



European Union Public Policy, Transatlantic Relations, the US Foreign Policy and the Global Peace

¹Sujoy Kumar Saha

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Indian Institute of Engineering Science and Technology, Shibpur
Howrah 711103, West Bengal, INDIA

¹Corresponding Author

Date of Submission: 04-08-2023

Date of Acceptance: 17-08-2023

ABSTRACT: *European Union public policy, Transatlantic Relations and the US Foreign Policy have been dealt with in this paper. The EU Internal–External Security Nexus is important. Soft Power, European Security Strategy and Radicalism: Cultural, Religious and Dimensional Challenges; The Strategic Context of the European Security and Defence Policy; Securitization: Theoretical Underpinnings and Implications; Small EU Member States and the European Security and Defence Integration have been dealt with. Next comes the Operations: From the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) to the European External Action Service (EEAS). Last but not the least the important issue is EU vis-a-vis Russia and Transatlantic Challenges: Russia’s Challenges to International Security and the Western Response: Moscow’s Objectives in the Middle East; West v. Russia: A Role for Diplomacy; Transatlantic Relations at a Time of Uncertainty: The Formation of Transatlantic Axis; Augmenting European Security and Defence: A Multiple Challenge for the EU; and NATO Security Challenges.*

KEYWORDS: *European Union; Transatlantic Relation; Public Policy; European Parliament, US, Russia, Ukraine.*

I. INTRODUCTION: TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS, UNCERTAINTY, UKRAINE, CRISES IN EU-US RELATIONS

There is strong evidence to suggest that EU-US relations are weakening. This is partly a consequence of the EU’s own internal policies, as it becomes more unified and autonomous of the US in some areas, while fragmenting in others. Most importantly, it is a consequence of the two actors’ increasingly diverging perspectives and positions on international issues, institutions, norms and indeed the value of the transatlantic relationship as such. It is likely that the cracks in the foundation of transatlantic relations will continue. No other regions of the world are as closely connected in

economics, security and politics as Europe and the US. The question of US-EU relations has become very important. Some of the core principles are transatlantic relations since the Second World War. This includes the US defence guarantee, open trade relations and the support for multilateral institutions and agreements such as the Paris accord on climate change and the Iran nuclear accord. We call the four types of relationships 1) An emerging EU super power, 2) Unraveling of transatlantic relations, 3) US hegemony and 4) Differentiated relations.

On the one hand, we might be witnessing a *weakening of EU-US relations*. Notwithstanding the deep economic, strategic, and value based ties between the EU and the US, transatlantic relations are facing a number of severe challenges. US foreign policies are now more Asia-centric diverting attention and resources away from Europe. For US actors concerned with defence policy, the Ukraine crisis, recent terror attacks and the war in Syria support a view that the EU does not spend enough resources on security. Areas of economic cooperation also reveal contentious splits.

It might however also be that the EU member states are not able to unify in response to crisis, but instead are becoming more *fragmented* in their responses to contemporary challenges. Cooperation among EU member states within EU institutions can be a thorny undertaking. In light of all the crises that have beset the EU in recent years, realist observers have in particular pointed to the EU’s inability to act and criticized its lack of appropriate joint policy-responses to contemporary challenges such as external migration or a changing international security landscape ‘divide and conquer’, as we have seen on issues linked to access to natural resources. If not coordinated in the EU, special relationships between the US and some member states might also contribute to internal EU fragmentation. Following a liberal intergovernmentalist approach, one may also



expect strengthened ties to form between the two owing to economic interdependencies and common interests in the face of financial challenges. A second key pillar of the transatlantic relationship is the multilateral, international institutional and normative order, established after the Second World War by the US and evident in particular within the UN framework. The pertinent questions are 1) Is the EU unified vis-a-vis the US in its dealing with crises, or are the EU member states becoming more fragmented in their response? 2) To what extent are US and EU relations strengthening or weakening in different fields? It is interesting to find evidence to suggest that *EU-US relations are weakening in the context of contemporary crises and a changing US administration*. This weakening of EU-US relations is partly a consequence of the EU's own internal policies. The United States and Ukraine have a bilateral investment treaty. U.S. exports to Ukraine include coal, machinery, vehicles, agricultural products, fish and seafood, and aircraft. U.S. imports from Ukraine include iron and steel, inorganic chemicals, oil, iron and steel products, aircraft, and agricultural products.

