



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

EASTMED

Eastern Mediterranean Regional Training Partnership

Strategic Partnerships



Module Study Guides



Πανεπιστήμιο Πειραιώς
University of Piraeus

Τμήμα Διεθνών &
Ευρωπαϊκών Σπουδών
Department of International &
European Studies



UNIVERSITY OF PIRAEUS
RESEARCH CENTER



University of Cyprus



אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

www.eastmedproject.eu

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project acronym: Eastmed

Project title: Eastern Mediterranean Regional Training Partner

Agreement number: 2016-1-EL01-KA2013-023742

Project website: <http://eastmedproject.eu/en/>

© EastMed

Disclaimer: The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Περιεχόμενα

1 st Module – Study Guide.....	3
Class 1- Theory	3
Class 2- Does the Eastern Mediterranean consists a region?	3
Class 3	4
2 nd Module – Study Guide.....	6
Introduction	6
Unit 1: EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE MEDITERRANEAN, 1956-1969.....	7
Unit 2: EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE MEDITERRANEAN, 1969-1991.....	11
Unit 3: Towards the Venice Declaration- Towards a European ME Peace Initiative	14
3 rd MODULE – Study Guide	19
Introduction to the module	19
Unit 1, EU Policies on Migration & Governance	19
Unit 2, Human Rights & Refugee Status	25
Unit 3 – Integration & Inclusion Issues	30
4 th MODULE – Study Guide	34
Introduction to the module	34
Unit 1: Energy Discoveries & Energy Networks in the Eastern Mediterranean	35
Unit 2: EU Aspects & Implications.....	37
Unit 3: Legal & Political Aspects of Sea Delimitation in the Eastern Mediterranean	38



1st Module – Study Guide

Prof. Aristotle Tziampiris

Class 1- Theory

Regions are becoming all the more consequential for international politics since most of economic, military and diplomatic interactions take place at the regional level. As a result, proximity matters. Many countries that count for little or not much at the global level have a much greater impact on their neighbours. Nevertheless, despite their increasing significance, regions have not really received the kind of academic attention that they deserve. One of the reasons of this is that the concept of regions is certainly encased in ambiguity and disagreement about their magnitude, limits, characteristics or required level of cohesion.

Still, it is very important to delineate the regions for a number of reasons. First, regions are becoming a very useful analytical concept for the international relations of the 21st century. Secondly, correctly identified regions can permit decision makers to pursue advantageous initiatives. Finally, the concept of the region allows more elegant and concentrated academic approaches.

Instead of coming up with just one controversial definition, we should have just an approach to what are the major parameters that define a region. First of all, when we define a region the first inevitable parameter has to be geographical, and more specifically, we have to delineate its geographical and political state limits which do not necessarily coincide. Then again, we have to determine if this region includes some core and/ or peripheral states, a fact which is dynamic in time. Secondly, regions have a security dimension. In security terms, regions are distinct and significant sub-system of security relations which exists among a set of states characterized by geographical proximity. Third, regions are characterised by a specific degree of cohesion. Regional cohesion can be understood in two senses: when the region plays a defining role in the relations between the states and other major actors, and when the region form the organising basis for policy within the region across a range of issues. Furthermore, we can distinct between external recognition, which refers to the rest of the world's view of a region, and internal recognition, which stems from the states within the region. Fourth, regions are usually defined by a common historical background which leads usually to cultural commonalities and creates common points of reference. The fifth parameter is the potential existence of extended economic relations that it may also lead to the economic interdependence. Finally, regions may enjoy certain unique characteristics that provide an important commonality to the countries that compose it but may be completely irrelevant or absent to other regions.

Class 2- Does the Eastern Mediterranean consists a region?

The Eastmed includes the states of Cyprus, Egypt, Greece, Israel, Lebanon, Libya, Syria and Turkey which are mainly the core states of Eastern Mediterranean. To these someone may add some non-recognised "states" such as the Islamic State, the self-declared Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and Gaza. Even more, some states have been treated as "honorary" Eastern Mediterranean states such as Jordan and the Palestinian authority.

The states of Eastmed show a great degree of cohesion, although significant disparities do exists. As regards the regions external dimension, the fact that we have so many policy initiatives such as the Eastmed pipeline proves that the world is increasingly seeing the Eastmed as a distinct vital region.



Moreover, the Eastmed has very strong regional characteristics. It shares a common modern historical background of wars, revolutions, imperialism and diasporas, all of which compose common historical and cultural points of reference. Furthermore, there is some degree of economic activity and some form of moderate economic interdependence. Finally, the Eastern Mediterranean has a very unique characteristic. Specifically, the Eastmed should be regarded as border between the East and the West. As a result, we can conclude that the Eastern Mediterranean constitutes a distinct regional sub- system with modern cohesion and economic interdependence, shares a common historical background, high internal and lesser external recognition, operates as a border between East and West and has substantial security significance for contemporary international politics.

Class 3

a. What are the big issues and the big states of the region?

The Eastern Mediterranean is a region in flux, in transition and in turmoil. It is a region whose future has not yet been decided. One of the most interesting developments is the return of Russia in the region which is a state consequential for the Eastern Mediterranean. Russia has intervened militarily in the civil war in Syria, an intervention which tipped the scale in the region. Russia has now an air base in Attakia and a naval base in Tartus, Syria, which confirms Russia's military presence in the region. Russia has also military and trade agreements with Egypt, Cyprus and Greece. Currently, Russia has very good relations with Turkey which has missile and trade agreements. As a result, when we think the Eastmed region we have to take into account Russia which is a "new" but very significant actor in the region. Turkey is not just one of the core countries of the Eastern Mediterranean. However, Turkey has been turning more and more authoritarian. Turkey, a NATO member since 1952, has becoming a less reliable ally for NATO and US because of an important divergence of perceived interests. Turkey has been currently confronted with the existential threat of the emergence of a Kurdish state in Syria because of which it intervened militarily in Syria. Consequently, we do not know at the moment if Turkey will be a factor of stability and cooperation or a lever of instability and confrontation in the area. China has also been an important economic player since it maintains significant investments in the region.

The United States remains by far the most powerful actor in Eastern Mediterranean both militarily and financially. However, the United States has been less and less interested in intervening militarily and engage actively in Eastern Mediterranean, at least up until now.

Moreover, we have a quartet of states closely cooperating in the region. Within this framework, Greece, Cyprus and Israel as well as Greece, Cyprus and Egypt have been strongly cooperating in economic, security, tourism and other sectors. This two trilateral cooperation frames have been an important new success story.

b. What are the main issues affecting the region?

Among the many issues developed in the Eastern Mediterranean, the refugee crisis does predominate. Since the beginning of the civil war in Syria, more than 5 million people have been displaced. Having created a huge humanitarian and political crisis, Syrian refugees have been fled to



Turkey or Europe. Specifically, more than 1.5 million refugees have entered EU through the Eastern Mediterranean route. The refugee crisis has led to a major political crisis in EU, to the rise of nationalism and populism. A second important issue has been the state fragmentation and the economic crisis that many of the Eastmed states are facing. States such as Greece, Cyprus and Egypt are confronted with major financial problems and high unemployment rates. At the same time, many Eastmed states are rather weak or disintegrating. For instance, Libya is at least three states at the moment while Syria is at civil war. Political situation in Egypt is rather fragile because of percolating discontent.

A third fundamental issue tormenting the region is the increase of Islamic terrorism. We can not understand Eastmed wars without considering the clashes of Shia and Sunni Islamists such as in the case of Syria. Moreover, the Islamic State, the name of which connotes its ambition, controls a part of Syria and a small part of Iraq. The Islamic state's power seems to be receding but its terrorist initiatives have not decreased. The fourth important issue of the energy sources of the Eastmed region. Both gas and oil resources have been evidently found in Eastern Mediterranean and, specifically, in states such as Israel, Cyprus and Egypt. History has taught us that energy findings can be a potential source of cooperation but also a potential source of confrontation.



2nd Module – Study Guide

Introduction

The Study of the EU-Eastern Mediterranean as a reflection of the EU's position in external

relations: The study of the Union's relations with the Eastern Mediterranean countries is of a particular interest mainly because it reflects what has been faced by the EU in gradually establishing the Union's position in external relations and its foreign policy mechanism.

The Eastern Mediterranean in general and the Middle East in particular were on the agenda of the first meeting of the EPC and has remained there ever since: The Union's behaviour vis-à-vis the conflicts in the Eastern Mediterranean reflects to a large degree the conditions under which the EU developed its actorness.

