor Ukraine backed by the USA and NATO.

3.3.4 The Role of the USA, EU and NATO in the Conflict

Since the annexation of Crimea and the Donbas region in 2014 by Russia, the USA, United Kingdom, the

European Union and NATO have provided mostly non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine in its fight against Russia. Following the invasion of Ukraine in January 2022, the USA and NATO members began transferring weapons and ammunitions to Ukraine. For example, the United Kingdom has supplied Ukraine some NLAW (Next Generation Light Anti-tank Weapon) and Javelin anti-tank weapons.

On 26th February 2022, Anthony Blinken, the US Secretary of State, announced that he had authorized the sum of \$350 million as lethal military assistance that includes anti-armor and anti-aircraft systems. The United States has also sent 800 Stinger anti-craft systems that have the capacity of shooting down planes, to Ukraine. The US sent 2,000 Javelins, shoulder-held anti-tank weapons, 100 Tactical Unmanned Aerial Systems, 100 grenade launchers, 5,000 rifles, 1,000 pistols, 400 machine guns and 400 shotguns, over 20 million rounds of small arms ammunitions, grenade launchers and mortar rounds, 25,000 sets of body armor, 25,000 helmets and 6,000 AT-4 anti-armor systems (a Swedish produced single-use, unguided anti-tank weapon). Previously, the US has also sent to Ukraine over 600 Stinger anti-aircraft systems, 2,600 Javelin anti-armor systems, five Mi-17 helicopters, three patrol boats, four counter-artillery and counter-unmanned aerial system tracking radars, 70 High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWVs), explosive ordinance disposal and demining equipment, etc. The US is also involved in the training of Ukrainian soldiers in the use of these weapons. Under the Joe Biden administration, and as at March 16th 2022, the US security assistance to Ukraine was put at \$2 billion.

On its part, the European Union is supporting Ukraine by sending \$502 million worth of lethal assistance and \$56 million in non-lethal assistance. The EU has also supplied Ukraine with fighter jets. On humanitarian basis, the EU, through the European Commission, which is its independent political arm, made €93 million available for Ukrainian civilians affected by the war. From part of this sum, €8 million was for Moldova since the poor European country is playing host to fleeing Ukrainians. This expectation is that this support would help provide food, water, healthcare, shelter and to cover other basic needs of Ukrainians.

Since the 2014 annexation of Crimea by Russia, NATO has helped to train and fund Ukrainian armed forces and defense institutions in areas such as cyber defense, logistics and countering hybrid warfare. NATO has also included Ukrainian forces in its exercises and operations where they have developed capacities. After

the July 2007 NATO Summit in Warsaw, Poland, NATO demonstrated its practical support for Ukraine in a document known as The Comprehensive Assistance Package for Ukraine which includes NATO stepping up its presence in the Black Sea region. As per the current war, NATO has bolstered the alliance eastern flank with four additional battle groups to Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia and Romania in addition to the four already in the Baltic countries and Poland. This bolster comes with increase in the number of jets and carrier strike groups, submarines and combat ships to be deployed on a permanent basis. NATO also supports Ukraine with anti-tank air defense systems, drones, cyber security assistance, financial and humanitarian aid.

A major part of the involvement of the USA, NATO and the EU in the war between the two countries is not only militarily but economic by the placing of sanctions and bans on Russia. The EU announced measures that prevented many Russian vessels and trucks from accessing countries of the EU and a ban on four Russian banks, including the VTB, one of Russia's biggest banks. And from August 2022, the EU is to place a ban on Russian coal which is estimated to be worth 8 billion Euros to Russia. The EU has also indicated interest in banning Russian wood, rubber, cement, fertilizers, high-end seafood such as caviar, spirits and vodka, which have an annual value of 5.5 billion Euros. Restriction of export of jet fuel, quantum computers, advanced semiconductors, high-end electronics, software, sensitive machinery and transportation equipment to Russia with an estimated worth of 10 billion Euros has been placed. Add to these, the blacklisting of close to 900 Russians (who are mostly political leaders of the separatist regions of Donetsk and Luhansk) by the EU since Russia invaded Ukraine.

On March 2022, President Joe Biden of the US signed an Executive Order 14068 titled "Prohibiting Certain Imports, Exports, and New Investment with Respect to Continued Russian Federation Aggression" that placed economic sanctions against Russia. Among the many sanctions is the targeting of Russian banks, such as Sberbank and Alfabank and removing them from the SWIFT financial messaging system, and a ban on Americans from investing in Russia. The US has also imposed sanctions on President Putin's adult daughters, the families of Russian elites, companies and their personal vehicles.