II. DISCUSSION

What implications does all of this hold for the transatlantic relationship? Will Europe's significance for American policymakers increase or diminish in the future? Should Washington refocus its attention on Europe as a key partner, the question arises whether it will prioritize engagement with the European Union, NATO, or perhaps a novel amalgamation of the two to shape a fresh agenda.

Evidently, the trajectory of future transatlantic cooperation appears to extend beyond Europe's confines, hinging upon the United States and the EU's collaborative capabilities in addressing forthcoming challenges rather than dwelling on historical matters. While it is undeniable that a substantial agenda necessitating attention exists within Europe – such as cementing Balkan stability, aligning a democratic Ukraine with Western values, countering Russia's tilt toward authoritarianism, and extending influence in the Black Sea region – the linchpin of strategic significance remains steadfastly on counterterrorism efforts and fostering constructive transformations in the broader Middle East. This stance is compounded by the imperatives of managing relations with Asia and navigating the inevitable rise of China in the future.

Over the past decade, substantial shifts have occurred in how the EU addresses the evolving nature of its security dilemmas. Navigating this terrain, the EU and its member states have been compelled to adopt a comprehensive approach to these challenges, recognizing their interconnectedness, and intertwining external and internal dimensions of security.

The concept of 'securitization' has been introduced with the aim of highlighting the creation of shared understandings through discursive processes that identify a threat and subsequently rationalize exceptional actions. This chapter delves into the role of this concept within the realm of international relations, particularly in the field of security studies. It provides an encompassing view of its theoretical roots and challenges, encompassing various perspectives such as constructivist, critical, and post-structural, both within and beyond the Copenhagen School.

Securitization primarily revolves around security as a form of speech act, intertwined with the conditions that either facilitate or hinder its occurrence. Nonetheless, this notion demands further exploration, often entailing diverse interpretations of its theoretical essence, functions, and underlying ontological foundations. Intriguing examples arise, including viewing securitization as an ideal archetype or as a factor influencing the nexus between security and identity, extending its reach beyond a mere speech act.

In essence, the discourse surrounding securitization has rejuvenated the field of security studies, fostering a multifaceted dialogue concerning its intricacies. This discourse mirrors the varied trajectory of international relations theory, infusing new vitality into the ongoing exploration of securitization and its nuanced attributes.

European security stands as a pivotal focus within the EU's overarching strategic framework, as it grapples with the rise of Islamic radicalism. This endeavor hinges on innovative strategies, running parallel, to optimize outcomes. The EU wields soft power as a tool to bolster the fusion of external and internal security, fostering connections across faiths and laying the groundwork for mutual comprehension.

The bedrock of this approach lies in internal equilibrium, a prerequisite for constructing robust and efficient cores aimed at addressing the fundamental drivers of radicalization. The challenges at hand are far from one-dimensional; rather, they emerge from a complex interplay of cultural, cognitive, religious, historical, and



institutional factors. This chapter delves into these factors, assessing their impact on the EU's capacity to contain multifaceted threats.

The landscape in which the EU aims to fulfill its role as a safeguard for its citizens, both within its borders and in its surrounding regions, has undergone a profound transformation in recent years. A blend of external pressures and internal dynamics has forged an exceptionally intricate backdrop, compelling EU governments to transition from the relatively passive prosperity experienced in the early 2000s to the exacting agenda of the Defence and Security Union, championed by the European Commission.

A focal point of extensive research concerning small states within the EU revolves around the security and defense policies of these nations in the Union. This focus is well-founded, given that the interests and influence of smaller member states can markedly differ from those of their larger counterparts, leading to divergent strategies. With the notable advancements made by the Juncker Commission in integrating security and defence efforts, this chapter aims to pinpoint the novel challenges and prospects confronting small EU member states.

