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1. Borders and Foreign Policy

Foreign policy depends on the existence of borders. The word ‘foreign’ originally referred to that which is ‘outside’, and where there is an outside there must not only be an inside but also a line of demarcation between the two. This elementary point is worth making for two reasons: first, theorists of politics and international relations increasingly call into question polarities such as those between the domestic and external environments (because of globalisation, for instance), between the state and world society (for normative reasons) and between agents and structures (for epistemological reasons); second, the European Union itself is a perpetual challenge to the historical fixity of borders - it is steadily breaking down those between its member-states, and its rolling programme of enlargement, from six to fifteen and possibly 20 plus members, and from 1969 to well into the second decade of the 21st century, makes unclear the nature of its current border, let alone that of a putative permanent border in the future.

The discussion here does not go into these theoretical, even meta-theoretical issues in any depth. Its main focus is on the extent to which the current enlargement of the Union, a massive historical enterprise by any standards, requiring political stamina over many decades, will raise problems of foreign policy for the EU and its member-states. For borders imply foreign policy just as much as foreign policy implies borders. Where decisions are taken to exclude states from membership (even if not permanently) their relations with the Union remain by definition at the level of foreign policy. Their very desire to enter is premised on the view that being inside involves a qualitatively different kind of relationship than is implied even by close friendship from the outside. Moreover changing membership transforms relationships between those admitted and their neighbours left outside, previously shaped at least in part by the common status of exclusion. It is thus evident that enlargement should be seen not simply from the perspective of resources and institutional complications, but also from that of international relations and foreign policy.

Enlargement, indeed, is foreign policy. The decisions at Copenhagen, Corfu, Essen and Cannes between 1993-1995 can be seen as a commitment to a major new foreign policy on the part of the EU, that of changing the map of Europe to the East and to the South. Such a commitment is seen by third states as having a structural impact on the international system, as in fact the Fifteen intended it to have. They want to stabilise east, central and south-eastern Europe through taking in states from those regions where it is practicable to do so. With the precedents of Portugal, Spain and Greece fresh in the mind, the aim is to extend the zone of economic prosperity and the ‘democratic peace’ as a prophylactic against war, nationalism and autocracy. That the strategy has been
conducted on the basis of disjointed incrementalism rather than a fully worked out grand plan does not make it any less significant. The very flexibility of the process, or incoherence according to viewpoint, means that expectations outside the EU are unstable and its international politics the more turbulent.

The foreign policy aspect of enlargement is extended by virtue of the fact that this is one area where the EU does possess capabilities. Whereas many actions under the heading of the Common Foreign and Security Policy are vitiated by the inability of the Union to back them with resources or unified political will, the enlargement process was undertaken on the basis of considerable consensus and an evident ability to deliver gains for those states which were ultimately to be admitted. Enlargement cuts across all three pillars of the system set up by the Treaty of Maastricht and by its nature imposes a degree of unity on an EU decision-making process bound to generate incoherence. It mobilises both economic and political resources and cannot be ignored even by those states not themselves seeking membership. It has an impact on the international system, and it makes a difference.

There are two central foreign policy questions thrown up by the move towards a new external border which the EU is currently, if incidentally, engaged in. These are, firstly, where are we going, and secondly, what are the consequences of our actions? In the first case we need to have some sense of where we might end up, in terms of the ultimate shape and extent of the EU, even if those currently leading us there find the issue too difficult to discuss openly. If ‘Europe’ is really to stretch from the Atlantic to the Urals, from Malta to Tampere, from Scapa Flow to Batum, then it will be a very different entity from that which for most of its existence has been little more than a caucus within ‘the West’, led by the United States. Such a body might become a superpower, or it might be unable to cope with its sheer size and complexity, but it would certainly figure prominently in the mental maps of decision-makers across the world. Yet whatever enlargement takes place, even if it stops well short of the potential colossus I have described, would still make a significant difference to the international politics of eastern Europe, the Balkans and the Mediterranean. The geopolitics of any new borders should not, therefore, be relegated to the margins of discussions on agricultural prices, migration or the size of the European Parliament.

In the second case, the issues are just as important. Enlargement has neither a single decision-point nor a clear end-point. It is a virtually continuous and long-drawn-out process. This means that each stage will take some time - as we can see from the fact that even the first wave of new entrants from central Europe will not join until at least ten years after the decision to admit them in principle - and that it will be seen as a discrete event in its own terms, with distinct consequences. In
other words, the negotiations with candidate countries will be difficult and raise foreign policy issues in their own right, while the consequence of discriminating among the many would-be members by giving out queue-jumping tickets is bound to have international fall-out and complicate other aspects of the Union’s external relations. One advantage of this gradualism is that the map of Europe will change only slowly, perhaps even imperceptibly; the corollary, however, is that each stage can itself seem like a major upheaval in the diplomatic landscape.

Thus enlargement, borders and foreign policy are inextricably bound up with each other. Indeed, the border question is probably the most important of all the foreign policy implications of enlargement. Some, like Charles Maier in this volume, like to see the EU as so unusual, perhaps post-modern, in its character that it represents more a virtual than a territorial community, reaching out to peoples and processes well beyond its nominal borders. By contrast the present chapter argues that it is of vital importance where the external frontier of the EU falls, whether temporarily or permanently, for both the domestic and external environments of the Union. Outsiders are far from indifferent to its geopolitical character, in terms of size, range, resources, population proximity and potential. This is as true of the United States and Russia as it is of small states in the EU’s orbit such as Morocco or Iceland. Equally, each aggrandisement of the Union is inherently both territorial and communitarian. That is, it brings the external border into new zones of international relations (e.g. deeper into Balkan politics if Slovenia is admitted) and new problems of cross-border communities (e.g. the problem of ‘Hungarian’ Romanians). Turkey is the most obvious case in point: if admitted it would greatly enlarge the area, scope and population of the EU and would alter the way others currently perceive it - as a broadly rich, western, Judaeo-Christian entity. This may be a good thing; what is clear is that the international effects of Turkish entry would not be neutral.

What follows elaborates this argument by looking in more detail at the nature of geopolitics in the context of contemporary Europe, and by examining the question of whether territorial limits necessarily mean sharply-defined borders. It goes on to examine the issue of ‘otherness’ and how changes in size produce, or perhaps even require some excluded outsiders: to be ‘us’ we may need to have a clear idea of who is ‘not us’. The key issue of security is given particular attention, as are the geopolitical zones of greatest sensitivity so far as the EU is concerned, that is, Eastern Europe, north Africa and Turkey. Finally, the question of what the world role of an enlarged Europe might look like is raised, although the constraints of space require that it be left open.
2. Geopolitics, Grand Strategy and Geo-economics.