Thus, the examination of the Eastern Mediterranean pursued in our course will include an analysis of the EU as an international actor: In light of this, our course will also serve as an analysis of the EU as an international actor, as well as an analysis, of the Union's relations with the Eastern Mediterranean in general and the Middle East in particular.

When it comes to the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East (ME), the EU lacks coherent and independent foreign policy: The course will shed light on the fact that while the EU strives to find itself in the center of the international arena, when it comes to the Eastern Mediterranean and the ME, it lacks a coherent and independent foreign policy.

The EU lacks both interests and the political will to keep the Eastern Mediterranean and the ME, on the top of his agenda: In spite of the Union's declarations it looks as if the EU lacks both interests and the political will to keep its relations with the Eastern Mediterranean and the ME, on top of its agenda, or even high on its agenda.

No consensus on the Eastern Mediterranean and the ME: Mainly because of its own internal politics, it is extremely hard for the EU to reach a consensus on the Eastern Mediterranean and the ME.

The EU is challenged by an American domination in the Eastern Mediterranean and the ME: The EU faces a major competition from the US. The US enjoys a hegemony status in the Eastern Mediterranean and the ME. Of course, this is a major factor that limits the EU ability to act in the Eastern Mediterranean and the ME.

Our course will analyse the Union's relationship with the ME from the early 1950s to the present day: Three major time-periods will be examined: we will first turn to discuss the EU as an



international actor in the Middle East. The second part of the course analyses the developments in the European-Middle Eastern relations between 1950 and 1991. This part of the course focuses on relations between 1950 and 1969, EC/EU-Middle East relations between 1969 and 1991. The course then deals with the EU-Middle East relations between 1991 and 2008. The third part of the course reflects on some of the most central issues and challenges facing the EU and the Middle East today.

Unit 1: EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE MEDITERRANEAN, 1956-1969

Defining the EASTMED is not an easy task: This issue was discussed and argued for many years. This course therefore uses a very large definition that includes the following countries: United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, the Palestinian Authority, Jordan, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Oman, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Yemen.

The 1956 Suez war marks a turning point on several fronts: During the period that the Middle East was mainly controlled by Britain, this region was more or less isolated from international relations. After the Suez War, the Middle East became one of the major battlegrounds during the Cold War years, a region in which the US and the USSR were the key players.

The Suez crisis was a landmark for European relations with the EASTMED: It should be emphasized that the Suez crisis was a landmark for European relations with the EASTMED. It signaled the end of European colonialist influence in the region, underlined the different European and American attitudes and policies, and antagonized the emerging Arab nationalism.

EC6 and the Middle East

We will now turn to a general overview of the relations between the 6 founding member states and the EASTMED (we won't discuss the empire of Luxembourg which did not have a EASTMED policy at that time. Being a small state Luxembourg traditionally advocated solving conflicts through peaceful means according to public international law).

France:

Algeria and Israel: After the Suez crisis France preferred to forget Nasser and to concentrate on the Algerian crisis, while the French leaders of the Fourth republic manifested an almost total identification and cooperation with Israel.



In 1962 French opposition to Nasser was softened: Only after Algeria gained its independence in 1962 French opposition to Nasser was softened and France was able to conduct a more balanced policy towards the Arab world.

France preferred the national initiatives over European supranational programmes: Already then, France preferred bilateral relations with the region and the freedom to lead national initiatives than to follow a coherent and European approach. France preferred the national initiatives and not European supranational programmes, especially because of its domestic opposition, mainly from the agricultural lobby that was afraid of competition from the Maghreb.

French-Middle Eastern relations must be seen in a larger context: French-Middle Eastern relations, especially during the 1967 war must be seen in a more general framework, encompassing, in particular, French positions towards the Atlantic Alliance.

The French u-turn had significant implications on future Israeli-French and Israeli-European relations: Until 1967, Israel had regarded France as a key ally. Since 1967, and until President Sarkozy came into power in 2007, Israel lost complete faith in France and in Europe and turned to the US. On the other hand, since 1967 the Arab world considered France to be a more natural ally.

Germany:

Until the late 1960s Germany did not have a clear ME policy: After World War II, Germany focused on internal issues and due to the Holocaust, the ME was a very sensitive issue which Germany tried not to deal with on the bilateral level. Germany preferred to deal with the ME on the supranational level rather than on a bilateral level.

Germany was looking for a settlement that ensures on a permanent basis the existence of Israel and enables Arabs and Jews to live together in peace: Germany's interest in the Arab-Israeli conflict was to contribute towards a settlement of the conflict between the Arabs and Israel, a settlement that would permanently ensure the existence of Israel and enables Arabs and Jews to live together in peace.

As the guilt complex became less significant in relations to consideration of the ME policy, more attention was paid to the Palestinian problem and mainly to the refugee problem. Germany changed its attitudes towards the Palestinians' rights and above all towards the right of self determination.

The Netherlands:

For centuries, the Dutch foreign policy has been characterized by three major objectives: (i) promoting and protecting the Dutch foreign trade; (ii) maintaining Dutch national security; and (iii) promoting an international legal order.

During the 1950s and the 1960s there were special ties between the Netherlands and Israel: While Dutch ME policy was always guided by these three objectives, it is also safe to say that during the 1950s and the 1960s there were special ties between the Netherlands and Israel. Yet, in official policy the interests of trade or the EC or the Atlantic partnership, or an international legal order, these issues usually prevailed over Dutch pro-Israeli sympathies.

It is wrong to assume that the Dutch attitudes towards the Arab-Israeli conflict has been heavily influenced by Dutch moral guilt over the extermination of 70% of Dutch Jewry during World War II.

Dutch positions during the Suez crisis: When the Netherlands supported the French-British initiative in the Suez, it was interpreted as an attempt to force Nasser to comply with international law. The Dutch also supported the Israeli demand for a guarantee of free passage of Israeli shipping through the Straits of Tiran as an international waterway.

Belgium:

After 1945 Belgium committed itself to an active policy of collaboration within the UN: The attitude of Belgium towards the Arab-Israeli conflict since 1948 has developed in the context of its new foreign policy direction since the Second World War.

Belgium did not forget the part that it could play as a small independent state: With the launching of the Marshall Plan, and the beginning of the European integration project, Belgium found itself playing a significant role in Europe.

Italy:

Italy changed the nature of its relations with the ME towards diplomatic relations: Italy lost all African colonies after World War II and Libya in 1956. With its decolonization of the ME, Italy changed the nature of its relations with the ME towards diplomatic relations, built on a more cooperative basis focusing on economic and cultural issues.

Italy and Libya: Italy left Libya in 1956, wanted to establish diplomatic relations and improve its trade relations with Libya, but the 1969 Libyan Revolution complicated the situation (Ghadaffi came to power in 1970). In 1970, Ghadaffi confiscated all the Italian properties in the country and expelled all the Italians out of Libya.

From a security point of view Italy pushed for a coherent European policy towards the Mediterranean: Clearly, Italy had a strong interest in the creation of such a policy – unlike the central and Nordic states of the EEC.

EC Cooperation with the EASTMED

Random, unsystematic and case-to-case basis economic relations: The economic relations between the EEC and the ME and the Mediterranean before 1972 can be characterized as random, unsystematic and on a case-to-case basis.

In the 1960s, Europe was much more interested in the European integration project than in its neighbors: During the 1960s Europe was much more interested in itself, in the deepening of the European integration process and in the internal market, than in its relations with its next-door neighbors.

The absence of a ME policy was also the result of the absence of any coordinating institution (the EPC): Moreover, during the 1960s, in the absence of any coordinating institution, until 1969, when the European Political Cooperation (EPC) was established, it is obvious that there was little room for EEC foreign policy coordination towards the ME region.

MS' positions during the 1967 war: As the 1967 War broke out, the different positions of all the member states were very clear. France condemned Israel and supported the Arab side in the UN debates; West Germany declared its neutrality but in fact strongly supported Israel; While the Italian government supported the Arab side, domestically Italy was divided; the Netherlands adopted a complete pro-Israeli line; Belgium declared its support in the UN and in the Atlantic Alliance; and Luxembourg was neutral.



Unit 2: EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE MEDITERRANEAN, 1969-1991

Crisis follows a crisis: During this period, the ME and the Mediterranean saw everything: war, peace and hopes for peace. Until 1989, one crisis immediately followed another.

Behind all these crisis was the fundamental ideological rift between the US and the USSR.

If the ME was the play ground of the two superpowers what was then the role of the EC?