To achieve this goal, the chapter amalgamates existing studies on the involvement of small EU member states in European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), while also delving into primary sources. The initial segment assesses the evolution of security and defence integration within the EU. Subsequently, the chapter delves into the principal debates embedded within the literature concerning small EU member states' roles in ESDP/CSDP. Building upon the insights derived from these discussions, the final segment outlines the fresh array of challenges and opportunities that these smaller member states encounter in the realm of security and defence.

EU peace operations stand as a pivotal and highly influential force for stabilizing regions on both regional and global security scales. These endeavors not only showcase the EU's capacity to present an alternative to traditional unilateral interventions but also underscore its role as a purveyor of soft power and peace. Rooted in the EU's longstanding commitment to multilateral actions, these outcomes underscore its unwavering support for the established UN-led world order.

This chapter delves into the intricacies of the EU's operational strategies, its collaborative framework with the UN, and the rationale behind this partnership. It examines the EU's adeptness at

formalizing multilateralism through institutional means, outlines nominal evaluation criteria, and conducts a multifaceted assessment that considers complementary aspects with the UN and the EU's tangible capabilities.

The EU's global role finds expression through its engagement in international military endeavors, amidst a landscape fraught with challenges. Within this context, this chapter delves into intricately interconnected factors that influence the EU's efficacy as it leverages the tools within its institutional framework. European defence, its advancement or lack thereof, significantly impacts the operations of the European External Action Service (EEAS), while the advent of Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) lays the groundwork for more coordinated actions.

The optimization of each member state's capabilities, molded into a cohesive instrument of action, will ultimately define the EU's international role. The linchpin lies in the manner in which decisions regarding overseas military deployment are made domestically, and the extent to which EU institutions and national parliaments collaboratively facilitate the intricate political and institutional processes within the realm of defence.

The European Union (EU) has confronted a shifting landscape of security challenges in recent decades, catalyzing an imperative for institutional evolution. The past fluctuations in EU member states' endeavors to cultivate and fortify the Common Foreign and Security Policy were mirrored in the nascent institutional framework that took shape, particularly during the 2000s. Nevertheless, the inception of the European External Action Service (EEAS) signifies a definitive departure from prior inconsistencies. It stands as a testament to the EU member states' aspiration to enhance the Union's multi-faceted external engagement by creating a distinct and comprehensive institution. The EEAS has grappled with the intricate task of encompassing a spectrum of policies bearing foreign and security implications, all while navigating disputes and turf battles concerning the extent and effectiveness of its endeavors.

This article asserts that the EEAS embodies a 'dynamic hybridity logic', fostering the development of targeted collaborative arrangements designed to enhance or refine the execution of EU external actions. These arrangements ingeniously involve diverse services and resources from other sectors of EU policy, thereby fostering a more holistic and coordinated approach.



Presently, the European Union and the United States are pursuing distinct yet parallel security strategies. One rests on unilateralism, asserting the prerogative to pre-emptively strike perceived national security threats, while the other is rooted in a multilateral framework grounded in international law and institutions. Albeit both share concerns regarding rogue states and terrorist entities, a notable similarity emerges: both the European Security Strategy (ESS) and the U.S. National Security Strategy (NSS) arguably fall short in devising effective strategies to address these challenges.

The conflict against terrorism is inherently ideological, pitting non-state actors against states. Yet, both the U.S. and the EU seem reluctant to fully grapple with the realm of information and intelligence-led warfare. Rather than solely relying on tactics such as the American 'shock-and-awe' approach—largely proven counterproductive—or the somewhat disjointed European response, a more potent alternative could involve targeted intelligence operations, focusing on individuals and leveraging effective intelligence. Moreover, an extended media campaign could entail engaging Islamist propagandists by utilizing the tenets of Islam against their messages. This approach holds promise for achieving more constructive outcomes than the existing strategies employed by either side.

FRONTEX has stood as a central pillar within the EU's multi-layered approach to fortifying a comprehensive security framework across Europe. Its dynamic evolution has been pivotal in the EU's endeavors to address emerging threats on its periphery, and in turn, assess and augment its responsive capabilities. However, FRONTEX's operations have encountered a multitude of challenges stemming from diverse origins. This very complexity underscores the indispensability of coordination as a tool to achieve the desired policy outcomes.