The external boundary of the EU is of vital importance both to the Union itself and to the wider international system. Furthermore enlargement is the major influence on the character of that boundary. If these two propositions are accepted then the EU has to be analysed in a geopolitical context. This is particularly the case because it has something approaching a common foreign and security policy and generates many significant outputs to that end. It now also aspires to a common defence policy. Furthermore its very existence signifies a geopolitical presence in the world, with its resources and element of supranationality making for a sharp distinction between members and non-members, between inside and outside. Even if the Union still falls far short of being able to mobilise its resources and political will on a state-like basis, it still represents a distinct power-centre, a force for change, and, de facto, an entire region.

Students of the European Union have for too long neglected geopolitics, either because they could not see its relevance to a ‘civilian power’ or because they were uneasy with that kind of discourse for normative reasons. To some extent the neglect was mirrored among international relations specialists. The long tradition of realist writing about strategy and the balance of power produced a deep scepticism about civilian diplomacy, the inability to supplant NATO and the lack of the capacity to engage in ‘rational actor’ behaviour. Others, reacting against realism, were attracted by the EU and the model it embodied, but were not, by definition, interested in its geopolitical aspect. This dichotomization, however, can no longer be sustained, given the EU’s own evolution and aspirations, and the changing nature of security relationships in the aftermath of the Cold War. Of course, fundamental change is still more a matter of promise than realisation, but the admixture of multi-level foreign policies with an enlarging Union means that geopolitics can no longer be bracketed out of our analysis of the EU and its international functions.

The meaning of geopolitics is not, however, an uncomplicated matter. Although at bottom it refers neutrally to the impact of the spatial organisation of the world on international politics, it is contaminated by its association with notions first of lebenstraum and ‘heartland’ and then of containment and dominoes. From c. 1890 to c. 1985, with only a brief pause between 1919-33, international relations were conceptually dominated by the language of military strategy, with its apparent qualities of objectivity and determinism. The aggrandisements of Nazism, fascism and Japanese imperialism were all based on the idea that security, indeed civilisation, required territorial expansion. The Cold War which followed saw both sides place buffer zones and global reach at the centre of their concerns. As before 1939, international politics was dominated by the ‘great game’ of power politics, with at stake ‘key’ states like Poland or Korea,
and nodal strategic points like Suez. Complex interdependence and multipolarity came slowly to overlay this game, but even after the end of the Cold War, they have not wholly replaced it.

Yet if the post-war world has been largely understood geopolitically, the term ‘geopolitics’ itself fell into disrepute because of its association with Nazi dreams of world power, and it is paradoxically only since Mikhail Gorbachev sounded the tocsin for the Cold War that it has crept back into fashion as ‘the new geopolitics’. By this is meant: regional balances of power; the politics of control over natural resources; the differential impact of size, position and topography on foreign policy; and to a lesser extent, the international politics of the environment. There is under this cooler rubric no reason why the classical question of the emergence of new powers, their zones of influence and the ‘shatterbelts’ between the various geopolitical regions should not also be considered, now that the normative language of the old tradition has been stripped away. Moreover, unless we grant determining force to transnational economic regions like the Asia-Pacific Rim, or the ‘golden banana’ from Barcelona to Livorno, geo-economics can be subsumed within the new geopolitics. States may need to band together to dispose of economic power, but that is precisely what they are tending to do, and the configurations of strength thus produced create new fault-lines of competition in international affairs.

In this respect the EU is, of course, the leading example, possessing a formidable concentration of wealth and, through enlargement, even greater potential. Even without the development of a single military policy this economic power cannot avoid being political in its use and implications. The frequent use of terms such as ‘fortress Europe’ in relation to trade, ‘hard shell’ in relation to migration or ‘EurAfrique’ in connection with development denotes that even as it stands the EU is perceived as a major geopolitical/geo-economic entity. Given that the Union is also increasingly prioritising its own near abroad, with the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and a new Common Strategy on Russia, it is evident that it is beginning to behave like a traditional great power. Further evidence for this conclusion is provided by the reactions to Europe’s relative impotence in the Balkans. Britain and France in particular, but even the smaller and neutral Member States, have concluded that the EU needs to acquire more capabilities so as to enable it to intervene in crises in its own region independent of the United States. To this end the Anglo-French declaration at St. Malo in November 1998 started a process which led to all fifteen signing up to a prospective militarisation of the EU and the winding up of the Western European Union. If this happens the consequences will not be unmitigatedly positive. The emergence or growth of military power always alarms outsiders and very often leads to an increase in their own armament programmes and to a rise in tension in external relationships. In that event the EU will not be able to avoid the geopolitical implications of
integration and enlargement.

3. The Geopolitics of Enlargement by Stages

If a large-scale enlargement of the EU is indeed to happen it will not now be by the big bang method. Rather, it will be spread out over twenty years or so, and seems likely to take place through the accession of three or more groups of new members. If closely managed, with those at the end of the queue compensated and constantly reassured as to their eventual reward, this could work well enough. In geopolitical terms it would also have the advantage that the external border would only change slowly and predictably. It is already a decade since the newly free Visegrad countries first voiced their expectations of membership. They are still not in the EU and are very unlikely to enter before 2003. This hardly sets a breakneck pace risking sudden destabilisation of the international environment. By the same token, however, long term foreign policy projects, especially those on the grand scale, make it virtually impossible to ensure a close control over events and the greater likelihood is that those who miss the first bus will become ever more irate and insecure. The very fact of differentiation and delay will increase the possibility of the excluded looking for other protectors and/or suffering internal reactions. The great length and staccato nature of the process will also create an environment of perpetual uncertainty, to an extent counterbalanced by the discipline exerted on the candidate states through the fear of exclusion. The inevitability of changes inside the EU and differences amongst its principal member states are further factors making for an unpredictable and to some extent arbitrary process. Thus, given the complexity of the multiple issues involved, and the bargaining process over them, the problem of the external border is bound to be settled incidentally and not by strategic decision.