Although the USA, EU and NATO are on the side of Ukraine and are supplying the country arms and weapons to defend itself and prosecute the war with Russia, they have agreed not to send their own soldiers

into the war or directly launch attacks on Russia because doing so would risk the war becoming a large-scale one that has the propensity of leading to a third world war, which of course should be properly designated as a third European war since most countries of Latin America, Asia and Australia would not be directly involved in the war like they were uninvolved in the two previous 'world wars'. President Joe Biden had warned that if Russia's uses chemical weapons against Ukraine, the USA would be forced to become directly involved in the war.

3.3.5 Impact of the war on Europe

It is without doubts that the war between Russia and Ukraine, which is as a result of an invasion of the latter by the former, has far-reaching implications and impacts on European countries and their citizens, but particularly on the citizens of the two feuding parties.

One of the immediate impacts of the war is the rising number of refugees and internally displaced people it has thrown up. As at the last count, more than 4.2 million Ukrainians became refugees in countries like Poland, Hungary and Moldova while 6.5 million have been internally displaced within Ukraine. The number of refugees and IDPs are mainly Ukrainians because the war is being fought on Ukraine's homeland and not in Russia, although the war has also negatively affected Russia and Russians albeit economically. While Russians are not among the counted refugees and IDPs, many Russians living in Russia have lost their jobs due to sanctions placed on their country by the USA and other powerful NATO member countries like the United Kingdom, Canada, France and recently Germany. For example, popular American restaurant McDonalds has been in business in Russia since 1980 has now closed its over 850 outlets in the country and this led to the loss of 62,000 jobs hitherto occupied by Russians and other Europeans living and working in Russia. Other companies such as Adidas, Pepsi, Star Bucks, Coca-Cola, Unilever, Rui Tinto, Heineken, etc have also pulled out of Russia with adverse implications on the job market in particular and Russian economy in general. Dutch international company Shell has pulled out of Russia and the Russian economy suffered a loss of \$3.8 billion as a result.

In March 2022, the United Kingdom announced new sanctions against Russia. Some of them include the following: detaining of Russian aircrafts and the removing of aircrafts belonging to designated Russian

individuals and entities from the UK register, a ban on the export of aviation and space-related goods and technology to Russia and this includes technical assistance and ban on UK companies providing insurance and re-insurance services in relation to these goods and technology. Germany, France and Canada have also placed bans and sanctions on Russia as the fallouts from the country's invasion of Ukraine continue to grow over the coming months. These sanctions although targeting Russia also has serious implications on the citizens of other European nations as it in many cases directly relates to and affects their livelihoods since not everyone who works for these Russian companies and rich Russian individuals, in Russia and abroad, are Russians.

The major fallout of the war, even as the USA and NATO countries are outdoing themselves in the imposing of sanctions on Russia, is a disagreement on the kinds of sanctions to impose on Russia, particularly concerning Russian oil and gas. Russia is Europe's biggest exporter of energy and whiles the USA and Ukraine on one hand wants other European countries to impose a ban on the importation of Russian oil and gas, several countries led by Germany opposes it. The German Chancellor argued that a ban on Russian energy would leave Germans stranded. Therefore, the option is for the rest of Europe to, in the long run, build alternatives to Russian oil and gas but for now, Germany and other dependent countries would continue to buy Russian energy that directly fuels Russia's and President Putin's prosecution of the war against Ukraine and NATO. It is because of this that some people argue that a third world war is unlikely to break out from this crisis since European countries, whether they like it or not, are interconnected and interdependent on each other, such that in most cases, no one nation can provide all its needs. At this juncture, it is important to state that although the 2014 annexation of Crimea and the support of separatists groups in the Donbas region by Russia officially kick started the conflict between Russia and Ukraine, the two countries were still engaged in trade and business running to the tune of billions of dollars. Therefore, the disagreement on whether or not to place a ban/sanction on Russian energy has the potential of becoming the albatross in the Ukraine, NATO and US alliance against Russia's invasion of Ukraine. The more EU members buy Russian oil and gas, the more money they put in the hands of President Putin to continue with his war with Ukraine, even though sanctions against Russia exists in other areas.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

146

1. Discuss the role of the US and NATO in the 2022 war between Russia and Ukraine.

3.4 SUMMARY

The 2022 war between Russia and Ukraine has further polarized Europe and any hope of the European Union closing the ranks by embracing Russia has become a mirage. Russia is not prosecuting the war alone as it has the support of Belarus (and that of China) just as Ukraine has the support of the USA, NATO and the EU – so the war, if not well managed and quickly so, may surprise us and lead to a third world war, although this is unlikely. President Joe Biden of the USA has promised that the US would not send troops into Russia and/or Ukraine but that if Russia deploys chemical weapons against Ukraine; his country would have no other choice than to become directly involved in the war.

