Distr: General

CIMUN XIV
CHICAGO INTERNATIONAL MODEL UNITED NATIONS

BACKGROUND GUIDE

30 November 2017 – 3 December 2017
Honorable Delegate,

The European Union will be called into session on Thursday, November 30th at the Hilton Hotel in Chicago, Illinois to discuss matters of international importance. The following agenda items will be discussed:

Topic 1 – Revisiting the Implementation of Collective Security for Member States to Defend Against Conventional and Cyber Threats
Topic 2 – Exploring the Effect of the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) on Trade and Development
Topic 3 – Reevaluating the Relationship Between Turkey and the European Union

For your reference, our staff archivists have compiled the following Background Guide to provide you with relevant information regarding the topics that will be debated in the upcoming session. You will need to read and understand the contents of this Guide in order to expand upon their research and represent your home government accurately and effectively.

If you have any questions regarding the operations of the committee meetings being held at Chicago International Model United Nations (CIMUN), please refer to the CIMUN MUN Toolkit which you have been provided. Should you have any questions concerning the content of your guide or questions on policy, you may consult with an official from the Department of Home Government by sending an email to homegovernment@cimun.org.

Sincerely,

Walker Fountain

President of the General Assembly
## Contents

1. Topic 1 – Revisiting the Implementation of Collective Security for Member States to Defend Against Conventional and Cyber Threats ................................................................. 4  
   1.1 Topic Overview ............................................................................................................. 4  
   1.2 Historical Background ............................................................................................... 4  
      1.2.1 Early Attempts at Collective Security ................................................................. 4  
      1.2.2 Collective Security Post-World War II ............................................................... 5  
      1.2.3 Collective Security Post-Cold War ................................................................. 6  
   1.3 Current Situation ...................................................................................................... 8  
      1.3.1 The Current State of Collective Security ......................................................... 8  
      1.3.2 Issues with Cyberattacks ................................................................................. 9  
      1.3.3 Ukraine and the Russian Threat ..................................................................... 11  
      1.3.4 Relations with NATO and the USA ................................................................. 11  
   1.4 Bloc Positions ...................................................................................................... 12  
      1.4.1 Support for Greater Collective Defense in the EU ........................................... 12  
      1.4.2 Opponents of Greater Collective Security ...................................................... 12  
   1.5 Discussion Questions ............................................................................................. 13  
   1.6 Key Terms ............................................................................................................ 13  
   1.7 Additional Resources ............................................................................................. 14  

2. Topic 2 – Exploring the Effect of the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) on Trade and Development ............................................. 16  
   2.1 Topic Overview ....................................................................................................... 16  
   2.2 History and Background ....................................................................................... 18  
      2.2.1 1945-1992 ....................................................................................................... 18  
      2.2.2 1992-2013 .................................................................................................... 20  
   2.3 Current Events ..................................................................................................... 21  
      2.3.1 Domestic Developments ................................................................................ 21  
      2.3.2 International Developments ....................................................................... 23  
   2.4 Bloc Positions ..................................................................................................... 25  
   2.5 Discussion Questions ......................................................................................... 26  
   2.6 Key Terms ......................................................................................................... 27  
   2.7 Resources ......................................................................................................... 27
3 Topic 3 – Reevaluating the Relationship Between Turkey and the European Union .......... 32
  3.1 Topic Overview ............................................................................................................. 32
  3.2 Historical Background ............................................................................................... 33
  3.3 Current Situation ......................................................................................................... 35
  3.4 Bloc Positions ............................................................................................................. 38
  3.5 Discussion Questions ................................................................................................. 39
  3.6 Key Terms .................................................................................................................. 40
  3.7 Resources ................................................................................................................... 40
1 Topic 1 – Revisiting the Implementation of Collective Security for Member States to Defend Against Conventional and Cyber Threats

1.1 Topic Overview

The ever-increasing isolation of America from world affairs is causing concern in the strength of NATO among European states. As the major contributor to NATO defense, the US has called for other European countries to provide more resources, but this has further pushed EU member states to look towards themselves for further defense. Collective security in Europe, combined with economic integration, has been a long road that culminated in the European Union, but it is by no means perfect. The lack of coordination in security policy among the member states, vague defense policy, and a lack of a military force are all common criticisms of the EU security and defense. This committee will discuss solutions to the shortcomings of the EU’s defense and determine what improvements should be made, if any are necessary at all.

1.2 Historical Background

1.2.1 Early Attempts at Collective Security

The history of collective security in Europe can be traced back to ancient Greece in which the tribes formed the Amphictyonic League after an invasion by the Dorians\(^1\). Defense groups such as these were often seen throughout history, but more modern collective security began to be seen

\(^1\) [http://www.calvin.edu/academic/clas/pathways/delphi/dinf1.htm](http://www.calvin.edu/academic/clas/pathways/delphi/dinf1.htm)
during the Middle Ages due to the influence of the Church. Religious councils forced princes and clerics to avoid war and seek more peaceful resolutions by dedicating forces to a single, combined leadership. The following Era of Enlightenment saw an expansion in methods in which collective security was proposed and enacted such as with the treaties after the Thirty Years War, William Penn’s peace plan, and Abbé de Saint-Pierre’s Project for Perpetual Peace\(^2\). The first truly successful attempt at collective security, however, was known as the Concert of Europe. A council of the great powers in Europe began to meet to discuss issues that would otherwise erupt into continent-wide wars, and while the regular meetings stopped taking place quickly, special meetings were convened whenever an urgent new issue emerged. There were 26 meetings of the Concert of Europe between 1818 and 1913, and during that time no major conflicts raged across Europe.\(^3\)