It is worth considering how solid a construction Europe will be in terms of its ‘hard’ external boundary at the various stages which it might go through - the first few of them by definition merely transitional. These stages are illustrated in the maps in Figure 1, on the premise of a likely first round of expansion from 15 to 20 (Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia); a second from 20 to 25 (Bulgaria, Romania, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia); and a third of Cyprus and Turkey. These are to be taken as exemplars more than firm predictions.
An EU of the 20 states suggested by Agenda 2000 would bring new frontiers with Belarus and Ukraine, as well as lengthening that with Russia and pushing the Union’s reach further towards the Balkans and south-east Europe. Slovakia would then be almost encircled by EU states, and political pressures would build up for its inclusion - a kind of domino theory in reverse (a theory, of course, so far refuted by Switzerland). The same would apply to Bulgaria and Romania, to the two remaining Baltic States, and possibly by then to the states of ex-Yugoslavia, now much more difficult to ignore after the Kosovo war. At the very least the EU’s sense of responsibility for these by now neighbouring states would be sharply heightened. Relations with Russia would become more sensitive and significant in direct proportion to this eastwards expansion.

If a combination of pressure, planning and self-fulfilling prophecies then did produce an EU of 25, with the last-mentioned five states safely on board, the geopolitical pivot of the Union would certainly shift eastwards. Albania and the remaining successor states of ex-Yugoslavia would be wholly surrounded by the EU, and the issue would arise of whether in their turn Moldova, Belarus and the Ukraine were not possible candidates for entry. If by this time the EU had indeed acquired a significant defence capability, with or without a supplanting of NATO, then we can be sure that Russia would be becoming concerned in the extreme, while Turkey - unless sure of its place in the next round, would be on the verge of alienation. Moscow and Ankara have in common the fact that they are the major losers of EU enlargement - in the sense that they are both, despite being highly significant states, unlikely ever to gain entry. In the long run their options will reduce to either accepting a place in the EU’s orbit, or seeking other protective groupings.

This analysis assumes that Cyprus will not be in the next round of enlargement, for political reasons arising out of the division of the island. If, however, Greek Cyprus is allowed in despite the lack of a settlement with the North, Turkey will become hostile unless bought off with its own accession. Either way, Turkey is certain to continue protesting at being overtaken by parvenu states and will have few incentives to lessen the tensions arising from its relations with Greece, its role in Cyprus and its abuses of human rights. Turkey’s frustrations with the EU also have the potential severely to exacerbate its existing internal political problems, and quite possibly to precipitate a crisis inside what is an important NATO member and a large neighbour of the Union. If the unlikely comes about and Turkey does itself join the EU, then geopolitics will hit home with a vengeance (see section 7b below). In 1997 the 15 EU Member-States have between them borders with twelve non-members. Enlarged to 27, that figure rather surprisingly rises only to 15, but the composition of the neighbouring group would have changed radically.
4. A Sharp or Fuzzy Border?

The geopolitical implications of expansion will differ according to whether the external border of the Union is going to be sharp, in both practical and political senses, or fuzzy - by which is meant a condition of ambiguity resulting from some insiders having opted out from some common activities and some outsiders being ever more closely associated with what the EU does. At present, with only 10 of the 15 being full members of the WEU, a history of 'footnotes' by individual Member States in foreign policy co-operation, and a number of third countries engaged in political dialogues, it is arguable that the Union presents a less than distinct image as an international actor. In the future, with long transition periods and/or special arrangements on agriculture and labour mobility having to be found for some new members, the picture could be even more complex. On the other hand the very challenge of enlargement could precipitate internal crisis and a leap forward into unity. The apparent consensus on the need to make the 'European Security and Defence Identity' more than an aspiration could be the first manifestation of such a trend.

The converse of this, however, is that if the EU system continues not to be clearly demarcated, with insiders not accepting identical obligations and some outsiders enjoying privileged access, it will be the more difficult to pull together the threads of foreign policy as a sharply defined actor in international politics. It is not clear in which direction the causation will run, or what place enlargement will play in it: will the need to cope with expansion and the external challenges entangled with it push towards greater uniformity and a sharper inside/outside split, or will the combination of internal complexity and external pressures for involvement make both the physical and the political borders of the EU less clear? The United States, for example, may favour EU enlargement but it also has no wish to see an autonomous Europe emerge in contradistinction to itself. It wishes to continue a close association between the CFSP and US foreign policy, with NATO as the major producer of security. For their part the Europeans are only too aware that for the foreseeable future they still need American troops and guarantees.

From the Russian perspective, things might look rather different. Although Moscow has so far been relatively relaxed about EU enlargement, there is no guarantee that this will remain the case. The subtleties of differentiated integration and institutional overlap might seem less important than the image of an EU expanding eastward relentlessly, apart from the certainty that it will halt at the Belarus border, excluding Belarus and Russia itself. The consequence, of a massive trading and political bloc with the potential to place a second superpower on Russia's doorstep, is unlikely to be viewed with equanimity, particularly if the United States continues to favour enlargement. Conversely, despite the putative
advantages of not stirring up Russian fear and hostility, the states between the Oder and the Don rivers are not likely to settle for anything less than full membership, and will keep pressing if they are stalled with ‘special relationships’. Whatever the risks, they will seemed outweighed by the potential gains in terms of the transfer of resources, and *perceived* protection.

The question of a hard or soft outside border is closely related to that of where the enlargement of the EU will finally stop, as it must. Until there is a sense that the geographical and cultural limits of ‘Europe’ have been reached, there will always be an uncertainty as to whether those still outside are permanent or only temporary exclusions. The sense of an unrolling EU border could provoke just as much instability as it is able to reduce through ‘the power of attraction’. Furthermore the problems of absorbing some new members are likely to go beyond temporary attacks of indigestion. While anomalies like Norway or Switzerland could easily be absorbed if they should choose to reverse current policies, Croatia, Bosnia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria or Turkey would be a completely different matter. And yet all these states have some clear claims in cultural terms to be regarded as European (as indeed does Russia), even if they do not currently qualify under the Copenhagen conditions. There will come a time, when for both internal and geopolitical reasons, the EU will have to abandon its current policy of creative ambiguity in favour of a blunt statement that ‘enlargement stops here (or there)’, explaining precisely why some states cannot be included, whatever their political and economic progress. This will be necessary if only to resolve uncertainties and lower escalating expectations. If and when it does this and many will argue on grounds of *realpolitik* for perpetual ambiguity - it will not be able to avoid geopolitical reasoning. Countries will be excluded either because they are too far away, or because they would make the EU too big, or because they would involve it in problems and quarrels which even the ironic optimists in Brussels cannot take on. There may also, in the end, be some realisation that continuing the eastwards movement of the Union could end in a more direct confrontation between Europe and the Middle East than has existed since the height of Ottoman power in 1683, and a sharper division between Europe and Russia than has arguably ever existed before. A fourteenth century encyclopaedia said that:

‘Europe begins at the river *Tanay* (Don) and stretches along the Northern Ocean to the end of Spain. The eastern and southern part rises from the so-called *Pontus* (Black Sea) and is all joined to the Great Sea (the Mediterranean) and ends at the islands of Cadiz (Gibraltar).’

