

HIGH-LEVEL LECTURE

**THE LAUNCHING OF THE SECOND PHASE  
OF THE EUROPEAN NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICY (2014-2020)  
IN A CHALLENGING REGIONAL CONTEXT**

FRIDAY 10 OCTOBER 2014, BRUGES

**Fouad AMMOR**, Professor of International Relations, 'Groupement d'Etudes et de Recherches sur la Méditerranée' (GERM), Rabat  
*"The Maghreb, its regional environment and the revised ENP"*

**Salam KAWAKIBI**, Directeur Adjoint et Directeur de Recherche, Initiative pour la Réforme Arabe, Paris  
*"Le Moyen-Orient : les défis de la nouvelle donne"*

**Roman PETROV**, Jean Monnet Chair in EU Law, The National University "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy", Kyiv  
*"Eastern Europe – European Union relations at a crossroads"*

**Summary of the high-level lectures on "The launching of the second phase for the European Neighbourhood Policy (2014-2020) in a challenging regional context", Department of EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies, College of Europe, Bruges, 10.10.2014**

These high-level lectures were the last event of a series of conferences and lectures on the '[ENP in a Comparative Perspective](#)' organised by the Department of EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies in 2013-14 with the financial support of the European Commission. The initiative aimed at a comparison of different co-operation schemes that the European Union has in place with partner countries in order to put the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) into context and to draw lessons from the experience of other third countries.



The Rector of the College of Europe, **Professor Jörg Monar**, welcomed the many participants and made some introductory remarks on the challenging regional context of the EU's neighbourhood. He underlined the importance of turning crises into opportunities and expressed his confidence that the new EU leadership would be able to do so. Following his remarks **Professor Sieglinde Gstöhl**, Director of the Department of EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies, introduced the high-level speakers.

The roundtable was moderated by **Professor Erwan Lannon**, professor in the Department of EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies, who gave an overview of the main innovations of the new phase of the European Neighbourhood Policy and its regional context. He underlined that in the second phase of the ENP, elements such as conditionality, increased differentiation, mutual accountability and the promotion of political cooperation have been strengthened. Professor Lannon mentioned as well that the new priorities are currently being set out for the new European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI) under the leadership of the new European Commission. He stressed that the growing instability in the EU's neighbourhood showed that the revision of 2011 was not sufficient and required further changes. He also welcomed the regained focus on universal rather than EU values in the new financial instrument, and concluded that the recent events in the EU's neighbourhood, in which international borders have been unilaterally modified, prove that the stakes for the EU are considerable.



The first speaker to take the floor was **Professor Fouad Ammor**, Professor of International Relations and researcher at the University of Rabat. He started his presentation by drawing a general picture of the Maghreb, first at a regional level, and then at a country-specific level. He underlined that despite the multiple elements that unite the region – a common history, language, culture, and economic ties – the Maghreb region remains to this day one of the least integrated regions

in the world, and this mainly due to political conflicts that date back to the Cold War. Professor Ammor then turned to consider the first phase of the ENP and its impact in the region. While the ENP could to some extent be considered the successor of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP), launched with the Barcelona Declaration in 1995, he argued that the ENP in fact constituted a “rupture” with past policy, the objectives of which were much less clear than those of the EMP.

Professor Ammor went on to evaluate the ENP's economic, political and geopolitical impact. He pointed out that, notwithstanding the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument's contribution to the region in absolute terms, the breakdown of the figures per inhabitant and per

country reveals a great disparity between the South and the East, with the latter being clearly favoured over the former. Moreover, the conclusion of Free Trade Areas between the Mediterranean Partner Countries and the EU has widened their trade deficits with the EU. From a political point of view, Professor Ammor welcomed the 2011 European Commission Communications on democratisation in the region, but regretted the insufficient follow-up, as well as the EU's timid position on the regional conflicts and tendency to align with US positions. Finally, from a geopolitical perspective, he stressed once more that the EU should look beyond its immediate neighbourhood and consider the wider regional landscape.

Professor Ammor concluded his presentation by outlining what the Partner Countries expect of the EU: A stronger Europe speaking with a single voice, advancing coherent positions and pursuing clear strategies. He also underlined the need for a more inclusive Europe, and the rejection of the xenophobic movements fermenting in several member states. Finally, he also pledged for a more autonomous Europe vis-à-vis the United States, for a greater engagement of Europe in the regional conflicts and for a Europe that foresees problems and is able to anticipate solutions.

The second speaker was **Salam Kawakibi**, Deputy Director of the *Arab Reform Initiative*, who painted a picture of the challenges of the new context in the Middle East. Mr. Kawakibi began his intervention by criticising the oversimplified version that western media convey about the situation in the Middle East and went on to debunk some common myths.



First, he noted that the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), far from being a new phenomenon, has existed since 2004 and has been financially independent since 2007. We should, he argued, pay attention to other forces in the region than ISIS to account for the tearing down of the borders established by the Sykes-Picot Agreement in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The second oversimplification he tackled was the Syrian Revolution. He stressed that when the revolution started in 2011 it was a peaceful movement. Only after four years of conflict, the usage of heavy weaponry, including chemical arms, and continuous prevarication by the international community did the armed opposition in Syria turn radical. The third issue he addressed were the connections between the Syrian government and the jihadists. Mr. Kawakibi drew attention to the fact that from 2003 to 2008, the Syrian secret services trained a number of jihadists to combat the US in Iraq, some of whom were also put into action against Israeli forces in the refugee camps in Lebanon in 2006. However, in 2008, when Syria began to shed its international pariah status with Bashar al-Assad's visit to Paris, the government put an end to the programme. According to Mr. Kawakibi, this partially explains the decision of the terrorists to join the Syrian opposition and to transform this movement into a radical insurgency. As a fourth point, Mr. Kawakibi evoked the millions of internally displaced people in Syria and refugees living in camps outside the country, a humanitarian disaster which in his assessment lays the foundations for fermenting further extremism in the near future.