Thus, the situation is a daisy one demanding of cushion because Russia also has a fine reason for attacking Ukraine as no man sleeps and snores after knowing that his neighbor is extending a hand of friendship to his enemy and seeking to have that enemy move next door. By making overtures to Ukraine (and other countries close to Russia like Georgia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, etc), NATO and the US are courting trouble and renegeing on the gentleman promise after the end of the Cold War that they would not expand eastward of Europe. If Ukraine eventually becomes a member of NATO, NATO would station its army and assets in the country and this poses national security problems for Russia. It is also important to note that the two parties are holding talks/discussions in Turkey and this may help end the war as former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill counseled that it is better to jaw-jaw than to war-war.

This unit has discussed the Russo Ukrainian war that began on 24th February 2022, a conflict that has its foundation in the 2014 annexation of Crimea by Russia and Russia's support of separatist groups in Ukraine's Donbas region, Donetsk and Luhansk. After this background, the unit delved into the war itself,

the role of the USA, NATO and EU and then discussed the fallouts/implications/impacts of the war on Europe and Europeans. It should be clear from this unit that more individuals, countries, multinational companies and international organizations oppose Russia's and President Putin's "special military operation" in Ukraine than those who support it.

3.5 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Pikulicka-Wilczewska, A and Sakwa, R. (2016). *Ukraine and Russia: People, Politics, Propaganda and Perspectives*. E-International Relations Publishing.

Van Metre, L, Gienger, VG and Kuehnast, K (2015). "The Ukraine – Russia Conflict: Signals & Scenarios for the Broader Region". Special Report, United States Institute of Peace, Available at www.usip.com

Walt, S. (1996). "Revolution and War". Cornell University Press.

Alcaro, R. (nd). "West – Russia Relations in Light of the Ukraine Crisis".

3.6 POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

1. Discuss the role of the US and NATO in the 2022 war between Russia and Ukraine

The United States of America and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are opposed to Russia's invasion of Ukraine and in their stance; they are supporting Ukraine with both military and non-military assistance towards ensuring that Russia and Vladimir Putin do not have the last laugh. Although the US and NATO troops cannot, at least at this stage of the conflict, put boots on ground to directly engage in infantry combat on the side of the Ukrainians against the Russians because it would lead to an escalation of hostilities with the potential of leading to a Third World War, they are heavily involved in the war and without the supports of both, it is impossible for Ukraine to hold its own against Russia till this moment. Recall that the war, which Vladimir Putin prefers to describe as "special military operation" began in February 2022 and as at June 2022, four months and counting, it is still raging on with media reports indicating that Russia has lost at least 20 of its top army generals in an invasion that President Putin imagined would take him and his military less than two weeks to prosecute.

But thanks to the USA and NATO, Ukraine is still fighting on months after. So far, the United States have

sent 800 Stinger anti-craft systems that have the capacity of shooting down planes, to Ukraine. The US sent 2,000 Javelins, shoulder-held anti-tank weapons, 100 Tactical Unmanned Aerial Systems, 100 grenade launchers, 5,000 rifles, 1,000 pistols, 400 machine guns and 400 shotguns, over 20 million rounds of small arms ammunitions, grenade launchers and mortar rounds, 25,000 sets of body armor, 25,000 helmets and 6,000 AT-4 anti-armor systems (a Swedish produced single-use, unguided anti-tank weapon). Previously, the US has also sent to Ukraine over 600 Stinger anti-aircraft systems, 2,600 Javelin anti-armor systems, five Mi-17 helicopters, three patrol boats, four counter-artillery and counter-unmanned aerial system tracking radars, 70 High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWVs), explosive ordinance disposal and demining equipment, etc. The US is also involved in the training of Ukrainian soldiers in the use of these weapons. Thus far, the US security assistance to Ukraine is \$2 billion. With these kinds of supports from the USA and NATO, Ukraine would continue to push off Russian troops until a truce between the two is reached.