1.2.2 Collective Security Post-World War II

Following WWII, there was dissatisfaction among European countries with the inefficiencies of the UN due to the rise of the US and Soviet Union rival blocs in the Cold War; this rivalry often prevented anything of importance from passing in the Security Council. Consequently, Europe began to


\(^3\) [https://defenceindepth.co/2014/10/24/the-concert-of-europe-the-rise-and-fall-of-the-first-united-nations/](https://defenceindepth.co/2014/10/24/the-concert-of-europe-the-rise-and-fall-of-the-first-united-nations/)
look to itself in the matters of collective defense. In 1950, Jean Monnet of the French National Planning Board proposed the European Defense Community (EDC), which contained plans to organize a European army that would be under the political control of Europe. The prospect of the loss of military power was too much for any country to agree too, even France, so the proposed EDC was never realized\(^4\). In place of the EDC, the WEU, Western European Union, was created as an extension of the Brussels Treaty signed in 1948. The five signatories of the Brussels treaty (Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the UK), combined with Germany and Italy, made up this coalition. The WEU quickly become irrelevant to the time and was even nicknamed the “Sleeping Beauty.”\(^5\) The early 1980’s revealed the weaknesses of the European community when Reagan’s policies such as the Strategic Defense Initiative generated concern over potential US isolation and withdrawal from Europe. This led to the revival of the WEU as a place for European Community members, a political group dedicated to lower level politics such as the economy, to meet and debate security concerns.

1.2.3 Collective Security Post-Cold War

The need to establish relations with the post-communist states pushed the EC countries to look to a greater collective security effort. In 1991, the Maastricht Treaty was signed bringing together many different countries and adding justice and security policy to the European Community, thus establishing the European Union\(^6\). One of the major defense initiatives taken at the start of the EU was the creation of the European Defense Agency, an organization tasked with improving the defense capabilities of the EU and supporting cooperation within the EU on defense

\(^4\) https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/1c8aa583-8ec5-41c4-9ad8-73674ea7f4a7/bd191c42-0f53-4ec0-a60a-c53c72c747c2
\(^5\) https://www.cvce.eu/en/unit-content/-/unit/72d9869d-ff72-493e-a0e3-badb3e671f0a/578efb4-179a-486e-a75a-a1347ee1167c
\(^6\) http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in_depth/europe/euro-glossary/1216944.stm
Another initial idea for this agency was the creation of the European Union army, although this concept that has faced much push back due to the costs of such a group and the coinciding of roles with NATO.\(^7\) Due to the lack of an army and the failure of Europe to contribute during the Rwandan genocide, the EU developed the concept of battle groups. Battle groups are forces that are as small as possible but still effective enough to rapidly deploy in times of crisis. They can be formed by many states operating together or by a single nation. These are the only true combined military force of the EU.\(^9\) These groups have been active in operations outside of Europe, although the EU generally relies on other groups such as the UN for combat operations.\(^10\)

Another important component of modern EU security is the Common Security and Defense Policy. This policy was approved in 1999 and has since been endowed with different instruments to increase the defense capabilities of Europe. It enables the EU to utilize both civilian and military resources to respond to global crises and conflict including terrorism. It has led to 30 operations being executed across three continents though primarily in a supporting role to the UN or NATO.\(^11\) Despite these successes, the CSDP faces major limitations due to the defense policies of individual states. Each member state of the EU has its own defense and foreign policies that prevent the CSDP

\(^7\) https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/agencies/eda_en
\(^8\) http://www.idsa.in/idsacomment/european-union-army-objective-or-chimera_gsen_300617
from being effective. Without a strong cohesive foreign policy across Europe, defense planning and research and development will suffer and prevent the creation of an effective fighting force.

1.3 Current Situation

1.3.1 The Current State of Collective Security

On the 7th of January 2015, two gunmen entered the Charlie Hebdo offices killing eight people in France and causing a four-day manhunt at the end of which the death toll had risen to 17.\textsuperscript{12} On November 13th, six different locations throughout Paris were attacked causing a death toll of over 100 and leaving France in a state of national emergency.\textsuperscript{13} Subsequently, France

\textsuperscript{12} http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-30708237
\textsuperscript{13} http://www.cnn.com/2015/12/08/europe/2015-paris-terror-attacks-fast-facts/
responded by calling upon the EU through the mutual assistance clause, article 42(7) of the TFEU, the first time it had ever been invoked. In response, a few countries such as Belgium, Denmark, and the Netherlands entered direct conflict with ISIS, but the response to the call for mutual assistance varied among countries as the specifics of the aid are discussed in between member states leaving a want for greater organization and support. Another similar article, Article 222 of the TFEU called the solidarity clause, also involves a response to an attack on a state either by terrorists or nature that includes “a legal obligation to take action,” though the actions taken are left to the discretion of the European Council and member-states.\textsuperscript{14}

Since the attack on Charlie Hebdo, there have been multiple terrorist attacks in several EU member states including Germany, Brussels, and the U.K. (although the U.K. is in the process of leaving the EU.) These terrorist attacks are causing scrutiny on current levels of European security from terrorist threats. Many are doubting the extent or quality of intelligence sharing on terrorist activity between member states. Additionally, some fear that the high levels of refugees sheltered in Europe due to EU programs will contribute to future terrorist activities. There are just a few of the doubts that surround the EU’s approach to defense and security as it relates to the threat of terrorism.

