

**In what ways has the European Union or Japan responded to changes in the wider world through changes in its foreign policy content and management?**

Within this assignment it will assess how the European Unions has responded to the changes in the world overtime, in regards to its security and foreign policy since 1945. With this it will assess what actions the European union takes in terms of military and economic terms as well as find out if a common security policy is possible or are the too many issues regarding sovereignty that acts as constraints limiting its authority.

The European Union is a unique development in international relations since the end of World War Two. The European Union has combined the interests of fifteen member states into an international organisation, which has collected the sovereign states in a free market and that of a federal state all in one which look after the protection of world-wide interests such as energy resources, commodity prices, investment security etc.

Since the European Economic Community (EEC)/ European Community (EC) / European Union (EU) was founded the member states have tried to use their agreement to benefit one and another by factors like trade.

Since the Maastricht treaty (1992) the European Union was created and this cemented a Common Foreign Security Policy from one of the three pillars that created the European Union.

However there is an aspect which theorists do suggest, show a seeking of mutual foreign policy and 'pursuing of joint actors' beforehand. Theories like "Spillover theory" from neofunctionists suggests the actions of one state may that effects others, leading to other states joining together and deciding a common policy. There is also Inter-dependence theory that suggests that the EC is forced to react as an entity when a member doesn't have the power to do so<sup>1</sup>. These can be dated back to 1952 when the European Defence Community was signed by six, the Hague summit in 1969 where the six assumed responsibility of the world tomorrow and other reports, such as the Luxembourg Report

---

<sup>1</sup> Webb. C. 'Introduction : Variations on a Theoretical Theme' in Wallace. H, Wallace. W, and Carol Webb (eds), Policy making in the European Communities in Piening. C. Global Europe The European Union in World Affairs. Pg31

1970, Copenhagen Report 1973 and London Report 1981 which all encourage joint action.

The European Union could be said to be constantly evolving with further integration between member states and enlargement which other eastern European states.

The European security policy since the collapse of communism in 1989 has dramatically changed. Paul Hirst states that “The principal change being economic issues that has taken precedence over the military ones. As the cold war thawed the policy shifted from the need to contain the Soviet Union to the aim of reducing military confrontation between the two armed blocks of NATO and the Warsaw pact”<sup>2</sup>. Now the most advanced states like the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland are more concerned with economic development and eventual membership to European Union.

In particular there is the aspect of enlargement which is very topical at the moment. In the 1980’s the EC/EU began the second increase in membership of the Mediterranean countries of Greece, Spain and Portugal. Since then the break down in of communism in Central and Eastern Europe, Western Europe has wanted to create trade with these countries and normalise trade and economic relations<sup>3</sup>. Primarily to remove tariffs from trade.

This eventually grew further with the European Union wanting to find new relationships with the new democracies that could eventually be considered to join in with the EU. Under article 238EEC of the “European Agreements” meant that trade and economic co-operation as well as aid could then take place on a level of political dialogue. The first of these European agreements were offered to Poland, Hungary and the former Czechoslovakia in 1991 which were then followed by agreements with Bulgaria and Romania. Due to there closeness to the old Soviet Union they were seen as further away from membership and also because of Romania’s political situation at the time delayed their invitation.

---

<sup>2</sup> Hirst. P. *Security Challenges in post Communist Europe*, in Freeman. L. *Military Intervention in European Conflicts*. Pg175

<sup>3</sup> Nicoll. W. and Salmon. T. C. *Understanding the New European Community*. Pg122

This inevitably shows the EU's willingness to respond to change and open the opportunities to other countries however due to the differences in level of development and low costs such as wages did cause problems. They were particularly backward compared to the rest of Europe causing problems with linking trade to each other. The European agreements were criticised within Europe and elsewhere. An example in Europe was that many saw the industries of the eastern states like steel, textiles and food would have flooded the European market that would force European prices down to levels of the eastern states.

The amounts of cheap imports meant that tariffs and quotas had to be agreed, which protected European Union countries and farmers from the extra competition that would occur like those mentioned above.

However as time shows with Spain and Greece, the benefits for joining can be huge and provide an incentive for countries to enter such as Eastern Europe. Once allowed into the EU Spain was allowed to benefit from the Common Agricultural Policy that subsidises farms not to use their land to prevent an over supply of food<sup>4</sup>. This may not be possible for the likes of Poland yet but the possibility or an increased standard of living this could eventually give Poland more benefits. This however might mean the end of the common agricultural policy.