2. If Crimea is predominantly ethnic Russian, why is it internationally recognized as Ukrainian territory?

Although Crimea is recognized as a Ukrainian territory, 75% of the people living in the peninsula consider themselves Russians while 97% see themselves as Russian speakers. Crimea was transferred administratively from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) in 1954 and it is the only region of Ukraine whose population identifies itself as predominantly ethnic Russian – and this is at the center of the controversy where the peninsula should be under. Although Crimea is recognized as a Ukrainian territory, Russia had forcefully grabbed it for itself. While Crimea is internationally recognized as part of Ukraine but Ukrainians themselves acknowledge that the peninsula does not have the same cultural ties and tradition with other parts of their country. For example, former Ukrainian President Viktor Yushchenko once referred to Crimea as “where our language practically does not exist, where our memory is nonexistent, where our church is absent, where our culture is absent...utterly foreign lands”. In the same vein, Bohdan Chervak, the former chairman of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists once described Crimea as ‘not Ukrainian territory by content’ yet

the government of Ukraine sees the area as Ukrainian territory hence the conflict with the Russian Federation. It is for these reasons that Russia sees Crimea as a part of the country even though it is internationally recognized as a part of Ukraine.

3. How important is Russian oil and gas to the war between Ukraine and Russia?

Russia is Europe's biggest producer and exporter of oil and gas and most European countries depend on her for their energy needs. It is because of this that Russia is able to wade off direct confrontation and stringent sanctions from other European countries over its invasion of Ukraine. Till this moment, a country like Germany is hesitant over cutting ties with Russia over Ukraine because of its dependence on Russia for over 70% of its energy needs. The same is true with many other European countries like Hungary, Spain and Austria. With this strategic importance, Russia is not perturbed over moves by other big countries to sanction its activities in Ukraine. Among the many in Europe, only the United Kingdom is not dependent on Russian oil and gas and why it is able to join the United States of America and Canada to impose several stiff economic sanctions on Russia over its brutal invasion of Ukraine. Knowing the importance of its oil and gas on the continent, Russia has asked that henceforth the payments for its energy be done in Ruble instead of the Dollars so that it can escape some of America's sanctions. Although this change in currency did not sit well with many European countries, some of them are beginning to buy using the Russian currency. Therefore, it is because of its vast oil and gas reserve and the key role it plays on the continent of Europe that Russia is not deterred over continuing the war on Ukraine – because it knows that European countries need Russian energy to survive. Presently, there are moves by other European countries to have alternative oil and gas sources but until then, Russia remains the undisputed king of the European 'jungle'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SUGGESTED READING

- Agnew, J. (1998). *Geopolitics: Re-Visioning World Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Albrecht-Carrie, R. (1965). *The Meaning of the First World War*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Alcaro, R. (nd). "West – Russia Relations in light of the Ukraine Crisis".
- Archick, K, Belkin, P, Garding, SE, Mix, EM and Martin, RL. (2022). "Europe, Covid-19 and US Relations". Congressional Research Service. January.
- Berstein, S. (1993). *The Republic of De Gaulle, 1958-1969*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blouet, B. W. (2001). *Geopolitics and Globalisation in the 20th Century*. London: Reaction Books.
- Brezinzski, Z. (1998). *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. Connecticut: Basic Books.
- Bulmer, S. & Paterson, W.E. (2010). 'Germany and the European Union' *International Affairs*. 86: 5, pp. 1051-1073.
- Buzan, B.& Weaver O. (2003). *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