1.3.2 Issues with Cyberattacks

In 2013, the EU decided to create the first guidelines on defense against cyber attacks and appropriate responses to a variety of cyber attacks. The response to an attack that was deemed to threaten national security, as set by the Cyber Security Strategy for the European Union, was the right to invoke article 222 of the TFEU.\textsuperscript{15} Despite these and more recent efforts by the EU to prevent to bolster cyber security, attacks have continued such as the recent Petya cyber-attack, an

\textsuperscript{14} https://ec.europa.eu/epsc/publications/strategic-notes/mutual-assistance-collective-security_en
attack originating in Ukraine that eventually spread into Europe attacking major businesses in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{16} This attack comes in the wake of the WannaCry ransomware attack, the biggest cyber attack of its kind, affecting major banks and businesses in 150 countries, including many European countries\textsuperscript{17}. Ransomware is not the only cyber trouble Europe faces as problems with election hacking have also become relevant as seen during the French presidential election. The political party of the current French President, Emmanuel Macron, announced that it had been attacked through coordinated efforts which resulted in the release of many of Macron’s party emails during the French presidential election of 2017. The suspected culprit is a Russian hacking group, perhaps sponsored by the Russian government although the Kremlin denies this\textsuperscript{18}. Dutch elections have also seen attempts at hacking by Russian hacker groups attempting to steal information from many different government authorities.\textsuperscript{19} Russia is also suspected of having begun a campaign of spreading fake news across Europe with stories such as “Germans are fleeing their country, fearful of Muslim refugees,” especially in Eastern Europe. Many suspect that these efforts are presumably intended to weaken the European Union and perhaps increase Russian power in Eastern Europe, an area once largely controlled by the USSR. The main defense in Europe against this fake news attack is East Stratcom, an eleven-person team in Brussels working to discredit fake news stories. This team is too small to keep up with the influx of faulty articles and stories, but they are not the only group working against this attack. Many other groups are popping up in countries such as Finland and the Czech Republic aiming to disprove fake stories and

\textsuperscript{16} http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/06/27/ukraine-hit-massive-cyber-attack1/
\textsuperscript{17} http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/05/ransomware-attack-hit-200000-150-countries-170514104555370.html
\textsuperscript{18} https://www.wired.com/2017/05/nsa-director-confirms-russia-hacked-french-election-infrastructure/
\textsuperscript{19} http://www.dw.com/en/russian-hackers-use-dutch-polls-as-practice/a-37850898
boosting online security, but the biggest obstacle in this battle is finding tech specialists capable of keeping cyber security up.\footnote{https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/20/world/europe/europe-combats-a-new-foe-of-political-stability-fake-news.html}

1.3.3 Ukraine and the Russian Threat

In addition to the presumed Russian threat associated with cyber security and anti-EU propaganda, the Russian military action in Ukraine also has an impact on EU security. Russian military activity so close to EU member states strikes fear that Russia may be working to increase its sphere of influence in Eastern Europe—perhaps even through military means. While Russian military action against an EU member state seems highly unlikely, the mere possibility begs the question that the EU should have a plan to counter the growing military might of its eastern neighbor. While traditionally this has been addressed through NATO, as NATO was formed in the spirit of the Cold War to counter the USSR, the EU must address if NATO truly is the best way to address Russian military strength.

1.3.4 Relations with NATO and the USA

In November of 2016, Donald Trump was elected President of the United States of America. The USA has long been an ally of the EU, as the two political powers play leading roles in NATO. President Trump has criticized NATO allies, including the EU, for not contributing their “fair share” to NATO defense.\footnote{https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/26/world/europe/nato-trump-spending.html} Trump has additionally been vague about the collective defense pledge, causing the EU to question if it should rely less on NATO and the USA for its defense, perhaps increasing its own collective defense and security. Moreover, this uncertainty begs the question (even aside from the recent shift in USA policy), the relation European defense should have with the greater NATO defense community. Talk of the recent increase in European defense
spending\textsuperscript{22} and a recent rise in support for an EU army\textsuperscript{23} seem to suggest that the EU may be open to increasing control over its own defense.