Three frameworks to examine the EU's policy towards the ME: We should examine the European policies towards the ME and the Mediterranean under three different, though interlinked frameworks:

****The 3 frameworks of the EC policy towards the ME****

The Middle East Peace Process

The Global Mediterranean Policy (GMP)

The Euro-Arab Dialogue (EAD) and the EC-Gulf Dialogue (EGD)

The EPC and the ME 1969-1973

The EC member states held different views regarding the Middle East and as already discussed, even during and after the 1967 War, the member states could not reach a common position.

The EPC was one of the first topics on the agenda of the EPC: The first EPC meeting took place in Munich in November 1970. The important subjects on the agenda of the first EPC meeting were: (i) the European Security Conference ahead of the 1973 Helsinki Conference; and (ii) the problem of the ME, where the aim was to prepare a common position. The second EPC meeting was held in Paris in May 1971. The meeting centered around the situation in the ME and the participants confirmed their approval of UNSCR 242 and declared their willingness to contribute to the social and economic stabilization of the ME.

The 'Schuman secret report': The most noticeable result of the first meetings of the EPC in the early 1970s, before the energy crisis of 1973, was the 'Schuman secret report', on the Arab-Israeli conflict in May 1971. The Schuman document marked the beginning of coordinated EPC positions on the ME problem. The status of the Schuman Report was uncertain. France considered the report as an

official policy, but the Netherlands objected the report and the Germans and the Italians had their reservations regarding the report and they described it as an informal working paper.

****The 1971 Schuman Secret Report included****

- The establishment of demilitarised zones, in which international forces would be stationed;
- The overall Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories with minor border adjustments;
- The internationalisation of Jerusalem;
- The postponement of any conclusive solution regarding the sovereignty of East Jerusalem;
- The choice, for the 'Arab refugees' of either returning to their home or being indemnified;
- The approval of the Jarring mission (January 1971).

The Schuman report was more important internally than externally: Although the report did not add anything new to UNSCR 242, it constituted an important step in laying down the EC attitude towards the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Schuman report represented the first Community joint position on the ME dispute. The Report managed impressively to harmonize the development of the positions of each member state at the beginning of the 1970, and brought them together for the first time.

In January 1973 three new member states join the EC – the UK, Denmark and Ireland. The membership of the new countries did not improve the coherence among the EC members.

**** Member States' Positions at the Outbreak of the October 1973 War****

Members States' Positions at the Outbreak of the October 1973 War: At the outbreak of the October 1973 war, the EC was divided into three blocks: the pro-Arab block (France and Italy), a neutral block (Belgium, Ireland, Luxembourg and perhaps the UK), and a pro-Israeli bloc (Denmark, West Germany and the NL).

The Arab Oil Embargo and the Increase in the Price of Crude Oil

Utilizing the oil as a political weapon in the Arab struggle with Israel: In the wake of the 1973 war two separate yet interconnected developments took place: the decision by the Arab oil-producing countries to impose a general production cut-back and a selective embargo on exports to some

countries; the decision taken by OPEC (The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries) to increase the price of crude oil.

**** OPEC ****

In other words, the Arab boycott or call it cut-back or embargo, implied the idea of utilizing the oil as a political weapon in the Arab struggle with Israel.

Kuwait calls a meeting: Kuwait was the first country to call for a meeting of the OAPEC – The Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries, in order to draw up a common policy on how the Arab oil could be best used in the battle. The meeting took place on 17 October 1973.

**** OAPEC ****

OAPEC decided to cut their oil production: During their 17 October 1973 meeting, the oil ministers of the OAPEC countries decided to cut their monthly oil production by a minimum of 5% from the September 1973 level (with effect from October) until Israel will withdraw its forces from all Arab territories it occupied in 1967 and until the legitimate rights of the Palestinians are restored. The ministers also said that they will continue with this cut until the oil production of each OAPEC member will reach a situation in which its economy could not allow further reduction without serious damage.

Arab Oil Ministers divided the EC: The Oil ministers further decided to divide states into three categories: Friendly States, Neutral States, and Hostile States. The Arab countries simply divided the EC member states into these three categories:

**** The Arab Oil Embargo ****

Friendly or most favored nations: France and the UK – No sanctions were imposed.

Neutral Countries: Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Italy and Luxembourg – the 5% cut-back sanction was applied.

Hostile Countries: the Netherlands (because of its pro-Israel position) and the USA – a total boycott was imposed.

Europe felt that its economic security and its very existence were directly threatened: When the 1973 War broke out and the Arabs employed their oil as a political weapon, Europe felt that its economic security and its very existence were directly threatened. This resulted in a serious crisis within the EC, as well as within NATO.

The 1973 war and the oil embargo were a catalyst for many developments concerning the European integration process: The oil embargo made Europeans brutally aware of their vulnerability in both economic and political terms; it changed the patterns of relationships with both Israel and the Arab world, and brought about a dramatic shift towards more pro-Arab attitudes; it revealed the extent of European external disunity and generated calls for more integration as a result of this experience; it had economic effects not imaginable before the crisis; and, last but not least, it brought to the surface the uneasy nature of Euro-American relations.

Unit 3 - Towards the Venice Declaration- Towards a European ME Peace Initiative

Despite the evolution of positions there was no concrete European peace initiative in 1979: It is clear that between 1970-1979 the EPC positions slowly embraced most of the Arab demands on the Palestinian problem. Nonetheless despite this evolution of positions there was no concrete European peace initiative in 1979.

A purposeful European collective approach: As we entered the 1980s, however, the diplomatic coordination of the member states on the ME conflict began taking the form of a purposeful European collective behaviour.

The Community's relations with the Middle Eastern countries improved considerably as a result of bilateral and multilateral relations: By 1980 the member states had accumulated almost ten years' diplomatic experience in the ME and vis a vis other international problems.

The EC appeared to many Arab states as a useful alternative diplomatic option to the superpowers: As the Community's positions became more concrete, and as the Camp David peace process proved disappointing for the relevant countries, the EC appeared to many Arab states as a useful alternative diplomatic option to the superpowers. The dissatisfaction of many Arab states with the American policies in the ME, gave rise to expectations that Europe could lead the way to a more balanced approach. The contribution of Europe, as the Arabs saw it, would take place through direct bilateral pressures on the US, and through declarations which could make the Americans more sensible, and by that forcing them to seek new options.

Modifying Resolution 242- Moving towards the PLO: In 1979, the EC declared that the ME needs a comprehensive peace and that the Community attached great importance to resuming the Euro-Arab Dialogue (EAD). In March 1980, the member states voted for a UN Resolution condemning the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories with France, the UK and Germany making declarations in favour of the PLO.

The member states acted within the limits defined by the EPC: In 1979-1980, the EC member states managed to commit themselves to a particularly intensive diplomatic interplay which was sustained until the Venice meeting. Either individually or in consultation with each other through the EPC, the member states acted within the limits defined by the EPC. The member states, by and large, confined their positions within the limits defined by their EPC ME declarations. The EPC was seen as a useful diplomatic forum in the pursuance of both community collective objectives and national goals.

A clear division of labour: The member states had a clear division of labour: **France** was more daring than the others in advancing new statements, mainly due to its position as an independently-minded country. **Germany** worked towards the US with which it had friendly bilateral relations and with the Arab states, mainly Egypt, with which it maintained special economic and political relations. **Britain**, which also had good relations with the US tried to persuade the Americans to amend Resolution 242 and to pursue a more far-reaching approach towards the Palestinian problem.

The Venice Declaration of June 1980

The Venice declaration did not go as far as some had expected: The declaration of the heads of state or government meeting in the European Council in Venice on 12 and 13 June 1980, produced the new EC declaration, which did not go as far as some had expected. However, the Venice declaration was both a landmark and the highest level of collective European ME diplomatic involvement.

The central parts of the Venice declarations: The central parts of the Venice declaration are points 6-9 and the major issues it discusses are: (i) the Palestinian problem, (ii) the status of Jerusalem, (iii) the question of the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories.

****Venice Declaration, 13/06/1980 (I-IV)****

Europe gave notice of its aspirations to play a greater role in the Arab-Israeli conflict: The Venice declaration outlined a number of principles which have defined Europe's vision towards the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict ever since. These principles were not a radical departure in European thinking. Rather, they crystallized positions that had evolved gradually over the previous decade. The declaration asserted that it was imperative that a just resolution be found to the Palestinian problem, and that this issue should not be viewed as simply a refugee problem. In the eyes of the Nine (member states), a just and lasting solution to the conflict demanded that "the Palestinian people be allowed to exercise fully its rights to self determination."