However Economic security isn't the only area of foreign policy that the European Union has. Even though the cold war is over the EU has had to get involved with other military conflict including the wars in Yugoslavia. As Geoffrey Edwards states, "The conflict in the former Yugoslavia has tested the European Union to its utmost"<sup>5</sup>. This is to such an extent that it reveals the continued dependence on other nations and institutions, not least the United Nations, United States of America and also Russia. If it came it would be difficult to see the European Union being able to save lives or keep peace if it came to the crunch in a crisis even after the lessons of the Gulf War. The twelve EC members were still negotiating a Common Foreign and security Policy (CFSP) within the

---

<sup>4</sup> George. S. *Politics and policy in the European Community*. pg 155

<sup>5</sup> Edwards. G. The Potential Limits of the CFSP: The Yugoslav Example. From; Regelsberger. E, De Terarent. P de S, Wessels. W. *Foreign Policy of the European Union, From EPC to CFSP and Beyond*. Pg173

intergovernmental conference at the time of the conflict and later still the Maastricht Treaty's ramification also made the matter even more so complicating as well as the issues around the Soviet dominated territory.

The fact that most countries wanted to maintain the status quo while encouraging the democratisation and liberalisation of the area meant that there was little immediate support for allowing the minorities to have their say. This led to the conflicts and in the end at best, to put the "EC/union in a muddle" with what should be happening and what policies should be carried out.

It would be fair to say Yugoslavia was an awkward situation mainly due to the fact EC/EU countries bordered Yugoslavia and would have feared being dragged into the conflict however it needed to be resolved. This of, which was left to the EC and the UN and both the WEU and NATO took back-up roles, which with hindsight, shows a "serious overconfidence"<sup>6</sup> of its resources and power. It was Dominique Moise who wrote recently that "US fights the UN feeds and the European Union funds"<sup>7</sup>.

The E.U's foreign policy in the Balkans at this precise time is also very topical and is an important factor in its foreign policy. The EU is by far the biggest donor since 1991 providing more than six billion Euros since 1991 through various aid programs and by 2006 this is expected to rise to over ten billion<sup>8</sup>. This does reinforce the claim of the significant long-term commitment on the part of the EU to maintaining peace, stability and prosperity in South East Europe. And this is also matched with 36,000 ground troops in Kosovo and 800 civilian police from EU member states. The next step according to the EU is for the countries to make there own progress with the assistance of the EU behind them. An example being duty-free and unlimited accesses to EU markets. Something those possible future EU members don't have the luxury of.

In all this shows even though mistakes have been made the EU is willing to adapt their policies after the event and attempt to make up with supporting European Interests. It is

---

<sup>6</sup>Stavidis. S, Coulooubis. T, Veremis. T, Waites. N. Theforeign Policy of the European Unions Mediterranean states and applicant countries in the 1990s. Pg11

<sup>7</sup> Commission Chris Pattern, speech on European Union and Globalisation. 2000

<sup>8</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/see/news/ip03\\_576.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/see/news/ip03_576.htm)

not to say however the EU doesn't make the same mistakes again as was evident before the Balkans in the Gulf where politics and not action got in the way.

Another conflict that the European Union has to attempt to settle was the Middle East conflict between Palestine and Israel. This not new and Europe has always regarded their relationship as special in particular with the Arab world. However it is America who see itself as the sole mediator in the region its is however the responsibility of providing the bulk of the financial resources for developing any agreements that are made. The European Union contributes "approximately eighty five percent of the running costs of the Palestinian Authority and together with non-EU states such as Norway and Switzerland, the bilateral and multilateral assistance amounts to nearly half of the \$2.4 billion pledged to the rebuilding of the economy. Therefore it can be determined that without European Union influence the Peace Process could hardly get off the ground and could possibly see thousands dead and many more worse off than they are now because of the struggle of rebuilding after decades of Civil unrest and terrorism.

The conflict between Israel and Palestine was created after the Second World War and is still in the headlines today. There has been on and off peace since 1966 which saw the outbreak of rioting after Israel opened the Hasmonean tunnel in the old city of Jerusalem which led to the deaths of 64 Palestinians and fifteen Israeli soldiers<sup>9</sup>. The European Union in its statement in October 1966 held the new Likud-led Israeli government to blame and responsible for the marked deterioration in the Peace Process. The European Union believed that the lack of progress in the Middle East was the main cause for the rioting and deaths therefore a tour of the area was made by the European powers to establish peace and excerpt their influence in the region.