1.4 Bloc Positions

1.4.1 Support for Greater Collective Defense in the EU

France and Germany the main proponents for a stronger defense system within the EU. They have pushed for development of the Common Security and Defense Policy which strengthens the EU’s own defenses. France strongly believes in the EU solution to collective defense, but still, sides with NATO due to lack of support from fellow member-states. Germany continues to support the ESDP and is an avid support for the creation of the European Union army.\textsuperscript{24} The Baltic states also favor expansion of the EU’s defense systems due to a great want in all three states for a greater sense of traditional security. Membership in the EU and the benefits it brought also served as a reason to support the EU and its policies. This idea paired with a sense of distrust in the strength of NATO has made proponents of EU collective security out of the Baltic States, but the ones bordering Russia also are cautious of the loss of NATO defense due to their desire for protection against the superpower.\textsuperscript{25}

1.4.2 Opponents of Greater Collective Security

Many countries have opposed advancements in European shared security and defense due to a negative attitude towards political integration. Furthermore, the lack of a supranational command in NATO makes it more appealing to many countries such as Denmark, Ireland, Austria,
Finland, and Sweden who tend to remain more neutral in matters of conflict. Regarding a shared military, many countries would rather remain sovereign control over their own militaries, rather than depend on a shared EU military. Eastern European countries (Czech Republic Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia) also oppose strong European defense initiatives such as a European Army as they feel that NATO is a superior defense system that could not be matched.

1.5 Discussion Questions

- How can the EU respond more efficiently to threats on member-states by distributing the burden equally throughout union? Would this require supranational control or can member-states control defense independently?
- What security measures and responses should be developed to counter new threats against EU member-states such as cyber attacks or attempts an interfering with elections?
- What measures could the EU take to increase its common security and shared defense that would not be redundant with its NATO pledge? Will NATO serve any role in the future with the increasing isolation of the US?

1.6 Key Terms

- Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP)
- European Defense Agency
- EU Defense Fund
- Article 42(7) of the TFEU
- Article 222 of the TFEU

---
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- NATO
- European Defense Agency
- Cyber Security Strategy for the European Union
- Ransomware
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)

1.7 Additional Resources

2 Topic 2 – Exploring the Effect of the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) on Trade and Development

2.1 Topic Overview

Agriculture has always been of vital importance to the economic and political organizations of the European Union. As a leader in world food production, global health, and environmental protection and development, the EU participates in many agricultural endeavors to both feed its citizens and work towards the improvement of the hunger and ecosystem crises. To ensure that each of the Union’s member states partake in their fair share of these developments, the European Parliament and the Council of the EU moved to establish, debate, and legislate a central policy that would foster in a prosperous European agriculture industry. The result of their efforts is what is known as the Common Agriculture Policy, or CAP for short.

According to the European Commission, the Common Agriculture Policy is the European Union’s agenda that “ensures a decent standard of living for farmers, at the same time as setting requirements for animal health and welfare, environmental protection, and food safety.” Essentially, it is the foundation for modern agriculture in Europe, listing all the rules and regulations farmers must abide by to produce healthy and safe foods and to protect their lands and livestock interests. Since its establishment in 1962, the CAP has done tremendous work in boosting the quality and demand for European agricultural businesses. In fact, there are currently 66 million jobs in the agriculture industry because of this policy, with 44 million being in food production and retail and 22 million farmers. To add to these successes, the CAP has been instrumental in the €130 billion worth of EU food exports per year.
Sustainable economic development has been made easier for the countries of the EU by this agricultural system. To ensure the continuation of these economic successes, EU money is used for three main components of the CAP: income support for farmers, market measures to balance common agriculture markets, and environmental development programs. Of these three components, environmental development funds are the most widely discussed and debated. One of the most important regulations that the CAP addresses is that of rural development. Regulation (EU) No. 1305/2013 of the European Parliament provides the basic rules and structure for agricultural practices and the development of rural areas. These regulations are designed to promote “competitiveness, sustainable management of natural resources, and job creation.” Of the cultivation practices addressed in Regulation (EU) 1305/2013, one of the most controversial and debated is that of the ban on cultivation with new biotechnological practices and genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in EU farms.

The Institute of Responsible Technology defines a genetically modified organism (GMO) as “the result of a laboratory process where genes from the DNA of one species are extracted and artificially forced into the genes of an unrelated plant or animal.” While there are hopes that GMOs will be able to assist in increased food production and reduction of health risks in the future, there are only two beneficial traits at present: herbicide tolerance and the ability of plants to produce their own pesticides. These capabilities make it easier for farmers to cultivate and fight off insects, which is a huge advancement in agriculture. However, there are also several flaws in the use of GMOs in cultivation practices. The first is genetically modified foods have been connected to allergic reactions, sterilizations, and deaths of livestock. In addition, certain genetically modified plants internally produce their pesticides, making those plants toxic to both insects and other livestock.
Because of the ban on GMOs in the EU, international trade and development have become more complicated. Since European nations will not import several GMO products from abroad, many trade barriers have emerged in response. This not only frustrates international relations, but also internal economic developments. There are also several developing nations that have voiced their disapproval of the CAP, seeing that it is damaging trade relations for all parties involved. These conflicts put Europe in a difficult place in the geopolitical arena and require the immediate attention of the Union. As a committee, the member states must cooperate with one another to find sustainable, diplomatic, and realistic solutions. Factors like trade agreements, the development of rural areas, and the future of sustainable and environmental-friendly agricultural practices in Europe must all be taken into consideration. The successes of European agricultural industries depend on the negotiations of this committee.