In these terms the historical mould of Europe is a loose, geo-cultural one. There is a danger that too strong a push to enlarge on the part of the EU, which has, nonetheless, inherent limits and a geopolitical *non plus ultra*, will not make
the concept of Europe synonymous with the Union, but rather break Europe
damagingly in two. There will then be an 'other', alienated Europe.

5. The ‘Other’ as a Geopolitical Problem.

There can be little doubt that historically a good deal of international conflict has
revolved around the problems of scapegoating outsiders, polarising relations with
‘enemies’ and defining the ‘us’ and the ‘other’. The European Union has been
constitutionally ill-disposed towards polarisation of this kind, let alone the armed
camp syndrome which tends to be associated with it, but it cannot avoid certain
similar attributes through the very process of enlargement. The ghosts of the
division between the Roman and Orthodox churches, as well as that between
Christianity and Islam have inevitably been awoken by the flux which has
followed the Cold War and the choices which have confronted the EU in the east.
Fears have arisen that the EU will fix its external border as a way of
differentiating its culture and protecting itself from what are perceived as inimical
ways of life. Self-fulfilling prophecies could arise here to increase the sense of
threat on both sides of the EU frontier.

Rather more concrete are the fears which expansion can evoke in those
excluded, to the south as well as the east, on economic and security grounds. In
the case of the south, the issue is only indirectly connected to enlargement. That
the EU is not planning to enlarge onto the southern littoral of the Mediterranean
means at least that there is no ambiguity over membership and status. Morocco’s
expression of interest in accession was briskly rebuffed in 1987 without internal
disagreement. By the same token, the feelings of exclusion may be felt more
keenly, together with resentment at the images of the new threats from Islam and
Maghrebian emigration which are all too easily conjured up in the ‘new’ security
environment. King Hassan of Morocco openly opined that ‘[Europeans] look for
allies more ot the East, because there people are white....because it’s one big
family. And they look across the Mediterranean and say “Ah yes, it’s true, there
are those poor little people that we colonized”.

The EU naturally attempts to soften the impact of having clarified its
southern border, and to console the countries excluded with cooperation
agreements and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. Given the traditional
influence of France, Spain and Italy in the region, the combination of firm
exclusion with apparently open-ended enlargement towards the east and south­
east runs dangerously close to being seen as neo-colonialism and certainly makes
a mockery of the term ‘partnership’. Even if a commitment was made at
Barcelona to transfer to the Mediterranean non-members approximately seventy
per cent of the sums being given to the CEECs until the end of the century,
actions speak louder than words, and the implementation of transfers has turned out to be slow and tortuous. The countries of the Maghreb are well aware that the priorities of the rich northern states lie in eastern Europe, while the EU’s very concept of a clear southern border is premised on the notion of dangers which need to be kept at bay. Money has been promised on the intelligent if unsympathetic basis that young Arabs need to be given incentives to stay at home rather than seek admission, legal or otherwise, to the EU. Given this barely concealed double-think, it is hardly surprising that there is in-built resistance to European attempts to exert influence on the cheap, as with Algeria’s rejection of first Italian, then EU attempts to mediate in its civil war.

As for Russia, the sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’ is similarly never far from the surface. It is true that so far Moscow has been remarkably laid back about EU enlargement. NATO enlargement drew the Russians’ fire, and by comparison the EU’s role seemed almost benevolent. There is indeed something of a Russian interest in seeing the markets of east and central Europe develop, so long as both its own development can keep pace, allowing Russia to take advantage, and the accession of the CEECs does not lead to a damaging diversion of trade and investment. But these are big assumptions, both dubious, and it would be a mistake to assume that Russian attitudes cannot change. If the contrast becomes too marked between a large, inclusive and increasingly prosperous EU and a stagnant Russia, then the scenario of revived nationalism leading to disputes with the Baltic states and possibly other western neighbours will not seem so remote. In these circumstances it will not take much for the EU and Russia to start looking like security threats to each other, and the old realist game will have recommenced. Technical border problems will also arise when the EU frontier moves to that between Poland/Hungary and Belarus/Ukraine. The chances of this border being well-policied seem very low. It is currently highly permeable because of poor pay, training and equipment of the customs officials on both sides invites corruption. The highly organised mafias from Russia and other parts of eastern Europe are not slow to take advantage, and the consequent flows of crime and migration will be immensely hard to stem. Criminals tend to be insouciant about state boundaries wherever they are set.


This prospect leads us from the question of the general perception of opposing interests, even hostility, to that of concrete security problems. The EU cannot help but create various ‘Others’, by virtue of its existence and continued enlargement. But the nature and degree of this process is hardly inevitable. One of the factors on which it is most contingent is the degree to which the EU creates a genuine security and defence identity for itself. The Union is already seen from the
outside as secure zone - after all, that is an important reason why many wish so fervently to join it. If, however, it begins to acquire the capacity to use force, and in particular to project force externally, as wider borders brought more agonising dilemmas over humanitarian or political intervention, it would certainly sharpen the antagonisms with those still excluded, like Russia.