The declaration also outlined the diplomatic steps needed to be taken in order to achieve a lasting resolution of the Palestinian question: In addition to spelling out what was required for a viable solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Europeans castigated Israel for its settlement policy, and they also warned Israel over its policy in Jerusalem. The Venice declaration also outlined the diplomatic steps needed to be taken in order to achieve a lasting resolution of the Palestinian question. Specifically, and to the anger of Israel, it called for the inclusion of the PLO in any future negotiating process aimed at resolving the conflict.

Venice cast a large shadow over Israeli-European relations throughout the 1980s: From the issuing of the declaration in June 1980 to the convening of the Madrid peace conference in November 1991, Israel vigorously opposed any European attempt to play a significant role in the peace process.

The US reaction: In the US within hours of the Venice declaration, Secretary of State Edmund Muskie's released low-key comments.

****Secretary of State Edmund Muskie (Ed), 13/06/1980****

The US reaction was polite, and avoided openly confronting the logic of its transatlantic allies, despite the fact that later on the US systematically obstructed the follow up of the Venice initiative.

Venice declarations conclusions

It is true that all the criticisms that the Venice declarations received were all correct. Venice did not go so far as to recognize the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, it did stipulate a rather insecure guarantee for Israel and it did not interfere with the Camp David agreement.

EC positions evolved considerably and became pro-Arab: The positions of the EC member states, both collectively and individually, evolved considerably from the early 1970s and became pro-Arab.

Resolution 242 became an open call for Palestinian self-determination: In the 1980s the EC reference to Resolution 242 became an open call for Palestinian self-determination.

The fact that the Nine pooled their potential, created an image of strength: this image influenced the European actors themselves and encouraged them in being active and daring. Thus, to the extent that image in international relations is as important as anything else, a collective view by the nine European states creates a certain legitimacy which puts the opponents of this view on the defensive (this was not the case with Israel).

The possibility of hiding behind a collective policy statement: Venice is proof that the possibility of hiding behind a collective policy statement makes things easier for certain EC members. This is particularly true for Germany (because of its special relations with Israel and with the Arab states). For the other countries as well, political cooperation is a source of domestic and international legitimacy.

The EC's positions differ from Israeli positions on almost all points: The EC member states did not consult or took little account of Israel's views on the Arab-Israeli conflict. Certainly, they always referred Israel's right to secure borders (i.e. modifications to the 1967 borders), however the EC's positions differ from Israel's on almost all other points. It should be clear that the Venice Declaration was not geared towards balancing direct relations with both the Arabs and Israel. Hence, while the US maintains direct relations with both the Arabs and the Israelis, the Europeans in the Venice initiative put much more attention on their links with the Arab side than with the Israelis.

The Regan Plan 1982: On 1 September 1982, U.S. president Ronald Reagan issued a policy statement in the wake of Israel's June 1982 invasion of Lebanon and the expulsion of the PLO and about 15,000 PLO fighters from Lebanon. Regan issued this policy statement following extensive mediation by US special envoy Philip Habib. In his speech Reagan expressed [satisfaction](#) that Lebanon's troubles were over and turned his attention to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Regan Plan is based on the Camp David Agreement and it included the following points:

****The Reagan Plan, 1/9/1982****

1. Total autonomy for the West Bank and Gaza populations in association with Jordan;
2. Free elections of Palestinian authorities in these areas;
3. A freeze of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories; and
4. A gradual transfer of authority to the elected Palestinian authority.

Throughout the 1980s the EC positions did little to advance the Community's ambitions of playing a significant role in the ME: Why? 1. The Community's pro-Arab stance prevented it from being taken seriously by Israel as a serious mediator in the conflict; 2. The EC did not have the capacity and the influence to bring the parties to the negotiating table.

Only after the end of the Cold War the EC was able to come up with some serious peace proposals.



3rd MODULE – Study Guide

EU-EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN: THE REFUGEE CHALLENGE

COORDINATORS: PROF. IVANA MARIA PADOAN (UNIVE), PROF. SARA DE VIDO (UNIVE)

Introduction to the module

The module will explore, using interdisciplinary lens, the refugee challenge in Europe. It highlights the major socio-political elements, investigates the main legal issues, and proposes concrete examples of integration, which might be useful for the entire EASTMed Region. This module in line with the goals of the EASTMed project gives “an emphasis to the concurrent Refugee Crisis” offering “a new analytical tool in the frame of European Policies”. It will start with a reflection on migration and governance in the EU, proposing definitions and new forms of governance, and describing the phenomenon from a sociological point of view. It provides a focus on security issues related to migration. The module then investigates EU law and policies in the field of migration, with specific regard to human rights law. This part will unravel the complex relation between what occurs ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ EU in terms of protection of migrants’ human rights. The module will finally focus on the key issues of integration and social inclusion with regard to the UNHCR Note on the Integration of Refugees in the European Union, and on practice of integration proposed at local level.

This module will help students to make connections between theory and practice. All classes are held by university lecturers and experts to assure qualified learning outcomes and to contribute creating a sustainable course and a critical learning.

Unit 1, EU Policies on Migration & Governance

Class no. 1, Critical Understanding of Key Categories in the Asylum and Migration Field

Method: 1 video

Lecturer : dr. Iside Gjergji

Mail : iside.gjergji@unive.it

Class Description:

More than 65 million people are forcibly displaced across the globe, as refugees, asylum seekers, or internally displaced persons. Never have so many people been on the move for reasons beyond their free will. Conflicts and crises are an immediate trigger; however, the migration challenge has deeper roots: underlying trends in social inequalities, climate change and demographics are all playing a part in the record numbers of international migrants worldwide.

A deep combination of political and economic reasons is now featuring this new migration era. From a social and sociological point of view, it has become difficult to distinguish between refugees and migrants. Not by coincidence, the terms ‘refugee’ and ‘migrant’ are frequently used interchangeably in media and public discourse. But is there a difference between the two, and does it matter? What are the social consequences?



This class is designed to introduce students to key issues related to asylum, international protection and migration. Built on a socio-legal perspective, it will mostly define what migration and 'forced migration' are, both intended as social and global phenomena, through key categories such as: asylum, international migration, international protection, asylum seeker, displaced people, border, migration governance, migration laws, etc.

Topics: Definition of: Refugee, Asylum Seeker, Person Eligible for «Subsidiary protection», Displaced Person, Economic Migrant. Connections between concepts and categories.

Learning Objectives:

- To be able to understand contemporary debates around migration, asylum and international protection; ^[1]_[SEP]
- To develop a critical understanding of key categories in the asylum and migration field;
- To understand the legal differences (and social consequences) between 'migration' and 'forced migration'.

Prerequisites: None

Class no. 2, Towards new forms of Migration Governance

Method: 1 video

Lecturer: prof. Ivana Padoan

Mail: ipadoan@unive.it

Class Description:

Europe since its foundation, in 1957, was promoted by the 6 founding countries: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Europe is a place of union, dialogue, peace and growth, respecting the diversity of the countries that they compose it. If the first commitments were to work together to resolve post-war conflicts with the force of law, and dialogue instead of military conflict, then with the following treaties, in particular the treaty of Maastricht on the European Union, Europe has encountered the problem of how to further protect its borders. With the evolution of a more global international economic and financial system and more advanced technological communication, Europe has faced the problem of how European countries can collaborate in view of a broader and open union for those who travel, study and work in other countries. In recent years, after the entry into force of the Lisbon treaty, Europe intends to strengthen democratic principles and the protection of fundamental rights by sharing responsibilities between the European Union and the member states. In addition, Europe has recently faced several challenges: financial crisis, economic crisis, banking crisis, social crisis, terrorism, destabilizing the structure and the social context in continuous movement and integration.

The last challenge is linked to the flow of new migrations, which are no longer only internal, meaning between the different EU countries (28 before Brexit), but also they concern the flows of migrants from outside the area (asylum seekers, refugees, illegal migrants). Italy, together with Greece and Malta, is suffering more than other countries of the European Union, the burden of this situation which is no longer to be considered an emergency but has become a structural form of human existence and mobility.



The European Union at this event has presented itself strongly divided and disunited. It has refused to accept migrants, it has fixed quotas of selected migrants, it has faced challenges such as withdrawal from the Union (Brexit), it has built new walls along the borders ...