2.2 History and Background

2.2.1 1945-1992

After the Allied victory in World War II, agriculture in Europe was left in ruins. Farmers struggled to cultivate in fields torn up by tanks and ammunitions. Unstable governments could not
guarantee proper food distribution; meaning food supplies were highly irregular in many countries. Even Nikita Khrushchev, leader of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, complicated matters in Eastern Europe by extending membership of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Albania, Romania, and East Germany. Consequently, economies in the east could not grow at the rate of those in Western Europe, which virtually handicapped the Eastern European agricultural industry.

In June of 1960, West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands (the founding members of the European Union) began drafting proposals for a common agricultural policy that would assist in the rebuilding of European farming. This policy would allow the free movement of products, eliminate trade barriers, and establish a common market organization by product and price. The main architect of this policy was European Commissioner Sicco Mansholt, a Dutch politician and passionate farmer. In 1962, the Common Agriculture Policy was voted on and passed. With the established common market structure, six agricultural products including pig meats, eggs, poultry meats, fruits, and vegetables could be cultivated, regulated, and traded. In addition, the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) was created to set up rules of economic competition in Europe.

In the 1980s, Europe struck crisis in regards to the CAP. The financial subsidies to European farms and investors grew at to an alarming amount. Consequently, the EU faced serious overproduction problems and national expenditures became too lavish. To respond to this, the Union chose to purchase their surplus products to maintain prices and reduce the risk of inflation. This motion sparked a great amount of attention from the general public, which the media described as the EU accumulating “butter mountains and wine lakes.” As humorous as this campaign may have been, it was not too far from the truth. In 1985, at the height of the crisis, the
EU spent 72% of its total budget to fix the agriculture crisis. To make matters worse, the 1980s saw tremendous concern for environmental protection in response to Europe’s heavy use of chemicals and machinery in cultivation. Following the crises of the 1980s, it became apparent that CAP would need to be more frequently changed and less intrusive if it was going to be a successful mediator for agricultural commerce in Western Europe.

### 2.2.2 1992-2013

After the crisis of the 1980s, the European Parliament and the Council of the EU reconvened several times to reform the CAP. In general, these reforms were focused on fixing sustainable development programs and the competitive structure in the Union. Between the period of 1992-2013, there were three major reforms to the CAP:

- **1992**: This reform was created to avoid future purchasing of overproduced products. In a way, it reorganized the common market organizations and the economic structure of the CAP. The European Commission describes the 1992 reform as a “shift from product support (through prices) to producer support (through income support, direct payments).” The shift to producer support not only balanced income support and subsidies for farmers but also helped stabilize the EU’s budget spending.

- **2003**: The 2003 reform was centralized in the system of direct payments in the agriculture industry. This reform connected production payments to environmental and food safety, welfare standards, and animal health and protection. In many ways, it focused the CAP on more sustainable developments in the European cultivation. As a result, agricultural competitiveness and environmental protection in Europe improved.

- **2013**: Perhaps one of the most important reforms (and very important to committee debates) is the 2013 reform. This reform “underpinned producer support, integrating a
more land-based approach and sustainable agriculture with ‘green’ direct payments.” This “green” direct payments method became known as “greening.”

2.3 Current Events

2.3.1 Domestic Developments

In the past two years, there have been multiple developments in European politics that have put the CAP front and center of important debates. One of the greatest controversies regarding the CAP is that of the EU’s spending on maintaining the policy. At present, 39% of the EU’s total budget is spent on maintaining the CAP. In 2016, that 39% accounted for €58 billion of taxpayer money. However, European farmers represent only about 3% of the Union’s total population and less than 2% of the European Union’s GDP composition. While this 39% spending is an improvement from the 72% usage of the budget towards the CAP in 1985, many taxpayers are outraged about spending that amount of money on something that makes up such small portion of the overall economy. CAP expenditures are still too costly, even after three reforms to repair payment systems and government spending.
Genetically modified organisms are also an increasingly modern and critical factor in the debate about how the European Union should regulate agriculture. The debate over whether genetically engineered crops are environmentally safe continues in the discussions of rural development. While Europe continues to hold its ban on genetically modified foods, sixty genetically modified crops are approved for import into Europe. These approved foods from the Americas constitute a large portion of the EU’s animal feed. According to EuropaBio, 30 million tons of genetically engineered grains are imported per year from Asian and American countries. Argentina, China, Canada, and the United States are leaders in exporting genetically modified products; yet, they encounter great difficulties when trading with European countries. The main problem Europeans have with importing genetically engineered products is that many exporters do not label their products as containing GMOs, making it difficult for consumers to know the real difference. For example, China ran into difficulty exporting its processed foods to the United Kingdom because they had traces of genetically modified soybean imported from the United
States. In addition, several developing countries around the globe have started using GMOs in their agricultural cultivation, complicating trade. As a result, international trade is now an incredibly complex system, and many EU countries have called for change and simplification.