The EU’s emergence as a superpower, with correspondingly alarmed reactions along balance of power lines from the other powers, remains something of a doomsday scenario. Nonetheless, there remains an important security dimension to enlargement. As the security agenda has widened, encouraged but not begun by the end of the Cold War, so the range of problems which enlargement can bring the EU grows in proportion. Nor is this simply a matter of perception or language. We have already referred to the likelihood of a new, long and porous eastern frontier, with associated problems of crime and illegal immigration. The hard-won Schengen system will come under renewed pressure of both a technical and political nature once it has to be extended. It is revealing, for example, that citizens from both Bulgaria and Romania still need visas to enter the Union. The next round of accession will also bring the environmental problems still produced by old smokestack industries in eastern Europe into the Union, and create new responsibilities for protecting the peoples of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic from any future Chernobyls on their borders. The accession of Bulgaria and Romania would place the intractable problem of the ‘dying’ Black Sea on the EU’s plate. Moreover on the front of energy and the security of its supply, the eastern enlargement is likely to worsen the ratio of customers to producers within the EU. The Visegrads may have coal and lignite but they lack oil and gas. This does not matter in a period of stability and free trade, but things might look very different in the event of foreign policy crises with Russia or in the Middle East. Even a rise in the price of energy for economic or ecological reasons might cause an enlarged and more variegated EU significant problems.

If Turkey and/or the ex-Yugoslav republics were also to join the Union, these problems would be magnified further - although those citizens of the EU already playing host to substantial numbers of Albanian and Kurdish refugees might be forgiven for thinking that the external border of the EU makes little difference either way in some of these matters. Indeed, one of the strongest arguments for rapid and extensive enlargement is that the Union will have fewer problems when some of these countries are subject to the socialising effects of European integration than if they are left outside to fester. On the other hand ‘domesticating’ a large number of potentially intractable problems is hardly likely to make for a settled external frontier and geopolitical stability. It merely increases the number of potential flashpoints, depending on where the line is drawn - at Macedonia, Turkey, Israel, or the Transcaucasus. It might be added
that whereas enlargement might have neutral effects so far as the technical vulnerability to terrorism is concerned - the advantages of co-operation offsetting the greater number of sources and/or potential targets - an enlarged Europe would certainly present a high-profile and much more accessible target for anti-western groups than does the virtually island-continent of north America.

Notwithstanding these very real aspects of the new security agenda, the most important way in which enlargement raises security issues is in relation to the EU’s emerging defence dimension and to its impact upon NATO. And these questions in their turn are powerfully dependent on the reactions of the United States. Thus far the US has promoted EU enlargement with some enthusiasm. Indeed, arguably Washington has subtly and successfully incorporated the Union’s policy into its own range of foreign policy instruments, a factor which should lead all but those who regard European and American interests as inherently co-terminous, to give pause. If the United States sees EU enlargement as essential, perhaps it is because it reinforces Atlanticism more than European influence stricte sensu? The US certainly has no more wish than the already reluctant Europeans to expand NATO rapidly beyond the three members admitted in 1999 and it therefore wishes to see the Baltic and the Balkans stabilised through the use of the often satirised ‘civilian’ instruments of the EU, including that ‘power of attraction’ which is enlargement.18

So far, so good, and the Washington Summit of April 1999 even carefully endorsed in advance the EU’s move towards taking over the functions of the Western European Union, announced at the Cologne European Council the following June. Phrases like ‘the dual enlargement strategy’ and ‘combined joint task forces’ have not yet been exposed as misnomers, despite the sceptics. If, however, the European Union does make serious moves towards taking more responsibility for its own ‘defence’, in the broadest sense, then the continued rationale of NATO in Europe must come into question, and with it the role of the United States. In fact, if the future of NATO is the most crucial geopolitical question facing Europe, possibly the world over the few decades, then the enlargement of the EU will have a significant bearing on it and thus indirectly upon its own geopolitics. Things could go either way: enlargement could strengthen EU confidence and military resources, while also precipitating a great leap forward in integration - in this case NATO would be at risk, and the EU would become the major player in Eurasia; or, enlargement could so burden the EU financially and in terms of decision-making that the CFSP became even more circumscribed, with the Union turning into a vast, flabby territorial entity unable to rouse itself and even more dependent on externally provided security than before.
There are two more particular aspects of the twin current developments towards a larger and militarised EU which might prove problematical. The first is that the bigger the EU the weaker the distinction between it and the OSCE. Admittedly the latter contains Canada and the United States as well as Russia, which means that the major outside powers with an interest in European security can participate in a major forum for discussion on the continent’s international relations. But an EU which were to add ten states or so to its current size, most of them with no recent tradition of stable and independent foreign policy-making, might find itself in ever greater difficulties when confronting the need for joint actions, and resembling ever more closely the loose framework organisation (or talking shop) which is the OSCE.

The second current dilemma in the context of security and enlargement is the fate of the ‘WEU family’ if and when the WEU is absorbed into the EU. By this is meant the eighteen states which are not full members of the WEU but which are currently closely attached to it. Of these the five ‘neutrals’ already inside the EU need not detain us, except to note that if in practice they turn out not to have renounced fully their distinctive foreign policy traditions they will dilute the CFSP even more obviously than at present, and blur the distinction between insiders and outsiders. Likewise two of the three Associate Members of WEU, that is Iceland and Norway, will continue their current co-operation with the EU and NATO almost whatever happens, unless enlargement transforms the former into something unrecognisable. The problems really arise with the third Associate Member, Turkey, and with all the Associate Partners. These states have become used to being closely involved in WEU discussions, and indeed by extension with CFSP. If the EU is really to start down the road to militarisation, albeit in close association with NATO, then this might be manageable for the states on the verge of entering the Union, and accepting its acquis politique, namely the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Estonia and Slovenia - particularly since the first three are now in NATO. But it would be much more problematical to allow Turkey in on CFSP discussions given Greek concerns, and to give the other Baltic and Balkan states privileged access given the historical preference for restricting the CFSP to members of the EU. Anything short of rapid and wholesale enlargement would therefore leave a significant group of states rather more cast loose from European security co-operation than they have been in the recent past.

7. Special Sensitivities

The analysis above has already referred frequently to the three main potential sources of hostile reaction to EU enlargement on geopolitical grounds, namely Russia, the Maghreb and Turkey. But it is worth attempting to be more specific
about the extent to which problems are likely to arise on all three fronts, in both the short and the long terms.

(a) Russia

For Russia the enlargement of NATO and of the EU puts an end for the foreseeable future to the role in east and central Europe which she has enjoyed for the last 250 years. In consequence the Poles may feel safe at last from further partitions. In its relatively enfeebled condition, modern Russia has few means of obstructing EU enlargement, but that does not mean that the process will not cause problems for both sides. There can be little doubt that Moscow's already important relations with Belarus and the Ukraine will become ever more critical as Russia seeks to attenuate a perceived isolation, leading either to heightened tension (the Polish-Ukrainian relationship has already developed at Moscow's expense) or to an embattled sense of bloc unity. As for the Baltic States, it would not be surprising were Russia to grow uneasy about their possible EU entry, and conflicts could easily widen over the questions of the Russian minorities, and of Kaliningrad. The EU will need to show a high degree of sensitivity and skill in its relations with Russia over enlargement if it is not to add a major new difficulty to its external relations.