To avoid deep internal crises, it will be necessary to find a new form of governance: through new collaborations, strategies and paths, through new regulations among partners, new formulations of responsibility, recognition of fundamental rights, job promotion, training, housing support, protection and social well-being, in a system today crossed by flows (techoscape, mediascape, financialscape, ideoscape, ethnoscape), which deconstruct and restructure places, ideas, legitimacy, responsibility, economies and freedom between the local and the global.

Topics: World Flows and Migration; to find a New Form of Governance; Defining European Agenda; the New World Challenge.

Learning Objectives:

- Know and understand the fundamental elements of European policies towards 2025.

- Applying knowledge and understanding

Ability to understand how European policies and individual states include or exclude the migration process

- Making judgements

Critical capacity relative to the policies of the individual states regarding the migration processes

- Communication skills.

Ability to search for systemic information, to discuss, to compare the proposals and solutions of the various European countries in a comparative manner

- Learning skills.

Ability of how learn to learn. Recognizing one's own learning and that of others, the ability to overcome one's own point of view, metacognitive capacity.

Prerequisites:

Semantics: asylum, international migration, international protection, migrants, political refugees, asylum seekers, displaced persons, migration governance, migration laws.

Class no. 3, Understanding migration processes into Europe and the Mediterranean Region

Method: 1 video

Lecturer: prof. Pietro Basso

Mail: pbasso@unive.it

Class Description:

“The Age of Migration” is the phrase chosen by Stephen Castles and M.J. Miller (2009) to describe our era, and it could not be more appropriate. It stands for the international dimension of migration and refers to the post-war period from 1945 to present. Indeed, this period is distinguished from an earlier period of still-significant international migration – that of 1850 to 1914 – because migration has become a truly global process. This global



characteristic differentiates contemporary migration from all other “voluntary” or forced migrations in the past. It is a permanent and long-term phenomenon with enormous economic, social, political, cultural, and personal consequences both on emigration and immigration countries. It is both *a product of* and a *factor in* epoch-making changes.

A few basic figures help underscore the size and development of the phenomenon. From 1950 to 2005 world population more than doubled from 2.5 to over 6 billion. Over the same period the number of international emigrants of all types (‘economic migrants’, asylum seekers, ecological migrants, displaced persons, etc.) more than tripled from 60 million to 200 million. The gap between these two processes is likely to widen over the next thirty to forty years. According to projections by the International Organization for Migration, the world population is likely to reach 9 billion in 2050 (30% greater than now), while the number of international emigrants is set to double reaching over 400 million (IOM, 2011).

Europe and the Mediterranean region have been crossed by major migratory movements in recent years, thus becoming central places where new migration policies and governance are being experienced.

This class is designed to examine the root causes of international migration phenomenon and the contradictory effects of the European crisis and its policies on migration.

Topics: Migration as Long Term Phenomenon with several Consequences; Understanding Root Causes of Migration and contradictions of Migratory EU policies.

Learning Objectives:

- To be able to analyse contemporary debates around migration phenomenon and migration policies;
- To understand migration processes and become acquainted with different theoretical approaches;
- To develop an understanding of historical processes of migration into Europe and the Mediterranean region.

Prerequisites:None

Class no. 4, Migration and the security perspective

Method: 1 video

Lecturer : dr. Iside Gjergji

Mail : iside.gjergji@unive.it

Class Description :

In Europe, migration is now often framed as a security issue. In the security studies literature, 9/11 (September 9th, 2001) is marked as the date that opened up, in the Western countries, a number of discursive and political opportunities to correlate terrorism and fear with migration, thereby helping to legitimize practices and technologies in migration control that were usually reserved for emergencies.

The issue of migration policy most frequently characterized by security approach is irregular migration control – understood as policies to exclude irregular migrants through restrictions, border control, detention and deportation. The management of the European Union’s external borders is the area in which the European Union has taken the most evident and important measures. Since the establishment of the **Schengen System**, - based on **Schengen Convention**, which is the main EU legal document dealing with border security - the development of a joint management of the EU’s external borders has become a priority on the concerned EU member states. In term of management instrument, a set of centralized databases has been established, including the **Schengen Information System (SIS)**, the **Visa Information System (VIS)** and the **European database for information sharing (EURODAC)**, as well as the European **Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders (FRONTEX)**.

The security approach can be also subtle; it can be traced in many other European measures, such as: the *institutional arrangements*; the *emergency frame*; the *risk discourse* and the *social and material arrangements at the border*.

So far, Europe’s “*fight against illegal migration*” has created a worrying mechanism for controls to keep growing indefinitely, without defeating irregular migration.

Topics: Irregular migration control; Border control; security measures; understanding the links between migration and security approach.

Learning Objectives:

- To be able to understand contemporary debates around security perspective; [SEP]
- To develop a critical understanding of key issues on the security perspective;
- To understand the connections between the security perspective and European Migrants Policies.

Prerequisites: None

References for the Unit:

Appaduraj A., (1996), *Modernity at Large. Cultural dimension of globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota;

Basso, P. (2010), *Razzismo di stato. Stati Uniti, Europa, Italia*, Milano: Franco Angeli.

Brettel, C.B. and Hollifield, J.F., (2008), eds. *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*, London: Routledge.

Canagarajah S., (2017) *The Routledge Handbook of Migration and Language*, London: Routledge,

Castles, S., De Haas, H. and Miller, M. (2013). *Age of migration*, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, fifth edition.



Ceccorulli M., (2009), "Migration as a security threat: internal and external dynamics in the European Union", Forum on the Problems of Peace and War, Florence, GARNET Working Paper No: 65/09, April.

Chesnais, F. (1997), *La mondialisation du capital*, Paris: Syros.

Dimitriadi A., (2014), "Managing the Maritime Borders of Europe: Protection through Deterrence and Prevention?", ELIAMEP, June.

Ehrenreich, B., Hochschild, A. R. (2002). eds. *Global Women: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*, New York: Henry Holt.

Fakhoury T., (2016), "Tangled Connections between Migration and Security in the Wake of the Arab Uprisings: A European Perspective", IAI Working Paper No. 16/06, March.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Loescher, G., Long K., and Sigona, N., (2014).eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geddes, A., Scholten P. (2016), *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*, London; New York: Sage Foundation.

Gjergji, I. (2016), *Sulla governance delle migrazioni. Sociologia dell'underworld del comando globale*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Groenendijk, K., Guild, E. and Minderhoud, P., (2003). Eds, *Search of Europe's Borders*, The Hague: Kluwer Law International.

Guild E., (2015), Cathryn Costello, Madeline Garlick and Violeta Moreno-Lax, "The 2015 Refugee Crisis in the European Union", CEPS POLICY BRIEF, No. 332, September.

International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2011). *The Future of Migration: Building Capacities for Change*, World Migration Report. 2010.

Koser, K. (2007), *International Migration: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

OECD (2013), *International Migration Outlook*, Paris: OECD.

Padoan I. (1/2012), *Pensare l'interculturalità*, in *Interculturalità e cittadinanza AAVV*, Rivista SIPED Tecnodid, Roma

Padoan I., (2016) (by Ivana Padoan) *The cultural and social responsibility of the university*, Lecce: Pensa ed.,

Padoan I., (2017), *Cultura ,interculturalità transculturalità*, in AAVV, Pisa: Alfabeta dell'interculturalità ETS,



Padoan I., (2018), Epistemologia intercultural, in AAVV, Política, cultura y sociedad: perspectivas desde Europa y América Latina, Baranquilla: Universidad Uninorte,

Rodney, W. (1972), How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, London: Bogle-L'Ouverture.

Sassen, S. (2007), A Sociology of Globalisation, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Sayad A. (1999), La double absence, Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Semprini A., (2003), La société de flux .Formes du sens et identité dans les sociétés contemporaines, Paris: L'Harmattan

<https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2017/EN/COM-2017-2025-F1-EN-ANNEX-2-PART-1.PDF>

https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/migration_en

Wolff S., (2008), "Border Management in the Mediterranean: Internal, External and Ethical Challenges", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, June 2008

Wohlfeld M., (2014), "Is migration a security issue?" in O. Grech, & M. Wohlfeld (Eds.), *Migration in the Mediterranean : human rights, security and development perspectives* (pp. 61-77). Msida: Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies.

Assessment: Multi-choice test (threshold 70 percent)

Unit 2, Human Rights & Refugee Status

Class no. 1, The Common European Asylum System

Method: 1 video

Lecturer: Dr. Pietro Sullo

Email: pierosullo1974@gmail.com

Class Description:

The recent tragedies in the Mediterranean Sea and the pressure on EU borders have pushed EU leaders to discuss the possibility of a reviewing the Common European Asylum System (CEAS).