2.3.2 International Developments

The CAP has also been instrumental in international developments. Of the many global issues related to the CAP, there are three that are the most important to consider in future negotiations:

- **World Trade Organization conflict:** After the World Trade Organization (WTO) court found the EU guilty of violating the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement in 2006, international trade with countries like the U.S., Canada, Brazil, and Argentina have developed into quite a complicated endeavor. Negotiating tariff rates and “approved products” weaken the diplomatic trade relations the EU has with these nations little by little. Even though there have been several meetings of the Council of the European Union since 2012, Europe has made little to no efforts towards settling the WTO judgment made in 2006. In addition, the European Parliament disallowed member states from banning imports or use of genetically modified food products on an individual basis. These restrictions have limited the abilities of Europe and its trade partners to import and export agricultural products. Settling with the WTO judgment could benefit the EU’s trade relations. Whether this change will come about is yet to be seen.

- **Biotechnological research:** Biotechnologists around the world find it increasingly more difficult to work with EU scientists in researching environmental developments. While the GMO bans do not apply directly towards scientific research, many experts believe it useless to develop genetically modified plants with nations that most likely will illegalize them in
the future. This is a blow for the Union in its participation in biotechnological developments and for its own mission to research environmentally-friendly cultivation processes. If the European Union is going to continue to be at the forefront of international research and development, it must find a way to change regulations, so they do not continue to discourage research and development.

- **African Crisis:** This is perhaps one of the worst conflicts in relation to the EU’s agricultural policy. The CAP produces many boundaries to the economic progress of third world countries, especially in African nations. Claire Godfrey, a trade policy advisor for Oxfam International, states, “Not only does Common Agricultural Policy hit European shoppers in their pockets but strikes a blow against the heart of development in places like Africa.” Godfrey explains that the CAP lavishes subsidies to European farmers to the point of food surpluses. To respond to these surpluses, the EU dumps thousands of tons of subsidized foods like bread, milk, sugar, and chicken to African countries. This essentially cripples African farmers who cannot compete with the European exports, disrupting the economic development of their homeland. Mozambique, for example, loses more than €78 million per year (equivalent to its national budget on agriculture) due to dumped sugar products. Swaziland faces a similar crisis with EU sugar imports, letting go 12,000 workers because local industries cannot compete. Kenya, South Africa, and Mali have also reported a massive economic crisis due to heavy wheat, milk, and chicken imports. These heavy imports also cause a concerning amount of fluctuation in African prices of agricultural goods, all while European gross-domestic products (GDPs) continue to rise. The European Union’s dumping practices have virtually handicapped developing nations and make international trade for these countries extremely difficult.
2.4 Bloc Positions

There are roughly 19 EU countries that are adamantly against the cultivation of genetically engineered crops. Of these countries, France, Germany, Scotland, Italy, Austria, Greece, Poland, and Belgium are the leaders in the campaign against GMOs. France, in particular, is an interesting case when it comes to the CAP and the ban on GMOs. Since France consists of 17% of the EU’s farming lands (the highest of all EU member states) and its rural population makes up 21.2% of its overall population, France receives the most beneficiaries from the CAP. In 2003, France was the least in favor of the reforms to the CAP due to its high reception of government funds. Spain and Germany follow close behind in receiving the highest amounts of subsidies and are also leaders in CAP expenditures. As a result, they too are firm supporters of the CAP; however, they were more open to reforms than their French counterpart.

While there appears to be resounding support for this policy and the anti-GMO movement, there are also countries that have expressed interest in using biotechnological advances and reforming the CAP. Even before the Brexit referendum, the United Kingdom has been back and forth on its opinions of the CAP and GMOs. Since 1998, the UK has launched several media campaigns to persuade British citizens to stay away from the dangers of “Frankenstein foods.” After a failed pro-GMO campaign run by the American firm Monsanto, roughly 51% of British citizens surveyed said they had negative opinions of genetically modified products and
biotechnological researches. However, in recent years opinions of the public have grown to appreciate the advantages of biotechnology, even to the slightest degree. England has been open to cultivating genetically engineered crops in their farms for the purpose of biotechnical research. However, Scotland stands very firm in its stance against GMOs, which naturally causes some internal controversy. Nevertheless, many farmers and politicians in the UK, especially in the wake of the Brexit referendum, have expressed a desire to reform their agricultural structure. Most Brexit supporters desire to model their farming systems similar to Switzerland and Norway, countries outside the CAP that provide even larger benefits to their farmers. Policy changes in the UK will necessitate negotiations with the EU to continue an agricultural trade.

2.5 Discussion Questions

- Should the EU explore the opportunity to cultivate GMOs in their homelands? If yes, how should the Union adjust their policy to allow this new practice?
- Is the CAP too expensive? Should the EU make efforts to cut back on spending in the European agriculture industry? If so, where should the Union allocate those extra funds?
- Does the CAP do enough for environmental development and economic growth? What are some new effective developments that could be implemented in European countries to benefit rural communities?
- What can be done about the EU’s dumping of surplus foods in developing countries? In specific, what can be done to prevent crippling the abilities of African farmers to compete in their own homelands?
- How can the EU improve relations and agricultural trade with other countries, especially those who export genetically engineered products to Europe?
- In regards to the United Kingdom, how will agricultural trade function in the future, especially in relation to GMOs and CAP subsidies?
• Will the EU ever settle with the World Trade Organization verdict of 2006? What measures should the Union take to regain a diplomatic reputation in global trade?
• In general, should the CAP be reformed in any area? Whether in direct payments, market measures, rural development, or the cross-compliance system, how can this policy be improved to establish a successful and sustainable agricultural industry and market?