This also particularly relates to the Balkans, where Russian policy has all too evidently diverged from that of the western Europeans in recent years. It was something of a triumph for the new multilateralism that Russia was kept on board to the extent that it was during the end-game over Bosnia, but all the incipient tensions emerged over Kosovo in 1998-99. Although not now physically contiguous with the states of south Eastern Europe, Russia can still wield considerable influence in the region, as some of its decision-makers were keen to demonstrate at Pristina airport at the end of the Kosovo war. Through the taking of new responsibilities in this, the bear-pit of twentieth century Europe, through the new Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, and hints of rapid accession for helpful states, the EU has created a moving border zone for itself in Balkans, and one which is both atomised and unstable.

It is impossible to say whether the states of the Balkans will or should be able to enter the EU inside the next two decades, and, if so, in what order. What is certain is that the interplay between the seven of them, pivoting around the question of enlargement will be of critical importance to both Russia and the EU, and it will present major obstacles to their mutual relations. In this process bilateral problems, like those between Hungary and Roumania, Greece and Macedonia, Albania and Yugoslavia will no doubt continue to figure prominently. The EU will not be a bystander; indeed its policies and instruments will have an important impact on outcomes. But given that there is going to be no
wholesale movement of the EU’s border to the west coast of the Black Sea, but rather, at best, a faltering and contested series of particular changes, the geopolitical consequences will be particularly unclear. The EU is going to need the OSCE, the Stability Pact, the PfP, and more, if it is to move its border through the Balkans in a controlled and peaceful manner.

\( b \) Turkey

Despite the importance of the Balkans, Turkey is potentially the most serious geopolitical issue raised by enlargement. It is the country which holds the most critical strategic position of all the candidates for accession, poised as it is between Europe and the world’s most turbulent region, the Middle East. As a long-time (and valued) member of NATO on Russia’s southern flank, its ‘loss’ to the West would cause the most serious policy repercussions even today. And yet Turkey has aspired longer than any other candidate (since 1964) to enter the EC/EU, and its chances are still remote. The states of western Europe want good relations with Ankara, and they want to encourage the forces of democracy and modernisation in that country. Yet they fear the prospect of Turkey’s accession, for a whole range of reasons, which include foreign policy despite the fact that factors such as size, human rights and income levels are usually given far more prominence.

With Turkey the EU is really damned if it does and damned if it doesn’t. If a benevolent view were to be taken of the economic and demographic problems Turkey presents, and the prospect of its membership were to become real, then the EU would run straight into a set of foreign policy issues of even greater magnitude. Does it wish to be directly implicated - as opposed to involving itself by choice, as is the present case - in the politics of the southern Caucasus, the Levant and Mesopotamia? Turkish entry would give the EU long, unmanageable frontiers with three of the world’s most problematic states in Iran, Iraq, and Syria (to say nothing of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan), to add to those further north. If, on the other hand, it is made clear to Turkey that accession will not be possible in the foreseeable future, then bitter disappointment and alienation will probably follow. Indeed, Ankara has drawn its own conclusions in recent years and has already made various moves in directions other than the EU - in the first place towards Transcaucasia, and subsequently into a closer relationship with Israel. The Turks themselves take the question of EU membership very seriously and are perfectly capable of seeing through the various EU prevarications. If the most likely outcome in the medium term is that Turkey will remain outside an EU that continues to enlarge in eastern Europe, while being subject to an intermittent charm offensive (of which the latest manifestation is the revival at the Helsinki Council in December 1999 of the idea of Turkey’s ‘eligibility’ for membership), its reactions cannot be taken for granted.
The problem would be more manageable if one could assume a stable, strategically calculating government in Ankara. Unfortunately the issue of EU membership is intimately tied to that of the very identity of Turkey - secular modernity v. fundamentalist self-assertion - and by extension to internal political struggles of some ferocity. The EU is willy-nilly a player in these struggles. It is by no means inconceivable that the exclusion of Turkey from the EU, and anger over the preferences being shown to other ‘eastern’ states, could inflict severe damage on the standing of the pro-Western domestic parties, and by extension on Turkey-EU relations.

Petrol has been thrown on the fire in this respect by the way that the EU has played the Cyprus card, thereby apparently acceding to Greek wishes to put pressure on Turkey. Insofar as the move has been clearly thought through by the European Council (which is to be doubted), the decision to open negotiations with Cyprus six months after the end of the IGC was a calculated risk in order to break the deadlock over the partition of the island. And to some extent there have been gratifying moves over the last year towards better Greek-Turkish relations. But it is a very high risk gamble indeed. Turkey holds all the cards over northern Cyprus itself, and has little incentive to change the status quo, apart from - as the EU reasons - its desire not to see Greek Cyprus join the EU on its own. The leverage of the EU is in fact much more limited than it appears. If Ankara calls the bluff, and threatens a serious intra-mural crisis in the western alliance, the EU will find it difficult to admit Greek Cyprus without a prior settlement, despite the economic grounds for so doing. It will then have stirred up all parties to the dispute for little gain; indeed, another war over Cyprus or in the Aegean cannot be ruled out, and the prospect of enlargement could conceivably be the trigger.

The question of island states is of little geopolitical importance in itself (although micro-members pose major problems for the European institutions); Crete, Sicily and Sardinia are simply not international problems. Malta in or out of the EU is a distinction without a difference. Difficulties only arise when there are disputed jurisdictions, whether in the Aegean, or over the rightful home of Northern Ireland. In this context, Cyprus represents a major historical stalemate, and the general process of enlargement has added a dangerously unpredictable element to the inflammable cocktail. As Keith Kyle has said, ‘by decision of the EU the alarm clock is ticking over the Cyprus Problem’.  