Russian foreign policy in the Middle East has not merely disrupted the regional order; it has also fundamentally challenged the geostrategic landscape in the region. This engagement has introduced a novel dynamic to the regional security equation, impacting the equilibrium of power and interests. The domestic underpinnings of Russia's involvement play an instrumental role in elucidating its international conduct. This dimension furnishes an organizational and cognitive link, binding the imperative of leadership to validate decisions, terms of engagement, and competitors.

III. EUROPEAN UNION PUBLIC POLICY

European Union has a unique institutional set-up and its decision-making system constantly evolves. It has 7 bodies and more than 30 decentralized agencies working across the EU for common interests of the European people. In addition, 20 more EU agencies and organizations run its administration to carry out specific legal functions and its 4 inter-institutional services support the institutions. All the EU establishments play specific roles varying as widely as developing EU laws to implementing policies and working on specialist areas like health, medicine, transport and the environment.

4 main decision-making institutions of the EU lead its administration and they collectively provide the EU with policy direction playing different roles in the law-making process:

- the European Parliament (Brussels/Strasbourg/Luxembourg)
- the European Council (Brussels)
- the Council of the European Union (Brussels/Luxembourg)
- the European Commission (Brussels/Luxembourg/Representations across the EU)

The work of the EU is further complemented by

- the Court of Justice of the European Union (Luxembourg)
- the European Central Bank (Frankfurt)
- the European Court of Auditors (Luxembourg)

European Parliament

- **Role:** Directly-elected EU body with legislative, supervisory, and budgetary responsibilities
- **Members:** 705 MEPs (Members of the European Parliament)
- **President:** Elected
- **Established in:** 1952 as Common Assembly of the European Coal and Steel Community, 1962 as European Parliament, first direct elections in 1979
- **Location:** Strasbourg (France), Brussels (Belgium), Luxembourg
- **Website:** [European Parliament](http://www.europarl.europa.eu)

The European Parliament is the EU's **law-making body**. It is **directly elected by EU voters** every 5 years. The last election was held in May 2019.



The Parliament has 3 main roles:

Legislative, Supervisory and Budgetary.

Parliament's work comprises two main stages: Committees and Plenary Sessions. If one wants to **ask the Parliament to act** on a certain issue, one can petition it (either by post or online).

European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS)

The European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) is an EU agency that analyses foreign, security and defence policy issues.

The EUISS aims to:

- foster a common security culture in the EU
- help develop and project the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)
- support the drafting and projection of EU foreign policy
- contribute to debate on security strategy inside and outside Europe.

Its core mission is to provide analysis and organize discussion forums to help formulate EU policy. In carrying out that mission, it also acts as an interface between European experts and decision makers at all levels.

Together the US and EU dominate global trade, they play the leading roles in international diplomacy and military strength. What each one says matters a great deal to much of the rest of the world. Both the US and the majority of EU member states are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Energy and sustainability The US and EU cooperate on the topic of energy and sustainability. The general aim of both parties is to liberalize and enhance sustainability in the global energy markets.

Defense contracts

EU-US summits

Boeing and Airbus subsidies

Genetically modified food

Genetically modified food is another significant area of disagreement between the two. The EU has been under domestic pressure to restrict the growth and import of genetically modified foods until their safety is proven to the satisfaction of the populace.

International Criminal Court Kyoto Protocol

The European Union is one of the main backers of the Kyoto Protocol, which aims to combat global warming. The United States which initially signed the protocol at its creation during the Clinton Administration, never had the measure ratified by the United States Senate, an essential requirement to give the protocol the force of law in the United States. Later, in March 2001, under President George W. Bush, the United States removed its signature from the protocol, leading to much acrimony between the United States and European nations. In 2008, President Barack Obama said that he planned on setting annual targets to reduce emissions, although this doesn't include the Kyoto Protocol—likely because developing nations are exempt.

Visa waiver reciprocity

The EU is requesting from the US reciprocity regarding the visa waiver program for all its members. The European Union has threatened with the possibility of imposing visas for American citizens that would extend to the entire EU, excluding France in respect of its Outermost Regions, and Ireland, which operate visa policies distinct from the Schengen acquis. In 2008, many of the EU's new Central European members were granted visa-free access to the US, and currently, three out of 27 EU members (Bulgaria, Cyprus, and Romania) lack such access..