However, the 2015 EU Agenda on Migration is based on a full and effective implementation of the existing system rather than on an in-depth review aimed at addressing its structural deficiencies. Moreover, the relocation mechanism, the so-called hotspots approach and the EU-Turkey Statement have triggered serious human rights concerns. The load put on front-line countries, the possibility for refugees to work only in the country granting asylum and the non-homogeneous standards of reception and protection offered by EU MS triggered further criticisms. Despite the introduction of some guarantees for asylum seekers, the most controversial piece of the CEAS remains the Dublin III Regulation. The latter is applied



inconsistently throughout EU Member States (MS), which negatively impacts the standards of life and integration opportunities of asylum seekers. Based on research which takes into account the case law of the ECtHR and CJEU, as well as on empirical research including interviews with protection's seekers, staff of the Dublin units and of NGOs between the end of 2015 and the first half of 2017, my presentation provides an overview of the implementation of the Dublin III Regulation throughout the EU Member States.

In the light of the results gathered I discuss the proposal by the European Commission to set up a 'Dublin IV' Regulation and possible alternatives, stressing, where necessary, possibilities for overhauling in the light of human rights best practices and the principle of solidarity and fairness affirmed in Recital 5 of the Dublin III Regulation.

Contents: Reviewing the Common European Asylum System; the Reform of the Dublin System; to set up a Dublin IV Regulation.

Learning Objectives:

- To understand the structure and the legal basis of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS)
- To learn the key aspects and criticisms of the Dublin III Regulation
- To critically analyse the proposal by the European Commission to set up a Dublin IV regulation
- To understand the level of implementation of the Dublin III regulation throughout the EU Member States

Prerequisites: Basic knowledge of law

Class no. 2, Freedom of movement and migration law: the Schengen and the Dublin systems

Method: 1 video

Lecturer: Prof. Chiara Favilli

Email: chiara.favilli@unifi.it

Class Description:

One of the purpose of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) is avoiding secondary movements of asylum seekers and refugees. This overarching aim is pursued through two main tools: harmonisation of national asylum systems and definition of common criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining applications for international protection. However, none of these tools has proved effective and secondary movements have been always occurring during last fifteen years, with a substantial increase since 2013.

However, in an area of free movement people may cross internal borders without checks so that it is practically impossible to keep people staying in one country. Against this framework, during the migrants and asylum crisis Members States have reintroduced internal border checks according to the Schengen Borders Code. The Commission has even adopted a Recommendation allowing borders controls for a period up to two years. Furthermore, a reform proposal has been adopted by the Commission, allowing Member States to



reintroduce internal borders checks more easily. The same sequence of events that took place when around sixty thousand migrants landed to Italy during the Arab Spring in 2011.

Contents: How Asylum System works concerning Similar Procedures, Standards and Rules on Quality Implementation; Relocation decisions; to Stem the Flows of Migrants People.

Learning Objectives:

- To understand the links between the Dublin and the Schengen System
- To learn the key rules of the Schengen Borders Code
- To assess the measures adopted by Member States since 2014
- To analyse the reform proposal submitted by the European Commission

Class no. 3, Migrants' rights in the jurisprudence of the European Court of Justice

Method: 1 video

Lecturer: prof. Sara De Vido

Email: sara.devido@unive.it

Class Description:

The purpose of this class is to reflect on two recent judgments of the European Court of Justice, namely *X. and X. v. Belgium*, and *Al Chodor*, both decided in March 2017, which show a clear difference in the position of the Court concerning the application of human rights to migrants outside and inside the borders of the EU. The first case concerned Syrian migrants who had applied for humanitarian visas at the Belgian embassy in Lebanon. The Court argued that, since the applications for visas on humanitarian grounds were made with a view to applying for asylum in Belgium and thereafter being granted a residence permit with a period of validity exceeding 90 days, the applications fell entirely within the scope of national law, and that the provisions of the Charter do not apply to it. The Court departed from the opinion of Advocate General Mengozzi, who invoked the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights and the non-refoulement principle to support his argument that the values of the European Union should be protected both within the territory of the EU member states as well as in their relations with third states.

Al Chodor refers to the conditions of detention of asylum seekers pending a transfer to another Member State. The Court was asked whether Article 2 (n) and Article 28 (2) of the Dublin III Regulation must be interpreted as requiring Member States to establish, in a national law, objective criteria underlying the reasons for believing that an applicant for international protection who is subject to a transfer procedure may abscond. In this case, the Court ruled that the objective criteria to define a 'risk of absconding' must be established in a binding provision of general application. In the absence of that, Article 28(2) is inapplicable and detention on this ground must be declared unlawful. The Court affirmed the primacy of Human Rights law in EU asylum law implementation.

Contents: Analysis of two Recent Judgments by the European Court of Justice. International obligations in the field of Migration Law. EU law and State Sovereignty.

Learning objectives:



1. To understand the role of the European Court of Justice in the application of European migration law.
2. To link international migration law to human rights law
3. To reflect on the application of the rights enshrined in the Charter of fundamental rights of the EU
4. To critically analyse the position of the Court in two different situations, one concerning migrants inside, the other concerning migrants outside the EU.

Prerequisites: Basic knowledge of law

References for the Unit:

Brouwer, Eveliene. 2017. AG Mengozzi's conclusion in X and X v. Belgium on the positive obligation to issue humanitarian visas. A legitimate plea to ensure safe journeys for refugees https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/PI2017-09_EB_VisaCode.pdf

Carrera, Guild. 2015. Can the new refugee relocation system work? Perils in the Dublin logic and flawed reception conditions in the EU, CEPS Policy Brief, No. 332. <https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/PB334%20RefugeeRelocationProgramme.pdf>

De Vylder, Helena. 2017. X and X v. Belgium: a missed opportunity for the CJEU to rule on the state's obligations to issue humanitarian visa for those in need of protection. <https://strasbourgobservers.com/2017/04/14/x-and-x-v-belgium-a-missed-opportunity-for-the-cjeu-to-rule-on-the-states-obligations-to-issue-humanitarian-visa-for-those-in-need-of-protection/>

Di Filippo, Marcello. 2016 From Dublin to Athens: A Plea for a Radical Rethinking of the Allocation of Jurisdiction in Asylum Procedures, International Institute of Humanitarian Law, Policy Brief. <http://statewatch.org/news/2016/feb/eu-from-dublin-to-athens-reforming-dublin-reg-1-16.pdf>

De Bruycker, Philippe, and Tsourdi, Evangelia. 2016. 'In search of fairness in responsibility sharing', in Forced Migration Review, No. 51. <http://www.fmreview.org/destination-europe/debruycker-tsourdi.html>

Di Filippo, Marcello. 2016. The Reform of the Dublin System and the First (Half) Move of the Commission Università di Pisa <http://www.sidiblog.org/2016/05/12/the-reform-of-the-dublin-system-and-the-first-half-move-of-the-commission/>

European Commission. 2015. Evaluation of the Dublin III Regulation. Final report. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/asylum/examination-of-applicants/docs/evaluation_of_the_dublin_iii_regulation_en.pdf

European Court of Justice, Judgment In Case C-528/16, 15 March 2017

European Court of Justice, Judgment In Case C-638/16 PPU, 7 March 2017



European Parliament. 2016. Reform of the Dublin System.
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2016/586639/EPRS_BRI%282016%29586639_EN.pdf.

Guild, Elspeth, et al. 2015. Enhancing the Common European Asylum System and Alternatives to Dublin, Study PE 519.234 for the LIBE Committee of the European Parliament.
https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/CEPS_LSE_83_0.pdf

Poli, Tommaso. Immigration detention and the rule of law: the ECJ's first ruling on detaining asylum-seekers in the Dublin system, 5.5.2017.
<http://eulawanalysis.blogspot.it/2017/05/immigration-detention-and-rule-of-law.html>

Additional references for the Unit:

De Schutter, Olivier. 2006. The Promotion of Fundamental Rights by the Union as a Contribution to the European Legal Space (I): Mutual Recognition and Mutual Trust in the Establishment of the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice, Working paper series, REFGOV-FR-32, 2006.

ECRE, DUTCH COUNCIL for REFUGEES. 2014. The Application of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights to asylum procedural law, 2014.