(c) The Maghreb

Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia represent the same danger to the EU as Turkey does, namely the consequences of neglect, but not to the same degree or with the same strategic importance. That this is so at least at the level of perceptions is indicated by the relative indifference shown by both policy-makers and publics to
the current slaughter in Algeria, where deaths since 1991 amount to almost half the total killed in all the Balkan conflicts over the same period. A war like that in Algeria - the second in forty years - is important for its spillover of terrorism into France, and for the extra impetus it gives to migration into the southern European states and thereby the whole European Union. The same is true of structural problems like poverty, population growth and political instability. The EU states see that they have to do what they can to encourage the peoples of north Africa to be contented in their own countries if they are to discourage the pressure of illegal immigration and the export of indigenous conflicts with them.

Otherwise, this important part of Braudel’s ‘Mediterranean world’, a single geopolitical space going back to the Greeks and the Phoenicians, is seen as containable. Spain, Italy and France are particularly anxious to promote ‘Mediterranean security’ through ideas such as the Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean (abortive) and the Barcelona Process (still alive). This is conflict prevention rather than conflict management, and it is arguably having a modest success. The fears of the early 1990s about an ‘Islamic’ threat sweeping up from the South have quietly subsided, and there seems no imminent prospect of a rash of small Irans springing up along the north African coast. Islam’s presence through the headscarves of French schoolgirls is a more concrete political issue than the potential hostility of fundamentalist regimes in the Maghreb - whether because of the electoral intervention of the Algerian generals or despite it. Even the riddle wrapped in a mystery which is Qaddafi’s Libya has begun to come in from the cold.

This is not to say that the current regimes in the region are inviolable, or that the EU’s evident preoccupation with eastern Europe might not have some damaging effects on potentially friendly governments struggling to explain to their ever more youthful populations why the CAP and the Single Market only damage their livelihoods incidentally, and not by design. The problems which the EU faces in north Africa may seem at present largely historical and moral, but fundamentally they arise from one of the more world’s more clear-cut geopolitical fault-lines - between a homogeneous rich northern littoral and the poor but aspirant southern littoral, part of the world’s poorest continent and representing very different cultural and political traditions. What is more, given that enlargement is not available in this zone as a policy option, as a way of managing difference, the contrast must be faced directly. This means attempts at creating inclusive but ultimately limited processes like Barcelona, but also, inevitably, seeing north Africa as a question of foreign policy. Whatever the justice of the matter, the pressures from that region cannot but be regarded as of a different order from those deriving from states whose right to become part of the EU community has already been conceded.
The Shape of Future Europe?

In all the expert discussions of the details of enlargement, it is easy to forget the big picture: what kind of Europe will we end up with? What will it look like to outsiders, to geopoliticians in Beijing and Washington, to historians in the future, indeed to ourselves? Will it seem overbearing, and expansionist, or unwieldy and overstretched? An octopus or a giraffe? Is it moving towards territorial cohesion and defensibility, or are these very notions unnecessary in a post-modern age, where the kind of border problems represented by Danzig, Suez and East Pakistan are now only distant memories?

Even in this age of the new geopolitics, however, realism is far from dead, and the EU has to take it into account. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, believe that Bosnia is unsustainable and should have been partitioned. Even those who stop short of such bluntness accept that the Dayton settlement is inherently fragile, just as it will prove extremely difficult to reconstitute the Cyprus of the 1960 agreement. The EU itself has so far managed to avoid the dilemmas posed by realism, both in terms of its own foreign policy and the perceptions of others. Given that it is a multi-level foreign policy system which currently eschews military action, it neither wishes to constitute a ‘power’ in the world or to be seen as such.

The EU’s role in the world is, however, in constant evolution, and we may now be verging on a situation where the member states will make a commitment to a common defence capability and to more independence from NATO. If this is the case, then enlargement will have an even greater geopolitical resonance than has been suggested thus far. The nature of that impact will depend on two things in particular. The first is the pace of enlargement. It is by no means clear how quickly it might accelerate after the next round of accessions, which might be completed by 2005. On geopolitical grounds there are strong arguments for going slowly so as to give outsiders time to adjust to the new size and shape of the EU, both those sore at being excluded and those who can never hope to be members. On the other hand, the dragging of feet on promises once made creates bitterness and uncertainty, and what seems rapid to existing members can seem funereal to those waiting in the ante-room.

The second key variable in the interplay between enlargement and geopolitics is size. How big will the EU eventually be? Will it ever be possible to say that its boundary is final? What are the desirable stages of enlargement and how far should each be regarded as more a stepping-stone to an eventual imagined entity than a way of expressing Europe’s international presence in its own right? We have already considered, with the help of the maps in Figure 1, the possibilities of the EU expanding further but becoming becalmed at a number of
different points - 20, 25, 27 or almost anything in between, depending on individual states’ situations. Moreover size is likely to be related to effectiveness, both in terms of the degrees of supranationality engendered to cope with enlargement, and the international resources generated through economies of scale. The variables of pace, size and effectiveness combined make for many possible scenarios for the future of the EU in the world system. Of these four may be picked out as the most interesting:

- A large and loose EU, relatively quickly achieved. The pace of this transformation would complicate the international system considerably, but without giving the EU much extra ability to resolve problems or to pursue its interests. Indeed, because the Thatcherite model of intergovernmentalism would essentially have prevailed, the external capabilities of the Union might well turn out to have been diminished (not, ironically, an end which any British government would wish).

- A large, tighter EU, achieved within decades is perhaps the least likely outcome. This would, in effect, create a new superpower without civil war, and presumably without international war in the short term. Whether the very existence of another superpower to rival the United States (and possibly others by then) would add to the long-term stability of the international system as realists like Kenneth Waltz, and believers in the EU’s inherently peaceful intent, might both argue, must be open to argument. It would constitute the largest impact it is possible to imagine the EU having on the wider international system.

- An EU of only limited enlargement and progressive supranationalism would also be an important actor in international politics. It would pose serious questions for at least the United States and Russia, not least because the EU would inevitably have to assume full responsibility for its own defence. The issues of identity and purpose would also be central to the debates which would presumably proceed pari passu on the nature of both the EU polity and its world role.

- An EU of both limited enlargement and stalled integration would either stay as it currently is, that is with a CFSP interdependent with NATO and other organisations, and no autonomous military capacity (which many would regard as the most responsible outcome from the international point of view), [and]/or it would become preoccupied with internal conflicts over the reasons for the lack of change.
The EU wishes, in foreign policy as in trade policy, to be both a strong negotiating presence and a community open to the world and to international cooperation. This combination, perhaps also a contradiction, has led it both to undertake responsibilities for its liberated European cousins and to hesitate over the implementation of enlargement. From the viewpoint of strategic action it may seem too late now to do more than slow down the process and to damp down unreasonably raised expectations, but in practice there are still many hard choices to be made over enlargement, in relation to the countries chosen, to the pace of their admission and to the ultimate borders of the EU. In this the geopolitical dimension, that is, the effects on outsiders and on the structure of the world system, has too often been neglected or obscured, with the result that we now find ourselves in a catch-22, whereby both large-scale enlargement and any decision to slow it down have the potential to destabilise the EU’s rimland.