Centre for European Studies, A Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence :

The Center for European Studies (CES) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill advances understanding of the social, political, and economic events that shape contemporary Europe.

Transatlantic Relations... Ukraine

The United States and Ukraine have a bilateral investment treaty. U.S. exports to Ukraine include coal, machinery, vehicles, agricultural products, fish and seafood, and aircraft. U.S. imports from Ukraine include iron and steel, inorganic chemicals, oil, iron and steel products, aircraft, and agricultural products..

Since January 2021, the United States has invested \$ several billion in security assistance to demonstrate the US enduring and steadfast commitment to Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. U.S. Government assistance to Ukraine aims to support the development of a democratic, prosperous, and secure Ukraine, fully integrated



into the Euro-Atlantic community. Bilateral Relations Fact Sheet can be consulted.

European Union (EU) policies work towards ensuring the free movement of people, goods, services and capital in the member countries; enacting legislation in justice and home affairs; and maintaining common trade, agriculture, fisheries and regional development policies. EU aims at upholding and promoting its values and interests; contributing towards peace and security and the sustainable development of the earth including solidarity and mutual respect among people, free and fair trade conducive to eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights.

EU is an economic and political union of several countries (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Republic of Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and majority of member countries have the common currency, EURO. Some of the countries, of course, like UK, have exited from the EU. Switzerland is not a EU country because of its chequered history like its sovereignty and neutrality. Kosovo and Taiwan bear cognizable difference.

Russia is not the only country to straddle the line between Europe and Asia. Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Cyprus, Turkey, and even Kazakhstan are all considered European by some agencies and Asian by others. Shared values, peace, and stability, deep economic ties and mutual interest about climate, energy and science are the essence of the EU member countries and the US.

IV. CONCLUSION

European Union public policy, Transatlantic Relations and the US Foreign Policy have been discussed in detail in this paper. It has been transparent through the rendition that the peace in European Union Member Countries and US is an integral part of the Global Peace in general.

REFERENCES

- [1]. 'National Security Directive 75: American Policy Towards Sub-Saharan Africa', 23 December 1992. Online. Available: <http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/nsd/NSD/NSD%2075/0001.pdf> (accessed 12 December 2005).
- [2]. European Commission. (2019). Spring 2019 standard eurobarometer: Europeans upbeat about the state of the European Union – best results in 5 years [online]. Accessed November 20, 2019, from https://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-19-4969_en.htm.
- [3]. European Commission. (n.d.). Internal security strategy [online]. Accessed November 20, 2019, from https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/e-library/glossary/internal-security-strategy_en.
- [4]. Council of the European Union. (2016). Joint EU-NATO declaration, Warsaw [online]. Accessed November 20, 2019, from <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/21481/nato-eu-declaration8-july-en-final.pdf>.
- [5]. Council of the European Union (2018). Joint Declaration of EU NATO Co-operation, Press Release [online]. Accessed November 20, 2019, from https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/36096/nato_eu_final_eng.pdf.
- [6]. Pastore, G. (2013). Small new member states in the EU foreign policy: Towards 'small state smart strategy'? *Baltic Journal of Political Science*, 2(1), 67–84. <https://doi.org/10.15388/BJPS.2013.2.2818>.
- [7]. EEAS. (2017). Conflict prevention, peace building and mediation [online]. Accessed October 7, 2019, from https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/conflict-prevention-peace-building-and-mediation/426/conflict-prevention-peace-building-and-mediation_en.
- [8]. EEAS. (2018a). New European peace facility to boost EU action on security and defence [online]. Accessed November 20, 2019, from https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters/homepage/46794/new-european-peace-facility-boost-eu-action-security-and-defence_en.
- [9]. EEAS. (2018b). Promoting peace and security – EU moving forward with its multilateral partners [online]. Accessed November 20, 2019, from https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters/homepage/52863/promoting-peace-and-security-eu-moving-forward-its-multilateral-partners_en.
- [10]. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/portal/en>