European Commission. 2015. Evaluation of the Dublin III Regulation, DG Migration and Home Affairs, Final report, 4 Dec 2015. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/asylum/examination-of-applicants/docs/evaluation_of_the_dublin_iii_regulation_en.pdf

Favilli, Chiara. 2015. Reciproca fiducia, mutuo riconoscimento e libertà di circolazione dei rifugiati e richiedenti protezione internazionale nell'Unione Europea, *Rivista di diritto internazionale*, 2015, 3, p. 701-747;

Favilli, Chiara. 2013. *Migration law in Italy*, Kluwer Law International BV, The Netherlands;

Feraci, Ornella. 2013. Il Nuovo regolamento "Dublino III" e la tutela dei diritti fondamentali dei richiedenti asilo, Osservatorio sulle fonti, 2013;

Gaja, La compétence des Etats dans l'examen des demandes d'asile, in *Essais en l'honneur de Joe Verhoeven*, Bruxelles, 2014;

Ippolito, Velluti. 2014. The Recast Process of the EU Asylum System: A Balancing Act Between Efficiency and Fairness, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*.

Lenart, Joanna. 2012. «Fortress Europe»: Compliance of the Dublin II Regulation with the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, *Utrecht Journal of International and European Law*.



Mallia, Patricia. 2011. Case of M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece: A Catalyst in the Re-thinking of the Dublin II Regulation, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 2011.

Moestl, Markus. 2010. Preconditions and Limits of Mutual Recognition, *Common Market Law Review*, 2010.

Peers, Steeve. 2015. Relocation of Asylum-Seekers in the EU: Law and Policy, in *EU Law Analysis*, 24.9.2015.

Assessment: Multi-choice test (threshold 70 percent)

4. Unit 3 – Integration & Inclusion Issues

Class no. 1, Integration and Inclusion Issues

Method: 1 video

Lecturer: MarilenaSinigaglia

Mail: marilena.sinigaglia@unive.it

Class Description:

This class focuses on the key issues of integration and social inclusion with regard to the UNHCR Note on the Integration of Refugees in the European Union but also to the recent social sciences and social work's achievements. In particular, different models and approaches of social workers dealing with immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers, will be proposed

On the basis of a Human Rights-based approach the class will analyze in depth the relevance of social justices issues as well as the increasing needs of advocacy. Social workers act with immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers to build up their awareness of both international and local laws; at the same time, they pursue integration and inclusion matter with institutions, civil society, charities and volunteers. The issue of enjoyment of human and citizenship rights is strictly connected to the effective possibilities to access to social and health systems, the knowledge of the host country's language and the migrant's awareness of his/her own rights and obligations in order to engage in any society. Social work efforts are finalised to promote independent living of refugees and their courage to shoulder responsibilities. From this point of view an ecological framework is necessary to keep together macro, meso and micro migration issues. The class introduces to the meaning and the tools of community care and care by the community developing multidimensional solidarity, conflict mediation and cross-cultural work. A good networking is necessary to communicate from institutional, volunteers, NGO and migrants point of views in order to achieve good level of integration and inclusion. With reference to the crisis management response, also, the first phase of hosting is meant as a crucial moment of refugee and asylum seeker's project of life.

Contents: Integration and Inclusion Definitions, Refugees and Asylum Seekers Framework, Human Rights Approach, Anti-oppressive Approach, Emergency Crisis Interventions, Community Work's Multidimensional level.

Learning Objectives:



1. To understand the most important elements in refugee and migrant people's social integration;
2. To learn how to analyze social work models and approaches to deal with immigration;
3. To develop competences understanding migrant projects to achieve autonomy and to fight against handouts.

Prerequisites: None

Class no. 2, Best practices of integration

Method: 1 video

Lecturer: Bonesso Gianfranco

Mail: gianfranco.bonesso@comune.venezia.it;

Class Description:

This class concerns best practices based on professional and NGO experiences on dealing with migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. Each best practice is analyzed taking into account social, economic and institutional context features, organisational routines, history and migratory route, personal characteristics of refugee people to carry out a multidimensional assessment of needs.

Another issue, concerning person as a whole, is to find key aspects of interventions like flexibility, listening to her specific need coping to personal crisis and social emergency, how person could be resilient after migration trauma.

Best practices are referred to Conceptual Framework Defining Core Domains of Integration and Cohesion. The class particularly stresses employment, settlement, education and health issues.

The Class aims to propose best practices concerning different ways of hosting by the local community but also related to micro-projects finalized to entry into employment, combating illiteracy through new technologies, cross-cultural education and changes, etc .

Contents: Knowledge and Actions, Best practices with Asylum Seekers and Refugees: examples of Cultural integrations and Italian classes for vulnerable groups- experimentation

Learning Objectives:

1. To make a multi dimensional assessment of refugee social, relational and personal needs;
2. To understand correlation between best practices and social context features;
3. To develop competences to learn from experiences.

Class no. 3, Case Studies: a practical approach to integration

Method: 1 video

Lecturers: Bonesso Gianfranco, Marilena Sinigaglia

Mail: gianfranco.bonesso@comune.venezia.it; marilena.sinigaglia@unive.it;



Class Description:

This class concerns case studies illustrating the civic and social work that is necessary to support migrant social integration projects. The students will listen to life stories of migrants. The class, also, aims to simulate critical situations to support the student learning strategies to face different emergency situations, to develop networking competences to deal with several actors, to understand refugees profound distress.

The class aims to demonstrate the effective implementation of social integration models and best practices illustrated in class 1st and 2nd.

Contents: to check enjoyment of Human Rights and Needs related; to understand Migratory Route; Resources; Collaboration between Public, Private and Volunteers Network.

Learning Objectives:

1. To enable students to use both practical skills and theoretical knowledge
2. To understand migration complexity
3. To learn the importance of hearing migrant's point of view and his/her personal suffering, needs, resources.

Unit References:

Ager A. Strang A. (2008), Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework, Journal of Refugee Studies, vol 21, n. 2, Oxford University Press;

Cheong et al. (2007), Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: a critical review., February 1, 2007 in Critical Social Policy, vol 27, issue: 1 pp. 24-49;

Dominelli L. (2004), Social Work. Theory and practice for changing profession, Cambridge: Polity Press;

Lorenz W. (2006), Perspectives on European Social Work. From the Birth of the Nation State to the impact of Globalization, Berlin: Werlaf Barbara Budrich;

Lorenz W.(2016), Rediscovering the social question. European Journal of Social Work, 19;

Lyon K. May-Chalal C.(2017), Global social work, European Journal of Social Work, London Routledge

Nash M., Wong J. Trlin A.,(2008), Civic and social integration. A new field of social work practice with immigrants refugees and asylum seekers, International Social Work,

Powell F., (2001) The Politics of Social Work. London: Sage Publications;

UNHCR (2006) – Note on the Integration of Refugees in the European Union.

Additional References:

Coulshed V.(1991), Social Work Practice, London: Macmillan

Dal PraPonticelli M. (2010), Nuove prospettive per il servizio sociale, Roma:Carocci

Dolan P., Brady B., (2012), A guide to Youth Mentoring, London: J. Kingsley Publishers

Payne M. (1995), Social work and Community Care, London: McMillian;

Vernon S. (1993), Social Work and the law, Dublin: Butterworths

Assessment: Multi-choice test (threshold 70 percent)



4th MODULE – Study Guide

Energy Challenges & Developments in the Eastern Mediterranean

Coordinator: Dr. Pavlos I. Koktsidis (UCY)

Introduction to the module

1 video / 15 mins – Dr. Pavlos I. Koktsidis

Energy has become a major ‘strategic commodity’ in the formulation of country strategies in the Eastern Mediterranean. Given the ongoing concerns about energy security, countries are grappling to situate their energy policies in the broader context of their national strategies while the European Union is seeking to ensure its energy supplies. The module examines the intersection between international security, political, legal, and energy issues, exploring not only how countries shape their strategies to meet their energy needs, but also how such actions have implications for the EU and the regional and international systems. The module equips students with the knowledge and skills to develop a well-rounded understanding of the interaction between energy, security, law and politics, the interdependence and geo-strategic importance of international, regional and domestic developments, and their impact on Eastmed states and the EU.

Project Objectives

As integral part of the course’s educational curriculum and according to the designated aims set by the programme, this module gives emphasis to the energy security aspects in the Eastern Mediterranean and relates them to the European Union’s energy supply strategy. The module focuses on the intertwined interests between the EU and the Eastern Mediterranean on energy supply and presents actions and initiatives aiming at cooperation and stability as pointed in the projects description. The module contributes to the EU foreign policy and energy policy agenda, as it recommends understanding the region as both an important security subsystem and an energy supply alternative, offering a new analytical tool in the frame of European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP).