Then Mr. Kawakibi moved on to consider the role of regional actors. He first addressed the position of Turkey, underlining the importance of the Kurdish and Alevi minorities, and the fact that over two million Syrians are now taking refuge on Turkish territory. He also criticised the indecision of the EU, and in particular the behaviour of some of its Member States, such as Greece or Bulgaria, for not respecting their legal obligations towards immigrants and asylum-seekers. On the other hand, Mr. Kawakibi pointed out that the “true friends” of Syria were Russia and Iran. As regards Russia, he argued that Russia benefits from the EU’s disunity and that Moscow is now taking revenge for its decade-long marginalisation in the resolution of international differences.

In conclusion, Mr. Kawakibi expressed his scepticism about the possibility of a positive response from the EU, but expressed his faith in Europe’s civil society, appealing also directly to the students of the College of Europe. He concluded by drawing a parallel between the situation during the Spanish Civil War in the 1930s and the current situation in Syria. He shared his concern that as was the case then, when the international community rehabilitated Franco as an ally to combat communism, a similar situation could happen in the present by reintegrating al-Assad into the international concert to combat radical extremists.

The third and final speaker was **Professor Roman Petrov**, Jean Monnet Chair in EU Law at the National University “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy” in Kiev, who spoke about the relations between the EU and its Eastern neighbours. He first acknowledged the positive contributions that the ENP, and its Eastern dimension, the Eastern Partnership (EaP), have brought to the region. Professor Petrov highlighted Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia as the best examples of approximation to the EU *acquis* through the conclusion of a new generation of association agreements, and the impact that these new agreements will have in the legal systems of the respective countries. Another positive element underlined by Professor Petrov are the visa facilitation agreements.



Professor Petrov then moved on to outline some of its main failures. According to him, the main flaw of the EaP was the fact that the EU did not consider what he defined as the “Russian factor” when designing the policy, which in the long run has become the main obstacle to the EU’s engagement in the region. The second main failure has been the EU’s inability to foster the so-called “good neighbourly relations”, set as an over-arching goal of the EaP, due mainly to the incapacity of the EU to provide the necessary security guarantees to the EaP countries. For Professor Petrov, this has turned the EU’s Eastern neighbourhood from a “ring of friends” into a “ring of fire”. In his concluding remarks, professor Petrov suggested how and where the ENP and EaP could be improved. Firstly, he stressed the importance of strengthening the principle of ‘good neighbourly relations’, and urged the Union to step up as a regional security provider. Secondly, he insisted on Russia’s necessary role in the region and the need to avoid isolating Moscow to be able to reach a the resolution of the conflicts in the neighbourhood. Finally, he stressed the need for full implementation of the new association agreements, especially the DCFTAs, which he considered to be their core element.



The high-level lecture was followed by a very stimulating question and answer session with the audience as well as a reception.



### About the speakers

**Fouad M. AMMOR** is Professor of International Relations and has worked extensively on the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership as well as on defense and security issues. He is the national coordinator of the Tempus Programme in Morocco and an executive member of the Groupement d'Études et de Recherches sur la Méditerranée (GERM) as well as a member of the EuroMeSCo network. He is, since 1998, the socioeconomic counsellor to the Cabinet of the Moroccan Minister of Social Development, Solidarity, Employment and Professional Training. Furthermore, he is a member of the Expert Advisory Group – European and South Mediterranean Actors (EAG) of the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. Among his various publications are: 'Morocco in the world economy', 'Le partenariat euro-méditerranéen à l'heure de l'élargissement: perception du Sud', 'Le Futur du Dialogue Méditerranéen de l'OTAN : pour un Dialogue Méditerranéen "Plus"?''. Dr Fouad M. AMMOR holds a PhD from the Faculty of Law of the Sidi Mohammed Ben Abdellah University Fes and a superior study diploma in Economy of Development of the University Muhammed V in Morocco.

**Salam KAWAKIBI** is Deputy Director of ARI ([arab-reform.net](http://arab-reform.net)) and President of the Initiative for a New Syria ([insyria.org](http://insyria.org)). He holds postgraduate degrees in economics, international relations and political science, is Associate Researcher at the Barcelona Centre for International Studies and Documentation and Associate Professor at Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne University. From 2000 to 2006 he was Director of the Institut français du Proche Orient (IFPO) in Aleppo, Syria. From 2009 to 2011, he was Principal Researcher at the Faculty of Political Science at the University of Amsterdam. Mr Salam KAWAKIBI is member of the Consultative Council of Mediterranean Citizens' Assembly (MCA). He has published numerous essays in edited volumes and specialized journals in Arabic, English, French, Spanish and German. Topics include human rights, civil society, migration, media, North-South relations, and political reform.

**Roman PETROV** is Jean Monnet Chair in EU Law at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy since 2010. He taught the very first Jean Monnet Module on EU Law in Ukraine at the Donetsk National University. He conducted post-doctoral research as Max Weber Fellow at the European University Institute in Florence (Italy) and was awarded research visiting fellowships at the University of Heidelberg (Germany), the University of Oxford (UK) and others. Dr Roman PETROV is the author of one of the first Ukrainian textbooks on EU Law and he is active in publishing in recognized peer-review journals. He is the founder and first elected President of the Ukrainian European Studies Association. His areas of research and teaching are: EU Law, EU Business Law; EU External Relations Law; Approximation and Harmonisation of Legislation in the EU; and Legal Aspects of Regional Integration in the Post-Soviet Area. Professor PETROV frequently provides consultancy to state institutions in Ukraine, including the Constitutional Court of Ukraine and the Ministry of Justice.