- Chasek, P.S., Downie, D. L., Brown, J. W. (2010). *Global Environmental Politics: Dilemmas in Liberal Politics*. Boulder CO: Westview Press.
- Crawford, D. (2011). *Viruses: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Davies, N. (1996). *Europe: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deighton, A. (2002). 'The Rise and Fall of the European Defence Community: Anglo-American Relations and the Crisis of European Defence, 1950–55,' *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 118-20.
- Donaldson, R. H. & Noguee, J. L. (1998). *The Foreign Policy of Russia: Changing Systems, Enduring Interests*. New York: M.E. Sharpe Press.
- Dugin, A. (1997). *Osnovy Geopolitiki: Geopoliticheskoe Budushee Rossii*. Moscow: Arktogeya Press.
- Emerson, M., Aujean, M. Catinat, M. Goubet, P. & Jacquemin, A. (1988) "The Economics of 1992." *European Economy* 35.
- Goff, R. Walter, M. Terry, J. & Upshur Jiu-Hwa (1983). *The 20th Century: A Brief Global History*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Goldstein, J. & Pevehouse, J. (2009). *International Relations*. Pearson- Longman: New York.
- Golub, J. (2003). *New Instruments for Environmental Policy in the EU*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Gordon, P. H. (1993). *A Certain Idea of France: French Security Policy and the Gaullist Legacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Guzzini, S. (1993). 'Structural Power: the Limits of Neo-Realist Analysis,' *International Organisation*. 47: 3, Summer, pp. 443–478
- Harnisch, S. & Wolf, R. (2010). 'Germany: the Continuity of Change', in E.Kirchner & J. Sperling, (Eds). *National Security Cultures: Patterns of Global Governance*. London: Routledge. pp. 43–65.
- Hosseini, M. (2006). *Iran-Europe Relations: Challenges and Opportunities*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, D. & Robinson, P. (2005). *Perspectives on EU-Russia Relations*. London: Routledge
- Jordan, A. (2002). *A Guide to Environmental Policies in the European Union: Actors, Institutions and Processes*. New York: Earth Scan.
- Kenen, P. (1992). *EMU after Maastricht*.
- Keohane, D. (2005). *The EU and Counter Terrorism*. Brussels: Center for European Reform.
- Kerr, D. (1995). "The New Eurasianism: The Rise of Geopolitics in Russia's Foreign Policy," *Europe-Asia Studies*. Vol. 47, no. 6, 977-988.
- Larkin, P. J. (1965). *European History for Certificate Classes (1789- 1970)*. London: Hulton Educational Publications.
- Marrus M., (1985). *The Unwanted: European Refugees in the 20th Century*. New York: OUP.
- McDowell, M. & Thom, R. (1999). *Eastern Europe: the EU's Frontier - Incorporation or Regime*

- Competition? *Journal of Economic Studies*. Volume 26 Number 4, 383-403.
- Moravcsik, A. (1998). *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Palmer, N. & Perkins, H. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*. Delhi: AITBS.
- Paterson, W. E. (2010). 'Does Germany Still have a European Vocation?' *German Politics*, 19: 1, March, p. 47.
- Pikulicka-Wilczewska, A and Sakwa, R. (2016). *Ukraine and Russia: People, Politics, Propaganda and Perspectives*. E-International Relations Publishing.
- Prior, R. & Wilson, T. (2000). *The First World War*. (Ed.). J. Keegan. London: Orion House.
- Proudfoot, M. J. (1957). *European Refugees: 1939-1952*. New York: Faber.
- Read, R. & Bradley, S. (2001). The Economics of Eastern Enlargement of the EU, *Industrial Relations Journal*, Vol. 32 Number 5.
- Reichard, M. (2006). *The EU-NATO Relationship: A Legal and Political Perspective*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishers.
- Roloff, R. (2020). "Covid-19 and No One's World: What Impact for the European Union?". Partnership for Peace Consortium of Defense Academics and Security Studies Institutes.
- Royer, A. (2010). *The Council of Europe*. Strasbourg: The Council of Europe.
- Schoenbourg, D. (1966). *The Three Lives of Charles de Gaulle*, New York: Atheneum Publishers. pp295-300.
- Sloan, S. (2005). *NATO, the EU and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Snowden, F.M. (2019). *Epidemics and Society: From the Black Death to the Present*. Yale University Press
- Spence, D. (2007). *The European Union and Terrorism*. London: John Harper Publishing.
- Toynbee, A. (1953). *The World and the West*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tsoukalis, L. (1991). *The New European Economy: The Politics and Economics of Integration*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Van Metre, L, Gienger, VG and Kuehnast, K (2015). "The Ukraine – Russia Conflict: Signals & Scenarios for the Broader Region". Sepcial Report, United States Institute of Peace, Available at www.usip.com
- Viner, J. (1950). *The Customs Union Issue*.
- Walt, S. (1996). "Revolution and War". Cornell University Press.
- Whitaker, D. (2007). *Terrorism: Understanding the Global Threat*. London: Longman.

White, S. et al. (2002). A European or a Slavic Choice? Foreign Policy and Public Attitudes in Post-Soviet Europe, *Europe-Asia Studies*. Vol. 54, No. 2, 181–202.

Willis, F R. (1968). *Europe in the Global Age: 1939 to the Present*, New York: Harper and Row.