The major powers of Europe have always had an interest in the region since the colonial days of empire. Britain had controlled the area before the Second World War as a main site for oil as well as linking the East and western empires together. France also had influence in the area from its colonial empire in Lebanon and Syria.

During this period or violence there was an increased amount of diplomatic activity led by French President Chirac who made a well publicised tour of Syria, Israel, Gaza, the

---

<sup>9</sup> Peters. J. Europe in the Middle East Peace Process: Emerging from the sidelines, From Stavidis. S, Coulooubis. T, Veremis. T, Waites. N. The foreign Policy of the European Unions Mediterranean states and applicant countries in the 1990s pg 295

West Bank, Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon. In this he promoted a greater European role in the Arab-Israeli peace process and declared peace could only be maintained with an established Palestinian state.

Following Chirac's trip, Britain tried to extend its influence by sending the British foreign Secretary Rifkind. He took the opportunity to remind Israeli settlements were illegal in Gaza and the West Bank. He also set up a new regional security forum in the Middle East, modelled on the Organisation of Co-operation and Security in Europe<sup>10</sup>. However it is argued that the EU's influence is limited due to the role of America in the peace process which has caused disagreement as Europe has been regarded as a "second string player in the peace process". This frustration can be shown when none of the representatives showed up at the Washington summit set up by President Clinton.

In conclusion of Europe's role in the Middle East, individual countries have always found it difficult to get involved with the peace process with the exception of Chirac who acted independently from the United States. "Chirac wasted little time in stamping his own personal imprint on French policy in the region"<sup>11</sup>. However the EU would find it difficult to take over the primary role of the United States. It does provide the economic funds for the Peace Process to be maintained which is just as important as it provides the arena of which Peace can be secured, in a similar fashion to how America encourages the talks to happen.

According to Peters if the EU is going to assist in helping to maintain peace in the region it has to work with America rather than setting up rival initiatives in the region with each other and America. If this can be done then maybe it will also help in constructing a Common Foreign Security Policy for the EU.

Overall Europe has had to modify policies to adapt to the changing political challenge in respect to both the Balkans and the Middle East. They are both volatile situations that

---

<sup>10</sup> See Malcom Rifkind, 'Blueprint for a Region at Peace' The Times 5<sup>th</sup> November 1996. From Stavdis. S, Coulooubis. T, Veremis. T, Waites. N. The foreign Policy of the European Unions Mediterranean states and applicant countries in the 1990s. Pg296

<sup>11</sup> Peters. J. Europe in the Middle East Peace Process: Emerging from the sidelines, From Stavdis. S, Coulooubis. T, Veremis. T, Waites. N. The foreign Policy of the European Unions Mediterranean states and applicant countries in the 1990s pg 309

make it difficult for any state to solve. Previously when the EU/EC was first set up joint intervention in these conflicts wouldn't have occurred under the name of the EU. The European Union has become more political within the world as well as having more power within the European Union member states. This power of the EU is still limited and without a European army or military task force that provides back up for the EU, the EU will never become as influential as America or other states in terms of backing up its diplomacy with force.

A military force could be argued to be the next step to a common European Foreign Security Policy and is more likely than ever however there are many that believe such as Peter Foot, that say this will be impossible. This is because of the consequences on states sovereignty and the political implications of creating a European Superstate.

## **Bibliography**

- Eliassen. K.A. Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union. Sage publications 1998
- Freedman. L. Military intervention in European Conflicts. Blackwell Publishers Oxford. 1994
- George. S. Politics and Policy in the European Community. Clarendon, Oxford University Press 1985
- Mccinnes. C. Security and Strategy in the New Europe. Routledge London. 1992
- Nicoll.W, Salmon. T.C. Understanding the new European Community. Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hampshire. 1994
- Piening. C. Global Europe the European Union and World Affairs. London 1997
- Regelsberger. E, De Terarent. P de S, Wessels. W. Foreign Policy of the European Union, From EPC to CFSP and Beyond. London 1997
- Stavidis. S, Coulooubis. T, Veremis. T, Waites. N. The foreign Policy of the European Unions Mediterranean states and applicant countries in the 1990s. Macmillian Press 1999
  
- [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/see/news/ip03\\_576.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/see/news/ip03_576.htm)
  
- Hill. C. Journal of Common Market Studies. The Capability- Expectations, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role. Volume 31, No3 September 1993