Ultimately the citizens of the European Union have to decide whether they need collectively to be a major actor in world politics like the United States, with all the advantages and disadvantages that implies, or whether they are willing to settle for an EU near the centre of a network of international processes but without the ability to have a decisive impact on matters affecting security and the pattern of international order. It is not mere chance that this potentially explosive issue has barely surfaced thus far. The progress of enlargement, however, will bring it inexorably into the open.

Christopher Hill
London school of Economics
and Political Sciences


ENDNOTES

1 I am grateful to Jan Zielonka and William Wallace for comments on this chapter, and to Jane Pugh of the London School of Economic’s Drawing Office for help with the maps.

2 For a discussion of the differences between borders, boundaries and frontiers, see the chapters by William Wallace and Charles Maier in this volume. The term ‘borders’ is used as the reference point here, as it refers to the zone encompassing the exact boundary between states, and thus has a technical as well as a legal meaning.

3 Examples of these different kinds of challenges are the books by Jan Aart Scholte, *International Relations of Social Change* (Buckingham: the Open University Press, 1993), David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: from the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance* (Cambridge: the Polity Press, 1995), and Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) – although Wendt to some extent comes full circle by showing how some boundaries, both conceptual and political, are both inevitable and desirable (eg pp193-245, and pp211-14).

4 ‘Incidentally’, because the arrival at a new external border will be more a consequence than an intention of the enlargement process, which has arguably been driven on by a series of myopic piecemeal decisions, and been motivated more by general concerns about stability than by any clear geopolitical strategy.

5 The refrain ‘where are we going?’ was common among French soldiers in the Phoney War, impatient at being thrown this way and that by the tide of war, and without leadership from their generals. It can and should be asked by all those who make great decisions without necessarily thinking through (or owning up to) their implications. See Christopher Hill, “‘Where are we going?’ International Relations and the voice from below’, *Review of International Studies* (1999), 25, pp107-122.

6 Other implications are the impact of new members on decision-making, and on the resources available for external relations, and the changing image of the EU. But almost everything comes down in the end to the question of where the borders settle down, and who is included/excluded.

7 See also Robert Cooper, *The Post-Modern State and the World Order* (London: Demos Paper no.19, 1996). Cooper sees the EU as a post-modern polity but is not so idealist about the idea of openness to the world. For a series of commentaries on his ideas, including the thoughts of the present author see *Guerra e pace nel nuovo ordine internazionale* (Rome: Arel Informazioni, 3/98).

8 The reassertion of interest in the Mediterranean, with a ‘societal security’ perspective, dates from the Barcelona Process agreed in November 1995. The Common Strategy on Russia was launched at the Cologne Summit in June 1999. See presidency Conclusions, 3-4 June 1999, Annex II.

9 In the Cologne Summit, *ibid.*, Annex III.


11 Turkey and Cyprus are bracketed together, even though the latter is currently being considered for entry in the next round of enlargement, because their fates are inextricably intertwined and it seems improbable that decisions on the entry of either can be insulated from matters of geopolitics.

12 *Agenda 2000* was the document produced by the Commission in 1997 to set out the EU’s strategy, in particular towards enlargement, for the medium term. See *Bulletin of the European Union, Supplement 5/97*.

13 *Pace* Samuel Huntington, who argued in *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996, pp158-163), that the historical divide
between the churches of Rome and Byzantium reverberates in the conflicts. In his view: 'The
civilizational paradigm [thus] provides a clear-cut and compelling answer to the question
confronting West Europeans: Where does Europe end? Europe ends where Western Christianity
ends and Islam and Orthodoxy begin. This is the answer which West Europeans want to hear...'

Helmut Kohl’s foreign policy adviser Wolfgang Schäuble has made similar points in various
public speeches.


15 In an interview with the Financial Times, 28 October 1994, cited in Jan Zielonka, Explaining
euro-Paralysis: Why Europe is Unable to Act in International Politics (London: Macmillan,
1998) p77.

16 See Esther Barbé and Ferran Izquierdo, ‘Present and Future of Joint Actions for the
Mediterranean Region’ in Martin Holland (Ed.), Common Foreign and Security Policy: the
Record and Reforms (London: Pinter, 1997); also Nicola Minasi, I Rapporti tra L’Unione
Europea ed il Maghreb dalla politica Mediterranea al Partenariato, (Rome: LUISS Working

17 In the tragic events in Algeria over the last decade the EU has managed to alienate both sides,
first by failing to condemn the over-turning of a democratic election result and then by gradually
distancing itself from the government’s determination to match the rebels capacity for terror and
atrocity. For the difficulties of understanding the war in Algeria, let alone influencing it from the
outside, see the articles by Claire Spencer and Marc Marginedas in The World Today,
August/September 1998, Vol. 54, No. 8-9, pp 203-206

18 The phrase is Gabriel Munera’s in his Preventing Armed Conflict in Europe: Lessons from
Recent Experience, Chaillot Papers 15/16, Western European Union Institute for Security

19 The five (now six)-member Contact Group was invented in 1994 largely so as to be able to
prevent Russia’s alienation over the Balkans, and it implicitly acknowledged that neither NATO
nor the CFSP were sufficient instruments for diplomacy in the region. David Owen, Balkan

20 On the importance of Russia over Kosovo see Paul Rogers, ‘Lessons to Learn’, The World
Today 55, 8/9, August/September 1999, pp 4-6.


22 Probably more than 100,000 people have been killed in Algeria, an astonishing figure given
that full-scale civil war has not broken out. In the Balkans, about 230,000 people have died in
the 1990s, the majority in Bosnia. I am grateful to Malcolm Madden of the Royal Institute of
International Affairs library for help with these figures.


24 The Anglo-French summit in London on 25 November 1999, for example, announced the
creation of a joint rapid reaction force of 6000 men so as to facilitate the development of the
independent European defence capabilities heralded at Cologne the previous June.
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