Learning Outcomes

After completion of this module, students will obtain a clear understanding of the fundamental concepts related to the politics of energy security in the Eastern Mediterranean. Students are expected to gain a greater understanding of the political dynamics related to the energy discoveries in the region and be able to identify the emerging security concerns linked to the exploration and exploitation of energy reserves in the Eastern Mediterranean. Furthermore, students will familiarize themselves with the EU’s energy security strategy and the policy initiatives promoted by the EU in the region and relate these to the wider implications and risks for Europe’s energy supply in this complex environment. Finally, students will get acquainted with the major legal parameters of maritime delimitation and will be able to identify and critically assess the diplomatic and security strategies of regional actors.



Unit 1: Energy Discoveries & Energy Networks in the Eastern Mediterranean

Method: 1 video / 20 mins

Lecturers: Dr. Pavlos I Koktsidis

Email: pavlosk@ucy.ac.cy

Unit Description

What is the “geopolitics of energy”? How has the idea of energy security evolved? The unit introduces students to the recent energy discoveries in the Eastern Mediterranean (Cyprus, Israel, Egypt), examines the ‘resource realities’ in the region and discusses the prospects of alternative energy routes reaching Europe. The discovery of significant oil and gas deposits in the exclusive economic zones of Israel, Egypt and Cyprus and the alleged deposits in Greece and other states could potentially provide an additional energy source outside the former Soviet space and the Middle East proper and therefore contribute to the diversification of Europe’s energy suppliers.

Topics: The concept of energy security; the nexus between politics and energy in the EastMed region; Energy Discoveries in Eastern Mediterranean

Learning Objectives

- Gain a greater understanding of energy discoveries and developments in the region
- Identify and analyze how countries have altered their foreign policies and military strategies in light of emerging security concerns
- Anticipate new energy supply patterns and structural shifts in the international and European environment

Prerequisites

None

Unit References (APA citation style)

Patrício, Carla, Teresa Fernandes & Rodrigues Ferreira (2017). Geopolitics of Energy and Energy Security. Instituto da Defesa Nacional, Lisboa.

Av.at: https://www.idn.gov.pt/publicacoes/cadernos/idncadernos_24.pdf

Karakasis, Vasileios P. (2015) Energy Security and the Cyprus Question: “Securitization” of Energy in the Eastern Mediterranean. *Politikon: IAPSS Political Science Journal*, 27, pp.5-35

Av.at: <http://www.sen-foundation.org/wp-content/uploads/Energy-Security-and-the-Cyprus-Question-%E2%80%9C9Csecuritization%E2%80%9D-of-Energy-in-the-Eastern-Mediterranean.pdf>



Stergiou, Andreas. (2017): Energy security in the Eastern Mediterranean. *International Journal of Global Energy Issues*40, no. 5 320-334.

Additional References (APA citation style)

Fawcett, Louise (2017). MENA and the EU: contrasting approaches to region, power and order in a shared neighbourhood. *Contemporary Politics*, 24 (1), pp.: 65-80

Tagliapietra, Simone. (2017). Energy: a shaping factor for regional stability in the Eastern

Mediterranean (2017). Directorate General for External Policies.

Av.at:[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/578044/EXPO_STU\(2017\)578044_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/578044/EXPO_STU(2017)578044_EN.pdf)

Tagliapietra Simone. Towards a New Eastern Mediterranean Energy Corridor: Natural Gas Developments: Between Market Opportunities and Geopolitical Risks. FEEM December 2013. <http://www.feem.it/userfiles/attach/2013215105594NDL2013-012.pdf>

Assessment: Multi-choice test



Unit 2: EU Aspects & Implications

Method : video / 20 mins

Lecturers: Dr. Pavlos Koktsidis

Email: pavlosk@ucy.ac.cy

Unit Description

How important are the eastern Mediterranean gas and oil discoveries for European energy security? Large natural gas discoveries in the eastern Mediterranean have raised hopes that the region could serve EU energy needs, helping it to fulfil its goals of energy diversification, security, and resilience. This unit focuses on the energy concerns, aspirations and strategic involvement of the EU in the eastern Mediterranean. The unit explains how energy resources in the Eastmed create prospects, and specifies the kind of initiatives Europe has taken in order to forward its strategic goals in the region. It also examines what tensions and threats EU's aspirations and strategic involvement poses to different actors in the region and beyond.

Topics: Energy-reliance and supply risks; EU Energy Security Strategy; Strategic Projects of Common Interest

Learning Objectives

- a) Identify the risks for Europe's energy supply in a complex environment
- b) Understand the EU's energy security strategy
- c) the policy initiatives promoted by the EU in the region and their wider implications

Prerequisites

None

Unit References

Vimont, Pierre (2016). The strategic interests of the European Union. *Carnegie Europe*.

Av.at: http://carnegieendowment.org/files/P_Vimont_State_of_the_Union_2016.pdf

European Commission (2014). In-depth study of European Energy Security, COM(2014)0330, pp.:1-233

Av.at:https://ec.europa.eu/energy/sites/ener/files/documents/20140528_energy_security_study_0.pdf

Additional References

Seeberg, Peter and Musa Shteivi (2017). Introduction: New Challenges for the European Union in the Arab Mediterranean and the Revision of the European Neighbourhood Policy. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 22 (1), pp. 1–17

Ruble, Isabella (2017). European Union energy supply security: The benefits of natural gas imports from the Eastern Mediterranean. *Energy Policy*, 105, pp. 341–353

De Micco, Pasquale (2014). The prospect of Eastern Mediterranean gas production: An alternative energy supplier for the EU? Directorate-General for External Policies, pp.: 1-24

Av. at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/briefing_note/join/2014/522339/EXPO-AFET_SP%282014%29522339_EN.pdf

Assessment: Multi-choice test

4. Unit 3: Legal & Political Aspects of Sea Delimitation in the Eastern Mediterranean

Method : *video / 25 mins*

Lecturers: Prof. Costas M. Constantinou

Email: constantinou.m.costas@ucy.ac.cy

Unit Description

This unit examines the legal and security aspects and implications concerning the exploitation of energy resources in the Eastern Mediterranean. The unit introduces students to the basic legal concepts and practices regarding the delimitation of territorial sea, exclusive economic zone or continental shelf. It also explains the security measures and reactions stimulated by regional antagonisms concerning ownership, protection and exploitation of resources. Concepts are discussed through the lens of strategic competition, the 'politicization of resources', and the management of conflict.

Topics: Legal Dimension: The delimitation of territorial sea; exclusive economic zone and continental shelf in the Eastmed; Competition and the politicization of resources; Managing Conflict over Energy Resources in the eastmed.

Learning Objectives

- a) Understand the major legal parameters of maritime delimitation
- b) Identify and critically assess the diplomatic and security strategies of regional actors
- c) Encourage the adoption of creative thinking in conflict resolution and cooperation

Prerequisites

None



Unit References

Dokos, Thanos (ed.) (2016). The Eastern Mediterranean in 2020: Possible Scenarios and Policy Recommendations, Policy Paper, Eliamep and the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, 1-36

Av.at: <http://www.eliamep.gr/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/%CE%9D%CE%BF-26-The-Eastern-Mediterranean-in-20201.pdf>

Giannakopoulos, Angelos (ed.) (2016). Energy Cooperation and Security in the Eastern

Mediterranean: A Seismic Shift towards Peace or Conflict? Research Paper 8, The S. Daniel Abraham Center for International and Regional Studies, Tel Aviv University, pp.: 1-132

Av.at: <https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/Energy%20Cooperation%20and%20Security%20in%20the%20Eastern%20Mediterranean%20small%20file.pdf>

Pryke, Sam (2017). Explaining Resource Nationalism. *Global Policy*, 8 (4), pp.474-482

Av.at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1758-5899.12503/epdf>

Karagiannis, Emmanuel (2016). Shifting Eastern Mediterranean Alliances. *Middle East Quarterly*

Av.at: <http://www.meforum.org/5877/shifting-eastern-mediterranean-alliances>

Christou, Odysseas, and Constantinos Adamides. Energy securitization and desecuritization in the New Middle East. *Security Dialogue* 44, (5)6 507-522.

Steinberg, Philip E. (2001). *The social construction of the ocean*. Cambridge University Press,

Constantinou, Costas M. (2011). Escapades at Sea: Sovereignty, Legality and Machismo in the Eastern

Mediterranean. *OpenDemocracy*, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/opensecurity/costas-m-constantinou/escapades-at-sea-sovereignty-legality-and-machismo-in-eastern-med>

Assessment: Multi-choice test