2.6 Key Terms

• Cross-compliance system (CC)
• Basic Payment Scheme (BPS)
• The Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement (SPS Agreement)
• European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)
• Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

2.7 Resources


3 Topic 3 – Reevaluating the Relationship Between Turkey and the European Union

3.1 Topic Overview

The foundation for the eventual creation of the European Union was laid in the aftermath of World War II. After two world wars, European countries were determined to build peace through economic interdependence. The history of the European Union begins with the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1950. The ECSC was limited to promoting economic cooperation related to coal and steel trade and had six founding members: Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Italy, and the Netherlands. Since then, the level of economic interdependence has increased and the number of European countries involved has grown. Today, the European Union acts as a common market between all 28 member states (although that number is expected to fall to 27 with the impending exit of the United Kingdom from the EU), which most states using a common currency: the euro. In addition to economic integration, the EU functions as a governing body over all member states with many common laws as well as common foreign policy.

The Turkish Republic initially requested membership to the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1959. The EEC responded by expressing an openness for eventual accession, when Turkey’s economic and political situation improved. As the EEC eventually morphed in the EU, Turkey then applied to join the EU in 1987, but Turkey’s application to join the EU
remains pending to this day. Since its application, Turkey has sought to maintain friendly relations with the European and Western communities. As Turkey is a strategically placed member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) crucial for its geographic position between Europe and the Middle East, Turkey’s longstanding request to accede into the EU has always shown much potential benefit to both parties. However, due to the recent internal turmoil within its borders, Turkey has found itself experiencing historically high levels of tensions with the EU, with the large majority of EU member states now opposing Turkish accession. At present, it is yet to be seen how the current stall in negotiations can be overcome. Many Europeans oppose EU enlargement due to the political stressors of size, and are particularly opposed to Turkish accession.

3.2 Historical Background

Turkey has long served as a bridge between the West and the east, having a foot in both worlds but never fully belonging to either. To an extent, Turkey shares a kinship and much history
with Europe, dating back to the vast Roman empire. The great Ottoman Empire, founded by Turkish tribes, ruled over much of Europe for over 600 years before it disintegrated in 1992. In its place, the Turkish Republic (and other states) was born.

Yet, Turkish culture and values differ somewhat significantly from modern Europe. Turkey has a large Islamic population and Middle Eastern values, rather than a predominantly European culture. Additionally, the Turkish government has historically fallen short of championing the democratic governance and human rights that the EU values. A key example of this is the 1980 coup d’État that put the Turkish Armed Forces in control of the country. This complete suspension of democracy caused relations between the EU and Turkey to be frozen until democracy was restored a few years later. While Turkey’s record with democracy and human rights is spotty, Turkey is a member of the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe is not part of the European Union, but instead is a separate organization that focused on developing democracy, rule of law, and human rights in Europe.

Despite their differences, economic incentives and shared history have led to a close relationship between Turkey and the EU. Shortly after the inception of the EEC, the 1963 Ankara Agreement was signed, creating an “association agreement” between the two entities with eventual membership as the ultimate goal and proposing a future customs union, which eventually went into effect in 1996. Despite these joint ventures, however, the European community never fully viewed Turkey as a true European nation due to the numerous ways Turkey differs culturally and politically from the majority of the political union. Nevertheless, in 1987, Turkey officially applied for accession into the European Union and received “candidate status” in 1999. After multiple openings and closings of negotiations starting in 2005, three Turkey-EU summits were finally held
in 2015 and 2016 to attempt finalization of this process. In the last of these summits, the adoption of a EU-Turkey Statement made the prospect of Turkey finally reaching accession look promising.

3.3 Current Situation

Progress toward Turkish accession to the EU was halted in July of 2016 when an attempted military coup d’état created lasting turmoil in Turkey. The failed coup in Turkey occurred as a result of a faction of the nation’s military attempting to overturn the government by force. Eventually stopped by ordinary citizens and military forces still loyal to the government, the Turkish government pinned the cause of this militant uprising on the followers of Fetullah Gulen, whose long history of political conflict with the current President, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, and the Justice and Development Party (AKP) supposedly left many of Gulen’s supporters concerned with the current government’s stance toward their movement.

Due to the unrest caused by this failed coup attempt, the Turkish government immediately went into a widespread state of emergency and began a purge of all suspected Gulen supporters within their administration. What followed was a series of executive decisions that led to countless human rights abuses, with over 90,000 civil servants being dismissed on the allegation of association with Gulen, despite a lack of clear process or evidence in many of these cases. Furthermore, numerous journalists were arrested for expressing their thoughts on the situation in the media. Reports of torture, ill-treatment, and excessive use of force by police and military forces
on detainees all surfaced during this purge. Due to its response to the attempted coup, the Turkish government has faced widespread criticism for its violations of freedoms of expression, assembly, and various other universal human rights. These human rights abuses severely strained relations with the EU.

Additionally, Turkey has been accused of violating human rights of Kurds within its borders. Kurdish groups in Turkey have demanded separation from Turkey for a separate state, Kurdistan. While some Kurds approach this aim peacefully, others have turned towards violence. Unfortunately, there are many civilian deaths in Turkey at the hands of Turkish militants (deemed terrorists by the state of Turkey), yet there are also many deaths of innocent Kurds at the hands of the Turkish government. Violence between Turkish government forces and Kurds in the southeastern region of Turkey has escalated since 2015. In just one instance, “130 wounded militants and unarmed activists sheltering in three basements surrounded by the security forces were killed in circumstances which the state has neither explained nor effectively investigated.” This violence against the Kurds, often viewed as human rights violations, further worsens Turkey’s relations with the EU.

Turkey also has a poor record of respecting women’s rights and LGBTQ rights. Recently, the “UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW Committee) made many recommendations to the government to address gender inequality and remove obstacles for women and girls to access education, employment, justice, and reproductive health.”
Even worse, the Turkish government appears to have a tolerance for violence against women, including “deaths due to domestic violence and so-called “honor” killings.” The Turkish government has stifled LGBTQ movements, through bans and means of force. As Europe places a strong emphasis on women’s rights and LGBTQ rights, these differences have a major impact on Turkish accession.

Another stressor on EU-Turkey relations is the refugee crisis, which is placing significant stress on both parties. In an attempt to relieve pressures on Europe from refugees, the Balkan migration route was closed and the EU made a deal with Turkey in March of 2016. In this deal, Turkey “agreed to stop asylum seekers from crossing by sea to the Greek islands” and refugees currently settled in the Greek islands were to be transferred to Turkey. In exchange, the EU agreed to pay €6 billion to Turkey to assist the refugee community hosted by Turkey and the EU would accept some Syrian asylum seekers currently in Turkey to other European countries. As a result, Turkey had become the largest host of refugees in the world for a certain period. However, earlier this year, Turkish forces underwent a mass force return of displaced Syrians to their country, with reports of shootings and mistreatment of these asylum-seekers. These unlawful ejections of refugees have further heightened tensions from the EU given the fact that they are in direct violation of a recent agreement between them and Turkey.

Turkey is in the midst of constitutional changes that will increase the power of President Erdogan, such as allowing the President “to return to lead the ruling AK Party, and [changing] members of a top judicial body...Other steps, such as scrapping the post of prime minister, are due to take place within two years.” Many within the EU and globally criticize these changes as shifting Turkey away from democracy and towards authoritarian rule, which may enable future human rights violations. In response to these changes, the European Parliament called to suspend Turkey’s
EU accession talks in July of 2017 if these constitutional changes are realized, citing Turkey’s human rights violations in cracking down on dissident, suppression of free speech, and regression from democracy. While the Parliament passed this measure to suspend accession talks, the European Commission have refused to address this matter, causing the accession to not yet be officially suspended as of August 2017. The EU’s high representative on foreign affairs explained the continued formal relations by saying that “Turkey is and stays a candidate country…. Many of our colleagues prefer to focus on the red lines. I prefer to focus on what we have in common.”

Though the current prospect of Turkey becoming an EU member nation is less than likely given recent developments, the benefits of accession are not to be ignored. Besides the various military and economic importance Turkey holds for the EU and NATO, Turkey could facilitate economic and political cooperation with the Middle East. This influence would likely add stability to the Mediterranean and the Black Sea region, which is crucial to Europe’s interests. Furthermore, Turkey’s population of roughly 80 million would drastically increase the overall population of the EU, further increasing its power within the international community. On the other hand, the recent tensions with Turkey as well as longstanding differences with the nation in ideology have led to the large majority of EU members to oppose its candidacy as a new member. Considering this, allowing Turkey to become a member state may, in fact, be detrimental to the unification of the EU. Overall, going forward, each current EU member must consider its own stance in relation to Turkey diplomatically, as well as weigh the trade-offs that will be made if accession is achieved.

3.4 Bloc Positions

Many EU countries are against Turkey’s regression from democracy and human rights violations. Consequently, most all countries are not in favor of Turkey joining the EU today,
although some are more open to this possibility in the future if Turkey can work to restore these values in its political sphere. In general, the more developed Western European countries are less tolerant of Turkey’s human rights violations, whereas some less developed Eastern European countries that are still struggling with democracy and human rights themselves (such as Poland and Hungary), may be more open to forgiving these violations in the future if Turkey improves.

Additionally, some EU states are more opposed to any future enlargement of the EU than others, which may apply to Turkey (as well as other candidate states.) In general, lesser developed Eastern European countries are more open to enlargement than the more developed Western and Northern European countries. Views on enlargement are as follows according to the 2015 Eurobarometer 83:

3.5 Discussion Questions

- Under what circumstances can Turkey’s request of accession be reevaluated following their recent human rights violations?
- Does the influence on the international community that Turkey would bring to the EU outweigh the potential detriment to the unity of the EU?
- How would the inclusion of Turkey affect other enlargement plans of the EU in the future?
- Given your nation’s diplomatic relation to Turkey, what benefits or detriments would Turkey's addition to the EU serve to both you and the EU as a whole?
- How would Turkey’s membership to the EU impact the EU on the world stage?
- How would Turkey’s membership impact relations with Russia?

### 3.6 Key Terms

- Ankara Agreement
- Customs Union
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
- Turkey-EU Statement
- Turkish Purge
- Common Market
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